

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

SUMMARY REPORT

ACTION POINTS	EXECUTORS	PAGE
1. Opening of the meeting		5
2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure Adopted as amended.		5
3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme Adopted as amended.		5
4. Admission of observers Secretariat to remind observers from Parties or organizations to bring credentials in accordance with Rule 7.	Secretariat	6
5. Regional reports Secretariat to circulate a model format for a questionnaire to gather information from Parties in preparation of regional reports. Regional representative of South and Central America and the Caribbean to provide a printed copy of his report to the Animals Committee.	Secretariat Regional representative of South and Central America and the Caribbean	6
6. Strategic planning Regional representatives to contact Parties in their regions to establish a list of scientific experts in Management and Scientific Authorities.	Regional representatives	7
7. Report on the 49th meeting of the Standing Committee 7.1 Working Group on Technical Implementation Issues Creation of contact group with open membership. Observer from the United States of America to act as recipient of participants' suggestions and to report at AC20.	Contact group, observer from United States	8

ACTION POINTS	EXECUTORS	PAGE
<p>7.2 Export Quota Working Group Animals Committee to comment on reports from the Export Quota Working Group and to be kept informed about its progress.</p>	Animals Committee, Export Quota Working Group	8
<p>8. Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species</p> <p>8.1 Introduction to Resolution Conf. 12.8 Saker falcon to enter Review of Significant Trade with immediate effect. Consideration of other new species postponed until AC20. UNEP-WCMC to produce analysis of CITES trade data for consideration at AC20, with the help of IUCN and TRAFFIC.</p> <p>8.2 Review of the implementation of recommendations Further discussion postponed until AC20.</p> <p>8.3 Progress on the implementation of the Review of Significant Trade (Phases IV and V) Recommendations of working group 3 on <i>Strombus gigas</i> adopted as amended. Recommendations of working group 8 on the issue of the status of taxa selected for review since CoP11 adopted as amended.</p> <p>8.4 Progress on the first country-based Review of Significant Trade Further discussion postponed until AC20.</p> <p>8.5 Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade Recommendations of working group 8 adopted as amended.</p> <p>8.6 Conservation of <i>Saiga tatarica</i> Recommendations of working group 8 adopted as amended.</p>	<p>Animals Committee, Secretariat</p> <p>UNEP-WCMC, IUCN, TRAFFIC</p> <p>Animals Committee, Standing Committee, Secretariat</p> <p>Working group 8, Animals Committee, AC Chairman, Standing Committee, Secretariat</p>	<p>9</p> <p>31</p> <p>53</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>53</p> <p>53</p>
<p>9. Review of the criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II Recommendations of working group 1 adopted.</p>	Working group 1, Animals Committee, Plants Committee, Parties cited in table of page 3 of document AC19 WG1 Doc. 1, Secretariat	12 21
<p>10. Periodic review of animal species included in the Appendices IUCN CSG to seek funding and review the timeline in the light of CoP13 decisions.</p>	IUCN Crocodile Specialist Group	12

ACTION POINTS	EXECUTORS	PAGE
<p>10.1 Periodic review of animal and plant taxa in the Appendices Progress made by the contact group to be examined at AC20.</p>	Contact group on the review of the Appendices	
<p>11. Registration and monitoring of operations that breed Appendix-I animal species for commercial purposes</p> <p>11.1 Process for registering operations Secretariat to send the Notification to the Parties (see document AC19 WG5 Doc. 1), adopted as amended.</p> <p>11.2 Relationship between <i>ex situ</i> production and <i>in situ</i> conservation Recommendations of working group 2 adopted as amended. Secretariat to send Notification as amended in Annex 2 of document AC19 WG2 Doc. 1. International Wildlife Coalition to prepare definitions for <i>in situ</i> production and <i>ex situ</i> conservation.</p>	<p>Working group on the registration of operations, Secretariat</p> <p>Working group 2, Secretariat</p> <p>International Wildlife Coalition</p>	<p>13</p> <p>43</p> <p>25</p>
<p>12. Transport of live animals Recommendations of working group 10 adopted.</p>	Transport Working Group, Animals Committee	14 67
<p>13. Trade in hard corals Recommendations of working group 11 adopted.</p>	Working Group 11	15 69
<p>14. Control of captive breeding, ranching and wild harvest production systems for Appendix-II species Recommendations of working group 4 adopted.</p>	Working Group 4, Secretariat	15 41
<p>15. Conservation of and trade in tortoises and freshwater turtles Recommendations of working group 6 adopted as amended.</p>	Working Group 6, regional representative of Asia, Secretariat	16 45
<p>16. Seahorses and other members of the family Syngnathidae Recommendations of working group 7 adopted with the understanding that the Committee may look for alternative ways to undertake the recommended research.</p>	Working Group 7, Animals Committee, Secretariat	17 49
<p>17. Conservation of and trade in sea cucumbers in the families Holothuridae and Stichopodidae Recommendations of working group 9 adopted.</p>	Secretariat	18 65
<p>18. Biological and trade status of sharks Recommendations of working group 12 adopted. Secretariat to send the Notification to the Parties included in Annex 1 of document AC19 WG12 Doc. 1.</p>	Working group 12, IUCN Shark Specialist Group, Secretariat Secretariat	18 71

ACTION POINTS	EXECUTORS	PAGE
19. Trade in alien species Document on this issue to be submitted at AC20.	Regional representative of Oceania	19
20. Standard taxonomy and nomenclature No action.		19
21. Any other business No action.		20
22. Closing remarks No action		20

1. Opening of the meeting (No document)

The Chairman welcomed all participants to the meeting and thanked the Secretariat for their assistance in organizing the meeting. The CITES Secretary-General also welcomed participants to the meeting.

2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure (AC19 Doc. 2)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item recommending minor amendments to streamline the Rules of Procedure for the Animals and Plants Committees (AC and PC). Following interventions from the representative of Europe, and the observers from the Netherlands and Mexico, the Committee agreed to make the following amendments to the Rules of Procedures.

- a) Change Rule 18 from "Documents to be considered by the Committee shall normally be provided to the Secretariat at least 90 days before the meeting where they are to be discussed" to "Documents to be considered by the Committee shall normally be provided to the Secretariat at least 60 days before the meeting where they are to be discussed";
- b) Change the second sentence of Rule 19 from "The Secretariat shall distribute printed documents for any meeting at least 45 days before the proposed date of the meeting where they are to be discussed" to "The Secretariat shall distribute printed documents for any meeting at least 40 days before the proposed date of the meeting where they are to be discussed";
- c) Change the last sentence of Rule 23 from "Parties and alternates present at the meeting as observers shall be entitled to be present at closed sessions" to "Parties, alternates and inter-governmental organizations present at the meeting as observers shall be entitled to be present at closed sessions"; and
- d) Change the first sentence of Rule 25 from "The summary record of each meeting shall be prepared by the Secretary and sent to the Parties represented at the meeting within 120 days" to "The summary record of each meeting shall be prepared by the Secretary and sent to the Parties represented at the meeting within 60 days".

The Secretariat recommended that the Committee consider changing the wording of the last sentence of Rule 19. He noted that the current wording was ambiguous and could be interpreted in two very different ways. Following interventions from the representatives of Africa and Oceania, and the observers from Germany, Mexico, and the United States of America, the Committee decided to postpone debates on the possible re-wording of the last sentence of Rule 19 until its 20th meeting (AC20), after discussions had taken place on communication issues.

The observer from Slovenia enquired about the presentation of credentials for the observer Parties. Following some clarification by the Secretary-General, the Chairman announced that the credentials of observer Parties would be examined in accordance with Rule 7, as had been done for the organizations. The Secretariat agreed to remind observers from Parties or organizations to bring credentials in compliance with Rule 7.

3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme

3.1 Agenda [AC19 Doc. 3.1 (Rev. 7)]

The zoologist of the Nomenclature Committee (NC) stated that agenda items 20.1 and 20.2 would be discussed at the NC meeting and offered that the Nomenclature Committee report to the Animals Committee on the final day. The Animals Committee agreed to this.

The PC Chairman congratulated the AC Chairman on his election, which was echoed by many other participants in the course of the proceedings. The PC Chairman was grateful for the opportunity to attend the meeting to share matters in common and stated that, at the meeting of the NC for plants, it had been agreed that the NC botanist would draft proposed changes to Resolution Conf. 12.11 relating to standard nomenclature.

The Animals Committee also agreed to add the following items under 'Any other business':

21.2 Trade with States not party to the Convention (at the request of the observer from Mexico); and

21.3 Progress report on identification manuals (at the request of the Secretariat).

3.2 Working programme [AC19 Doc. 3.2 (Rev. 1)]

The Chairman noted that the working programme was provisional and may change depending upon the issues of the day. He also noted that there would be several working groups and that these working groups would run in parallel, therefore it would not be possible for participants to join every working group. The observer from the Netherlands noted that agenda item 4 on the Admission of observers was missing from the working programme. The Committee adopted the working programme with the addition of agenda item 4 on Admission of observers on the first day. The Secretariat added that regional reports would be presented the last day of AC19 and that regional representatives may wish to consult with Parties of their region to bring together any information for this agenda item.

4. Admission of observers (no document)

The Chairman advised the Committee of the procedure to accept applications from non-governmental organizations to be observers at the meeting. The Committee agreed to admit these observers to the meeting.

5. Regional reports

5.1 Africa (AC19 Doc. 5.1)

The Committee noted the report presented by the regional representative.

5.2 Asia (no document)

The representative of Asia gave an oral report of the following points:

- a) He had received a report from Brunei-Darussalam and there had been no record of high volumes of trade in CITES species;
- b) He had the report from Japan on sharks;
- c) There had been a meeting of experts on sharks from seven countries in the region at the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Centre;
- d) Israel had provided information on their public awareness work, national legislation plan and seizures; and
- e) The United Arab Emirates had provided a report on the status of the conservation of and trade in the saker falcon.

The Committee noted the oral report presented by the regional representative. The Chairman asked that a written copy be provided to the Committee.

5.3 Central and South America and the Caribbean (no document)

The representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean gave an oral report of the following points:

- a) There were communication difficulties in the region;
- b) *Strombus gigas* was an issue of concern for the region and that there had been a meeting held in June 2003 in Jamaica on this, organized jointly by several organizations and involving government Fisheries and Management Authorities; and

- c) Chile was one of the most active countries in the region but many other countries in the region were not in the same situation financially or in terms of capacity.

The Committee noted the oral report presented by the regional representative. The Chairman asked that a written copy be provided to the Committee. The observer from Chile raised concerns about representation in the region and following clarification from the Secretary-General regarding the difficulties faced by many regional representatives, the Chairman requested that the representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean and the observer from Chile speak about any concerns bilaterally. The observer from Mexico noted that they had also been doing CITES-related work activities in Meso-America.

5.4 Europe (AC19 Doc. 5.4)

The Committee noted the report presented by the regional representative.

5.5 North America (AC19 Doc. 5.5)

The Committee noted the report presented by the regional representative.

5.6 Oceania (AC19 Doc. 5.6)

The Committee noted the report presented by the regional representative.

Following the suggestion of the Plants Committee and the Secretariat, the Animals Committee agreed to consider using a questionnaire to gather information from Parties in preparation of regional reports and requested that a model format be made available before AC20.

During discussions interventions were also made by the observers from the Netherlands and International Wildlife Coalition.

6. Strategic planning (AC19 Docs. 6.1-6.3)

The Secretariat introduced documents AC19 Docs. 6.1 and 6.2. The Chairman introduced document AC19 Doc. 6.3, noting that it provided a list of priority activities based on documents AC19 Docs. 6.1 and 6.2.

During discussions appreciation was expressed for the documents produced by the Secretariat and the Chairman. The observer from the Netherlands noted that the database of sample CITES permits was a matter for the Secretariat and not the Animals Committee [see document AC19 Doc. 6.1, paragraph 3. b)]. He also noted that, because of current budget constraints, reviews may need to concentrate only on species currently listed on the CITES Appendices [see document AC19 Doc. 6.3, paragraph 4. l)]. The representatives of Oceania and Europe, supported by the observer from the United States, noted the importance of reviewing non-listed species and the value of past reviews in bringing to light species under threat from international trade. The representative of Asia stated that priority should be given to species already listed on the Appendices. The observer from the Republic of Korea noted that, in relation to non-listed species, decline was not necessarily a result of international trade but could be the result of many other factors.

The observer from Spain noted that the issue of standardized units of measures was very important and needed to be developed further. The Chairman noted that the list provided in relation to standardized units was not meant to be an exhaustive list. The observers from Israel, the Netherlands and Spain noted that technological issues may be outside the scope of the Animals Committee. However, the observer from Spain added that some elements such as tagging, marking and microchips were relevant to the work of the Animals Committee. The Chairman referred participants to agenda item 7.1 where technological issues would be discussed.

The observers from Israel, Mexico, Spain, the United States and WWF International discussed the registration of captive-breeding operations for specimens of Appendix-I species, *in situ* conservation and *ex situ* production. They wondered whether these should be dealt with together or separately and asked about their relevance to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The AC Chairman pointed out that these issues would be dealt with separately under agenda item 11.

The observers from Israel and the Republic of Korea, supported by the observer from the Animal Welfare Institute, noted that there should be a way for the Transport Working Group to address issues of capture and storage of specimens. Alternatively, they suggested the creation of a separate working group on this. The observer from the International Wildlife Coalition noted that the issue of capture and storage of specimens could be linked to that of animal mortality and of the process of non-detriment findings. The Secretariat noted that the Animals Committee did not have to deal with matters relating to catching and storage of animals and should focus on the prevention of unnecessary loss of live animals. It added that this could be an issue for the Transport Working Group.

Clarification was requested, from the representative of Oceania, for the wording in the last sentence of paragraph 4. f) in document AC19 Doc. 6.3. The Chairman and Secretariat both confirmed that the sentence should read "At SC49 it was decided that proposals resulting from the process should be submitted to the Conference of the Parties".

There were also discussions concerning the development of regional directories of experts. The PC Chairman advised that the Plants Committee had completed its directories for all regions in a standardized format and that these were available on the CITES website.

Following a brief and informal discussion with the regional representatives, and after consulting with the Chairman of the Plants Committee, the AC Chairman instructed the regional representatives to contact Parties in their regions to establish a list of scientific experts in Management and Scientific Authorities who would act as focal points.

Following the discussions the Committee adopted the list of priorities as outlined in document AC19 Doc. 6.3.

During these discussions interventions were made by the regional representatives of Asia and Europe, and the observers from the Netherlands, the Republic of Korea and Spain.

7. Report on the 49th meeting of the Standing Committee

The Secretariat explained that agenda items 9 and 10 of the present meeting had also been discussed during SC49.

7.1 Working Group on Technical Implementation Issues (AC19 Doc. 7.1)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and encouraged members of the Committee to consider how best to collaborate with the Working Group on Technical Implementation Issues. The observer from of the United States noted that there was a working group on this issue and that it was chaired by a colleague in the United States Management Authority who was not present at AC19. The Chairman of the Plants Committee noted that during discussions on this issue at the 13th meeting of the Plants Committee (PC13), several observers had volunteered to send ideas to the working group and had also requested the working group to keep the Plants Committee informed of specific issues.

The Committee established a contact group with open membership. The observer from the United States volunteered to act as the recipient of participants' suggestions and report to the Committee at AC20.

During this discussion, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Asia, North America and Oceania, and the observers from Chile, Mexico, the Netherlands and International Wildlife Federation.

7.2 Export Quota Working Group (AC19 Doc. 7.2)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. The PC Chairman advised that during discussions on this issue at PC13 the Plants Committee had offered to provide comments to the Export Quota Working Group and had requested to be kept informed on progress made. The AC Chairman suggested that the Animals Committee do the same.

The Committee offered to comment on reports from the Export Quota Working Group and requested to be kept informed about its progress.

