

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



## **SUMMARY RECORD**

**Twenty-fourth meeting of the Animals Committee**



**Geneva, (Switzerland), 20-24 April 2009**

# Contents

Agenda item	Page No.
1. Opening of the meeting.....	4
2. Rules of Procedure.....	4
3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme.....	4
3.1 Agenda.....	4
3.2 Working programme.....	4
4. Admission of observers.....	4
5. Regional reports.....	4
5.1 Africa.....	4
5.2 Asia.....	5
5.3 Central and South America and the Caribbean.....	5
5.4 Europe.....	5
5.5 North America.....	5
5.6 Oceania.....	5
6. Cooperation with other multilateral instruments.....	5
7. Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species.....	5
7.1 Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade.....	5
7.2 Overview of the species-based Review of Significant Trade.....	6
7.3 Species selected following CoP13.....	6
7.4 Selection of species following CoP14.....	6
7.5 Scientific information from the range States of <i>Huso huso</i> .....	6
7.6 Activities with regard to the population of <i>Tursiops aduncus</i> of the Solomon Islands.....	6
7.7 Development of the Significant Trade online Management System.....	15
8. Ranching.....	15
8.1 Review of the use of source code 'R'.....	15
8.2 Revision of Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14).....	15
9. International expert workshop on non-detriment findings.....	17
9.1 Working group reports.....	17
10. Periodic review of animal species included in the CITES Appendices.....	22
10.1 Periodic review of species selected before CoP13.....	22
10.2 Periodic review of species selected between CoP13 and CoP15.....	22

10.3	Periodic review of Felidae – <i>Lynx</i> spp. and look-alike issues (outcome of the workshop) ...	24
11.	Implementation and effectiveness of the universal tagging system in the trade in small crocodylian leather goods .....	24
12.	Sturgeons and paddlefish .....	24
12.1	Secretariat's report.....	25
12.2	Assessment and monitoring methodologies used for shared stocks of Acipenseriformes species.....	25
13.	Nomenclatural matters .....	26
13.1	Revision and publication of CITES Appendices .....	26
13.2	Harmonization of nomenclature and taxonomy with other multilateral environmental agreements .....	26
14.	Conservation and management of sharks and stingrays.....	32
14.1	Activities concerning shark species of concern (Decision 14.107) .....	32
14.2	Regional workshop on South American freshwater stingrays .....	32
14.3	Linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat, and illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing .....	32
14.4	Other Animals Committee's tasks related to conservation and management of sharks.....	33
15.	Transport of live animals .....	37
15.1	Activities of the Transport Working Group and information on cases of high mortality of specimens.....	37
15.2	National Legislation Project – Analysis of the Parties' legislative provisions and draft legislative guidance.....	37
15.3	Distribution of the current IATA <i>Live Animal Regulations</i> .....	38
16.	Sustainable use and management of sea cucumber fisheries .....	38
17.	Progress report on the Identification Manual.....	39
18.	Proposals to amend the Appendices for possible consideration at CoP15 .....	39
18.1	Possible deletion of <i>Anas oustaleti</i> from Appendix I .....	39
18.2	Proposal to reconcile the CITES appendices for <i>Puma concolor</i> with the standard nomenclature reference for mammals agreed to in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14).....	39
19.	Preparation of the Chairman's report for CoP15.....	39
20.	Time and venue of the 25th meeting of the Animals Committee.....	40
21.	Any other business .....	40
22.	Closing remarks.....	40

## SUMMARY RECORD

### 1. Opening of the meeting

The CITES Secretariat welcomed participants on behalf of the Secretary-General. The Chair also welcomed participants and made some preliminary comments.

### 2. Rules of Procedure

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 2

An amendment was suggested to Rule 22 to harmonize it with that adopted by the Plants Committee. In the third line after "10 days after", replace the words "they have been technically agreed upon by both sides" with "the deadline for the submission of documents"

An amendment to the Spanish version of Rule 23 was suggested to change the sense of the wording ("y no podrán discutirse") to conform with the English version.

With these amendments, the Committee adopted the Rules of Procedure in the Annex to document AC24 Doc. 2.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Europe (Mr Ibero Solana) and North America (Mr Medellín), and the Chair.

### 3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme

#### 3.1 Agenda

The Chair introduced document AC24 Doc. 3.1

A proposal was made to consider including *Balearica* spp. in the **Review of Significant Trade** as an urgent case under agenda item 7.4. With this amendment, the agenda in document AC24 Doc. 3.1 was agreed.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representative of Africa (Mr Bagine), the Chair and the Secretariat.

#### 3.2 Working programme

The Chair introduced document AC24 Doc. 3.2

The Secretariat clarified that agenda item 9.1 would be discussed together with item 9 and that item 18.2 would be discussed together with item 18. With these amendments, the working programme in document AC24 Doc. 3.2 was agreed.

No other interventions were made.

### 4. Admission of observers

The Chair introduced document AC24 Doc. 4, which the Committee noted. The list of observers was accepted.

No interventions were made.

### 5. Regional reports

The representative of Africa (Mr Zahzah) introduced document AC24 Doc. 5.1. Replying to a question on the results of a workshop on marine species, Mr Zahzah noted that a report was now available and would be circulated.

The representative of Asia (Ms Prijono) introduced document AC24 Doc. 5.2. China requested an amendment to the wording on the fifth line of paragraph 11. The words "China and Taiwan" should be replaced by "China (including the Taiwan Province)". India intervened to mention they had launched a conservation scheme for the snow leopard, which also covered 14 other species.

The representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Calvar Agrelo) introduced document AC24 Doc. 5.3, adding that a lengthy report had been received subsequently from Peru. Nicaragua referred to a report on a workshop on non-detriment findings, and on additional work that had been carried out on trade in *Strombus gigas*, and on regional trade in *Iguana* spp. Brazil noted that it had set up three new Management Authorities in 2007, and that it had developed various breeding projects in 2008, including an ornamental fish breeding system. Responding to a question about the reduction of exports following the prohibition on bird imports for disease control reasons in the European Union, Mr Calvar Agrelo explained that it had had a negative impact on the sustainable use project for *Amazona aestiva*, and that this prohibition was unwarranted because South America was free from avian flu.

The representative of Europe (Mr Ibero Solana) introduced document AC24 Doc. 5.4. He thanked the alternative representative, Mr Ó Críodáin, for his help in preparing this report, and the 17 Parties that had responded with information.

The representative of North America (Mr Medellín) introduced document AC24 Doc. 5.5.

The representative of Oceania (Mr Hay) introduced document AC24 Doc. 5.6 and noted that, in paragraph 4, Tonga should be added to the list of non-Parties in the region, which totals nine countries, and not 10 as stated. Mr Hay also updated the Committee on the regional meeting in Australia.

The Committee noted the reports presented by the regional representatives.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by Brazil, China, India, Nicaragua, Peru, IWMC World Conservation Trust, the Chair and the AC nomenclature specialist (Ms Grimm).

## 6. Cooperation with other multilateral instruments

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 6 and drew attention to some errors. In paragraph 1, the word "Animals" should be replaced by "Plants". In paragraphs 6 and 8 "PC17 Doc. 7" should be replaced by "AC17 Doc. 7". Document AC24 Inf. 8, which was a preliminary gap analysis for the purpose of facilitating the discussions on how to strengthen the science-policy interface, was referred to, and it was noted that the mention of CITES required amendment. The Committee agreed that members should submit comments on the consultation letter from UNEP to the Chair by 5 May.

The Committee noted the potential extra workload that could be created by the Chair's involvement in IPBES and other instruments and, finally, noted the document.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by Mexico (in his capacity as Vice-chair of the IPBES meeting in Malaysia), the Chair and the Secretariat.

## 7. Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species

### 7.1 Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade

The Secretariat introduced documents AC24 Doc. 7.1 and AC24 Doc. 7.1 Addendum.

It was suggested that the evaluation should include a list of Parties subject to recommendations under the Review of Significant Trade and that the species selected should be those previously reviewed more than once.

## 7.2 Overview of the species-based Review of Significant Trade

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 7.2

The Committee noted that *Cuora amboinensis* and *Cuora galbinifrons* would be passed to the Standing Committee for action because no responses had been received from the Lao People's Democratic Republic or Viet Nam, and that *Lissemys punctata* should be removed from the Review of Significant Trade because Bangladesh had clarified that export of the species had been banned.

The Committee noted that the Secretariat would address the fact that, in a number of cases, zero export quotas instructed by the Standing Committee were not included in the CITES website. The Committee also noted that the Secretariat would investigate reports of trade in captive-bred specimens of *Psittacus erithacus* from the Central African Republic.

The Committee also noted that the Secretariat would investigate reports of trade in captive-bred specimens of *Psittacus erithacus* from the Central African Republic. A request was made to investigate the correct source code for *Tridacna* species reported in trade because the existing agreed codes did not correspond to the specimens in trade.

The United Republic of Tanzania referred to an error in paragraph 2 of Notification to the Parties 2009/03, where "31 December 2009" should read "31 December 2008".

## 7.3 Species selected following CoP13

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 7.3.

## 7.4 Selection of species following CoP14

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 7.4. The Committee agreed to retain in the review all cases in the Annex to document AC24 Doc. 7.4 (Rev. 1) where the relevant Party had not responded to communications. This also applied to *Orlitia borneensis* where no responses had been received from the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam. It was also suggested that, for species that were being considered for inclusion in the Review of Significant Trade, that lack of response to a request for information would provide a useful indication as to whether to include the species or not.

## 7.5 Scientific information from the range States of *Huso huso*

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 7.5.

Discussion centred on whether the species should be included in the Review of Significant Trade, with some in favour while others felt that the decision should be delayed until further relevant information became available.

## 7.6 Activities with regard to the population of *Tursiops aduncus* of the Solomon Islands

The representative of Oceania (Mr Hay) introduced document AC24 Doc. 7.6, and a discussion ensued on whether the actual trade reported, as opposed to established quotas, fulfilled the requirements for inclusion in the Review of Significant Trade. One response suggested that the impact on populations was more important than the numbers involved.

To discuss agenda items 7.1 to 7.6, the Committee established a working group (Working Group 1) with the following membership:

Chair: AC Chair

Parties: Austria, Brazil, Canada, China, the Czech Republic, Germany, Japan, Mexico, Mongolia, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America; and

IGOs and NGOs: European Community, IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, Alliance of Marine Parks and Aquariums, Animal Welfare Institute, Conservation International, Defenders of Wildlife, Humane Society International, Institute for Ocean Conservation Science, International Caviar Importers Association, International Environmental Resources, IWMC World Conservation Trust, Pet Care Trust, Pro Wildlife, Safari Club International Foundation, Species Management Specialists, Swan International, TRAFFIC, Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, and WWF.

Later in the meeting, it was agreed that Brazil would be transferred from the Significant Trade Working Group to the Ranching Working Group.