During this discussion, interventions were made by the regional representative of Asia, and the observers from China, Mexico, the Russian Federation and the United States.

8. Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species

8.1 Introduction to Resolution Conf. 12.8 (AC19 Doc. 8.1)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item with a PowerPoint presentation that was made available in printed copy to the participants. In order to allow for the completion of work on taxa already under review, the Committee decided to postpone the consideration of new species for inclusion in the Review of Significant Trade until AC20. The observer from UNEP-WCMC noted that UNEP-WCMC could produce a user-friendly and comprehensive analysis of CITES trade data before the next meeting of the Animals Committee and that this could be done with input from TRAFFIC and IUCN.

However the observer from the United Arab Emirates informed the Committee that there was a report on trade in the saker falcon (*Falco cherrug*) and requested that the Committee review this species, in compliance with Resolution Conf. 12.8, paragraph c). He noted that 92 per cent of the saker falcon in trade were wild-collected and originated from 13 different countries. In addition, he noted that 6,500 specimens had been exported to the Gulf region without proper documentation and that this level of harvest must be unsustainable. The representatives of Asia, Europe and Oceania, and the observer from the Czech Republic supported the review of the species. The observer from China noted that this was an implementation issue and should be referred to the Standing Committee. The Chairman asked the United Arab Emirates to make its report available for consideration to the Animals Committee and to the working group on significant trade (working group 8).

During this discussion, interventions were made by the observers from the Netherlands and International Wildlife Coalition.

8.2 Review of the implementation of recommendations (AC19 Doc. 8.2)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. TRAFFIC reported on the compilation of information for the database referred to in document AC19 Doc. 8.2, paragraph 4. b), and advised that the database would be available for AC20. Following a question from the observer from Israel about the availability of the database on the Internet, the observer from UNEP-WCMC noted that an easy link could be made to the species database maintained by UNEP-WCMC and available from the CITES website.

The observer from the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society suggested that the narwhal should be considered as a priority species for review. She also noted that there had not been any population status surveys carried out on the species since 1979 and that trade in the species had increased. The observer from Canada noted that under a bilateral agreement with Greenland, stock assessments for Narwhal had been conducted as recently as 1999. The Chairman referred the issue of the narwhal to AC20 when they would consider new species for inclusion in the Review of Significant Trade.

The Committee noted the report by TRAFFIC and decided to postpone further discussion until AC20.

During this discussion, interventions were made by the observers from the United States and the Species Survival Network.

8.3 Progress on the implementation of the Review of Significant Trade (Phases IV and V) (AC19 Doc. 8.3)

The Secretariat introduced the document section relating to *Strombus gigas*. TRAFFIC introduced the Annex to document AC19 Doc. 8.3. The observer from the International

Wildlife Coalition congratulated TRAFFIC on the report but noted that a regional approach would have been the best way to proceed, not excluding range States of least concern.

The Committee established a working group (working group 3) that would examine the information provided in the report by TRAFFIC, review the provisional categorization of the species and formulate recommendations. This group comprised:

- a) Regional representatives: Mr Mohammad Pourkazemi (Asia, Chairman) and Mr Sixto Incháustegui (Central and South America and the Caribbean);
- b) Observers from Parties: France, Mexico, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America;
- c) Observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations: the World Bank International Finance Corporation and TRAFFIC; and
- d) The Secretariat.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of working group 3 presented document AC19 WG3 Doc. 1. The representative from Central and South America and the Caribbean congratulated the working group on its work. He also noted that being from the Dominican Republic, which is one of the countries listed under Category 1, he urged the support of the Secretariat to assist the Category 1 countries, in particular, develop and adopt measures for the successful management of this species. The Committee adopted the group's recommendations as outlined in document AC19 WG3 Doc. 1 with the addition, recommended by the observer from the Netherlands, of a sub-paragraph g) to Annex 1, paragraph 1, to read "Show that paragraphs 2. a) and 2. b) below have been initiated".

The Secretariat then introduced the document section relating to the status of taxa selected for review since the CoP11. Following the intervention from the representative of Asia, the Committee decided to establish a working group on significant trade (working group 8) and referred this issue to it.

8.4 Progress on the first country-based Review of Significant Trade (AC19 Doc. 8.4)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. The observer from Madagascar reported on the progress made. She also noted that a correction was required to the last sentence of paragraph 11 of document AC19 Doc. 8.4, in order to read:

In the meantime, the Malagasy Management Authority is not issuing export permits for species subject to the annual quotas that are communicated to the Secretariat until the Scientific Authority has gathered information on the exporters' facilities. Once this information has been assessed and analysed, quotas will be allocated between these exporters as appropriate and permits will be granted.

The observer from the United States requested a copy of the report on workshop proceedings. The Secretariat stated that it would be happy to make the report available in order to make the process more transparent. The observers from Pro Wildlife and IWMC stated that they were concerned about the level of trade in some species exported from Madagascar, and IWMC asked the Secretariat to send out a new Notification to the Parties listing the species that can and cannot be traded with Madagascar. The Secretariat replied that it was already imposing a huge amount of work on the Malagasy Management Authority, and that it would first look to finalizing the Action Plan.

The Committee decided to postpone further discussion until AC20.

During this discussion, interventions were made by the observers from the Czech Republic, Spain, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States and the Species Survival Network.

8.5 Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade (AC19 Doc. 8.5)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item, noting that a working group at PC13 had also discussed this issue and that its report was included in document PC13 WG4 Doc. 1. The observer from the Defenders of Wildlife noted that they were unable to participate in the working group and hoped that a process of public consultation could be included in the evaluation.

The Committee referred this issue to the working group on significant trade.

8.6 Conservation of *Saiga tatarica* (AC19 Doc. 8.6)

The observer from the United States introduced this agenda item. He invited the Committee to consider the Annexes to document AC19 Doc. 8.6. The observer from the Russian Federation noted that he did not agree with some of the assumptions made in the documents presented by the United States and stated that, although still low, populations were stable. He also noted that poaching may not be the only reason for population decline and that there may be some natural population cycle as the population of the species had also been low in the early 1900s. The Secretariat noted that in June 2001 the Standing Committee had recommended Parties to refuse importations of the specimens of saiga (*Saiga tatarica*) from the Russian Federation and Kazakhstan until certain actions had been taken by the two range States, including the development and implementation of a regional conservation strategy. The observer from WWF International noted that her organization had provided funding for a workshop in 2002 on this issue and to address the drastic population decline. She also noted that there was poaching for horns and that these were used in the traditional medicine trade. She suggested referring the matter to the Standing Committee. The observer from IFAW-International Fund for Animal Welfare noted that populations had increased during the years prior to the break-up of the Soviet Union as a result of strict protection, but that poaching had flourished after that event.

The Committee referred this issue to the working group on significant trade.

The Committee therefore agreed that the working group on significant trade would discuss agenda items 8.3, with the exception of *Strombus gigas*, 8.5 and 8.6. This group comprised:

- a) Regional representative: Ms Katalin Rodics (Europe);
- b) Observers from Parties: Canada, China, Iran, the Russian Federation, Spain, the United States and the United Arab Emirates;
- c) Observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations: the European Commission, IFAW-International Fund for Animal Welfare, International Wildlife Coalition, Nabu Naturschutzbund Deutschland E.V, Species Survival Network and TRAFFIC;
- d) The Chairman of the Animals Committee (Chairman); and
- e) The Secretariat.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of working group 8 in specimens of Appendix-II species presented document AC19 WG8 Doc. 1, including the recommendation that the saker falcon enter the Review of Significant Trade immediately and as an exceptional case. Regarding sturgeons, the observer from the Russian Federation noted that *Acipenser persicus* (see page 10 of document AC19 WG8 Doc. 1) was found throughout the Caspian Sea in small quantities, but was only harvested by Iran.

The Committee adopted the group's recommendations as outlined in document AC19 WG8 Doc. 1 with one amendment. In the section on the saiga, a new sentence to the last bullet point on page 12, under "The Working Group agreed", should be added to read "A scientific programme should be elaborated and launched as soon as possible to support saiga conservation and management".

9. Review of the criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II (AC19 Doc. 9)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. The Chairman of the Plants Committee presented the approach adopted by her Committee, as outlined in document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev. 1). This approach was supported by the representatives of North America and Oceania, the observers from China, Mexico, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The observers from Canada and the United Kingdom noted that controversial species should not be selected for testing the proposed criteria, and the observer from the Defenders of Wildlife requested that the selection include some species for which data were known to be lacking.

The Animals Committee agreed to follow the same approach as that of the Plants Committee. It established a working group (working group 1) to select the taxa that would be used to review the listing criteria in the Chair's text (document AC19 Doc. 9, Annex), taking into consideration the timetable adopted by the Plants Committee.

The Chairman announced the members of working group 1 as follows:

- a) Regional representative: Mr Rod Hay (Oceania);
- b) Observers from Parties: Canada, Chile, China, Germany, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland, the United States (Chairman) and Zimbabwe; and
- c) Observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations: the European Commission, IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, International Wildlife Coalition, Safari Club International, TRAFFIC, Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, and WWF International.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of working group 1 presented document AC19 WG1 Doc. 1. A number of observers that had not attended the working group offered to assist with species reviews. The Chairman of the Animals Committee requested that any comments relating to the scientific names used in the document be passed directly to the Chairman of the working group as work would continue on this intersessionally. He added that participants who wished to nominate a species for inclusion on the list should also contact the Chairman of working group 1. The Committee adopted the group's recommendations as outlined in document AC19 WG1 Doc. 1.

10. Periodic review of animal species included in the Appendices (AC19 Doc. 10)

The Secretariat introduced document AC19 Doc. 10 and noted that there were two main issues, one relating to the requirement that the Animals Committee undertake a general periodic review of animal species in the Appendices, and the other relating to the specific review of crocodile ranching operations.

The specific review of crocodile ranching operations was introduced by the observer from the IUCN Crocodile Specialist Group (IUCN CSG), as outlined in the Annex to document AC19 Inf. 3. The Committee congratulated IUCN CSG on this proposal and recommended that it seek funding to carry out the work and review the timeline in the light of CoP13 decisions.

During this discussion, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia, North America and Oceania, and the observers from the United States, the Defenders of Wildlife, International Wildlife Coalition and WWF International.

10.1 Periodic review of animal and plant taxa in the Appendices (AC19 Doc. 10.1)

The Chairman of the Contact Group on the Review of the Appendices introduced this agenda item. The Chairman of the Plants Committee noted that the contact group on this issue had contacted the Plants Committee to gather information to include in this document, and that additional members were selected at PC13 to join the contact group. As stated at PC13, the group now consisted of the PC representatives of Africa (John Donaldson and Quentin Luke) and Oceania (Greg Leach), the observers from the United States (Javier Alvarez, Chairman) and UNEP-WCMC (Gerardo Fragoso), the observer from Spain at the Animals Committee (Carlos Ibero) and the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees.

The Committee adopted the approach laid out in document AC19 Doc. 10.1 and agreed to examine the progress made by the Contact Group at AC20. The observer from Mexico noted that they had several reviews currently under way and that they were not willing to stop the process because they had already invested a substantial amount of money. The Committee noted that a few reviews were currently under way but agreed not to initiate any new reviews until CoP13.

11. Registration and monitoring of operations that breed Appendix-I animal species for commercial purposes

11.1 Process for registering operations (AC19 Doc. 11.1)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item, noting that there was some overlap with agenda item 11.2. The observer from the United States noted that the process allowed for rejection and that the small numbers of operations being registered was not a failure but a success. The observer from the Netherlands requested the Secretariat to explain why they thought the 99 registered operations were a small number. The Secretariat responded that it received few applications for registration, that these were for the same species and the same countries, and that practically all were accepted. However the Secretariat was aware of the much larger number of commercial breeding operations and amateur breeders in Europe and the United States that bred specimens of Appendix-I species. The Secretariat therefore perceived this small number of registered operations to be a problem and wished Management Authorities to make wider use of the registration process.

The Committee established an intersessional working group (working group 5) to address the different aspects of Decision 12.78 and to provide comments on the draft Notification to the Parties in document AC19 Doc. 11.1, Annex 1. This group comprised:

- a) Regional representative: Mr Choo-Hoo Giam (Asia);
- b) Observers from Parties: Canada, Chile (Chairman), China, the Czech Republic, Israel, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, South Africa and Spain; and
- c) Observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations: IUCN, the American Zoo and Aquarium Association, Animal Exhibitors Alliance, Animals Asia Foundation, Birds International Avicultural Park Breeding and Research Centre, IWMC, and Species Survival Network.

The Chairman advised that there was always a possibility for additional Parties and organizations to become involved in working groups intersessionally.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of working group 5 presented document AC19 WG5 Doc. 1. The Committee adopted the text of the Notification to the Parties in document AC19 Doc. 11.1, Annex 1, with the amendments outlined in document AC19 WG5 Doc. 1, and urged the Secretariat to send it.

11.2 Relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation (AC19 Doc. 11.2)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and also referred the participants to document AC19 Inf. 5, prepared by IUCN. The observers from Israel, the United Kingdom, the United States and WWF US agreed that this was an important issue and required a separate working group that should include range States and the commercial sector. The representative of North America, noting that few origin countries or countries from the neotropical region were represented at AC19, recommended that the working group work intersessionally. The Committee established an intersessional working group (working group 2) to address the different aspects of Decision 11.102 (Rev. CoP12). This group comprised:

- a) Regional representative: Mr Rodrigo Medellín (North America, Chairman);
- b) Observers from Parties: Canada, Chile, Mexico, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, the United Arab Emirates and Zimbabwe; and

- c) Observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations: IUCN, the Animal Welfare Institute, the Defenders of Wildlife, International Elephant Foundation, IFAW-International Fund for Animal Welfare, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd., Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, World Association of Zoos and Aquariums, and WWF US.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of working group 2 presented document AC19 WG2 Doc. 1 and invited the observer from International Wildlife Coalition to prepare definitions for *in situ* production and *ex situ* conservation. The observer from Mexico offered to submit additional species and carry out a case study. The Committee adopted the group's recommendations as outlined in document AC19 WG2 Doc. 1 with the following amendments, as proposed by the Chairman of the working group, to Annex 2, paragraph 6. X:

- a) The first line should read "Effects of the ex situ operation on the in situ conservation of the species";
- b) Sub-paragraph g. should read "Other effects of the ex situ operation on in situ conservation of the species"; and
- c) Addition of a sub-paragraph h. to read "Is there any evidence that captive breeding either stimulates or reduces legal or illegal trade in wild specimens?".

12. Transport of live animals (AC19 Doc. 12)

The Chairman of the Transport Working Group (TWG) introduced this agenda item. She noted that the research study referred to in document AC19 Doc. 12, paragraph 10, on transport mortality was available from the CITES Management Authority of Germany and summarized in document AC19 Inf. 4. The Chairman of the TWG also informed the Committee that she would step down from her post and thanked the Animals Committee, the members of the TWG, the Secretariat and others for their assistance and contributions. The Chairman congratulated her and her group for their hard work.

The Committee decided that the TWG (working group 10) would develop a programme of work. Following the requests from the Humane Society of the United States, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) and the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) to participate in the working group, the Chairman requested that they meet and decide on one or two representatives only. However the Committee noted that the TWG may have to restructure and that the final decision on membership rested with its Chairman.

This group comprised:

- a) Regional representative: Ms Katalin Rodics (Europe, Chairman);
- b) Observers from Parties: Austria, the Czech Republic, Israel, the Russian Federation and the United Republic of Tanzania; and
- c) Observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations: IUCN, American Zoo and Aquarium Association, Animal Exhibitors Alliance, Fund for Animals, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, Pro Wildlife, RSPCA, Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, World Association of Zoos and Aquariums and WSPA.

The interim Chairman of the TWG presented document AC19 WG10 Doc. 1 and advised that the newly appointed Chairman for the TWG was the representative of Austria (Peter Linhart). The observer from South Africa expressed concern about including the issue of reducing mortality before international transport into the TWG's Terms of Reference, although it does support the work done by the TWG to attempt to reduce mortality during international transport. The Committee adopted the group's recommendations as outlined in document AC19 WG10 Doc. 1.

13. Trade in hard corals (AC19 Doc. 13)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. The Committee established an intersessional working group (working group 11) to consider and recommend a practical means of distinguishing fossilized corals from non-fossilized corals in international trade. This group comprised:

- a) Regional representative: Mr Rod Hay (Oceania);
- b) Observers from Parties: Switzerland, the United Kingdom (Chairman) and the United States;
- c) Observers from non-governmental organizations: European Pet Organization, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd. and Ornamental Fish International.

Major producer countries and commercial organizations involved in the export of coral that were not represented at AC19 would also be allowed to participate in the working group intersessionally.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of working group 11 presented document AC19 WG11 Doc. 1, noting that working group 11 would look into re-constituting the original hard coral working group. The Committee adopted the group's recommendations as outlined in that document.

14. Control of captive breeding, ranching and wild harvest production systems for Appendix-II species (AC19 Doc. 14)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. The observer from IUCN introduced document AC19 Inf. 6 noting that they would like the input from the Animals Committee for inclusion in the final report. The Chairman of the Plants Committee noted that the Plants Committee had recommended waiting for the completed report before making a decision. The observer from the Netherlands agreed with this recommendation.

The representative of North America noted that this document was a significant advance but that a table briefly describing the different production systems and species involved would have been a useful addition. The observers from South Africa and the United Republic of Tanzania both noted that they had production systems in their countries, that there was still enhanced production of wild animals and that current production definitions created confusion for Management Authorities.

The observer from the United Kingdom noted that at AC18 the coral working group had called for additional source codes that would cover the mariculture and farming of coral and that this was an important issue that needed to be addressed. He also noted that joint issues from the Animals and Plants Committees needed to be taken forward.

The observers from Israel and the United States noted that the report covered many very different issues apart from those covering production systems, and that input should be given here at AC19. The observer from the International Wildlife Coalition called for simplicity and clarity when dealing with production system definitions, and the observer from Pro Wildlife called for better implementation of existing systems. The observer from the Defenders of Wildlife stated the need to consider the impact of new codes on frontline enforcement authorities. The observer from Project Seahorse stated the need to keep in mind the impact of captive-bred specimens on wild populations.

The Committee established a working group (working group 4) to consider the proposals in document AC19 Inf. 6. This group comprised:

- a) Regional representatives: Mr Edson Chidziya (Africa, Chairman) and Ms Katalin Rodics (Europe);
- b) Observers from Parties: Germany, Israel, Madagascar, the Netherlands, the United Republic of Tanzania, South Africa and the United States; and
- c) Observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations: IUCN, the European Pet Organization, Pro Wildlife, World Conservation Trust and World Parrot Trust.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of working group 4 presented document AC19 WG4 Doc. 1. He noted that the debate had not been closed and that they would accept further input. Interventions

were then made by the representative of Asia, and observers from South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States. The representative of North America noted that a data matrix had been prepared for a past Animals Committee meeting highlighting different codes in use and their characteristics, and that this data matrix could be expanded and used by the working group. The Committee adopted the group's recommendations as outlined in document AC19 WG4 Doc. 1.

15. Conservation of trade in tortoises and freshwater turtles

15.1 Addressing recommendations from the Kunming workshop (AC19 Doc. 15.1)

The observer from the United States introduced this agenda item noting that the Annex to document AC19 Doc. 15.1 could assist the Committee in prioritizing the recommendations from the Kunming workshop. Following interventions by the observers from WAZA and IWMC, the Committee decided to establish a working group on tortoises and freshwater turtles (working group 6) and referred this issue to it.

15.2 Development of mid- and long-term conservation measures for tortoises and freshwater turtles [AC19 Doc. 15.2 (Rev. 1)]

The observer from Germany introduced this agenda item, welcoming comments and input from the Committee on Annexes 1 and 2 of document AC19 Doc. 15.2 (Rev. 1). The Chairman noted that this was an interesting paper that contained information on some controversial issues. Following interventions by the observers from the International Wildlife Coalition and Pro Wildlife, The Committee referred this issue to working group 6.

15.3 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 11.9 (Rev. CoP12) and Decisions 12.41, 12.42 and 12.43 (AC19 Doc. 15.3)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item noting that the working group on tortoises and freshwater turtles could update, clarify and prioritize the recommendations stemming from the Kunming workshop; and develop Terms of Reference for a study on pancake tortoises (*Malacochersus tornieri*). The observers from the Netherlands and the United Republic of Tanzania noted that there had been an Animals Committee mission to the United Republic of Tanzania to look at tortoise production and export and therefore some of the work had already been done. The Secretariat noted that it would make the mission report available but that this agenda item referred to a status review and to trade control and production of pancake tortoises in all range States of the species. The Committee referred this issue to working group 6.

Following the requests from the observers from the European Pet Organisation and the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council to participate in the working group, the Chairman requested that they meet and decide on one representative. The European Pet Organisation eventually joined the working group.

The working group on tortoises and freshwater turtles comprised:

- a) Regional representative: Mr. Michael Griffin (Africa, Chairman);
- b) Observers from Parties: China, Germany, Malaysia, the Netherlands, the United Republic of Tanzania, Slovenia, Switzerland and the United States; and
- c) Observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations: IUCN, the Chelonian Research Foundation, the European Pet Organization, FAW-International Fund for Animal Welfare, Pro Wildlife, TRAFFIC, World Association of Zoos and Aquariums and WWF US.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of working group 6 presented document AC19 WG6 Doc. 1. The observer from Japan noted that if paragraph 2. a) i) of that document referred to the listing of non-endangered species, then he did not agree with the recommendations of the working group. The Secretariat expressed concern that the recommendations of working group 6 did not address all the points raised in Decision 12.43. The Committee noted these comments and adopted the group's recommendations as outlined in document AC19 WG6

Doc. 1 with the following amendments to paragraph 1, as recommended by the observers from the Netherlands and the United Republic of Tanzania:

- a) Sub-paragraph a) to read "Recommends that the issue of genetic identification of separate wild populations and farmed individuals of *Malacochersus tornieri* be studied, in order to address Kenya's concerns that the control of Tanzanian breeding stock is inadequate";
- b) Sub-paragraph b) to read "Recommends that proposals to undertake such a study be invited from suitable institutions, and that the institution chosen should liaise with resident Management and Scientific Authorities to find reliable sources of genetic material; and
- c) Sub-paragraph d) to read "Recommends that countries that have indicated that they are also range States for this species (i.e. Uganda, Mozambique and Zambia) provide detailed evidence that this is the case".

The representative of Asia asked how many tortoise and freshwater turtle species remained unlisted and the observer from the Chelonian Research Foundation responded that only a small percentage remained but that these could be threatened because they are 'look-alike' species.

16. Seahorses and other members of the family Syngnathidae

16.1 Implementation of the Appendix-II listing for *Hippocampus* spp. (AC19 Doc. 16.1)

The observer from the United States introduced this agenda item. The observer from Mexico offered Mexico as a host country for the technical workshop. The observer from Project Seahorse noted that they could provide technical input to the workshop. The Committee referred this issue to the working group on Syngnathids (working group 7).

16.2 Universal minimum size limit for seahorses (AC19 Doc. 16.2)

The Chairwoman of the working group on Syngnathids introduced this agenda item. The Secretariat advised that Decision 12.56 invited the World Customs Organization (WCO) to develop harmonized codes for live seahorses, dried seahorses, live pipefishes (and pipehorses), and dried pipefishes (and pipehorses). The Secretariat reported that it had contacted WCO and that WCO had asked for additional information. The Secretariat requested assistance from the working group in answering the queries of WCO, and stated that it would make available the relevant correspondence.

The Committee referred this issue to the working group on Syngnathids, recommending that it also take into consideration points raised in agenda item 16.1. The membership of the working group was changed and it now comprised:

- a) Regional representatives: Mr Rod Hay (Oceania) and Mr Choo-Hoo Giam (Asia);
- b) Observers from Parties: China, Greece, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, and the United States; and
- c) Observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations: IUCN, IFAW-International Fund for Animal Welfare, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd., Ornamental Fish International, Project Seahorse (Chairwoman) and Swan International.

Later in the meeting, the Chairwoman of working group 7 presented document AC19 WG7 Doc. 1. The observer from Japan noted that minimum size limits should be established for each species and that, in general, basic management and implementation issues should have been resolved before including a species in the CITES Appendices. The Committee adopted the group's recommendations as outlined in document AC19 WG7 Doc. 1 with the understanding that the Committee may look for alternative ways to undertake the recommended research.

17. Conservation of and trade in sea cucumbers in the families

Holothuridae and Stichopodidae (AC19 Doc. 17)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item noting that Decision 12.60 directed to the Animals Committee could not be carried out until Decision 12.61, directed to the Secretariat, was completed. The observer from Japan noted that FAO was organizing a meeting in China in October 2003 on sea cucumbers and suggested that the Secretariat collaborate with FAO.

The Committee established a working group (working group 9) to look at the objectives and agenda of and participation at the proposed workshop. Working group 9 comprised:

- a) Regional representatives: Mr Rod Hay (Oceania, Chairman) and Mr Choo-Hoo Giam (Asia),
- b) Observers from Parties: China, Japan, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, the United Republic of Tanzania and the United States; and
- c) Observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations: IUCN, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd., Ornamental Fish International, Project Seahorse, Swan International and TRAFFIC.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of working group 9 presented document AC19 WG9 Doc. 1. He also noted that UNEP-WCMC should be approached as they had a significant body of information on this group of species. The observer from Mexico wished to point out that there was already a technical workshop on seahorse conservation and management proposed for late 2003 or early 2004. The Committee adopted the group's recommendations as outlined in document AC19 WG9 Doc. 1.

18. Biological and trade status of sharks

18.1 Progress made by the United States of America in developing and

implementing the IPOA-sharks (AC19 Doc. 18.1)

The observers from the United States introduced this agenda. The representative of Asia noted that nine Asian countries had participated in a regional technical meeting on fisheries issues and that the results of this meeting would be released before CoP13. The representative of South Africa also noted that they had developed a draft plan waiting to be finalised for submission to FAO. The Committee established a working group on sharks (working group 12) and referred this issue to it.

18.2 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.6 and Decision 12.47 (AC19 Doc. 18.2)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. The Chairman notified that, in compliance with Decision 12.47, he had liaised with FAO that had agreed to keep him informed of progress on this issue. The Secretariat asked that the Committee review all available information and make species-specific recommendations. The Committee referred this issue to working group 12.

18.3 Progress made by Japan in developing and implementing

the IPOA-sharks (AC19 Doc. 18.3)

The observer from Japan introduced this agenda item. The observer from the United States welcomed the report by Japan and noted that shark species listed on CITES Appendices does not prohibit trade but rather regulates the trade. She also noted that the United States does not prohibit the landing of whole sharks (sharks with fins intact) thus promoting effective utilization of the whole animal. The Secretariat also referred the Committee to document AC19 Inf. 7 with regard to agenda item 18. The observer from IUCN noted that IUCN and TRAFFIC would soon be publishing a report on the status and international trade in sharks. The Committee referred this issue to working group 12.

Working group 12 comprised:

- a) Regional representative: Mr Choo-Hoo Giam (Asia);
- b) Observers from Parties: China, Greece, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom and the United States; and
- c) Observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations: the European Commission, IUCN, Defenders of Wildlife, IFAW-International Fund for Animal Welfare, NABU Naturschutzbund Deutschland E.V, TRAFFIC, WildAid and WWF UK.

The Chairman noted that the group would have to appoint its chairman.

Later in the meeting, the observer from the European Commission, whom working group 12 had appointed as its Chairman, presented document AC19 WG12 Doc. 1. The observer from Japan noted that they appreciated the constant efforts being made and the work of the working group but that working group 12 should seriously consider support for the management of shark species and not simply recommend the inclusion of all shark species in the CITES Appendices. The Committee adopted the group's recommendations as outlined in document AC19 WG12 Doc. 1, including the draft Notification to the Parties in Annex 1.

19. Trade in alien species (no document)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item stating that Decision 10.76 directed the Animals Committee to establish cooperation with the IUCN/SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) in the implementation of their document *IUCN Guidelines for the Prevention of Biodiversity Loss due to Biological Invasion*. The representative of Oceania, as intermediary between the Animals Committee and IUCN/SSC ISSG, noted that there had been slow progress with the preparation of a list of CITES invasive species but that the IUCN guidelines were now finalized and available in English, French and Spanish from <http://www.issg.org>. The observer from Mexico noted that the issue of *in situ* measures recommended for the import of invasive species should be a matter better dealt with through the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Committee recommended that the representative of Oceania submit a document on this issue at AC20. The observers from Chile, Israel and the United States, and the Secretariat, offered their help in preparing this document.

20. Standard taxonomy and nomenclature

20.1 The role of standard taxonomy and nomenclature references and the amendment of the Appendices as a consequence of nomenclatural changes (AC19 Doc. 20.1)

The Chairman introduced this agenda item explaining that this document had been discussed at the meeting of the Nomenclature Committee (fauna) held on 19 August. The regional representative of North America expressed concern about the transparency of the decision-making process of the Nomenclature Committee and recommended a review of the Nomenclature Committee's operation. The zoologist of the Nomenclature Committee noted that all documents prepared for the Conference of the Parties were done so against deadlines set by the Conference of the Parties. He also noted that it was not possible to speculate which species would be proposed for inclusion in the CITES Appendices and take this into account when making any recommendations regarding nomenclature. He also noted that Terms of Reference for the Nomenclature Committee were included in Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP12) and that it was not appropriate for one committee to review the terms of reference of another committee. The representative of North America agreed with the zoologist of the Nomenclature Committee but noted that there was no regional representation on the Nomenclature Committee. The representative of Africa recommended caution on the issue of regional representation. The observer from the International Wildlife Coalition noted that the problem highlighted might be one of perception, as the Nomenclature Committee had not attracted much attention in the past. He added that if a review was necessary, it should be done through a revision of Resolution Conf.12.11.

The Committee noted the document.

20.2 Standard nomenclature for birds (AC19 Doc. 20.2)

The observer from Mexico introduced this agenda item explaining that this document had been discussed at the meeting of the Nomenclature Committee (fauna). The zoologist of the Nomenclature Committee noted that the problem raised regarding the split-listing of the *Amazona ochrocephala-oratrix-auropalliata* complex was not a problem of nomenclature but of identification. He also noted that the change of standard reference for birds from Sibley and Munroe to the Handbook of the Birds of the World was because the Handbook of the Birds of the World was a more recent publication and provided additional and useful information. The Committee noted the document and the Chairman suggested that perhaps the Animals Committee or a Party could put forward a document suggested ways to tackle this issue.

21. Any other business

21.1 Research projects (AC19 Doc. 20.1)

The Chairman introduced this agenda item. The Secretariat encouraged Parties to submit project proposals. The representative of North America welcomed this news and encouraged Parties to publish any research studies in peer-reviewed journals. The Committee noted the document, reminding Parties of the procedure laid out in Resolution Conf. 12.2 for approval of externally funded projects and urging them to submit project proposals.

21.2 Trade with States not party to the Convention (no document)

The observer from Mexico introduced this agenda item, recommending a review of procedures for trade with States not party to the Convention following their experiences with the Solomon Islands over dolphin imports. This was supported by the observer from the Defenders of Wildlife. The Secretariat noted that establishing different trade requirements for Parties and non-Parties could lead to problems with the World Trade Organization. The Secretariat also noted that Resolution Conf. 9.5 offered adequate provisions for trade with non-Parties. The representative of Oceania noted that this may be more an issue of building the capacity of Parties and non-Parties to enable them to make non-detriment findings. The Committee noted the issues raised.