The mandate of WG1 was agreed as follows:

**Regarding agenda item. 7.1: *Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade***

- a) Agree on the Parties and experts listed in paragraph 5 of document AC24 Doc. 7.1 to be invited to form the advisory working group; and
- b) Identify and prioritize the case studies referred to in paragraph 7 b) of the terms of reference and endorse the *modus operandi* for conducting the evaluation set out in Annex 2 to document Doc. 7.1.

**Regarding agenda item. 7.2: *Overview of the species-based Review of Significant Trade***

- a) Review the information provided in the Annex to document AC24 Doc. 7.2;
- b) Re-evaluate recommendations concerning the Malagasy chameleons and day geckos; and
- c) Determine whether the provisions of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3 of the Convention are being complied with.

**Regarding agenda item. 7.3: *Species selected following CoP13***

- a) Revise the preliminary categorization of species from genus *Mantella* proposed by IUCN and, in doing so, either eliminate the species from the review, or formulate recommendations to address problems related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, differentiating between short-term and long-term actions and setting deadlines; and
- b) Identify any problems in the course of the review that are not related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, that should be addressed by the Secretariat.

**Regarding agenda item. 7.4: *Selection of species following CoP14***

- a) Consider replies received from affected Parties and eliminate species where it appears that Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, are being correctly implemented; and
- b) Decide whether or not to include *Balearica* spp. in the Review of Significant Trade.

**Regarding agenda item 7.5: *Scientific information from the range States of Huso huso***

- a) Review the information from the range States; and
- b) Decide whether or not to include the species *Huso huso* in the Review of Significant Trade in accordance with paragraph c) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13).

**Regarding agenda item 7.6: *Activities with regard to the population of Tursiops aduncus of the Solomon Islands***

- Decide whether or not to include the species *Tursiops aduncus* in the Review of Significant Trade in accordance with paragraph c) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13).

Later in the meeting, the Chair of Working Group 1 introduced document AC24 WG1 Doc. 1.

**Regarding agenda item. 7.1: *Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade***

The Committee adopted the recommendations of WG1 as follows:

a) Membership in the Advisory Group

The Chairman informed the WG that the AC representative would be Thomas Althaus until CoP15 when a new representative would have to be appointed.

Under AC24 Doc.7.1 Paragraph 5 d, in addition to the four invited experts mentioned, the WG **recommended** that the Canadian Scientific Authority Working Group should also be listed.

It further **recommended** that if a country is unable to participate, a regional representative should nominate another country to maintain the appropriate balance.

b) Case Studies

The Working Group **agreed to** the following case studies, listed in order of priority:

1. *Psittacus erithacus*
2. *Strombus gigas*
3. *Cuora amboiensis*
4. *Hippopotamus amphibius*
5. Madagascar, country study

c) Modus operandi

The Working Group supported the modus operandi proposed by the Secretariat and **recommended** that it be treated as general guidelines and not restrain the Advisory Group from making further amendments.

The Working Group agreed with PC 18 that the Secretariat should utilize the expertise of the Advisory Group and the Technical Committees in identifying consultants with appropriate expertise to carry out the Review.

**Regarding agenda item. 7.2: *Overview of the species-based Review of Significant Trade***

Malagasy chameleons and day geckos

Concern was expressed that making the requirements of paragraphs a)-f) obligatory would introduce unnecessary stricter measures, that the footnote added an extra level of complication, and that no recent population data were available for any of the species involved.

The Committee agreed to the following amendments to the recommendations:

- Second and third paragraphs: amendment of "UNEP-WCMC" to "the consultant" and swapping of the two paragraphs; and
- Fourth paragraph: deletion of the word "following" and insertion of "a)-c)" after "recommendations".

With these amendments, the adopted recommendations read as follows:

Where a species is categorized by the consultant in more than one category, the lower category is relevant.

Concerning species categorized by the consultant as C1 and C2 in the Annex to document AC24 Doc. 7.2, the trade suspension should remain.

Concerning species categorized as C3 and C4 in the Annex to document AC24 Doc. 7.2, the trade suspension may be lifted provided the recommendations a)-c) are met.

- a) Establish conservative annual export quota for wild specimens intended for trade, based on estimates of sustainable off-take and scientific information.
- b) The Management Authority should forward the quota details to the Secretariat (including zero quotas) and provide information and data used by the Scientific Authority to determine that the quantities would not be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild.
- c) The Secretariat, after consultation with the Animals Committee, will publish the quota agreed by the AC (including any zero quotas). No export should occur until the agreed quotas have been published on the Secretariat's website<sup>1</sup>.
- d) Ensure that specimens produced from captive-production systems are distinguished in trade from genuine wild-harvested specimens, that separate export quotas are established and notified to the Secretariat.
- e) Conduct a status assessment, including an evaluation of threats to the species; develop and implement an internationally agreed standard population monitoring programme for the species; and advise the Secretariat of the details of the assessment and the programme.
- f) Any changes to the conservative annual export quota for wild-taken specimens should be based on the results of the assessment and monitoring programme.

The Committee encouraged Madagascar to provide further information on species categorized in the study in groups C1 and C2 for consideration at AC25.

#### Tridacnidae from the Solomon Islands

The Committee adopted the recommendation that *Tridacna* spp. be included in the Review of Significant Trade for the Solomon Islands, as an urgent case. It instructed the Secretariat to write to the Solomon Islands and include in its letter *inter alia*:

- a) An explanation of the differing information provided by the Solomon Islands in their letter of 10 June 2004 and the published trade data from UNEP-WCMC.
- b) An update on the status of captive-production facilities.
- c) Information on any recent quantitative surveys that have been conducted on giant clam abundances in the Solomon Islands for all six species.

It also invited the Secretariat to reassure the Solomon Islands authorities that a decision to include a species in the review was not, at the outset, intended as a punitive measure and that, if the Animals Committee was satisfied with the response, the review would conclude.

#### **Regarding agenda item. 7.3: *Species selected following CoP13***

Concern was expressed about the possible resumption of trade in species where a zero quota had been established.

The Committee agreed to the following amendments to the recommendations:

- a) *Mantella milotympanum*: addition of "or resume trade in a species" after "establish a quota" in the penultimate line of footnote 2 in the document, which relates to this species.

---

<sup>1</sup> If the AC agrees by consensus (intersessionally) with the proposal of Madagascar under c), then the quotas would be posted on the CITES website. If the AC needs further information or clarification to reach consensus, those issues would be taken up following further consultation with Madagascar at the next AC meeting.

- b) *Mantella crocea*, *M. expectata* and *M. viridis*: addition of “immediately” to the end of recommendation a), and recommendations b)-d) to be left without a time-frame.
- c) *Mantella aurantiaca*: addition of “through an expedited procedure” to the end of the recommendation.

With these amendments, the adopted recommendations read as follows:

*Mantella milotympanum*

The Committee agreed to eliminate *M. milotympanum* from the Review of Significant Trade because a zero quota had been set<sup>2</sup>.

*Mantella crocea*, *M. expectata* and *M. viridis*

The Committee agreed to retain these three species in the Review of Significant Trade and proposed the following additional recommendations:

- a) a zero quota should be established immediately.
- b) Madagascar should find the resources for a long-term standardized monitoring programme for the three species to be able to monitor the population trends in protected and unprotected areas and the effect of trade, should it be resumed. For reference to such standardized monitoring programme, refer for example to document AC24 Doc. 9.1 – p. 25, *Measuring and Monitoring Biological Diversity – Standard methods for Amphibians*.
- c) on the basis of the information received and the results stemming from these programmes, such as population estimates and NDFs, precautionary quotas may be set in the future.
- d) adaptive management strategies should be implemented.

*Mantella aurantiaca* (which was eliminated from the review at AC23 as of 'Least Concern')

The Committee noted with concern that a quota of 2,500 specimens had been established given the species has been listed as Critically Endangered (CR) by IUCN and **recommended** that these concerns be expressed in a letter from the Secretariat in which MG would be asked to explain in more detail the basis for and method of the calculation of this quota for *M. aurantiaca* (with a deadline of three months). This information should be submitted to the AC for review and possible recommendations including re-instatement into the Review of Significant Trade, through an expedited procedure.

*Mantella baroni*, *M. betsileo* and *M. ebenau*

The Committee took note of the new quotas submitted.

*Mantella bernhardii*

The Committee took note of the quota. However, due to the localized distribution as well as the IUCN status being Endangered, it recommended that these concerns be expressed in a letter from the Secretariat in which Madagascar would be asked to explain in more detail the basis for and method of calculation of this quota for *M. bernhardii* (with a deadline of three months for reply). This

---

<sup>2</sup> Concerning the exclusion of species from the Review of Significant Trade due to the setting of a zero quota:

The WG notes that, in the past, various Parties have been excluded from the Review of Significant Trade if they informed the AC that for export of a given species a zero quota was set or that there was no trade in this species. The recommendation by the AC was then to exclude this Party from the Review of Significant Trade without further recommendations. This may lead to the situation that, if later a quota is set or trade is taken up by a given Party shortly after elimination from the Review of Significant Trade, no obligations have to be met for setting this quota or taking up trade. The WG has therefore in such cases added some recommendations which may serve as a reference in similar cases. In particular, if a Party wants to re-establish a quota or resume trade in a species, it would need to provide population data and the details of the NDF to the satisfaction of the AC. If the AC is not satisfied, the species may be included in the Review of Significant Trade.

information should be submitted to the AC for review and possible recommendation, including reinstatement into the Review of Significant Trade. In addition the Committee recommended to include this species in a long-term standardized monitoring programme such as for *M. crocea*.

#### **Regarding agenda item. 7.4: *Selection of species following CoP14***

Although there was some agreement with the suggestion in the document that there was inadequate information to make a decision on the three *Hippocampus* spp., some more recent trade data were provided, showing that the trade in all three amounted to many thousands in 2006 and 2007, which led to general support for including them in the review.

A plea to consider coral species for potential inclusion in the review was not supported, and it was suggested that specific examples should be brought up at AC25.

The Committee adopted the recommendations with the following amendments and additions.

#### *Hippocampus kelloggi*, *H. spinosissimus* and *H. kuda*

The Committee agreed to include these three species in the Review of Significant Trade.

#### *Saiga tatarica*

The Committee agreed that this matter should be pursued intersessionally when the letter from the Chinese Management Authority referred to in paragraph 10 of document AC24 Doc. 7.4 (Rev. 1) became available.

#### *Orlitia borneensis*

The two countries, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam, are not range States of the species. However, wild-caught specimens are being exported from these States. The Committee recommended that the Secretariat inform the Standing Committee accordingly to take appropriate action.

#### *Pandinus imperator*

The formal inclusion of *P. imperator* in the Review of Significant Trade had been postponed for several years due to the fact that a report on the trade in this species was promised to be published shortly. However, since this report on the trade in this species was still not available at AC24, the Committee decided to include this species in the Review of Significant Trade as an urgent case. It also recommended that all efforts be made so that the report be submitted to the AC as soon as possible.