21.3 Progress report on identification manuals (no document)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item, noting that document PC13 Doc. 17 contained an overview of progress on identification manuals. The observer from Israel asked whether the identification manual sheets would become available on the Web. The Secretariat noted that there were indeed plans to do this and work had started but that this was not yet complete. The Committee noted the report.

The Chairman noted that the time and venue for the next Animals Committee meeting was not yet confirmed. The observer from the United States requested that the meeting be early in 2004 to give sufficient time to prepare documents for CoP13.

The observer from the Netherlands withdrew document AC19 Inf. 8. On his request, the Secretariat agreed to provide budgetary information at AC20 on the costs of Animals Committee meetings held in different locations.

The representative of Asia noted that there was under-representation from observers from the Southeast Asian region. The representative of Africa also noted that many Parties in their region had insufficient funding to attend.

22. Closing remarks (no document)

The Chairman thanked the members and alternates of the Animals Committee and the observers for their constructive spirit and their cooperation in arriving at the decisions that had been taken. He also thanked the Secretariat for organizing the meeting and the interpreters for their support throughout the meeting.

The representative of Oceania thanked the Chairman, on behalf of the Animals Committee for his efficiency and gentlemanly chairmanship of the meeting.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

REVIEW OF THE CRITERIA FOR AMENDMENT OF APPENDICES I AND II (DECISION 12.97)

Members of the working group

The regional representative of Oceania and the observers from Canada, Chile, China, Japan, Mexico, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Spain, Switzerland, the United States of America (Chair), Zimbabwe, the European Commission (rapporteur), IUCN, International Wildlife Coalition, Safari Club International, TRAFFIC, and WWF International.

Terms of reference

- Select a very limited number of taxa "non-sensitive" species for review to ensure the applicability of the criteria and guidelines, taking into consideration also the previous work done by the Plants Committee at its 13th meeting on this issue [Decision 12.97 and SC49 Summary Report (Rev. 1), Agenda item 19].
- Recommend a process to check taxa against the proposed criteria, taking into consideration the proposed time frame (Decision 12.97).

Summary of the discussions and recommendations

1. The Chairman reminded the group of the process that had been agreed by the Plants Committee and the Animals Committee in plenary. He emphasized that it was not the purpose of the exercise to prove whether or not a given species qualified for Appendix I or II.
2. The rationale for including non-listed species was discussed. It was agreed that some non-listed species would merit inclusion if, because of their biological and trade characteristics, they provided an opportunity to test aspects of the listing criteria that would not otherwise be tested by examination of CITES-listed species.
3. The following additions/clarifications were made to the *modus operandi* agreed by the Plants Committee:
 - a) The need to use and test the definitions in Annex 5 of the Chair's text when applying Tables 1A and 2A of document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev. 1) was emphasized (i.e. the exercise should not just focus on changes to Annexes 1 and 2a);
 - b) The compilation process scheduled to take place in November should result in recommended changes to the Chair's text to be discussed at the 14th meeting of the Plants Committee (PC14) and 20th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC20);

- c) The Chair's text identified issues which merited further work at PC14 and AC20 and the review should help to bring these forward;
 - d) The CoP12 working group on criteria did not have time to consider Annex 6 to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) and this would have to be addressed at some stage; and
 - e) It was agreed that Parties who wished to carry out review of other species than those agreed by the working group could propose these to the Animals Committee's Chairman before 5 September 2003 for his approval.
4. The following proposed timeframe would allow for completion of the tasks in Decision 12.97. Changes to the timeline adopted by the Plants Committee [PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev. 1)] have been included.

August 18-21, 2003: The Animals Committee discusses the workplan and the list of species for review at their meetings in Geneva, and achieves consensus on objectives and timelines.

22 August – 5 September, 2003: A small contact group comprised by the United States (Robert Gabel and Javier Alvarez), United Kingdom (Noel McGough and Vincent Fleming), and Spain (Margarita Clemente and Carlos Ibero) finalizes edits to document CoP12 Com. I. 3 and drafts guidelines for conducting the review.

6 September – 31 October, 2003: An intersessional working group named by the Animals Committee, along with the Committee Chairman, work toward completing the taxonomic reviews and simultaneously recommending specific changes to Doc. CoP12 Com. I. 3 criteria, if necessary, using the tables in Annex 2. If budget dictates it, this working group could conduct their business by email/post/telephone.

1 November – 30 November, 2003: The Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees compile in a table the results of the taxonomic reviews.

5 December 2003: The Secretariat posts the results of the taxonomic reviews on the CITES web site.

5 December 2003 – February 2004: Parties submit comments on the results of taxonomic reviews to the Animals and Plants Committees through their regional representatives.

February 2004: The Animals and Plants Committees hold a joint meeting to analyze the results of the taxonomic reviews, discuss revisions to CoP12 Com. I. 3, and prepare a draft resolution for consideration at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP13) in October 2004.

Note: At the end of PC13, it was announced that PC14 would be held in Namibia in February 2004. However, Namibia informed the Plants Committee that it would be unable to host a joint meeting of the Animals and Plants Committees. Consequently, during AC19, the Secretariat and Chairman of Animals Committee began conversations, still on-going, with South Africa to see if that country could host AC20 in February 2004 just prior to or immediately after PC14. A second option considered was holding AC20 in April 2004 and inviting PC members to attend a joint AC-PC session on the review of the listing criteria during AC20. Since most PC14 participants will have to stop in South Africa on their way to Namibia, several AC19 participants noted that the first option would be more cost-effective to those wishing to attend a joint AC-PC session on the review of the listing criteria, thus allowing a larger number of individuals to participate in the discussions on listing criteria. In addition to increasing the travel costs associated with attending disjunct PC and AC meetings and limiting the number of PC members able to attend AC20, the second option would provide the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees with only a few weeks to finalize a draft resolution on criteria to amend Appendices I and II.

March 2004 (SC50): The Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees submit draft resolution to the Standing Committee.

May 2004: A final draft resolution is posted on the CITES website (by the Secretariat) by the 150-day deadline prior to CoP13.

PROPOSED LIST OF TAXA TO EVALUATE THE DRAFT REVISED CRITERIA
CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT COP12 COM. I. 3

CITES-listed Animals

Mammals

Marine:

1. Gray whale (*Eschrichtius robustus*) - Japan (Kengo Tanaka), Mexico (Hesiquio Benítez), and United States of America (Robert Gabel)

Carnivore:

2. Leopard (*Panthera pardus*) - Zimbabwe (Tapera Chimuti)

Herbivore:

3. Argali (*Ovis ammon*) - China (Zhigang Jiang)
4. Vicuña (*Vicugna vicugna*) - Chile (Agustín Iriarte)

Primate:

5. Crab-eating macaque (*Macaca fascicularis*) - China (Zhigang Jiang); Viet Nam ?

Birds

Raptor:

6. Gyrfalcon (*Falco rusticolus*) - Canada (Veronique Brondex) and the United States of America (Robert Gabel)

Herbivore:

7. Yellow-headed amazon (*Amazona oratrix*) - Mexico (Hesiquio Benítez)
8. Lilac-crowned amazon (*Amazona finschi*) - Mexico (Hesiquio Benítez)

Reptiles

Crocodylian:

9. Yacare caiman (*Caiman yacare*) - Argentina (Victoria Lichtschein)

Snake:

10. Angolan python (*Python anchietae*) - Namibia (Michael Griffin)

Fish

Anadromous:

11. White sturgeon (*Acipenser transmontanus*) - United States of America (Robert Gabel) and Canada (Veronique Brondex)

Freshwater:

12. Isok barb (*Probarbus jullieni*) - United Kingdom (Vincent Fleming)
13. Asian arowana (*Scleropages formosus*) - United States of America (Robert Gabel)

Arthropods

Arachnid:

14. Emperor scorpion (*Pandinus imperator*) - Spain (Carlos Ibero) and France (Jacques Rigoulet)

Insect:

15. Apollo butterfly (*Parnassius apollo*) - Spain (Carlos Ibero)

Molluscs

16. Bear paw clam (*Hippopus hippopus*) - France (Jacques Rigoulet)

Non-CITES-listed Animals

Birds

Colonial:

17. Adelie penguin (*Pygoscelis adeliae*) - New Zealand (Rod Hay)

Amphibians

18. Western toad (*Bufo boreas*) - United States of America (Robert Gabel)

Reptiles

Lizard, Endemic:

19. Horned gecko (*Rhacodactylus* sp; species to be determined by reviewer) - France (Jacques Rigoulet)

Turtle:

20. Alligator snapping turtle (*Macrolemys temminckii*) - United States of America (Robert Gabel)

Fish

Marine, short-lived, high productivity:

21. Pacific sardine (*Sardinops melanostictus*) - Japan (Kengo Tanaka)
22. California sardine (*Sardinops sagax*) - United States of America (Robert Gabel)
23. Norwegian spring-spawning herring (*Clupea harengus*) - Norway (Arne Bjorge)

Marine, moderate productivity:

24. George's bank haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*) - United States of America (Robert Gabel)

Corals

25. Red coral (*Corallium rubrum*) - United Kingdom (Vincent Fleming) and Spain (Carlos Ibero)

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN *EX SITU* PRODUCTION AND *IN SITU* CONSERVATION

Participants

The working group was chaired by Rodrigo Medellín, Mexico.
Vincent Fleming, United Kingdom, served as rapporteur.
Tapera Chimuti, Parks and Wildlife Management Authority of Zimbabwe;
Masha Vorontsova, IFAW-Russia;
Karen Steuer, WWF-US;
Adam Roberts, Animal Welfare Institute;
Carroll Muffett, Defenders of Wildlife;
Marshall Meyers, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council;
Laura van der Meer, International Elephant Foundation;
Yolanda Matamoros, IUCN;
Peter Dollinger, World Association of Zoos and Aquaria.

1. This working group is coordinated with the WG on Registration for Commercial Captive Breeding of Appendix I species to avoid overlap and achieve synergy with that group.
2. The group took note of Decision 11.102 and reviewed the terms of reference as stated in document AC19 Doc. 11.2. The calendar for the group will be set when we have a final date for the next AC meeting but in the meantime we're assuming that the AC will meet in February of 2004.
3. The working group felt that a final report before the next CoP is not feasible at this point but we will work intersessionally to have a progress report that will include:
 - a) Results of the notification as modified below
 - b) Preliminary results of case studies of species that are bred *ex-situ* and the relationship with conservation *in-situ*
4. The WG decided that the case studies should not include only registered facilities, as most captive breeding operations are not registered. The terms of reference, coming from document AC19 Doc. 11.2, paragraph 11 was amended as reflected in Annex 1.

5. The initial list of case studies offered to be prepared by the WG members include:

<i>Crocodylus simensis</i>	Siam crocodile
<i>Ailuropoda melanoleuca</i>	Panda
<i>Falco peregrinus</i> (US and UK)	Peregrine falcon
<i>Crocodylus niloticus</i>	Nile crocodile
<i>Ursus tibethanus</i>	Asian black bear
<i>Bison bonasus</i>	European bison
<i>Diceros bicornis</i>	Black rhino
<i>Acinonyx jubatus</i>	Cheetah
<i>Scleropages formosus</i>	Asian bony tongue
Sturgeons from the Caspian sea	
<i>Vultur gryphus</i>	Andean condor
<i>Cyclura cornuta</i>	Caribbean iguana
<i>Leontopithecus rosalia</i>	Golden lion tamarin
<i>Panthera leo</i>	African lion

WAZA will expand this list in consultation with the regional associations.

6. The notification requesting information on additional case studies and relationship between ex-situ breeding operations and in-situ conservation programs was modified as it appears in Annex 2 of this document.

EXTRACT FROM DOCUMENT AC19 DOC. 11.2

11. The following elements could be included in the terms of reference of the working group suggested in the previous paragraph:

- a) Using the expertise of its members, responses to the Notification to the Parties and input from specialized organizations and the PC, evaluate the relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation by:
 - ~~iii)~~ assessing the ~~contribution-effect~~ of commercial and non-commercial captive breeding of CITES-listed animal species to the *in situ* conservation of those species;
 - ~~iv)~~ ~~consulting with the~~ Take into account the work of the Convention on Biodiversity on issues of access and benefit sharing in relation to *ex situ* production;
 - iii) asking Parties and organizations to identify and provide information on potential case studies; and
 - ~~iv)~~ requesting organizations to provide information on the conservation costs and benefits of different captive-production systems.
- b) In liaison with the PC ~~In collaboration with WAZA, AZA, EAZA and others, and in liaison with the PC,~~ identify possible strategies and other mechanisms by which (nationally or internationally) registered or non-registered *ex situ* breeding operations may contribute to enhancing the recovery or conservation of CITES-listed species ~~within the countries of origin by~~ *in situ* by:
 - i) identifying examples of *in situ* recovery or conservation programmes for species produced in breeding operations, and examining in what form and under what conditions operations could usefully contribute to these programmes;
 - ii) ~~examining means to facilitate the transfer of offspring or breeding stock so as to maintain the genetic diversity of the captive populations;~~
 - iii) ~~proposing means to~~ assessing the effect of reintroduction of captive-bred specimens for the conservation of the species ~~whether re-introduction of captive-bred specimens could be beneficial to species conservation and, if so, how to develop programmes where this would be the case;~~
 - iv) examining mechanisms for generating sustainable funding for in-situ conservation from ex-situ breeding operations to establish conservation funds that are linked to registered captive-breeding activities, for instance through applying a 'conservation' levy on the sales of captive-bred specimens entering international trade;
 - v) evaluating the capacity and need of range States to develop or manage *in situ* recovery and conservation programmes for species produced in ~~registered~~ *ex situ* breeding operations ~~that can attract support from these operations;~~ and
 - vi) ~~encouraging the support to and establishment of conservation projects by consortia of ex situ production operations; and~~
- c) consider the development of a draft resolution for discussion at the 13th meeting of the Conference of Parties on tools for Scientific and Management Authorities to assist in monitoring and assessing the impacts of captive production systems, and to develop recommendations concerning *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation of CITES-listed species.

DRAFT

NOTIFICATION TO THE PARTIES

CONCERNING:

Relationship between ex situ production and in situ conservation

1. Decision 11.102 (Rev. CoP12), directs the Animals Committee to

continue to examine the complex issues related to the origin of founder breeding stock and the relationship between ex situ breeding operations and in situ conservation of the species and, in collaboration with the Plants Committee, the American Zoo and Aquarium Association, the European Association of Zoos and Aquaria and the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums, identify possible strategies and other mechanisms by which registered ex situ breeding operations may contribute to enhancing the recovery and/or conservation of the species within the countries of origin, and report its findings at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
2. The Secretariat circulated Notification to the Parties No. 2001/91 of 19 December 2001, inviting all Parties and organizations to provide information on the relationship between *ex situ* production systems and *in situ* conservation programmes for CITES-listed species. The response to this Notification was limited, and this new request for information has been developed in collaboration with the Animals Committee.
3. As communicated in Notification to the Parties No. 2001/091, a range of different perspectives and critical views appear to exist on the relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation of the species concerned.
4. A working group has been established within the Animals Committee to look at the relationship of *ex-situ* captive breeding and *in-situ* conservation.
5. Parties and organizations are invited to provide case studies to the In-Situ Ex-Situ Working Group that may assist the Animals Committee in examining the relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation of CITES-listed species.
6. The case studies should be submitted to the Chair of the WG by December 15th, 2003, in the following format:

TEMPLATE FOR CASE STUDY PREPARATION

- I. Author
- II. Taxon
- III. Range states where this taxon is found
- IV. Current estimated wild population size (if known)
- V. Species' status under CITES and the IUCN
- VI. Population trend for the species in the wild (Increasing, Decreasing, Stable, if known)
- VII. For each *ex situ* breeding operation that is the subject of this study:
 - a. Name,
 - b. Location,
 - c. Year of establishment,
 - d. CITES registration number (if applicable)
 - e. Type of operation (registered commercial, non-registered commercial, non-commercial)
 - f. Origin of the founder stock for the operations if known
- VIII. Number of individuals of this species successfully bred annually
- IX. Is there an *in situ* conservation program for this species? In which countries?