#### Species selected at AC23

The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania provided information on *Hippopotamus amphibius* in that country: in 2001 the population was over 10,000 and was stable or increasing, and the export quota was less than 3% of the total population.

A request to remove the Indonesian population of *Amyda cartilaginea* from the review was not supported because there were no population estimates available, the numbers exported were high and the export quota had recently been substantially increased.

The Committee agreed to the following amendments to the recommendations of WG1:

*Hippopotamus amphibius*: removal of Zimbabwe from the review.

*Chamaeleo africanus*: retention in the review of Niger only.

Deletion of all references to Footnote 2 for the species in the table.

The Committee adopted the following recommendations as amended:

Range State	Comment
<b><i>Hippopotamus amphibius</i></b>	
Angola	To be removed because it is a non-Party.
Benin	To be retained.
Botswana	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Burkina Faso	To be retained.
Burundi	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Cameroon	To be retained.
Central African Republic	To be retained.
Chad	To be retained.
Congo	To be removed from the review, if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Côte d'Ivoire	To be retained.
Equatorial Guinea	To be retained.
Eritrea	To be retained.
Ethiopia	To be retained.
Gabon	To be retained.
Gambia	To be retained.
Ghana	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Guinea	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Guinea-Bissau	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Kenya	To be retained.
Liberia	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Malawi	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Mali	To be retained.
Mauritania	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Mozambique	To be retained.
Namibia	To be retained.
Niger	To be retained.
Nigeria	To be retained.
Senegal	To be retained.
Sierra Leone	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Somalia	To be retained.
South Africa	To be retained.
Sudan	To be retained.
Swaziland	To be retained.
Togo	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.

<b>Range State</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Uganda	To be retained. Uganda is to be asked about the origin of the stocks of hippopotamus teeth mentioned in their response
United Republic of Tanzania	To be removed from the review.
Zambia	To be removed from the review.
Zimbabwe	To be removed from the review.
<b><i>Heosemys annandalii, H. grandis and H. Spinosa</i></b>	
Brunei Darussalam	To be retained.
Cambodia	To be retained.
Indonesia	To be removed from the review.
Lao People's Democratic Republic	To be retained.
Myanmar	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Philippines	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Thailand	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, the case may be re-evaluated.
Viet Nam	To be retained.
<b><i>Indotestudo forstenii</i></b>	
Indonesia	To be removed from the review; if the quota is significantly increased, the case may be re-evaluated.
<b><i>Testudo horsfieldii</i></b>	
Afghanistan	To be retained.
Armenia	To be removed from the review. Not a Party at the time the letter from the Secretariat was sent (the Convention entered into force in Armenia on 21 January 2009). In addition, Armenia is not a range State.
Azerbaijan	To be removed from the review because it is not a range State.
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	To be retained.
Kazakhstan	To be removed from the review; if trade is taken up, or if there are detected problems with re-exports that originated in Kazakhstan, the case may be re-evaluated.
Kyrgyzstan	To be retained
Pakistan	To be retained.
Russian Federation	To be retained.
Tajikistan	To be retained.
Turkmenistan	To be removed from the review because it is not a Party.
Uzbekistan	To be retained.
<b><i>Amyda cartilaginea</i></b>	
Indonesia	To be retained.
<b><i>Uroplatus spp.</i></b>	
Madagascar	To be retained.
<b><i>Brookesia decaryi</i></b>	
Madagascar	To be retained.
<b><i>Chamaeleo africanus</i></b>	
Burkina Faso	To be removed from the review.
Cameroon	To be removed from the review.
Chad	To be removed from the review.
Djibouti	To be removed from the review.
Egypt	To be removed from the review.

Range State	Comment
Eritrea	To be removed from the review.
Ethiopia	To be removed from the review.
Gabon	To be removed from the review.
Greece	To be removed from the review.
Mali	To be removed from the review.
Niger	To be retained. The WG expressed its concerns on the discrepancy between quotas set and specimens exported.
Nigeria	To be removed from the review.
Somalia	To be removed from the review.
Sudan	To be removed from the review.
<b><i>Chamaeleo feae</i></b>	
Equatorial Guinea	To be retained.
<b><i>Cordylus mossambicus</i></b>	
Mozambique	To be retained.
<b><i>Gongylophis muelleri</i></b>	
Ghana	To be retained.
<b><i>Scaphiophryne gottlebei</i></b>	
Madagascar	To be retained

*Testudo horsfieldii* from Ukraine

The Committee decided to bring this matter to the attention of the Standing Committee.

Trade in two African cranes, *Balearica regulorum* and *B. pavonina*

The Committee decided to include these two species in the Review of Significant Trade as an urgent case.

**Regarding agenda item 7.5: *Scientific information from the range States of Huso huso***

The Committee decided to include *Huso huso* in the Review of Significant Trade.

**Regarding agenda item 7.6: *Activities with regard to the population of Tursiops aduncus of the Solomon Islands***

Suggestions that the population of this species did not qualify for inclusion in the Review of Significant Trade because of the low number of specimens actually exported in recent years, were countered by claims that even this level of trade might affect the population, which numbers only hundreds.

The Committee agreed to the following amendments to the recommendations:

Paragraph b) amended to read "To instruct the Secretariat to inform the Solomon Islands that the AC recommends the Solomon Islands to set a more cautious quota."

Rejection of paragraphs c) and d).

The Committee adopted the recommendations with the following amendments:

- a) The inclusion of the Solomon Islands population of *Tursiops aduncus* in the Review of Significant Trade.
- b) To instruct the Secretariat to inform the Solomon Islands that the AC recommends the Solomon Islands to set a more cautious quota.

- c) The Committee further invited the Secretariat to reassure the Solomon Islands authorities that a decision to include a species in the review was not, at the outset, intended as a punitive measure and that, if the Animals Committee was satisfied with the response, the process would conclude.

During discussion of items 7.1-7.6, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia (Mr Ishii), Europe (Mr Ibero Solana), North America (Mr Medellín) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the alternate representative of Europe (Mr Ó Críodáin), Canada, China, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, Humane Society International, the Humane Society of the United States, the International Caviar Importers Association, IUCN, IWMC World Conservation Trust, the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, WWF, the Chair and the Secretariat.

#### 7.7 Development of the Significant Trade online Management System

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 7.7. The Committee noted the document.

No interventions were made.

### 8. Ranching

#### 8.1 Review of the use of source code 'R'

The Netherlands introduced document AC24 Doc. 8.1, and added that the Plants Committee had agreed that source code R would no longer be used for trade in plants.

#### 8.2 Revision of Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14)

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 8.2.

To discuss agenda items 8.1 and 8.2, the Committee established a working group (Working Group 2) with the following membership:

Co-Chairs: The representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Marcel Calvar Agrelo and Mr Jose Alberto Alvarez Lemus), and the observer of the Netherlands;

AC alternate member: The Alternate representative of Asia (Mr Giam);

Parties: Canada, China, France, Germany, Mexico, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: IUCN, Animal Welfare Institute, Humane Society of the United States, IWMC World Conservation Trust, Pro Wildlife and Species Management Specialists.

It was later agreed that Turkey would be a member of the Ranching Working Group and that Brazil would be transferred from the Significant Trade Working Group to the Ranching Working Group.

The mandate of WG2 was agreed as follows:

#### **Regarding agenda item 8.1: *Review of the use of source code 'R'***

- a) Discuss the following options for the use of source code R related to animals:
- i) Delete source code R completely. "Ranched" specimens should be exported as wild with a proper NDF;
  - ii) Maintain source code R only for crocodylian and sea turtle species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II, in conformity with Resolutions Conf. 9.20 (Rev.) and Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14); or

- iii) Use source code R for animal species of Appendix II and develop criteria for the use of this source code; and
- b) Propose a definition of ranching and the use of source code R, as directed by Decision 14.52 to the Committee.

**Regarding agenda item 8.2: *Revision of Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14)***

- a) Consider the following suggestions by the Secretariat:
  - i) Repeal (most parts of) Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) and Resolution Conf. 9.20 (Rev.) as they are rendered purposeless by paragraphs A. 2. b) and c) in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14); or
  - ii) Simplify the conditions for making an amendment proposal to revise the two ranching Resolutions in order to bring them on a par with the provisions in paragraphs A. 2. b) and c) in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), thereby removing any disincentive to follow this approach; and
- b) Advise the Committee whether to propose revisions to the Resolution for consideration at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Later in the meeting, the Co-Chair of Working Group 2 (Mr Schürmann) introduced document AC24 WG2 Doc. 1.

All suggestions to revise Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) were met with opposition, as were ideas of extending the use of source code 'R' beyond its original use as applied to populations of crocodylians transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II.

The Committee agreed to amend the recommendations of WG2 as follows:

Recommendation 1: amended to "Maintain source code R only for species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II, in conformity with Resolutions Conf. 9.20 (Rev.) and Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14)."

Recommendation 4:

- paragraph c): amended to "such elements, which should be in line with other provisions in Annex 4, paragraph A.2, of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), should be incorporated in a separate new draft resolution that refers to Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14)";
- Addition of a new paragraph "d)" stating that "this draft resolution should be prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with the Animals Committee for presentation at CoP15"; and
- Relettering of paragraph "d)" to paragraph "e)".

Paragraph 6 was deleted.

The Committee noted the report, as amended, and adopted the following recommendations:

- a) The Committee did not recommend deleting source code R completely. Rather, the Committee recommended the use of source code R only for species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II, in conformity with Resolutions Conf. 9.20 (Rev.) and Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14).
- b) The Committee felt there was a need for a more precise definition of ranching. Accordingly, it recommended adopting the following definition (derived from the definition used by the Crocodile Specialist Group): *Ranching means the rearing in a controlled environment of specimens which have been taken as eggs or juveniles from the wild where they would have a very low probability of surviving to adulthood.*

- c) Even though the Committee agreed that this definition better defined ranching, the Committee felt strongly that there was a need for better guidance to the Parties on the use of this source code (given that its application has been the subject of confusion in the past). The Committee felt that this guidance might best be dealt with by production of a manual and recommended the adoption of a draft decision, directed to the Secretariat, which might provide such guidance on the use of source code R (and other source codes), namely: *Contingent upon the availability of external funds, the Secretariat shall contract an appropriate expert to prepare a guide to advise the Parties on the appropriate use of source codes.*
- d) With respect to the revision of Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14), the Committee recommended that:
- i) all proposals for the transfer of populations from Appendix I to Appendix II, whether for ranching or not, be done under the provisions of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14);
  - ii) the core elements of Resolutions Conf. 9.20 (Rev.) and Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) be retained to inform consideration of precautionary measures under Annex 4, paragraph A.2.d, of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14);
  - iii) such elements, which should be in line with other provisions in Annex 4, paragraph A.2, of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), be incorporated in a separate new draft resolution that referred to Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14);
  - iv) this draft resolution be prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with the Animals Committee for presentation at CoP15;
  - v) accordingly, Resolutions Conf. 9.20 (Rev.) and Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) be repealed in their entirety.
- e) The Committee recommended that the Secretariat assess, in consultation with the Animals Committee, and report at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties any implications of the approach suggested in Recommendation 4 for populations previously downlisted for ranching under Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) and its predecessors.

During discussion of items 8.1 and 8.2, interventions were made by the representative of Europe (Mr Ibero Solana), the alternate representative of Europe (Mr Ó Críodáin), the Chairman and Humane Society of the United States.

#### 9. International expert workshop on non-detriment findings

Mexico introduced documents AC24 Doc. 9, AC24 Doc. 9 Addendum and AC24 Doc. 9.1, and a discussion followed on the desirability of the draft resolution in the Addendum. No consensus was achieved in Plenary in this regard.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 7) with the following membership:

Co-Chairs: The Representative of Africa (Mr Bagine) and the representative of Asia (Ms Prijono); and

AC alternate member: The Alternate representative of Europe (Mr Ó Críodáin); and

Parties: Belgium, Canada, China, Czech Republic, France, Malaysia, Mexico, the Netherlands, South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: European Commission, UNEP-WCMC, Alliance of Marine Mammal Parks and Aquariums, FACE, Humane Society of the United States, International Environmental Resources, Safari Club International Foundation, TRAFFIC and VC International.

The mandate of WG7 was agreed as follows:

- a) Review the proceedings resulting from the International expert workshop on non-detriment findings (paragraph 43 of document AC24 Doc. 9); and
- b) Using the work already done by PC18 (AC24 Doc. 9 Addendum), complete a discussion paper and, if considered appropriate, a draft Resolution on the making of non-detriment findings, so that this may be agreed with the PC for presentation at CoP15.

Later in the meeting, the Co-Chair of WG7 introduced document AC24 WG7 Doc. 1.

The Committee agreed to amend the recommendations and draft decisions as follows: in the included questionnaire, in paragraph 5, "above" should read "below", and the subsequent eight rows should be lettered a) to h).

With these amendments, the adopted recommendations and draft decisions read as follows:

- a) The Committee agreed that an email working group was not necessary. Other ways forward were explored that are set out under the second heading below.
- b) The Committee recommended that the Secretariat issue a Notification to the Parties inviting comments on the proceedings. These comments would be reviewed by two nominated representatives of each Committee, as previously suggested by the Plants Committee, which had nominated Mr Greg Leach (representative of Oceania) and Mr Hesiquio Benitez (Mexico). The Committee nominated Mr Richard Kiome Bagine (representative of Africa) and Ms Zhou Zhihua (China). The draft operative text of the Notification follows.
- c) The Committee also recommended that members of the Animals and Plants Committees contact Parties (and non-Parties, if appropriate) in their respective regions to encourage them to respond to the Notification in a timely manner.
- d) The Committee:
  - i) Recognized that capacity building with regards to making non-detriment findings was an important issue;
  - ii) Noted that there were processes to assist with capacity building already established in the Convention (e.g. built into the costed programme of work and under the Strategic Vision, as well as under Resolution Conf. 12.2 on the *Procedure for approval of externally funded projects*); and
  - iii) Recommended that the Secretariat specify to Parties that any non-detriment finding capacity issues should be identified when coordinating regional meetings.
- e) The Committee also:
  - i) Noted that the Secretariat had already incorporated elements of the non-detriment finding workshop outcomes in its ongoing revisions of materials for capacity building with regard to non-detriment findings and was in the process of preparing a page for its website on the making of non-detriment findings in accordance with Decision 14.51, paragraph (c); and
  - ii) Agreed that the results of the questionnaire set out in the above-mentioned Notification would further inform deliberations on this issue.
- f) The Committee agreed that the working group overseeing the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade in Appendix-II species should be informed of the outcomes of the workshop.

- g) The Committee considered the draft resolution prepared by the Plants Committee included in document AC24 Doc. 9 Addendum. The Animals Committee agreed that it was not the time for a resolution at this stage and, instead, adopted a set of draft decisions to take the work forward after CoP15. The rationale for these decisions was as follows:
- i) To engage with the Parties and the scientific committees more fully in their consideration of the outcomes of the workshop;
  - ii) To elaborate on these outcomes, incorporating other work on the making of non-detriment findings; and
  - iii) To ensure that CoP16 considers the results of this work in more detail.

#### DRAFT NOTIFICATION ON NON-DETRIMENT FINDINGS

This Notification is intended to address the concerns of Parties, as expressed at the 18th and 24th meetings of the Plants and Animals Committees, respectively, that there had not been sufficient time to assimilate the outcomes of the international workshop on the making of non-detriment findings hosted by Mexico in 2008. The outcomes of this workshop are presented in PC18 Doc. 14.1

(<http://www.cites.org/eng/com/PC/18/E-PC18-14-01.pdf> ) and document PC18 Doc. 14.2

(<http://www.cites.org/eng/com/PC/18/E-PC18-14-02.pdf> ), and in document AC24 Doc. 9

(<http://www.cites.org/eng/com/AC/24/E24-09.pdf>) and document AC24 Doc. 9.1

(<http://www.cites.org/eng/com/AC/24/E24-09-01.pdf>). Full proceedings are available at:

[http://www.conabio.gob.mx/institucion/cooperacion\\_internacional/TallerNDF/taller\\_ndf.html](http://www.conabio.gob.mx/institucion/cooperacion_internacional/TallerNDF/taller_ndf.html)

Parties are asked to complete the attached questionnaire in consultation with their Scientific Authorities. Responses should be forwarded to the following address: [ndf@conabio.gob.mx](mailto:ndf@conabio.gob.mx) and copied to the Secretariat. Responses should be received by 30 September 2009.

The responses to this Notification will also be used to inform the Animals and Plants Committees of further capacity-building needs with respect to the making of non-detriment findings.

The outcomes of the survey will be reported to the Animals and Plants Committees in summary form (i.e. no references will be made to individual Parties' responses).

#### QUESTIONNAIRE

(Please mark or circle the options as required)

Party Name	
Name and contact details of respondent	
<b>1. What are the principal taxa that your country exports:</b>	
a.Trees;	
b.Perennials;	
c.Succulents and cycads;	
d.Geophytes and epiphytes;	
e.Mammals;	
f.Birds;	
g.Reptiles and amphibians;	
h.Fish;	
i.Aquatic invertebrates;	
j.Other.	

<b>2. Do you currently use the IUCN guidelines when making non-detriment findings</b> <a href="http://data.iucn.org/themes/ssc/our_work/wildlife_trade/cite_scop13/CITES/CITES-guidance-prelims.pdf">http://data.iucn.org/themes/ssc/our_work/wildlife_trade/cite_scop13/CITES/CITES-guidance-prelims.pdf</a>	YES	NO
If so, please indicate to what extent and under what circumstances. If not, why?		
<b>3. Apart from the IUCN guidelines, do you use other information or guidance in making non-detriment findings?</b>	YES	NO
Please specify		
<b>4. Do you find that the outcomes of the NDF Workshop (see citations and hyperlinks above) are a useful addition to the available guidance for making non-detriment findings?</b>	YES	NO
Please comment.		
<b>5. The summary report (<a href="http://www.cites.org/eng/com/AC/24/E24-09-01.pdf">http://www.cites.org/eng/com/AC/24/E24-09-01.pdf</a>) of the workshop identified a number of common aspects in making non-detriment findings. Do you agree that the summary report has identified these concepts adequately?</b> (Please respond Yes or No for each of the items below, a-h and please indicate if there are other significant matters not covered by the list below)	YES	NO
a) Geographical scope of the non-detriment finding;	YES	NO
b) Level of confidence in the non-detriment finding;	YES	NO
c) Risk analysis;	YES	NO
d) Regulation of the harvest;	YES	NO
e) Monitoring and adaptive management;	YES	NO
f) Identification of the specimen;	YES	NO
g) Origin of the specimen;	YES	NO
h) Capacity building and information sharing.	YES	NO
Please offer additional comments as necessary.		
<b>6. Taking into account that the problems with making non-detriment findings may vary from taxon to taxon, which of the following challenges do you find overall to be the most problematic in making non-detriment findings?</b>	("1" means "least problematic" and "4" means "most problematic").	
Determining that there is sufficient information available to support the non-detriment findings		
Assessing the level of risk associated with the non-detriment finding		
Assessing whether or not the level of regulation of harvest practices is sufficient or, if not, what additional regulation is required		
Evaluation of the effects of harvest and subsequent adaptation of the non-detriment finding		
Please elaborate.		
<b>7. Which of the following components of the non-detriment finding Workshop outcomes did you find most useful</b>	("1" counts as "most important" and "3" as "least important")	
Summary report ( <a href="http://www.cites.org/eng/com/AC/24/E24-09.pdf">http://www.cites.org/eng/com/AC/24/E24-09.pdf</a> )		
Taxonomic Working Group reports ( <a href="http://www.cites.org/eng/com/PC/18/E-PC18-14-02.pdf">http://www.cites.org/eng/com/PC/18/E-PC18-14-02.pdf</a> and <a href="http://www.cites.org/eng/com/AC/24/E24-09-01.pdf">http://www.cites.org/eng/com/AC/24/E24-09-01.pdf</a> ); and		

Case studies (see: ( <a href="http://www.conabio.gob.mx/institucion/cooperacion_internacional/TallerNDF/taller_ndf.html">http://www.conabio.gob.mx/institucion/cooperacion_internacional/TallerNDF/taller_ndf.html</a> )	
Please offer comments	
<b>8. What additional guidance beyond the non-detriment finding Workshop outcomes (refs) and other previously existing material, such as the IUCN guidelines could be provided that you would consider useful to make non-detriment findings?</b>	
<b>9. Do you have additional information to that provided in the workshop reports (such as case studies, national or regional guidelines, experience) that would assist other scientific authorities in making non-detriment findings?</b>	

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

#### DRAFT DECISIONS ON NON DETRIMENT FINDINGS

##### ***Directed to Parties***

15.XX Parties:

- a) are encouraged to consider the usefulness of the outputs of the international expert workshop on non-detriment findings hosted by Mexico to enhance CITES Scientific Authorities' capacities, particularly those related to the methodologies, tools, information, expertise and other resources needed to formulate non-detriment findings; and
- b) are encouraged to organize and promote activities such as workshops on capacity building to better understand what non-detriment findings are and how to enhance the ways to formulate them.

##### ***Directed to the Animals and Plants Committees***

15.XX The Animals and Plants Committees shall:

- a) review feedback received from Parties on the outputs from the international expert workshop on non-detriment findings, and advise on a path forward on how best to use the outputs to assist Scientific Authorities in the making of non-detriment findings;
- b) prepare a discussion paper for consideration at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties with options on how to use the workshop outputs, including, if considered appropriate, a draft resolution on the making of non-detriment findings; and
- c) review the non-detriment finding training materials used by the CITES Secretariat when conducting regional capacity-building workshops and provide advice for their improvement.