- X. How does the *ex situ* operation contribute to the *in situ* conservation of the species? For example:
- a. Have individuals been released into the wild? How many? Where did the release occur? From what operation? are relevant IUCN Reintroduction Guidelines being followed?
 - b. Have causes for the decline in the wild been identified? Mitigated? Stopped?
 - c. Is there an ongoing monitoring program in place covering the animals released into the wild?
 - d. Have the data from the monitoring program been analyzed and peer reviewed published and has success of releases been quantified?
 - e. What financial and other (specify) resources have been made available and used to support *in situ* conservation programs for the species from the *ex situ* breeding operation?
 - f. Explain how the *ex situ* breeding operation has demonstrably affected conservation education in the country of origin of the species and the country in which the *ex situ* breeding operation exists.
 - g. Other ways in which the *ex situ* operation contributes to the *in situ* conservation of the species.
7. The information received in response to this Notification will be presented to the Animals Committee to assist in its implementation of Decision 11.102 (Rev. CoP12) and its report for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

Working group reports

REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE IN SPECIMENS OF APPENDIX II SPECIES -
STROMBUS GIGAS (PHASE V)

Chair: M. Pourkazemi (Regional representative for Asia)

Participants: Sixto Inchaustegui (Regional Representative for Central South America and the Caribbean), Jacques Rigoulet (France), Jorge Alvarez-Romeo (Mexico), Alison Littlewood (United Kingdom) Miguel A. Rolon, Nancy Daves, John Field (United States of America), Stephanie Theile (TRAFFIC), Sabrina Birner (World Bank), Jim Armstrong (CITES Secretariat).

1. The working group recognized that *Strombus gigas* presents a unique situation in that it is the only species to have entered the significant trade process twice; which indicates that the process was not effective the first time round. In addition it was also acknowledged that since entering into the process in 2001 the Resolution dealing with Significant Trade had changed.
2. It was also recognized by the working group that although some range States would not have been informed of the proposed categorizations prior to AC19, that ample opportunity had been given to all range States to comment on the consultants report and on their implementation of Article IV in relation to *S. gigas*. In addition the major issues of concern identified in the report had all been highlighted during the International Queen Conch Initiative (IACI) workshop which met in Montego Bay, Jamaica (11-12 June 2003).
3. Members of the working group agreed that the report was a comprehensive summary of the current situation in the region and agreed with all the proposed categorizations as recommended by the CITES Secretariat and the consultant, except in the case of Mexico where, upon clarification, it was decided that it had sufficient regulatory mechanisms in place to ensure that harvest was being conducted in a sustainable manner and exports only concerned shells derived from this harvest. For this reason Mexico was moved from the category of 'possible concern' to 'of least concern',
4. In accordance with Resolution Conf. 12.8 all Parties categorized as of least concern would be removed from the review. However, in recognition of the fact that effective management of the population requires regional cooperation, these Parties should be invited to participate in the regional activities arising from this process.
5. The working group, in consultation with the CITES Secretariat, formulated a series of recommendations for those Parties' populations of 'urgent concern' and proposed specific actions to address problems related to the implementation of Article IV. The recommendations differentiate between short-term and long-term actions and are included in Annex 1 of this report. Countries in

this category should be encouraged to seek assistance from FAO and other appropriate organizations. These countries should also explore opportunities to strengthen bi-lateral communication with importing Parties and urge major importing countries to contribute technical and financial assistance. The working group also formulated recommendations for countries identified as having populations of 'possible concern' (see Annex 1).

6. In compliance with paragraph k) of Resolution Conf. 12.8, the working group identified that there were other issues of concern in many of the range States other than those specifically related to the implementation of Article IV, and identified a series of issues which the CITES Secretariat is asked to address in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Convention and relevant Resolutions (see Annex 1).
7. The working group asks the members of the Animals Committee to adopt this proposed approach and to consider actively engaging the consultant when finalizing the recommendations directed to the Parties identified as of 'possible concern', to ensure that the recommendations address the specific issues of concern raised in the report commissioned by the CITES Secretariat and identified in relation to individual countries.
8. The CITES Secretariat is requested to remind those countries subject to a trade suspension under Phase III of the Review of Significant Trade to provide information, as required by the Standing Committee, in order for the suspension which is currently in place to be withdrawn (namely Antigua & Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica and Trinidad & Tobago).

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Animals Committee proposes that the Standing Committee recommends a suspension of imports of specimens of the species from those Parties in Category (i) and Category (ii) if the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairman of the Animals Committee, has not been able to verify that they have implemented the following:

Category (i) - 'species of urgent concern' for which the available information indicates that the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2(a), 3 or 6, are not being implemented

Dominican Republic; Haiti; Honduras

1. Short-term actions to be taken within 6 months:
 - a) Establish a voluntary moratorium on the commercial harvest (excluding legal harvest in territorial waters of the Parties concerned) and the international trade of *Strombus gigas* within four weeks of this recommendation being made (upon communication by the AC to the Parties);
 - b) Identify areas to be designated for commercial fisheries;
 - c) Undertake density studies in these designated areas;
 - d) Identify and analyse trends in available landing data;
 - e) Establish a standardized minimum meat weight that corresponds to adult specimens of unprocessed and processed meat;
 - f) Based on the results of the density studies, the analysis of landing trends and standardized meat weight establish cautious catch and export quotas in consultation with the Secretariat;
 - g) Demonstrate that items 2a) and 2b) below, have been initiated.
2. Long-term actions for implementation to be taken within 18 months:
 - a) design and implement a fishery data collection programme. This programme is designed to collect catch and effort data and shall include 1.) a system of permits and licenses for commercial harvesters and exporters, and 2.) regular reporting of landing and export data;
 - b) Design and implement a long-term population monitoring programme for the designated commercial fishing areas. This programme should provide reliable estimates of adult and juveniles densities within commercial fishing areas, at a minimum.
 - c) Give serious consideration to the recommendations of the June 2003 IQCI meeting and commit specifically to those recommendations on:
 - i) development of a regional management regime, including cooperative quota setting,
 - ii) law enforcement capacity and effectiveness
 - iii) population assessments and other research relating to the management of Queen Conch

Category (ii) – ‘species of possible concern’ for which it is not clear whether or not the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2(a),3 or 6(a) are being implemented

Antigua and Barbuda*; Barbados*; Bahamas; Belize; Colombia; Cuba; Dominica*; Grenada; Nicaragua; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Trinidad and Tobago* (* refers to those countries currently subject to a trade suspension under Phase III of the Significant Trade Process)

3. Short-term actions to be taken within 12 months:

Bahamas, Belize, Colombia, Cuba, Nicaragua, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines shall:

- a) Establish within 12 months cautious catch and export quotas, communicate these to the Secretariat and provide information for the basis of these quotas.
- b) Establish a standardized minimum meat weight that corresponds to adult specimens of unprocessed and processed meat
- c) Design and implement a fishery data collection programme. This programme is designed to collect catch and effort data and shall include 1.) a system of permits and licenses for commercial harvesters and exporters, and 2.) regular reporting of landing and export data.
- d) Design and implement a long-term population monitoring programme for the designated commercial fishing areas. This programme should provide reliable estimates of adult and juveniles densities within commercial fishing areas, at a minimum.

4. Long-term actions to be taken within 24 months:

All Parties included in Category (ii) shall:

- a) apply adaptive management procedures to ensure that further decisions about harvesting and management of the species concerned will be based on the monitoring of the impact of previous harvesting and other factors.
- b) give serious consideration to the recommendations of the June 2003 IQCI meeting and commit specifically to those recommendations on
 - i) development of a regional management regime, including cooperative quota setting,
 - ii) law enforcement capacity and effectiveness
 - iii) population assessments and other research relating to the management of Queen Conch

The Secretariat should remind those countries subject to a trade suspension as a result of the Review of Significant Trade under Phase III to provide the required information to the Standing Committee in order for the suspension to be withdrawn.

Category (iii) – ‘species of least concern’ for which the available information appears to indicate that the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2(a), 3 or 6(a) are being met

Anguilla, Aruba, Bermuda, Brazil, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Costa Rica, France (including Guadeloupe and Martinique), Guatemala, Jamaica, Mexico, Montserrat, the Netherlands Antilles, Panama, Turks and Caicos Islands, United States of America (including Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands) and Venezuela.

On the basis of Resolution Conf. 12.8 all Parties categorized as of ‘least concern’ would be removed from the review.

These Parties are invited to participate in the regional activities arising from this process and should give serious consideration to the recommendations of the June 2003 IQCI meeting and commit specifically to those recommendations on:

- development of a regional management regime, including cooperative quota setting,
- law enforcement capacity and effectiveness
- population assessments and other research relating to the management of Queen Conch.

Problems identified in the course of the review that are not related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a)

In compliance with paragraph k) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 the working group recognized that there were other issues of concern in range States other than those specifically related to the implementation of Article IV, and directed the Secretariat to address these in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Convention and relevant Resolutions.

Problems identified included:

1. Several countries and dependent territories reportedly import specimens of *Strombus gigas* that have been obtained illegally, for example through unauthorized fishing in waters under the jurisdiction of other states and the subsequent transfer of the product across international borders. Often, the product is sold at sea or reported as being landed in national waters. Although this happens in many range States this is of particular concern for **Aruba (NL), the Dominican Republic, Guadeloupe (FR), Honduras, Martinique (FR) and the Netherlands Antilles (NL)**.
2. In several countries illegal fishing and subsequent transfer of the product across international borders occurs undermining national management measures. This is of particular concern for Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and Venezuela. These countries should also explore opportunities to strengthen bi-lateral communication, cooperation and exchange of data on law enforcement issues. This cooperation should especially be sought between importing and exporting States.
3. Insufficient monitoring and reporting of trade occurs in a number of range States and needs to be addressed. Monitoring and reporting of trade volumes seems especially problematic for the dependent territories of **France, the Netherlands** and the **United Kingdom**, with trade often not monitored and going unrecorded.
4. The majority of Parties have reported trade in *Strombus gigas* meat in numbers instead of kilograms. This prevents proper monitoring and analysis. All meat in international trade should be reported in kilograms (kg) and live specimens and shells in kilograms (kg) or number of specimens.
5. To properly control and monitor levels of exportation, information on percentages of tissue loss (and thus weight) during the processing is needed.
6. All countries are requested to collaborate in the development and establishment of a standardized conversion factor for queen conch meat found in international trade.
7. These queen conch range States should also seek assistance from FAO and urge major importing countries to contribute technical and financial assistance specifically in those countries categorized as of urgent concern.

Draft recommendations of IQCI-CITES Workshop
Montego Bay, Jamaica 11-12 June, 2003

Recognizing that *Strombus gigas* is one of the most important fisheries for the region and that this species is experiencing continued and significant declines,

Recognizing also that due to its biological characteristics, this species is vulnerable to over-exploitation and that once depleted, recovery can take many years to occur,

Recognizing further the 1996 San Juan Declaration establishing the International Queen Conch Initiative,

Considering that an active program to cooperate on the conservation and management of this species will directly respond to guidance from leaders given at the World Summit on Sustainable Development with respect to the need to take action at all levels to restore depleted fish stocks on an urgent basis,

Reaffirming our commitment to proper implementation of Article IV of CITES,

Recognizing that a lack of financial and human resources limits the ability of national governments and regional organizations to implement the recommendations in this document,

Noting that stock declines have occurred despite 10 years of listing on Appendix II of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES),

Deeply concerned that a lack of focused attention to this species will result in the loss of this species as a commercially viable resource in many parts of the region,

Acknowledging the management and regulatory measures including closures, gear and size restrictions already underway at the national level in support of the sustainable use of this species,

Fully aware of the need to consider management of this species in the context of scarce resources for fisheries enforcement and as one component of a sustainable fisheries management program at the national, sub-regional and regional level,

Noting that reliability, compatibility and quality of data on the status and trends of queen conch stocks and on trade constitutes a serious impediment to effective management of conch stocks,

Understanding the need for greater networking among countries and regional partners to manage this shared resource,

Committed to building partnerships among all interested organizations, institutions and stakeholders in the region to maximize effective use of scarce human and financial resources, and

Welcoming the recent establishment of the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism in this regard,

The International Queen Conch Initiative-CITES Workshop submits the Following Recommendations, pending approval by governments, for consideration by national governments and appropriate inter-governmental bodies, in particular CARICOM, CRFM, CITES and FAO.

Relating to Significant Trade Review Process/ Improvement of CITES implementation capabilities

1. States should provide specific comments on the report in its totality and national implementation of Article IV to CITES Secretariat by June 30 deadline.
2. After consideration in Capitals, meeting organizers should provide to CITES, by June 30 deadline, these recommendations along with a summary report as a regional response to the TRAFFIC Report.
3. States should urge appropriate authorities to review relevant national legislation implementing CITES with a view to meeting minimum standards in the CITES National Legislation Project.

4. States that have not already done so should consider establishing catch and export quotas to improve the management of *Strombus gigas* and should report those quotas to CITES authorities for notification to Parties.
5. States, where appropriate, are urged to find the most effective channel of communication between authorities responsible for queen conch management and national CITES authorities and stakeholders, and between the CITES Secretariat and the Parties.
6. CITES and FAO are urged to work together to finalize the Memorandum of Understanding between them as soon as possible.
7. One goal of the CITES-FAO MOU is to facilitate improved communication and exchange of information between CITES and fisheries authorities at the national level bearing in mind the existing FAO communication network.
8. States should consider designating authorities responsible for management of conch stocks as CITES authorities for this species.

Relating to Improvement of Scientific Research on Queen Conch Biology

9. Establish regional database and/or standardized data storage formats for conch biological research.
10. Promote partnership with existing organizations working on similar activities.
11. Stock assessment, early life history, growth and recruitment studies need to be priorities in national and regional research programs.
12. Promote the undertaking of more abundance surveys for *Strombus gigas*.
13. Need to develop standardized methodologies and implementation strategies for more robust abundance surveys taking into account the biological characteristics of *Strombus gigas*.
14. Explore stock enhancement opportunities for this species as well as opportunities for transplantation of spawning stocks to locations that will maximize spawning success.
15. Biological research should also focus on identification of essential spawning and recruitment habitat as well as research addressing dispersal of larvae for *Strombus gigas* with a view to assisting planners in establishing effective marine reserves to promote rebuilding of stocks.
16. Cooperative arrangements should be sought to conduct stock assessments, based on the best science available and transparency of data, for queen conch, as necessary.

Relating to Improvement of Status and Trends Reporting for Queen Conch Stocks

17. Promote exchange of standardized data to facilitate a more accurate regional picture of status and trends of *Strombus gigas* stocks. In this regard, a harmonized conversion factor for conch product types is critical.
18. Favourably consider CRFM Project proposal for Strengthening Assessment and Management of the Conch Resources in the Region.
19. As a matter of priority, States should consult within governments to reduce discrepancies in reporting on status and trends of stocks as well as trade data (e.g. differences in CITES data and fisheries export data).
20. The region should actively participate in the implementation of FAO's Strategy for Improvement of Status and Trends of Fisheries – requesting that Queen Conch be considered as a priority by FAO in implementing the Strategy.

Relating to Improved Cooperation on Management of QC Stocks

21. States should favourably consider CRFM proposal to establish a Caribbean regional lobster and conch fisheries management organization. CRFM should consult with other regional bodies in order to avoid duplication of efforts.
22. Non-CARICOM countries are encouraged to become Associate Members of CRFM at the earliest opportunity. Non-CARICOM countries should work closely with CRFM to establish criteria for associate member status in CRFM.
23. During discussions/negotiations to establish a Caribbean regional lobster and conch fisheries management organization, consideration should be given to the use of the CRFM Lobster and Conch Working Group as a mechanism to organize efforts in this regard.
24. Pursue discussions and cooperative opportunities on the utility and feasibility of establishing marine reserves for queen conch stocks, in particular pursue cooperation between CRFM initiative, Caribbean Environment Program, FAO, and other governmental and non-governmental organizations on these issues.
25. Cooperation on management measures at the sub-regional level will be critical to leveraging scarce resources.

Relating to Improved Law Enforcement Capacity and Effectiveness

26. States should pursue, as a matter of priority, regional cooperation to deter and eliminate IUU fishing activities in the Caribbean region.
27. Recognize the need for and initiate capacity building programs to implement these recommendations, in particular with respect to law enforcement issues.
28. Cooperative programs should include but not be limited to information sharing, law enforcement initiatives, training opportunities, technical assistance, and other relevant means.
29. States, where appropriate, should strengthen their legal and regulatory structures for law enforcement relating to fisheries management.
30. Promote opportunities for regional cooperation on implementation of the FAO International Plan of Action to deter, prevent and eliminate IUU fishing, in particular Caribbean regional participation in upcoming FAO consultations on IPOA implementation.
31. Consider participation in the voluntary Fisheries Monitoring Control and Surveillance Network.
32. Explore opportunities to strengthen bilateral communication, cooperation and exchange of data on law enforcement issues. This cooperation should especially be sought between importing and exporting States.

Relating to Improved Education, Outreach and Involvement of Industry/Interested Stakeholders

33. Develop and implement education and outreach programs targeting fishers, consumers and young people designed to raise awareness of queen conch status and concerns.
34. Seek partnership opportunities with industry and NGO community to fund these efforts. (note: Dominican Republic, Archipelago of the Sciences Program (Guadeloupe), CONACYT (Mexico), CINVSTAV (Mexico), Parque Xelha (Mexico), Conch Heritage Network (USA) and CFMC programs for youth outreach).
35. Ensure transparency throughout the development of a regional fisheries management organization for conch and lobster fisheries by including industry and interested stakeholders in these discussions at local, national, sub-regional and regional levels.

Relating to Operationalizing Resolutions and International Conventions and Other Relevant Arrangements

36. Promote cooperation between intergovernmental organizations interested in this resource, in particular CITES and SPAW protocol, as a means to secure adequate resources for States to implement these recommendations and meet commitments under international conventions.
37. States should solicit donor parties and organizations that are interested in the conservation and sustainable use of the queen conch outside the range States region to provide the technical assistance and financial support in accordance with Conf. Res. 12.8 to ensure that adequate human resources, institutional capacity, legal and regulatory systems, research and management strategies are executed and maintained for the overall improvement of this marine resource.
38. States should promote the continued viability of *Strombus gigas* for the food security of the region by fully implementing appropriate quality assurance programs, recognizing the need for capacity building assistance in this regard and noting the value-added such work would bring to the sector.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

Report of the working group

CONTROL OF CAPTIVE BREEDING, RANCHING AND WILD
HARVEST PRODUCTION SYSTEMS FOR APPENDIX-II SPECIES

Chair: Edson Chidziya, Regional Representative for Africa

Present: Irina Sprotte, Germany
Maria Anastasiou, Greece
Simon Nemtzov, Israel
Thea Carroll, South Africa
Julius Kibebe, United Republic of Tanzania
Roddy Gabel, United States of America
Alison Rosser, IUCN-The World Conservation Union
Jaques Berney, IWMC-World Conservation Trust
Cristiana Senni, World Parrot Trust
Ger van Vliet and Anna van der Heijden, CITES Secretariat

Mandate:

- Examine the IUCN document AC19 Inf. 6, which summarizes the IUCN report on a review of the different wildlife production systems
- Review and refine the suggestions and proposals in the documents as appropriate.

Recommendations:

1. The production systems should be grouped on the basis of three main characteristics:
 - a) the level of wild collection and its impact on population survival;
 - b) the extent to which wild collection is offset by enhancing productivity through rearing; and
 - c) the extent to which specimens are bred in captivity according to Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.).
2. The existing source codes (C, F, D, R, W) should be maintained in order to remain simple, practical and clear.
3. The code C should be used for specimens bred in captivity according to Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.).

4. The code F should be used for specimens resulting from the exchange of gametes under captive conditions or propagated asexually in captivity (F1 or subsequent generations) that do not fulfil the definition of 'bred in captivity' in Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.).
5. The code D, as defined in Resolution Conf. 12.3, should be used only from specimens from operations captive-breeding Appendix-I species for commercial purposes that are registered with the CITES Secretariat. (There was no full agreement within the working group on this recommendation.)
6. With regard to the code R: 'specimens originating from a ranching operation': Resolution Conf. 11.16 should be revised or amended to include ranching operations other than those linked to a down-listing from Appendix I to Appendix II. This will therefore include a management plan that provides for sustainable use of the species The Group through IUCN and with the input from the Secretariat, will intersessionally, develop a draft resolution in this regard for consideration at AC20
7. By default, W will be used for wild specimens of animals and should refer to those from any source other than those mentioned above.
8. To improve implementation of source codes by both importing and exporting countries interpretative material with relevant examples of production systems under the source codes should be developed. These materials should include a description of elements that should be considered in making non-detriment findings within each production system.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

Report of the working group

REGISTRATION AND MONITORING OF OPERATIONS THAT BREED APPENDIX-I ANIMAL SPECIES
FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES. DOC. AC19 DOC. 11.1 ANNEX -
PROCESS FOR REGISTERING OPERATIONS

Members of the Working Group: N. Ishii, Japan; M. Calderon, Spain, V. Brondex, Canada; J. Stankova, Czech Republic, A. Iriarte, Chile; J. Galvin, Animal Exhibitors Alliance, A. Michels, SSN, P. Ross, IUCN; G. Cochrane, Animals Asia Foundation; K. Vehrs, AZA; M. Jardinel, Birds International.

1. Chairman of the Working group was unavoidably detained. The WG delegated P. Ross as interim Chair. After introduction, the WG reviewed AC19 Doc. 11.1, and identified these points 4. a), b) and c) as their scope:
 - a) *describe and analyse the specific problems that limit the wider use of the registration procedure;*
 - b) *provide recommendations to resolve these problems; and*
 - c) *study and evaluate how commercial captive breeding operations contributes to conservation of Appendix-I species.*
2. The WG agreed to focus on a) and b). The Parties are divided on whether there is a problem. Recognizing that the WG would complete its work intersessionally, the first task is to collect information and analyze it. We reviewed the draft notification (AC19 Doc. 11.1 Annex 2) and accepted points 1, 2. and 3. as suitable background. Operational part 4. a) and b) should produce useful information. After discussion the WG decided 4. c) i), ii) and iii) properly address the concern of WG2 and are not necessary to evaluate the registration process *per se*. The Chair of this WG has coordinated with the Chair of WG2 and harmonized on this point.

The WG recommended that the Secretariat review the outputs of WG5 and WG2, and remove 4.c) i), ii) and iii) from the notification assuming this point is covered by a notification of WG 2.

3. Noting concerns raised in AC discussion the WG identified an additional need for information from Parties about unregistered captive breeding operations. There is a continuum from small scale, non-commercial hobby breeders to large scale, commercial breeders, some of whom are registered.

The WG recognized that CITES can only be concerned with operations that supplied specimens to international trade. Therefore, Parties need not register operations that do not supply specimens to international trade, but the transfer of specimens from unregistered to registered operations should be regulated.

4. After discussion of the information that was required by the WG to "a) describe and analyse the specific problems that limit the wider use of the registration procedure;", the WG recommended additional requests for the draft notification as follows:
- 4. c) i) Provide information on the numbers and species concerned of any unregistered operations that are captive breeding Appendix-I specimens that enter international trade.**
- ii) Provide available information, best estimates or information from other sources (e.g. hobby, amateur and commercial breeding associations) on any operations involved in commercial captive breeding of Appendix-I species (it would assist the Secretariat and the Working Group to be advised if this information is not available).**
5. As a preliminary guide to topics and concerns regarding problems with the registration procedure (Conf. 12.10) the WG offers the following list of perceived issues and problems. We do not necessarily agree that these are all serious or substantive, but they have been raised in this and previous discussions:
- a) The time required to process applications by both the Management Authorities and the Secretariat is too long.
 - b) Following from this delay, and the absence of any mechanism to update the registry, information in the registry regarding captive breeding operations is not current.
 - c) Management Authorities expressed difficulties in determining whether operations are commercial despite the clear CITES definitions of "commercial".
 - d) Breeding operations and Management Authorities have difficulties documenting the legal acquisition of the original stocks, particularly when these were acquired a long time ago.
 - e) Many small operations routinely exchange specimens with other operations and therefore do not meet the criteria definition for "closed facility".
 - f) Unregistered operations may transfer specimens to registered operations which then enter international trade.
 - g) The volume of work for Management Authorities to register and monitor breeding operations, when these are numerous, is overwhelming.
 - h) Detailed reporting of stock and operations is onerous to both the operations and the Management Authorities.
 - i) Documenting production of F2 or procedures previously successful in producing F2 are difficult.
 - j) The registration criteria are too strict.
 - k) There are possibilities of delay to listing by range States.
 - l) In spite of Conf. 10.17 (Rev.) Decide c), some Parties perceive a difficulty in registering operations that produce hybrids with an Appendix-I parent.
6. Finally, the WG recognized the very short time available for distribution and responses to this notification. Therefore, the WG anticipated collecting the same information directly and independently from diverse sources (including the Secretariat) during its intersessional work. We will also request details of trade in captive bred Appendix-I specimens from UNEP-WCMC. Information received from all sources could be combined in a data base. In relation to the last term of reference c) that was not addressed by the WG, this will be discussed intersessionally. The WG also addressed the need for efficient electronic communication to conduct its work (private list or e-group). Due to the schedule of COP13 and the next AC Meeting the WG request the Secretariat to distribute the notification immediately and encourage the Parties to respond within 45 days. The WG will report the analysis of information received and recommendations to resolve this problem to the AC20.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

CONSERVATION OF AND TRADE IN TORTOISES AND FRESHWATER TURTLES

Participants:

Regional representative of Africa (Chair), Germany, China, [Indonesia], Malaysia, the Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America (Rapporteur); IUCN (Deputy Chair); WWF – World Wide Fund for Nature (Rapporteur);

Chelonian Research Foundation, [Conservation International], European Pet Association, [International Fund for Animal Welfare], IWMC – World Conservation Trust, International Wildlife Coalition, ProWildlife, [TRAFFIC], [Wildlife Conservation Society], World Association of Zoos and Aquariums.

Not all working group participants attended the full meeting; additional participants are invited to participate intersessionally.

The working group was provided with terms of reference for their discussions by the Secretariat, which were to:

- Consider the Annexes 1 to AC19 Doc. 15.1 and 1 and 2 to AC19 Doc. 15.2 (Rev.1) and formulate recommendations for follow-up.
- Monitor the implementation of Resolution Conf. 11.9 (Rev. CoP12) and follow up on the recommendations and findings formulated at the Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles held in Kunming, China, 25-28 March 2002 (see Document CoP12 Doc 10.1, paragraph 99).
- Address the actions called for in Decision 12.43 regarding *Malacochersus tornieri* (pancake tortoise) [see AC19 Doc. 15.3 (Rev.1)-pp 1-2].

Conclusions of the working group:

The working group agreed that determining specific and detailed priorities, for both species and conservation recommendations, is a complex task requiring continuation during intersessional work, with the benefit of input from additional Parties and other stakeholders.

1. Pancake Tortoise

The working group:

- a) Recommends that the issue of genetic identification of separate wild populations and farmed individuals of *Malacochersus tornieri* be studied, in order to address Kenya's concerns that the control of the Tanzanian breeding stocks is not adequate.

- b) Recommends that proposals to undertake such a study be invited from suitable institutions, and that the institution chosen should liaise with the responsible Management and Scientific Authorities to find reliable sources of genetic material.
- c) Recommends that a desktop study on the natural history of the species be undertaken.
- d) Recommends that countries that have indicated that they are also range States for this species (i.e. Uganda, Mozambique, Zambia) provide detailed evidence that this is the case.

2. Continuing Development of Conservation Measures for Asian Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles

a) Future listings

The working group:

- i) Encourages range States to proceed with the development of proposals to list all remaining unlisted species of Asian freshwater turtles on Appendix II of CITES by CoP13 [referring to AC19 Doc.15.1 and the recommendations of the Kunming Workshop in AC19 Doc. 15.3 (Rev. 1)]. This would facilitate border controls and other enforcement efforts.
- ii) If it is not feasible for the range States to prepare all these proposals for CoP13 (October 2004), the WG recommends that the range States list the remaining species on Appendix III as an interim measure.
- iii) Requests that the Secretariat send out a notification to Parties about this recommendation.
- iv) Requests the Asian Representatives to inform Parties in their region about this recommendation.
- v) Recommends that the prioritization for proposals to list species on Appendix II follow the recommendations contained within document AC19 Doc. 15.1.
- vi) Encourages NGOs with expertise and resources on this issue to support and assist range State efforts to prepare proposals for listings of these species.

b) Enforcement

Enforcement issues include:

- i) The working group recognizes the need for further improvement of national and domestic legislation concerning tortoises and freshwater turtles.
- ii) The working group is concerned about indications that turtles are at times shipped declared as 'Fisheries Products', and recommends consideration of adopting Harmonized Customs Codes to prevent such misrepresentations.
- iii) Communications between Management Authorities within the region were identified as an ongoing problem, which needs to be addressed in the wider CITES context.

c) Transport

The working group recommends that:

- i) The CITES Secretariat strongly urges that all Parties enforce IATA regulations, and that National Authorities insist that airlines adhere to these regulations.
- ii) Close liaison be developed with the Transport working group.

d) Confiscation and Disposal

The working group:

- i) Encourages Management Authorities and law enforcement personnel to continue and enhance cooperation with rescue centres.
- ii) Encourages authorities and institutions to follow existing guidelines on the disposal of confiscated animals as closely as local circumstances permit.

e) In-situ Conservation and Management Issues

The working group:

- i) Recommended that further consideration be given to various marking and identification techniques for turtles, including consideration of the specific problems involving small and juvenile animals.
- ii) Recalled the management utility and conservation value of restricting trade to specific size classes, as instituted for Pancake Tortoises.
- iii) Discussed whether farming affects harvest pressure on wild populations. In certain cases, a higher value may be placed on wild specimens, and in some cases, the introduction of farming may stimulate an increase in the value of wild specimens. Alternatively, farming may help prevent extreme pressure on wild resources through overall price moderation due to market forces. The group concluded that the impacts of farming can vary.
- iv) Discussed the issue of invasive species and agreed that this issue is better considered in the context of other fora, specifically the Convention on Biological Diversity.
- v) Discussed management practices in existing Asian turtle farms, and considered avenues to harness the energy and resources of commercial farms for the benefit of conservation actions.

3. General Recommendations

The working group agreed that:

- a) All Asian range Parties should be encouraged to participate intersessionally in further development of specific working group priorities.
- b) A follow-up regional workshop after CoP13 should be considered to share successful achievements and assist with further development towards implementation of prioritised recommendations to address outstanding challenges.
- c) Training on enforcement is needed, and this is needed at the generic level as well as specific to turtles and tortoises. It was suggested that regional Asian Parties involved in the trade of these species should be given consideration for more immediate training and capacity building, over other countries on the Secretariat's training schedule. Training for these countries should include specific modules that focus on enforcement and identification problems specific to the trade in turtles and tortoises, as well as general enforcement training.
- d) The valuable information contained in the full Proceedings of the Kunming Workshop should be made available as a matter of priority.
- e) Although trade in turtles and tortoises is an increasingly global issue, involving many countries, the group agreed that the most immediate need for attention remains in Asia, and that Parties should continue to make this region a focal point to support the implementation of the recommendations from the Kunming Workshop.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

SEAHORSES & OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FAMILY SYGNATHIDAE

Participants

Asia, Oceania, China, Greece, Mexico, Republic of Korea, United States of America, IUCN, IFAW-International Fund for Animal Welfare, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association, Ornamental Fish International, Project Seahorse (Chair), SWAN International.