##### ***Directed to the Secretariat***

15.XX The Secretariat shall:

- a) include non-detriment findings as a component of their regional capacity-building workshops where appropriate; and
- b) assist in obtaining funds from interested Parties, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, and other funding sources to support activities for capacity building on non-detriment findings.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia (Mr Ishii), Europe (Mr Ibero Solana), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Calvar Agrelo), North America (Mr Medellín) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the alternate representative of Europe (Mr Ó Críodáin), China, Malaysia, Humane Society International, IWMC World Conservation Trust, the Chair and the Secretariat.

#### 10. Periodic review of animal species included in the CITES Appendices

##### 10.1 Periodic review of species selected prior to CoP13

The representative of Europe (Mr Ibero Solana) introduced document AC24 Doc. 10.1.

The Committee agreed to delete *Cephalophus silvicultor*, *Mirounga leonina* and *Pteropus macrotis* from the Periodic Review.

##### 10.2 Periodic review of species selected between CoP13 and CoP15

The representative of Europe (Mr Ibero Solana) introduced document AC24 Doc. 10.2 (Rev. 1) and suggested that an amendment to Resolution Conf. 14.8 was required so that consultants could be contracted for the review.

To discuss agenda item 10-10.2, the Committee established a working group (Working Group 3) with the following membership:

Chair: Representative of Europe (Mr Ibero Solana)

Parties: Brazil, China, Japan and Mexico; and

IGOs and NGOs: Humane Society of the United States and IUCN.

The mandate of WG3 was agreed as follows:

**Evaluate PC18 recommendations on the budget and the process of the Periodic Review of the Appendices.**

##### **Regarding agenda item 10.1: *Periodic review of species selected before CoP13***

- a) Discuss the review on *Callithrix jacchus* submitted by Brazil; and
- b) Make recommendations to the Committee as appropriate.

##### **Regarding agenda item 10.2: *Periodic review of species selected between CoP13 and CoP15***

- a) Discuss the reviews of *Ambystoma dumerilii* and *Andrias japonicus* submitted by Mexico and Japan, respectively.
- b) Make recommendations to urge the Parties that are undertaking reviews to complete them as soon as possible, and encourage them to make the pending reviews

Later in the meeting, the Chair of WG3 introduced document AC24 WG3 Doc. 1, and thanked the Working Group members, especially the representative of the Humane Society of the United States for acting as rapporteur. The Committee agreed to the following amendments to the recommendations:

Recommendations 1 and 3: addition of the words "of the text of the Convention" at the end.

Recommendation 2: "*Crocodylus*" amended to "*Crocodylurus*".

Recommendation 5: addition of the following before "BIRDS":

"MAMMALS

Felidae

*Lynx* spp.: United States of America

*Panthera onca*: Mexico"

Recommendation 6: addition of "(Rev. 1)" after "AC24 Doc. 10.2" and of "the list of Felidae spp. in document AC23 Doc. 11.2.1" at the end.

Recommendation 8: first sentence amended to read: "The Working Group recommends that the Animals Committee agree that Resolution Conf. 14.8 should not be amended, as proposed by the Plants Committee at its 18th meeting."

The Committee noted the report, as amended, and adopted the following recommendations:

**Regarding agenda item 10.1: *Periodic review of species selected before CoP13***

- a) The Committee supported the recommendation of Brazil to maintain *Callithrix jacchus* in Appendix II, in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2 b) of the text of the Convention.
- b) The Committee urged the United States of America to complete the review of *Crocodilurus lacertinus*\*.

**Regarding agenda item 10.2: *Periodic review of species selected between CoP13 and CoP15***

- a) The Committee supported the recommendation of Mexico to maintain *Ambystoma dumerilii* in Appendix II, in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2 b) of the text of the Convention.
- b) The Committee supported the recommendation of Japan to maintain *Andrias japonicus* in Appendix I, in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), biological criteria B iii), iv) and C ii) of Annex 1, and because there was potential international demand.
- c) The Committee urged the following Parties to complete the following reviews:

MAMMALS

Felidae

*Lynx* spp.: United States of America

*Panthera onca*: Mexico

BIRDS (Galliformes)

*Colinus virginianus ridgwayi*: United States of America.

*Gallus sonneratii*: Hungary.

*Tympanuchus cupido attwateri*: United States of America.

AMPHIBIANS

*Andrias davidianus*: China.

- d) The Committee requested the Secretariat to send a Notification to the Parties, similar to Notification to the Parties No. 2008/049, to request Parties that reviews be conducted of species included in document AC24 Doc. 10.2 (Rev. 1), Annex 1, paragraph 4 and the list of Felidae spp. in document AC23 Doc. 11.2.1, Annex 2.

---

\* Note from the Secretariat: This species is called *Crocodilurus amazonicus* according to the standard nomenclatural reference adopted by the Conference of the Parties.

## Regarding PC18 recommendations on the budget and the process of the Periodic Review of the Appendices

- a) The Committee did not support the proposal of the Plants Committee to introduce a new budget line for the Periodic Review [PC18 Sum 4 (Rev. 1) (21/03/09)]; the Committee considered that there were more important priorities for funding.
- b) The Committee agreed that Resolution Conf. 14.8 should not be amended, as proposed by the Plants Committee at its 18th meeting. The Committee believed that the proposed amendments depended on the existence of a budget (see previous comment on the budget).
- c) The Committee agreed to communicate the final outcome to the Plants Committee in order to ensure that they were aware of the results and to coordinate further action.
- d) The Committee agreed that this was a good example of why it was important that there be joint meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees.

During discussion of item 10-10.2, an intervention was made by the Chair.

### 10.3 Periodic review of Felidae – *Lynx* spp. and look-alike issues (outcome of the workshop)

The United States introduced document AC24 Doc. 10.3, adding that they would develop new identification techniques for specimens of *Lynx* in trade. They also referred to document AC24 Inf. 10 on the status of *Lynx rufus* in Mexico, and the representative of North America (Mr Medellín) noted that the full report of the survey, which concluded that *Lynx rufus* was not threatened in Mexico, would soon be posted on the Web. In the United States, available data suggested that populations of *Lynx rufus* were robust, and increasing in all States except Florida.

The Committee noted that no contributions had been received from Parties to undertake a review of Felidae spp. and agreed that no working group was needed for this agenda item and that it would be closed.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the United States, the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Humane Society International, the Chair and the Secretariat.

### 11. Implementation and effectiveness of the universal tagging system in the trade in small crocodylian leather goods

Germany introduced document AC24 Doc. 11. The Committee noted the document and requested that further comments be sent to Mr Jelden.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by Germany and the United States.

### 12. Sturgeons and paddlefish

#### 12.1 Secretariat's report

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 12.1, noting that the reference to "paragraph 10" in paragraph 12 should be changed to "paragraph 11". The Animals Committee was reminded of its responsibility to evaluate the assessment and monitoring methodologies used for shared stocks of Acipenseriformes other than in the Caspian Sea. Advice was sought on how to use USD 30,000 provided by the European Union for this purpose. In response to a question about why a 2009 quota for the Amur/Heilongjiang River shared stock was not yet published, the Secretariat explained that it had only received a response from one of the two range States.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by China, the Chair and the Secretariat.

12.2 Assessment and monitoring methodologies used for shared stocks of Acipenseriformes species

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) introduced document AC24 Doc. 12.2, adding that a workshop on hatchery management in Kazakhstan had just been finalized.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 4) with the following membership:

Chair: Representative of Asia (Mr Ishii);

Parties: Azerbaijan, Canada, Germany, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: Association of Northeastern Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Institute for Ocean Conservation Science, International Caviar Importers Association and IWMC World Conservation Trust.

It was later agreed that China would join Working Group 4.

The mandate of WG4 was agreed as follows:

- a) Consider the outcome of the Technical Workshop on Stock Assessment and TAC Methodologies; and
- b) Make recommendations to the Committee as appropriate.

Later in the meeting, the Chair of WG4 introduced document AC24 WG4 Doc. 1. He stated that there had been great participation in this working group and thanked the rapporteur. The Committee adopted the following recommendations:

- a) the Animals Committee endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of FAO and of the CITES Technical Workshop presented in document AC24 Doc 12.2.
- b) the Animals Committee requested the Standing Committee to urge the range States to consider all recommendations in document AC24 Doc. 12.2, including those provided in the Appendices in working with the Commission on Aquatic Bioresources to continue to improve the sturgeon stock assessment and Total Allowable Catch (TAC) determination methodology.
- c) the Animals Committee requested the Standing Committee to ask the Caspian range States to implement the above recommendations and report at the 25th meeting of Animals Committee on progress made in improving the existing sturgeon stock assessment and Total Allowable Catch (TAC) determination methodology through a detailed report describing how the recommendations in document AC24 Doc. 12.2 have been implemented and whether they have been accepted by all range States. This report should be submitted to the Secretariat four months prior to the 25th meeting of Animals Committee for the purposes of external review as mentioned below.
- d) the Animals Committee requested that the Secretariat have the above report reviewed by FAO (or the outside experts who contributed to document AC24 Doc. 12.2) and make that review available at the 25th meeting of the Animals Committee.
- e) the Animals Committee requested that the Standing Committee ask the range States to provide a report at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties on progress made in improving the existing sturgeon stock assessment and Total Allowable Catch determination methodology.

- f) the Animals Committee requested the Secretariat to use the available funds toward achievement of the above recommendations as appropriate.

No interventions were made.

### 13. Nomenclatural matters

The specialist on zoological nomenclature introduced document AC24 Doc. 13 (Rev. 1) and requested to add further items for discussion, including adoption of the published version of the turtle and tortoise checklist, and some very recent nomenclatural changes in CITES-listed species.

#### 13.1 Revision and publication of CITES Appendices

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 13.1.

#### 13.2 Harmonization of nomenclature and taxonomy with other multilateral environmental agreements

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 13.2. The observer from the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) noted that there were other regional agreements that listed species, which were going to be examined for harmonization issues.

To address items 13, 13.1 and 13.2, the Committee established a working group (Working Group 9) with the following membership:

Chair: specialist on zoological nomenclature (Ms Grimm);

AC member: the Representative of North America (Mr Medellín);

Parties: Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: UNEP-WCMC, Conservation International and Humane Society International.