Working Group (WG) Member not present: South Africa.

Terms of Reference

- Identify a minimum size limit for specimens of all *Hippocampus* species in trade as one component of an adaptive management plan, and as a simple precautionary means of making initial non-detriment findings in accordance with Article IV of the Convention. Also, consider other means of making non-detriment findings.
- Identify other technical issues that might be of interest or that need to be discussed at the workshop in Mexico proposed in AC19 Doc 16.1
- Consider the issue of developing harmonised codes for Syngnathidae for the World Customs Organisation (Decision 12.56).

I Non-detriment findings

1. Making non-detriment findings (NDFs) for *Hippocampus*
 - a) The WG agreed that it would be necessary for the Animals Committee to offer Parties advice in making NDFs, in light of the complex nature of this high volume trade in many species. Parties could adopt such recommendations as they saw fit.
 - b) Management tools that can assist Parties to improve the sustainability of fisheries as a basis for making NDFs include establishment of quotas, restriction of fishing effort, spatial or temporal fishing closures, gear adjustment, adopting initially low precautionary catch limits, tenurial rights, selective fishing (by sex etc), and size restrictions.
 - c) In light of limited understanding of *Hippocampus* population dynamics and fishing mortality, the WG concluded that minimum size limits offered the best tool to allow Parties to make interim NDFs (see paragraphs 3 & 5 below).

Recommendation: Animals Committee should encourage Parties to assess the value of other scientific and management tools that may assist in making NDFs for *Hippocampus*, with particular consideration to temporal and spatial closures and gear adjustment.

Recommendation: Animals Committee should encourage Parties to advance monitoring and assessment of *Hippocampus* populations in order to assess the effectiveness of universal minimum size limits and other management tools in securing sustainable fisheries at levels that allow NDFs.

2. Making non-detriment findings for cultured *Hippocampus*

- a) Parties that have satisfied themselves about the sustainable nature of aquaculture or captive breeding operations with respect to their impacts on wild populations may, of course, make NDFs at their discretion (according to the Convention), regardless of any other measures proposed in this report; the recommended universal minimum size limits (see paragraph 5) would not apply to approved aquaculture or captive-breeding operations.

Recommendation: Animals Committee should develop (by AC20) advice to Parties about factors they might consider in evaluating the sustainability of aquaculture ventures with respect to wild populations, as they seek to make NDFs.

Recommendation: Recognising potential difficulties in enforcement, Animals Committee should investigate (by AC20) costs and benefits of different types of tracking, labelling and monitoring systems (either for individuals or for batches) to distinguish between captive-bred and wild-caught *Hippocampus*.

3. Different forms of size limits

- a) The WG explored the viability of minimum, maximum and slot (minimum and maximum simultaneously) sizes as NDFs, and concluded that minimum sizes offered the best combination of precautionary management and enforceability.

4. Selective removal

- a) The WG acknowledged that the existing preference for large *Hippocampus* in traditional medicine means that establishing a minimum size limit is unlikely to shift further pressure onto the larger cohorts of *Hippocampus* within a population. Changes in size composition of catch and trade should, however, be assessed.

5. Universal minimum size limit

- a) After extensive discussion and careful consideration of a wide array of arguments and concerns, the WG decided that the AC should recommend a universal minimum size limit for all *Hippocampus* to Parties, in order to facilitate their NDFs. This would be set to allow most species (that reach a maximum adult size above the agreed minimum) to breed before recruiting to the fishery.
- b) The WG agreed that it would be helpful to have further research available before recommending a precise minimum size limit, in order to incorporate all available biological and trade knowledge. The 10 cm universal minimum size limit proposed in AC19 Doc 16.2 was felt to be a reasonable estimate, but the WG would prefer to review this proposed threshold at AC20, incorporating any further findings, in order to refine it if necessary.

Recommendation: Animals Committee should recommend (at AC20) a universal minimum size limit for export of all *Hippocampus* that do not originate from approved aquaculture operations.

Recommendation: As a matter of urgency, Animals Committee should encourage Parties, IGOs, NGOs and trade sectors to offer financial and technical support for necessary research on size at maturity, maximum adult size, and size distributions in trade for all *Hippocampus*. This work must be completed by AC20 in order to enable refinement of the recommendations in AC19 Doc 16.2 to

minimize economic loss while maximizing conservation benefit. The cost of research should amount to approximately US\$30-40K.

6. Live *Hippocampus* in trade

- a) Representatives of the ornamental fish industry expressed concern about the application of a universal minimum size to their relatively low volume trades, which often value smaller animals, as do the curiosity trades. After due deliberation, however, it was agreed that the minimum size to be recommended at AC20 would apply to all wild-caught *Hippocampus* in all trade, live and dried. This consensus reflected the recognition that live and dried trades are interconnected and that simple means of enforcing trade regulations are needed at this stage.

7. Species with maximum size lower than the proposed threshold size

- a) The smaller species (with adult size less than the agreed minimum) would not be subject to international trade if the proposed universal minimum size limit were used to make NDFs. This measure should not compromise trade, as very few of these small *Hippocampus* are currently exported from the wild.
- b) Smaller species could still be traded where they originated from approved aquaculture or captive-breeding operations, or where Parties demonstrated other suitable means of making NDFs.

Recommendation: Animals Committee should encourage Parties to develop complementary means of making NDFs that might allow smaller *Hippocampus* species to re-enter trade.

8. Trade of parts and derivatives

- a) The WG encouraged Parties to restrict *Hippocampus* exports from country of origin to whole animals only, in line with existing trade practice; all raw *Hippocampus* are currently exported whole, although they may be processed before re-export. This measure should preclude the possibility of *Hippocampus* below the minimum size limit being exported as parts and derivatives.

Recommendation: Animals Committee should consider (at AC20) how best to address the export of patent or pre-packaged traditional medicine where it is manufactured in the country of origin; few Parties would face this challenge at present.

9. Bycatch and discards

- a) The WG recognised that a universal minimum size limit, although still highly recommended, would be less effective in reducing detriment for *Hippocampus* populations subject to high bycatch pressure than for those subject to target fisheries.

Recommendation: Animals Committee should urge Parties, as a matter of great importance, to work with fishers and fisheries managers to document and analyse bycatch comprehensively in order to develop mitigation measures that would allow other, complementary, means of making NDFs; these might include temporal and/or spatial closures and gear adjustment.

10. Enforcement

- a) The WG noted that a universal minimum size limit has the advantage of being practical and relatively easy to enforce, particularly if enforcement officers employ careful sampling regimes.

Recommendation: As noted in AC19 Doc 16.2, the Animals Committee should develop conversion factors in order to set a universal minimum trade height that could be readily assessed by enforcement officers, as a surrogate for full *Hippocampus* height. This research could be integrated with that outlined in paragraph 5.

11. Independent certification

- a) The WG noted a potential role for independent certification bodies to assist Parties to make NDFs for aquaculture and captive breeding facilities, and to help develop complementary means of making NDFs for wild *Hippocampus*.

II Mexican workshop sponsored by USA

12. The WG congratulated the USA for its initiative in organising a technical workshop on making NDFs for *Hippocampus*, expected in late 2003 or early 2004 (as outlined in AC19 Doc 16.1). It requests the USA to include fishers and fisheries industry representatives among the participants. The workshop provides an opportunity to make progress on technical issues identified in this report. In particular, the WG encourages the USA to consider incorporating the following matters in the agenda:

- a) assessing value of scientific and management tools in making NDFs for *Hippocampus*
- b) monitoring and assessment of *Hippocampus* populations to allow NDFs.
- c) making NDFs for *Hippocampus* aquaculture and captive breeding operations;
- d) tracking, labelling, and monitoring so as to distinguish captive-bred from wild-caught animals;
- e) identifying analyses that may contribute to refining the recommended universal minimum size limit;
- f) making NDFs for the smaller species, with maximum adult size below the recommended universal minimum size;
- g) assessing *Hippocampus* bycatch, in order to recognise detriment and identify management options;
- h) making NDFs for *Hippocampus* populations caught in non-selective fishing gear;
- i) factors for height to trade height conversions;
- j) sampling procedures for enforcement officers handling large volumes of *Hippocampus*;
- k) anticipated changes in supply and demand of *Hippocampus* as Appendix II listing is implemented and thereafter.

III Decision 12.55

13. The WG considered a request from the World Customs Organization for further information on the nature of *Hippocampus* trade. In response to its questions, the WG noted that (a) most *Hippocampus* in trade are indeed used for human consumption, as medicines and tonic foods, and (b) the standard taxonomy approved by the Nomenclature Committee on 19 August 2003 represents the working list of species used by CITES.

Request: The Secretariat is requested to provide this information to the WCO, again asking that the WCO provide Customs codes that distinguish four categories of syngnathids in trade, as undertaken in Hong Kong SAR: live seahorses, dried seahorses, live pipefishes (and pipehorses), dried pipefishes (and pipehorses).

Final recommendation: The Animals Committee should continue the activities of this WG intersessionally to achieve necessary outputs by AC20 and CoP13, and should expand its membership to include representatives of key exporting countries.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

Report of the working group

REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE IN SPECIMENS OF APPENDIX-II SPECIES

The Significant Trade Working Group met on 20 August to work on the following Terms of Reference:

- a) Revise the documentation available in regard to the Review of Significant Trade for all taxa that have been selected since CoP11 (see list under paragraph 6 on p. 2 of AC19 Doc. 8.3 and in 8.6 (*Saiga tatarica*), as well as the saker falcon (*Falco cherrug*).
- b) Formulate recommendations as appropriate as outlined in Resolution Conf. 12.8.
- c) Examine the draft Terms of Reference (TOR) for an Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade, to be considered at CoP13, as proposed in AC19 Doc. 8.5. Review or amend the draft if appropriate, taking into consideration PC13 WG4 Doc.1.

The documents to be used were:

AC19 Doc. 8.1; AC19 Doc. 8.1 Annex: Resolution Conf. 12.8
AC19 Doc. 8.3 (other than *Strombus gigas*)
AC19 Doc. 8.5
AC19 Doc. 8.6
PC 13 WG4 Doc.1

The participants in the Working Group were:

Members of the Committee:

Chairman:	Thomas Althaus	AC Chairman, Regional Representative for Europe; Switzerland
	Katalin Rodics	Regional Representative for Europe; Hungary

Parties:

Robert Jones	Canada
Meng Sha	China
Jiang Zhigang	China
Zhou Zihua	China
Mohammad Reza Hosseini	Iran
Ju Young Park	Republic of Korea
Alexey Nikiforov	Russian Federation
Tatyana Kretova	Russian Federation
Raissa Khodorevskaya	Russian Federation

Alexander Sorokin	Russian Federation
Andrey Subbotin	Russian Federation
Carlos Ibero	Spain
Frederic Launay	United Arab Emirates
Abdulnasser Alshamsi	United Arab Emirates
Javier Alvarez	United States of America

Intergovernmental Organizations:

Colmán Ó Críodáin	European Commission
Peter Paul van Dijk	IUCN

Non-governmental Organizations:

Anders Rhodin	Chelonian Conservation Society
Masha Vorontsova	International Fund for Animal Welfare
Ron Orenstein	International Wildlife Coalition
Heike Finke	NABU: German Society for Nature Conservation
Angela Barden	TRAFFIC
Sue Fisher	Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society
Susan Lieberman	WWF International (Rapporteur)

I. Draft Terms of Reference for an Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade, to be considered at CoP 13, as propose in AC 19 Doc. 8.5

The first issue discussed referred to Decision 12.75 adopted at COP12, which directs the Animals and Plants Committees to draft TOR for an evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade, to be considered at CoP13.

The USA provided a detailed summary of the Plants Committee (PC) discussions regarding the evaluation (see Doc PC13 W4 Doc1). He noted that the PC hasn't even completed one phase, and has not made recommendations that are specific to plant species. The PC believes that the country review process in Madagascar may have impacts on the evaluation and recommendations, particularly with this new country-based review process. PC recommends not commencing until after COP14. The USA agreed with the PC that there should be a joint document from both committees to be considered (as per the Plants Committee). He noted that the PC is concerned that undue attention is given to animals issues when dealing with significant trade.

This Working Group spent considerable time discussing the document from the PC (WG4 Doc1). It was agreed to discuss the PC Document first then look at the actual draft Terms of Reference (provided by the Secretariat). There was significant discussion as to whether the process can begin after COP13, or should wait until after COP14, as recommended by the PC. There was also discussion as to whether the review should wait for the results of the country-based pilot study (Madagascar).

The Working Group agreed on the following:

- **It is important that the TOR are focused on how the Parties and others can learn from the lessons of the past years (more than 13 years for animals).**
- **TRAFFIC is to be congratulated for its work on the database on significant trade information, and is encouraged to design the database so that questions can be asked to enable it to inform the process of the review. The database will be critical to the process of the review.**
- **The Review should also address the conservation impacts of the significant trade process, including case studies and, if available, information on changes to the status in the wild of species that have been reviewed. Some members did not agree with case studies.**
- **The Animals Committee has a long history with significant trade, with more than 250 animal species having been reviewed. It is important to proceed with this review, using the animals-related expertise and experience.**

- However, it is preferable that the TOR reflect a phased-in process, with some of the review taking place between COP13 and COP14.
- The Working Group greatly appreciated the concerns of the PC, but nevertheless believes the review should commence its first phase after COP13, with subsequent plants-related input after COP14 (when the first phase will be complete for plants).
- The Working Group agreed that the pilot country-based study in Madagascar is exceedingly important. The review should not wait for that study to be complete, as it will take a long time to be completed with recommendations implemented; however, the Working Group hopes that as results become available, any information from that study, particularly that is species-specific, should be part of the review and learning.
- The evaluation will be dependent on funds being made available. Parties and the Budget Committee at COP13 are encouraged to ensure that funds are available.
- Range states should be actively encouraged to participate in the evaluation process.
- Work should commence inter-sessionally on the draft TOR, but the Animals Committee should not finalize its recommendations until AC20 (in 2004). The Working Group recommends the following process:
 - Comments from the members of this Working Group on the TOR should be provided to a contact point. The person recommended is Colmán Ó Críodáin of the European Commission.
 - Comments should be sent to Colmán Ó Críodáin by email, no later than 1 October 2003.
 - Colmán Ó Críodáin will work with the Plants Committee-designated representative, Noel McGough (UK), on proposed final TOR. Colmán Ó Críodáin's input will take into consideration all comments received, and comments made during the Working Group meeting.
 - The AC will finalize timing issues and the draft TOR at AC20.
 - It is recommended to include in discussions at AC20 on the TOR, information received from the TRAFFIC-produced Significant Trade Database, which will be finalized by AC20.

The Working Group made the following observations on the draft TOR in AC19 Doc. 8.5 Annex:

Objectives

- Objective 1.a. Rather than "evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the Review of Significant Trade...", it is preferable to say "evaluate the importance of the review of Significant Trade and its contribution to implementation of Article IV paragraphs 2(a), 3, and 6(a)." This is the same text as recommended by the PC.
- The TOR should include in its objectives an assessment of the value of information gathered through the review (which may have value for the Parties beyond the country concerned).
- Objective 1.c: The objective should be to formulate recommendations *concerning the significant trade process*, in view of the results and findings of the evaluation and the impact assessments. [Note: it is important that the review not make any recommendations regarding the listings of species, but rather the process itself].

Process

- The US noted that the PC recommended including impacts on unlisted species in the review. The Chairman and China felt that it should only consider Appendix II species. The Working Group did not endorse the PC recommendation to look specifically at impacts on unlisted species.
- China and others suggested the review should look at not only impacts on species, but whether legislation and regulations have improved, impacts on enforcement, CITES implementation in general

and other impacts in exporting countries (which are more general and not only for the species subject to the review).