The mandate of WG9 was agreed as follows:

Discuss the following issues and develop recommendations for the AC on how to deal with them:

- a) Revision and publication of the CITES Appendices (document AC24 Doc. 13.1)
  - Recommendations of the Secretariat under points 12 and 13
- b) Nomenclatural matters [document AC24 Doc. 13 (Rev. 1)]
  - *Glaucidium mooreorum*, *Micrastur mintoni*, *Pionopsitta aurantiocephala*
  - *Puma concolor* (document AC24 Doc. 18.2)
  - *Canis lupus* and domesticated forms of dogs and dingos
  - Identified recent nomenclatural changes in CITES-listed animal species
- c) Harmonization of nomenclature and taxonomy with other multilateral environmental agreements
  - Recommendations of the Secretariat under point 9 of document AC24 Doc. 13.2
  - Recommendations on the published turtle and tortoises checklist

Later in the meeting, the Chair of WG9 introduced document AC24 WG9 Doc. 1. The Secretariat stated that not following the Convention on Migratory Species in its adoption of Perrin *et al.* (2009, Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals) was unfortunate from the point of view of harmonization.

The Committee agreed to add the following wording after "original reference" in the first bullet point under paragraph c) of the Recommendations "(Sasaki, T., Nikaido, M., Wada, S., Yamada, T.K., Cao,

Y., Hasegawa, M., and Okada, N. 2006. *Balaenoptera omurai* is a newly discovered baleen whale that represents an ancient evolutionary lineage. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 41(1): 40–52.)”.

The Committee agreed to change the sentence in the third bullet point under paragraph c) of the Recommendations to: “That the representative of the Animals Committee informs other representatives of the scientific advisory bodies of biodiversity-related conventions (CSAB) to consider legal, budgetary and other issues that might be involved, particularly in a CITES context.”

The Committee noted the report, as amended, and adopted the following recommendations:

a) **Revision and publication of the CITES Appendices (document AC24 Doc. 13.1)**

– **Recommendations of the Secretariat under points 12 and 13**

The Committee recommended that any proposal to the Conference of the Parties to change a standard nomenclatural reference for CITES species contain a list of the amendments that would have to be made to the Appendices if the proposal were adopted (as per paragraph 12 of document AC24 Doc 13.1). The Animals Committee should consider that funding may be required to support this work.

Further to the request of the Secretariat on suggestions to accelerate the revision of the Appendices after a meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Committee made the following recommendations:

- Parties were encouraged to submit queries regarding nomenclature to the Chair of the Working group as early as possible in advance of submitting any amendment proposal.
- An analysis should be undertaken to identify mono-specific taxa listed in the Appendices, and where appropriate to prepare proposals to simplify the listing of these taxa to cover the highest taxon possible, without altering the scope of the listing. This would accelerate the revision of future Appendices after the CoP.

The Committee also recommended that, if nomenclature changes were identified that affected Appendix-III listings, the Animals Committee specialist for nomenclature advise the Secretariat whether these changes also resulted in changes in distribution affecting the countries issuing certificates of origin.

b) **Nomenclatural matters [document AC24 Doc. 13 (Rev. 1)]**

- *Glaucidium mooreorum*, *Micrastur mintoni*, *Pionopsitta aurantiocephala*
- *Puma concolor* (document AC24 Doc. 18.2)
- *Canis lupus* and domesticated forms of dogs and dingos
- Identified recent nomenclatural changes in CITES-listed animal species

The Committee recommended:

- i) That, at CoP15, the references outlined in paragraph 3 of document AC24 Doc. 13 (Rev. 1) referring to *Glaucidium mooreorum*, *Micrastur mintoni* and *Pionopsitta aurantiocephala* be added to Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14).
- ii) That, in accordance with the recommendation of AC23 (see AC23 Summary record, p. 26), Wilson and Reeder (1993) be included in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14) as the standard reference for *Puma concolor*.
- iii) That a proposal be prepared for CoP15 to add the following annotation to the listing of *Canis lupus*: “Excludes the domesticated form and the dingo which are referenced as *Canis lupus familiaris* and *Canis lupus dingo*.”

- iv) Where the nomenclature working group recommended against new nomenclatural changes outlined in the Annexes to document AC24 Doc. 13 (Rev. 1), that, subject to the availability of funding, the names concerned be entered into the species database (where appropriate) as synonyms of the name under which they were listed in CITES. If this was not possible, the nomenclature specialist offered to produce an annex to her report to the Conference of the Parties, which would clarify which were the valid names to be used in place of the non-accepted species names.
- v) That a "tool-kit" to facilitate the Parties inputting information into their own databases be developed, subject to funding. This tool could include data outputs and summaries of nomenclature changes in a variety of electronic formats to suit different types of databases, thus assisting Parties in including the changes into their own databases.
- vi) That a review be undertaken, subject to funding, of recent proposed changes to the taxonomy and nomenclature of CITES-listed mammals, reptiles and amphibians of Madagascar, with a view to producing checklists to be considered by the Animals Committee in preparation for CoP16.
- vii) That the references for the species listed in the present summary record be included in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14).

**c) Harmonization of nomenclature and taxonomy with other multilateral environmental agreements**

**- Recommendations of the Secretariat under point 9**

The Committee welcomed the progress made to date towards harmonizing the nomenclature used in CITES with the nomenclature of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, and encouraged and supported the work of the Secretariat in this regard.

The Committee recommended that the reference "Perrin W.F., Würsig B. and Thewissen J.G.M. (Editors), (2009) Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals, Second edition, Academic Press" not be adopted as a standard reference for marine mammals. However, it recommended that *Balaenoptera omurai*, which had been split from *Balaenoptera edeni*, be accepted, and that the original reference describing this species (Sasaki, T., Nikaido, M., Wada, S., Yamada, T.K., Cao, Y., Hasegawa, M., and Okada, N. 2006. *Balaenoptera omurai* is a newly discovered baleen whale that represents an ancient evolutionary lineage. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 41(1): 40–52.) be included in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14) at CoP15.

The Committee expressed interest in and supported the creation of a nomenclature and taxonomy panel as outlined in paragraph 8 of document AC24 Doc. 13.2.

The Committee recommended that the representative of the Animals Committee inform other representatives of the scientific advisory bodies of biodiversity-related conventions (CSAB) to consider legal, budgetary and other issues that might be involved, particularly in a CITES context.

The Committee recommended that, when the Secretariats of CITES and CMS next convene, the CITES Secretariat suggest that CMS consider the feasibility of adopting the CITES reference for sea turtles.

**Recommendations on the published turtle and tortoise checklist**

The Committee recommended that the published version of the Fritz and Havaš (2006) *CITES Checklist of Chelonians of the World* replace the current checklist for tortoise and turtles in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14), but without its Annex so that the *status quo* be maintained.

Additional species/genera or species with spelling changes for which references should be included in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14)

Species name	Comments
MAMMALIA	
CETACEA	
BALAENOPTERIDAE	
<i>Balaenoptera omurai</i>	
DELPHINIDAE	
<i>Orcaella heinsohni</i>	
PRIMATES	
<b>TARSIIDAE</b>	
<i>Tarsius lariang</i>	
<b>AVES</b>	
APODIFORMES	
TROCHILIDAE	
<i>Eriocnemis isabellae</i>	
FALCONIFORMES	
ACCIPITRIDAE	
<i>Aquila hastata</i>	
PASSERIFORMES	
MUSCICAPIDAE	
<i>Garrulax taewanus</i>	
PSITTACIFORMES	
CACATUIDAE	
<i>Cacatua goffiniana</i>	
PSITTACIDAE	
<i>Aratinga pintoii</i>	Accept <i>pintoii</i> subject to investigation before CoP15 as to whether <i>pintoii</i> or <i>maculata</i> should be recognized as the valid name.
<i>Pyrrhura parvifrons</i>	
STRIGIFORMES	
STRIGIDAE	
<i>Ninox burhani</i>	
<i>Otus thilohoffmanni</i>	
REPTILIA	
SAURIA	
AGAMIDAE	
<i>Uromastyx yemenensis</i>	
CHAMAELEONIDAE	
<i>Bradypodion atromontanum</i>	
<i>Bradypodion caeruleogula</i>	
<i>Bradypodion caffrum</i>	
<i>Bradypodion damarum</i>	
<i>Bradypodion gutturale</i>	
<i>Bradypodion nkandlae</i>	
<i>Bradypodion transvaalense</i>	
<i>Bradypodion ventrale</i>	
<i>Calumma amber</i>	
<i>Calumma ambreense</i>	
<i>Calumma andringitraense</i>	
<i>Calumma brevicorne</i>	
<i>Calumma crypticum</i>	
<i>Calumma cucullatum</i>	

<i>Calumma hafahafa</i>	
<i>Calumma jevy</i>	
<i>Calumma marojezense</i>	
<i>Calumma nasutum</i>	
<i>Calumma peltierorum</i>	
<i>Calumma tsaratanaense</i>	
<i>Calumma tsysorne</i>	
<i>Chamaeleo narraioaca</i>	
<i>Chamaeleo necasi</i>	
<i>Chamaeleo ntunte</i>	
<i>Kinyongia adolfifriderici</i>	
<i>Kinyongia boehmei</i>	
<i>Kinyongia carpenteri</i>	
<i>Kinyongia excubitor</i>	
<i>Kinyongia fischeri</i>	
<i>Kinyongia matschiei</i>	
<i>Kinyongia multituberculata</i>	
<i>Kinyongia oxyrhina</i>	
<i>Kinyongia tavetana</i>	
<i>Kinyongia tenuis</i>	
<i>Kinyongia ulugurensis</i>	
<i>Kinyongia uthmoelleri</i>	
<i>Kinyongia vosseleri</i>	
<i>Kinyongia xenorhina</i>	
<i>Nadzikambia mlanjense</i>	
GEKKONIDAE	
<i>Phelsuma andamanense</i>	
<i>Phelsuma grandis</i>	
<i>Phelsuma inexpectata</i>	
<i>Phelsuma kely</i>	
<i>Phelsuma kochi</i>	
<i>Phelsuma pasteuri</i>	
<i>Phelsuma ravenala</i>	
<i>Phelsuma rosagularis</i>	
<i>Phelsuma vanheygeni</i>	
<i>Uroplatus giganteus</i>	
IGUANIDAE	
<i>Brachylophus bulabula</i>	
<i>Phrynosoma blainvillii</i>	
<i>Phrynosoma cerroense</i>	
<i>Phrynosoma wigginsi</i>	
TEIIDAE	
<i>Tupinambis duseni</i>	Accept if can be confirmed that skins are identifiable.
VARANIDAE	
<i>Varanus beccarii</i>	
<i>Varanus bushii</i>	
<i>Varanus cumingi</i>	Accept if can be confirmed that skins are identifiable.
<i>Varanus marmoratus</i>	Accept if can be confirmed that skins are identifiable.
<i>Varanus nuchalis</i>	Accept if can be confirmed that skins are identifiable.
<i>Varanus rainerguetheri</i>	
<i>Varanus reisingeri</i>	
<i>Varanus togianus</i>	Accept if can be confirmed that skins are identifiable.
<i>Varanus zugorum</i>	
SERPENTES	
PYTHONIDAE	
<i>Python natalensis</i>	

TROPIDOPHIIDAE	
<i>Tropidophis xanthogaster</i>	
TESTUDINES	
GEOEMYDIDAE	
<i>Batagur affinis</i>	
<i>Batagur borneoensis</i>	
<i>Batagur dhongoka</i>	
<i>Batagur kachuga</i>	
<i>Batagur trivittata</i>	
TESTUDINIDAE	
<i>Homopus solus</i>	
AMPHIBIA	
ANURA	
DENDROBATIDAE	
<i>Dendrobates daleswansonii</i>	
<i>Dendrobates dorisswansonae</i>	
<i>Dendrobates nubeculosus</i>	
<i>Epipedobates narinensis</i>	
<i>Epipedobates yungicola</i>	
MANTELLIDAE	
<i>Mantella ebenau</i>	
ACTINOPTERYGII	
OSTEOGLOSSIFORMES	
OSTEOGLOSSIDAE	
<i>Scleropages aureus</i>	
<i>Scleropages legendrei</i>	
<i>Scleropages macrocephalus</i>	
SYNGNATHIFORMES	
SYNGNATHIDAE	
<i>Hippocampus biocellatus</i>	
<i>Hippocampus debelius</i>	
<i>Hippocampus patagonicus</i>	
<i>Hippocampus procerus</i>	
<i>Hippocampus waleanus</i>	
ARTHROPODA	
ARACHNIDA	
ARANEAE	
THERAPHOSIDAE	
<i>Brachypelma kahlenbergi</i>	
INSECTA	
COLEOPTERA	
LUCANIDAE	
<i>Colophon endroedyi</i>	
ANNELIDA	
HIRUDINOIDEA	
ARHYNCHOBDELLIDA	
HIRUDINIDAE	
<i>Hirudo verbana</i>	
CNIDARIA	
ANTHOZOA	
ANTIPATHARIA	

CLADOPATHIDAE	
<i>Chrysopathes micracantha</i>	Accepted but as there is no standard reference for the group, they will not be included in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14).
<i>Chrysopathes oligocrada</i>	Accepted but as there is no standard reference for the group, they will not be included in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14).
SCLERACTINIA	
PORITIDAE	
<i>Machadoporites</i>	Accepted but as there is no standard reference for the group, they will not be included in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14).

During discussion of items 13, 13.1 and 13.2, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Europe (Mr Ibero Solana) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the nomenclature specialist (Ms Grimm), Japan, New Zealand, the United Republic of Tanzania, CMS, Conservation International, the Chair and the Secretariat.

#### 14. Conservation and management of sharks and stingrays

It was noted that a report on the FAO Technical Workshop was now available as information document AC24 Inf. 6.

##### 14.1 Activities concerning shark species of concern (Decision 14.107)

The United States introduced document AC24 Doc. 14.1.

##### 14.2 Regional workshop on South American freshwater stingrays

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 14.2.

##### 14.3 Linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat, and illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing

The representative of Oceania (Mr Hay) introduced document AC24 Doc. 14.3 and referred to a report that was available as document AC24 Inf. 2.

##### 14.4 Other Animals Committee's tasks related to conservation and management of sharks

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 14.4. It was noted that an advance copy of a report on the FAO Technical Workshop was now available as information document AC24 Inf. 6. The final report would soon be posted on the CITES website.

The observer from CMS noted that it was organizing a meeting to finalize a plan for conservation of three migratory shark species.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 5) to address agenda items 14.1 to 14.4 with the following membership:

Chair: Representative of Oceania (Mr Hay);

AC alternate members: The alternate representatives of Asia (Mr Giam) and Europe (Mr Ó Críodáin).

Parties: Canada, China, Germany, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain and the United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: CMS, European Community, IUCN, Earthtrust, Ocean Conservancy, Ornamental Fish International, Species Management Specialists, Swan International, TRAFFIC and WWF.

The mandate of WG5 was adopted as follows:

**Regarding agenda item 14.1: *Activities concerning shark species of concern (Decision 14.107)***

- a) Examine the report of the shark intersessional group on the implementation of Decision 14.107 in Annex 1 to document AC24 Doc. 14.1 and the comments in Annex 2 to document AC24 Doc. 14.1;
- b) Work further on refinement of the list of shark species of concern;
- c) Discuss the progress made in the implementation of Decision 14.107 and decide on future activities; and
- d) Make recommendations to the Committee as appropriate.

**Regarding agenda item 14.2: *Regional workshop on South American freshwater stingrays***

- a) Consider the outputs of the South American freshwater stingray workshop; and
- b) Make any necessary species-specific recommendations to the Committee on improving the conservation status and regulation of international trade in these taxa.

**Regarding agenda item 14.3: *Linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat, and illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing***

- a) Consider the report on linkages between the international trade in shark fins and meat and IUU shark fishing activities;
- b) Discuss the progress made and propose follow-up actions to the Committee as appropriate; and
- c) Make recommendations to the Committee as appropriate.

**Regarding agenda item 14.4: *Other Animals Committee tasks related to Conservation and management of sharks***

- a) Examine:
  - i) The responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2008/058;
  - ii) The outcome of the *International expert workshop on non-detriment findings*; and
  - iii) Outputs of the FAO Technical Workshop on the Status, Limitations and Opportunities for Improving the Monitoring of Shark Fisheries and Trade; and
- b) Make recommendations to the Committee as appropriate.

Later in the meeting, the chair of Working Group 5 introduced document AC24 WG5 Doc. 1, and thanked all the participants, particularly the rapporteur.

The alternate representative of Asia (Mr Giam) requested that the following statement be recorded in the summary record.

*Document AC24 Inf. 2 Illegal, unreported and unregulated shark catch: A review of current knowledge and action by consultants M. Lack and G. Sant should not be accepted as a document of the meeting as it is neither (a) from a Party nor (b) from a recognized NGO, in spite of the heading of the publication TRAFFIC. Though given the impression that it is from Australia and TRAFFIC, the 'Disclaimer' in the publication shows otherwise. Therefore the (a) report of the Working Group AC24 WG5 Doc. 1 'Mandate 3, agenda item 14.3: Linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat, and illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing' cannot*

*be accepted, and the report of the Working Group to the Animals committee should also be expunged.*

The Chair explained that document AC24 Inf. 2 had been properly submitted for the meeting. TRAFFIC added that the disclaimer was standard text that appeared in their publications and that it did not mean that TRAFFIC dissociated itself from the report.

A suggestion that the Animals Committee should, in future, not become involved in matters related to IUU fishing because this was a technical issue, was countered by others who felt that it was also a scientific issue.

The Committee agreed the following amendments to the recommendations:

In the second sentence of paragraph 3, under Mandate 1: addition of the words "in Table 1" after "For these species".

In paragraph 2. iii), under Mandate 2: addition of the words "as needing the cooperation of other Parties in the control of trade. This would additionally serve" after "in CITES Appendix III".

At the end of paragraph 3, under Mandate 3: addition of the words "and other specialists and stakeholders" at the end.

In paragraph 2, under *Other matters*: deletion of the words "and FAO".

The Committee noted the report, as amended, and adopted the following recommendations:

**Regarding agenda item 14.1: *Activities concerning shark species of concern (Decision 14.107):***

For the species in Table 1, the Committee recommended Parties improve data collection, management and conservation, which could be implemented, enhanced and enforced through domestic, bilateral, RFMO, or other international measures, including under Resolution Conf. 12.6.

**Table 1: Shark species of concern listed in document CoP 14 Doc 59.1 Annex 3.**

Species listed in document CoP14 Doc. 59.1 and/or AC24 Doc. 14.1.	FAO's list of primary species for monitoring of fisheries and trade <sup>2</sup>	Action taken under CITES
Spiny dogfish shark <i>Squalus acanthias</i>	Nominated by Argentina, Japan, Spain,	Considered and rejected for listing in Appendix II at CoP14; have entered range State consultation prior to consideration at CoP15
Porbeagle shark <i>Lamna nasus</i>	Nominated by Spain	Decision 14.109. New AC recommendations proposed.
Freshwater stingrays Family Potamotrygonidae	—	Decision 14.109. New AC recommendations proposed.
Sawfishes Family Pristidae	Nominated by United States	Listed in the CITES Appendices
Gulper sharks, genus <i>Centrophorus</i>	Nominated by Sri Lanka	
School, tope, or soupfin shark <i>Galeorhinus galeus</i>	Nominated by Argentina	Decision 14.114 not yet implemented.
Guitarfishes, shovelnose rays Order Rhinobatiformes	Four species nominated by West African CSRP (seven States)	

<sup>2</sup> Document AC24 Inf. 6. Report of the FAO Technical Workshop on Status, Limitations and Opportunities for Improving the Monitoring of Shark Fisheries and Trade (Advance copy). FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report No. 897. Appendix IV: Provisional list of primary species of elasmobranchs for the monitoring of fisheries and trade.

Species listed in document CoP14 Doc. 59.1 and/or AC24 Doc. 14.1.	FAO's list of primary species for monitoring of fisheries and trade <sup>2</sup>	Action taken under CITES
Requiem and pelagic sharks	Many species nominated	Some reviewed in document AC24 Doc 14.1
Devil rays, Family Mobulidae	—	
Leopard sharks <i>Triakis semifasciata</i>	—	
<b>Species reviewed in document AC24 Doc. 14.1</b>		
Hammerhead sharks <i>Sphyrna</i> spp.	Nominated by eight States: West African CSRP (seven States) and Hong Kong SAR	
Dusky shark <i>Carcharhinus obscurus</i>	Nominated by United States	
Thresher sharks <i>Alopias</i> spp.	Nominated by Indonesia, Panama, Sri Lanka	
Shortfin mako <i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>	Nominated by Hong Kong SAR, Spain, Japan, United States	
Silky shark <i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>	Nominated by China, Hong Kong SAR, Sri Lanka, Indonesia	
Oceanic whitetip shark <i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>	Nominated by Panama	
Blue shark <i>Prionace glauca</i>	Nominated by China, Ghana, Hong Kong SAR, Japan, Panama, Spain, United States	
Sandbar shark <i>Carcharhinus plumbeus</i>	Nominated by China, Hong Kong SAR, United States	
Bull shark <i>Carcharhinus leucas</i>	-	
Tiger shark <i>Galeocerdo cuvier</i>	Nominated by Ghana	

**Regarding agenda item 14.2: *Regional workshop on South American freshwater stingrays***

The Committee recommended that:

- i) Range States take note of the workshop's findings and conclusions, and increase their efforts to improve data collection on the scale and impact of the threats facing stingray species and populations from collection for ornamental trade, commercial fisheries for food, and habitat damage.
- ii) Range States consider implementing or reinforcing national regulations regarding the management and reporting of capture and international trade of freshwater stingrays for all purposes, including commercial fisheries for food and ornamental trade, and standardizing these measures across the region, for example through existing South American intergovernmental bodies.
- iii) Range States be encouraged to consider the listing of endemic and threatened species of freshwater stingrays (Potamotrygonidae) in CITES Appendix III as needing the cooperation of other Parties in the control of trade. This would additionally serve to support domestic management measures for species entering international ornamental trade and to improve and enhance trade data collection.

**Regarding agenda item 14.3: *Linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat, and illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing***

- a) The Committee recommended continued research to improve understanding of the situation and identify the linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat, and IUU fishing. It was necessary to improve the collection of catch and trade data at the lowest taxonomic level possible (ideally by species). In this context, close cooperation with FAO and RFMOs was encouraged in order to further clarify the nature of IUU fishing. In addition, studies of trade in shark meat, including prices in major fish markets, were also encouraged in order to better identify the shark products that were driving IUU fishing.
- b) The Committee noted the FAO Guidelines on Responsible Fish Trade<sup>3</sup>. These contained recommendations of direct relevance to the work of FAO and CITES on the topic of sharks. Therefore, the Committee agreed to discuss with FAO any benefits that may be gained by discussing elements of Article 11.2.2 of these Guidelines, for example catch and trade certification schemes (paragraphs 8 & 9), with the involvement of representatives from Parties, relevant regional fisheries organizations and the fishing industry, the shark product industry, retailers and the IUCN Shark Specialist Group and other specialists and stakeholders.

**Regarding agenda item 14.4: *Other Animals Committee tasks related to Conservation and management of sharks***

- a) The Committee endorsed the conclusions of the report of the FAO workshop chaired by the United States and Japan (see document AC24 Inf. 6<sup>2</sup>). The report outlined possible reasons for the poor implementation of the FAO IPOA–Sharks. Suggestions for improving this situation include greater use of existing management measures and regulations, adopting a more pragmatic, step-by-step approach when developing and implementing National Shark Plans, and improving stakeholder participation.
- b) The Committee recommended that Parties which were shark fishing States but had not yet implemented a National Shark Plan (NPOA) develop their own NPOAs at the earliest opportunity and take steps to improve research and data collection on both fisheries and trade as a first step towards their Shark Plans. Parties should also improve their outreach to RFMOs. This may be achieved by greater consultation between the Fisheries and Environment Departments of Contracting Parties, in order to ensure that CITES' recommendations were discussed by these bodies.

During discussion of item 14, interventions were made by the regional representative of Oceania (Mr Hay), the alternate representative of of Asia (Mr Giam), Canada, China, Mexico, Spain, the United States, CMS, Earthtrust, FAO, IUCN, IWMC, WWF, the Chair and the Secretariat.

**15. Transport of live animals**

**15.1 Activities of the Transport Working Group and information on cases of high mortality of specimens**

Austria introduced document AC24 Doc. 15.1.

**15.2 Analysis of the Parties' legislative provisions and draft legislative guidance**

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 15.2 and made a correction to the wording of paragraph 100, which would now read: "The CITES *Guidelines* served a useful purpose for many years by providing simple, practical guidance for the transport of live specimens by means other than air. They are now outdated and should be replaced by the IATA *Live*

---

<sup>3</sup> FAO (2009). *Responsible Fish Trade*. FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries No. 11. FAO, Rome, Italy. <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/011/i0590e/i0590e00.pdf>

*Animals and Perishable Cargo Regulations* and any additional guidance that might be needed for the transport of live specimens by land and sea or inland waterways.”

To address items 15.1 and 15.2, the Committee established a working group (Working Group 8) with the following membership:

Chair: Chair of the Transport Working Group;

Parties: Chile, Germany, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania and the United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: Alliance of Marine Mammal Parks and Aquariums, Animal Welfare Institute, Born Free USA, Defenders of Wildlife, FACE, Humane Society of the United States, International Environmental Resources, Ornamental Fish International, Pan African Sanctuary Alliance, Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, VC International and WAZA.

The mandate of WG8 was agreed as follows:

**Regarding agenda item 15.1: *Activities of the Transport Working Group and information on cases of high mortality of specimens***

- Consider document AC24 Doc. 15.1 and make recommendations to the Committee as appropriate.

**Regarding agenda item 15.2: *National Legislation Project - Analysis of the Parties' legislative provisions and draft legislative guidance***

- a) Review document AC24 Doc. 15.2; and
- b) Report to the Committee on the implementation of the Decision 14.59 including, where appropriate, proposals to amend the Resolution on *Transport of live specimens*.

Later in the meeting, the chair of Working Group 8 introduced document AC24 WG8 Doc. 1.

The Committee adopted the following recommendations:

- a) The TWG should work intersessionally to:
  - i) proceed with replacing the CITES *Guidelines for transport and preparation for shipment of wild live animals and plants (1981)* by developing new guidelines for non-air transport of live specimens for consideration and adoption at CoP16.
  - ii) consult with members of the AC, transport experts and other stakeholders to gather relevant information.
  - iii) prepare, in consultation with the Chair of the AC and the CITES Secretariat, a discussion document for CoP15 on the transport of live specimens which reports on the implementation of Decisions 14.58 and 14.59 and proposes new or revised decisions for adoption.
  - iv) review and propose, if necessary, revisions to Resolution Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP14) for consideration and adoption at CoP16.
- b) The Secretariat should:
  - i) Issue a Notification:
    - A. Informing Parties that a process for replacing the current CITES *Guidelines for transport and preparation for shipment of wild live animals and plants (1981)* has started with the aim of submitting new CITES guidelines for non-air transport for consideration at CoP16.

B. Inviting Parties to provide to the Chair of the TWG any available legislation, guidelines, codes of conduct, and other information on transport standards related to non-air transport.

C. Inviting Parties to identify experts on non-air transport of CITES listed species and provide this information to the Chair of the TWG.

- ii) Further liaise with IATA and investigate ways to make IATA Live Animals Regulations and Perishable Cargo Manual accessible to Parties.
- iii) Explore ways to establish enhanced cooperation between CITES and various organizations that deal with transport (OIE/World Animal Health Organization, International Maritime Organization, etc.) through, *inter alia*, a Memorandum of Understanding, or the creation of a liaison group.
- iv) Incorporate the transport related guidance found in paragraphs 77–89 of document AC24 Doc. 15.2 into the CITES National Legislation Project.

During discussion of items 15.1 and 15.2, interventions were made by the regional representative of Oceania (Mr Hay) and the United States.

### 15.3 Distribution of the current IATA *Live Animal Regulations*

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 15.3.

This document was noted by the Committee.

No interventions were made.

## 16. Sustainable use and management of sea cucumber fisheries

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 16. The observer from FAO referred to a paper entitled *Sea cucumbers, a global review of fisheries and trade* that was available for the working group. A further report on technical guidelines would be made available later.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 6) and suggested that the group decide on a Chair.

The membership was agreed as follows:

Parties: Canada, China, Japan, Saudi Arabia and the United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: European Community, Earthtrust, Swan International and TRAFFIC.

The mandate of WG6 was agreed as follows:

- a) Evaluate the outcomes of the FAO *Workshop on Sustainable Use and Management of Sea Cucumber Fisheries*; and
- b) Recommend appropriate follow-up actions at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Later in the meeting, the Chair of Working Group 6 introduced document AC24 WG6 Doc. 1, and thanked the participants.

The Committee adopted the following recommendations:

- a) The Secretariat should prepare a report containing the executive summary of the FAO Technical Paper and the “Evaluation of the pros and cons of a CITES listing” contained in the Galapagos

case study and these should serve as the working group's evaluation of the FAO report for submission to CoP15;

- b) The Secretariat should request from FAO their technical guidelines on Sustainable management of sea cucumber fisheries and inform the Parties of the website link for the document, along with the website link for the workshop report, in a Notification to the Parties.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by Japan, FAO and the Chair.

#### 17. Progress report on the Identification Manual

The Secretariat reported orally on progress with this issue, noting that it was planned to develop the Identification Manual into a Web-based database, incorporating a "Wiki" system that would allow registered users to edit the species sheets. The Committee noted the report of the Secretariat.

#### 18. Proposals to amend the Appendices for possible consideration at CoP15

##### 18.1 Possible deletion of *Anas oustaleti* from Appendix I

The Secretariat introduced document AC24 Doc. 18.1.

The Committee agreed that a proposal to delete this taxon from the Appendices would be prepared and that the depositary government would be requested to submit it to CoP15 on behalf of the Committee.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the nomenclature specialist (Ms Grimm), Switzerland, the United States, the Chair and the Secretariat.

##### 18.2 Proposal to reconcile the CITES Appendices for *Puma concolor* with the standard nomenclature reference for mammals agreed to in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14)

Canada introduced document AC24 Doc. 18.2, which was referred to the working group on nomenclatural matters for further discussion.

No interventions were made.

#### 19. Preparation of the Chairman's report for CoP15

The Committee noted the oral report given by the Chair.

No interventions were made.

#### 20. Time and venue of the 24th meeting of the Animals Committee

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item.

The Committee noted that AC25 would probably be held in Geneva in early 2011, unless a Party came forward with a proposal that included a provision to cover the difference in costs from holding the meeting in Geneva.

No interventions were made.

#### 21. Any other business

The representative of Africa (Mr Bagine) made a statement referring to document AC24 Inf. 3, which he requested be recorded in the summary record.

*The Animals Committee representatives for the African region would like to briefly introduce document AC24 Inf. 3 to participants of this meeting. This document was prepared as a result of in-depth consultations with the 52 CITES Parties in the African region. A first regional meeting*

*was organized during the last Animals Committee meeting (AC23) where 10 African Parties supported the idea of launching a CITES process to address the difficulties encountered by the African region which negatively impact on their participation in CITES. As a follow-up to this meeting, a document was developed and distributed in the region and 14 countries expressed support for the document and its submission to the Standing Committee for adoption. Some also submitted comments which were included in document AC24 Inf. 3. The African regional representatives to the Animals Committee have thus submitted this document for consideration at the next Standing Committee meeting. They have also led additional consultations with the region at this meeting with the African countries represented in the room and these consultations have confirmed support from the region for this process. This document proposes the creation of a Working Group on the participation of the African region in CITES and defines terms of reference for this Working Group. This working group would have two complementary general goals, which as stated in the document are:*

- a) To strengthen cooperation and coordination between countries in the African region in order to implement the CITES Strategic Vision; and*
- b) To identify practical measures needed to facilitate the participation of African Parties in CITES and to improve CITES implementation in Africa.*

*The African regional representatives of the Animals Committee would like to invite the Animals Committee to note this document. We invite participants to this meeting, who will be present at the Standing Committee meeting, to support this document at the 58th meeting of the Standing Committee and, should it be adopted, we respectfully ask interested Parties, NGOs and other stakeholders to consider providing financial support for the organization of a meeting of the Africa working group.*

The Committee noted this intervention.

## 22. Closing remarks

The Chair thanked all the participants, the Secretariat and the interpreters for making the meeting successful and closed the meeting.