- Paragraph 2 should be changed to read: The evaluation will *commence* between the 13th and 14th meetings of the CoP. That is in recognition of the PC concerns, and also in recognition that funds may be a factor.
- The Working Group agreed that paragraphs 3, 4, and 6 should be edited to reflect a more active role of AC and PC members in overseeing the review.

Content of the Evaluation

- The USA raised several concerns about paragraph 7, which will be provided in writing to Colmán Ó Críodáin. Concerns regard lack of clarity in use of terms (types of species, constraints, etc.), mechanisms for choosing case studies, and what is meant by markets. The USA expressed significant concerns with inclusion of costs and benefits, as that is not part of the AC's work and is not relevant to the evaluation. No member disagreed.
- The Chairman and several NGO's also identified difficulties with the text, and all are asked to provide comments as per the above procedure.

II. Saker falcon (*Falco cherrug*)

The delegate of the United Arab Emirates (Fred Launay, UAE Scientific Authority) provided an extensive summary of the conservation status and international trade in Saker falcons (*Falco cherrug*). The UAE provided a document to members of the Committee and the Secretariat, which the Secretariat will be asked to copy. An oral presentation on the issue was provided to the Working Group. In brief, trade in the species has increased; and there are serious concerns about the species' status in the wild. The UAE summarized trade issues, and information gathered as the result of a data collection and registration scheme in the UAE. The UAE found that fewer than 10% of saker falcons have proper CITES permits (based on the registration scheme). Many countries have established quotas without any attention to the status of the species' populations in the wild. One country (Mongolia) has increased its quota from 40 to 300 per year, while its population has decreased significantly. In the UAE, 3,200 falcons were registered last year, and 1,200 are sakers, with 92% of the sakers that are wild caught, from 13 countries. It is notable that 80% of the birds in UAE are now registered.. Of particular concerns is the fact that 89% of the saker falcon imports into the UAE were from 1 country (Pakistan), with more than 1000 birds, but Pakistan is believed to have only 10 breeding pairs in the wild. UAE noted that they take this very seriously, and are bringing the issue to the attention of the Animals Committee, to request the assistance of the Secretariat, the range states, and the AC. Work is needed to monitor wild populations, and to bring trade to be brought to sustainable levels. If nothing is done, the numbers in the next 5-6 years in the wild will be so low that there will not be able to be ANY trade (illegal or legal). The UAE noted that it will be hosting a major international workshop on falconry trade, in cooperation with the CITES Secretariat, involving importing and exporting countries, transit countries, and relevant NGOs, early in 2004.

The Working Group thanked the UAE, and discussed the issue.

Europe (Hungary) noted that Eastern European countries (including Slovakia, Czech Republic, Slovenia, and Ukraine) not present here have been consulted, and although they considered an Appendix I proposal, the Secretariat recommended to them that the significant trade process should be explored as an alternative. Hungary recommends taking the illegal trade issues to the Standing Committee, but also moving on the significant trade process. The situation is serious, and urgent steps are needed. Hungary hosted the World Conference of Birds of Prey in 2003. The Saker falcon subgroup of that conference agreed that CITES action must be taken urgently. Hungary is the only country with an increasing saker falcon population (from 10 pairs in the 1970's to 140 pairs today), since every nest has been guarded by volunteers for 20 years.

There was further discussion of the Pakistan issue. Pakistan is a hub- with most birds being illegal exported from China moving through Pakistan. Imports from Pakistan are a combination of. re-exports, exports, and illegal trade. Many come in without any permits. There is concern that some countries have

increased their export quotas to meet the commercial demand, but are not linked with population status or non-detriment findings.. .

China appreciated the UAE paper and the fact that UAE brought the issue forward, and noted that they are working hard to crack down on smuggling of this and other species, with more than 1,000 of Pakistani nationals involved every year. Many wild-caught saker falcons are illegally exported to the Middle East each year, and it is not a significant trade review issue. China recommends asking the Standing Committee to help address the illegal trade issues. However, China noted Rule 19 of the Rules of Procedure, and that it was unfortunate that the document had not been provided in sufficient time before the meeting.

China, Russia, the Secretariat, WWF, and others welcomed the workshop to be hosted by the UAE for early in 2004, and all hoped that the workshop with assist in solving problems for this species and addressing the relevant issues.

Russia noted this is a major problem, and agrees strongly with UAE that this is an issue both of significant trade (and non-detriment) as well as illegal trade. The situation must be studied. The problem is one of pressure on wild populations, and for Russia it is entirely an issue of illegal trade (since no permits are issued for wild-caught sakers).

TRAFFIC and WWF recommended that the issue should go directly to the Standing Committee, as well as to the significant trade process.

The Working Group agreed by consensus:

- **This is a serious conservation issue, and should be addressed as a matter of urgency.**
- **As per Resolution Conf. 12.8 paragraph c, this species should go forward as an exceptional case and enter the Significant Trade Review process immediately.**
- **This is an issue both of illegal trade and of Article IV/non-detriment findings, and as such it both belongs in the Significant Trade Review, and should be dealt with as regards illegal trade.**
- **The issue should go forward, through the AC Chairman and the Secretariat, to the Standing Committee.**
- **As a matter of urgency, the Secretariat should send letters to both Pakistan and Mongolia on the issue, based on the information provided by the UAE.**

III. Progress on the implementation of the Review of Significant Trade (Phases IV and V)

The Working Group discussed Doc. 8.3, for each species identified in paragraph 6. It was agreed that Resolution Conf. 12.8 should be used, even for species where the process was begun previously, rather than create tremendous confusion by going back to Conf. 8.9 (Rev) for those species. It was agreed that the Secretariat would summarize the issue for each species, and Working Group members would comment as relevant, including range states when present. Based on the discussion, and information received by the Secretariat, the AC Chairman would determine whether the species and country concerned could be removed from the significant trade process, or brought forward to the Standing Committee as per relevant paragraphs of Conf. 12.8.

Species have been identified by the Animals Committee (at prior AC meetings) as either "of urgent concern" (former category 1), "possible concern" (former category 2), or "least concern" (former category 3). Details are in Conf. 12.8.

Moschus spp.

China: The Secretariat reported that the AC assigned the species in China as "urgent concern". AC18 sent a range of recommendations to China, to be implemented within 1 year, and some within 3 months. They were sent to China the end of November. 2002 and received in December, and must be implemented within 12 months. The secretariat noted that the 90-day recommendations asked China to commit to or initiate certain actions, including: provide results of a national musk deer survey, clarify

harvest of wild musk deer in China, establish conservative harvest quotas if harvest is allowed, initiate a number of studies, establish a national conservation and management strategy for musk deer (taking into consideration captive breeding), implement enforcement efforts to combat poaching and domestic use, collaborate with neighbouring countries (particularly Russia), develop a system to inspect and register musk deer farms, develop non-lethal techniques to collect musk, register importers and exporters.

China replied that the primary recommendations related to commitments. China wrote to the Secretariat in February 2003 and provided the required information. China changed the protection level of all musk deer species. All are now Class I protected animals under Chinese law. Domestic management is under the State Forestry Administration of China, and China will respond as required by the end of 2003. China noted that in February 2003 the State Forestry Administration issued regulations for hunting and capture, initiated an investigation of stockpiles of raw musk, prohibited production from raw musk of anything other than medicines. A great deal of work is underway in China.

China's CITES Scientific Authority (ESSC) did a market survey of Traditional Chinese Medicine and musk deer in 2001, and provided the report to the Secretariat. The Management Authority of China is paying attention to musk deer conservation. It is now listed as one of 15 key animals for the 21st century for China (also includes the giant panda, golden monkey, etc.). The State Forestry Administration will provide funds for these species. A nation-wide survey was conducted in 2002, and will be published soon. ESSC and TRAFFIC East Asia held a symposium on the sustainable use of musk deer in 2002. No sale of musk deer is allowed in China other than for medicine; all other trade is strictly illegal. Medicines must be made from stockpiles only.

In response to an inquiry from WWF, China noted that the survey results, the result of 5 years of work, will be released shortly.

The Chairman noted that the AC will await the final results from China, and its response by November 2003, but no further action is needed by the Committee at this time. **The Working Group agreed.**

The Secretariat stated that by the end of 2003, the outcome will be evaluated, with a report to the Standing Committee in March 2004.

Russia: Russia's musk deer were included in "category 1" (urgent concern). The Secretariat reported that the AC made several recommendations that went to Russia in 2001. Examples of recommendations included: a commitment to monitor populations, establish mechanisms to prevent illegal harvesting for domestic or international trade, and mechanisms to regulate export of legally-obtained specimens. Russia was requested not to authorize exports of raw musk until these commitments made (in 3 months). Within 12 months: Russia was asked to initiate population monitoring, establish effective mechanisms to prevent illegal harvest, and put in place mechanisms to regulate export After 90 days: the Secretariat received the commitments from Russia to take these actions.

Russia reported to the Secretariat on its long-standing population monitoring programme, which was the basis for setting quotas. Russia reported that mechanisms to prevent illegal harvest are in place, including anti-poaching teams, etc. After 12 months, the Secretariat asked Russia for further clarification, which was provided.

Russia noted the musk deer workshop held in Moscow in July 2003. Russia reported some of the results of a 3-year TRAFFIC Europe/Russia project, devoted to a survey of conservation of and trade in musk deer in Russia. Participants included government, scientists, NGOs. The workshop discussed measures needed to strengthen the conservation and management of Russian populations of musk deer. The main conclusions of the workshop were:

- The government census understates the size of the musk deer population.
- Current harvest and export quotas are low, based on the population size.
- Notwithstanding poaching and illicit trade in musk, the Russian population is sustainable, although it has dropped catastrophically in some regions. Ex: in Sakhalin, it is endangered (in Russia Red Data Book).

- The Russian population doesn't meet criteria for Appendix I.
- A strategy is needed for the conservation and management of musk deer in Russia.

Activities and measures for conservation and management agreed by the participants were:

- Establish Musk Deer Specialists Working Group
- Establish a monitoring system for musk deer populations.
- Work out principles for sustainable harvest (e.g., harvest without killing, selected harvest of males)
- Establish permanent monitoring of the market (legal and illegal)
- Work out principles of using a legal market as an alternative to the illegal, black market
- Develop legislation for sustainable use and conservation

The workshop in Russia decided to ask WWF-Russia and TRAFFIC Russia to draft the preliminary Strategy of Conservation and Management of Musk Deer.

TRAFFIC read a statement from the UK Management Authority, who commissioned a report from TRAFFIC Russia on population status, harvest, and trade. The report is now in draft, and will be available in the next few months. The research assessed musk deer populations in selected areas, analyzed hunting and illegal and legal trade in musk. The report indicates that populations cannot sustain present levels of harvest (legal and illegal). The UK MA would like to keep the species in the significant trade process until the report can be evaluated. TRAFFIC noted that although the population is fortunately higher than was thought, the level of illegal harvest and poaching are also higher. TRAFFIC also noted that increased efforts to deal with poaching are needed (with which Russia concurred). TRAFFIC said the report will be available shortly; and perhaps musk deer should stay within the process until results are available.

IFAW noted that there are seizure data from the Russian Far East; there is no information on seizures on the Russia/China border, which is a serious problem. IFAW welcomed the work China is doing on the market. They noted that strict border controls are needed.

The Chairman noted that even if the AC recommendations resulted in actions, the issue may not be fixed, and the issue should go forward to the Standing Committee (it is already on the agenda).

WWF recommended sending the issue to the Standing Committee, urging that TRAFFIC's report, the UK study, and other information be put on the Secretariat's website, and provided to Parties, the AC, and the SC.

China said it has taken measures to decrease demand. Musk is not used in perfume in China, and half of the medicine demand is satisfied by artificial production.. All medicine production is strictly controlled, and demand is decreasing. TRAFFIC noted that work in China is critical to what is happening in Russia, in terms of poaching, and controls on illegal trade. The issue should go forward for discussion at the Standing Committee meeting.

The Working Group agreed:

- **The secretariat will provide all relevant materials to the AC Chairman, and together they will provide information and a report on progress to the Standing Committee (including reports, studies, conclusions, etc.).**
- **Russia and China have complied with the 90-day recommendations. Russia has complied with the 12-month deadline, and it is expected China will reply by the November 2003 deadline.**

Naja naja spp.

The Secretariat noted that this was discussed at AC18. All countries identified with problems had to establish cautious export quotas and provide information on the scientific basis of those quotas.

China - least concern (category 3). China was asked to provide information if had a trade ban. The Secretariat never received official confirmation of the ban (the decree or legislation), and China agreed to send it forward.

Indonesia: category 2 (possible concern). Indonesia was asked to establish a cautious quota. It established a quota in 2003 of 500 individuals. The Secretariat considers it complied with the recommendations.

Laos: category 1: urgent concern. Letters were sent, and no response was received. Laos is a non-party.

Malaysia: category 1: urgent concern. Responses were sent in 2001, but Malaysia never clarified the issue of quotas, and Malaysia continues to export specimens. It has never provided information on the scientific basis of export quotas.

Thailand: category 1: urgent concern. No response has been received by the Secretariat.

Singapore: category 3: least concern. Singapore was asked about controls on transit, and a satisfactory response was received.

The Working Group recommends reporting to the Standing Committee as regards: Laos (lack of response), Thailand (lack of response), and Malaysia (inadequate response regarding implementation of Article IV).

Cuora amboiensis. Discussed at AC18. The Secretariat reported:

Indonesia: category 1: urgent concern. Indonesia was asked for the basis of their quotas. The 2002 quota was for 18,000 animals. Questions were asked as to how the species is distributed within the country, the role of the Management Authority, Scientific Authority, and Fisheries Department in establishing the quota. Indonesia responded with information on distribution, and limited information on population status, and felt that 18,000 is a conservative quota. Indonesia claimed the distribution and habitat are ample and widespread. There has never been a thorough study of the species, and no information is provided to the Secretariat on the basis of the quota or how it is set. There is no evidence of an actual non-detriment finding.

Malaysia: category 1: urgent concern. Malaysia was asked for the scientific basis of its non-detriment findings. The export quota was 50,000 per year for Peninsular Malaysia. Malaysia was asked for information on exports from all 3 parts of Malaysia (Peninsular, Sabah, Sarawak). There are concerns of illegal trade in animals from Indonesia. Malaysia was asked how they verify specimens exported are really from Malaysia. Response referred to Peninsular Malaysia only,, and not Sabah or Sarawak. Malaysia reported that the quota is based only on exports in previous years, and observed stocks in collection centers. Malaysia says this is a reduced quota. Malaysia has exported: 276,000 in 2000, 50,000 in 2001, 32,000 by Sept. 2002.

Viet Nam: category 1: urgent concern. A letter was sent from the Secretariat. No response was received. The request was comparable to that sent to Malaysia and Indonesia.

Singapore: category 3 (least concern) but action was requested. This is not an issue of non-detriment findings but rather Singapore believed to have problems controlling transit shipments. The letter asked Singapore to pay attention to transit, since these species are identified frequently as fish products. Singapore has replied that all consignments of freshwater turtles must be declared, and subject to government approval.

IUCN noted that the species is subject to intensive, organized harvest, and there is no good population status information available.

The Working Group agreed:

- Malaysia and Indonesia should be brought forward to the Standing Committee, as it is clear Article IV is not being complied with at all for this species.
- Viet Nam should be brought to the Standing Committee, as it has not responded at all.

WWF and others further discussed the issue of trade in live freshwater turtles that are identified as fish and not wildlife, suggesting that this be one of the issues sent to the Technical Working Group of the Standing Committee (for work on Customs codes, enforcement, checking during shipment, etc.). China shared its experience in revising their Customs code for live turtles.

The Working Group agreed that:

- The issue of misidentification as fish or fishery products should be brought to the attention of the Technical Implementation Working Group.
- The Turtle and Tortoise Working Group should be asked to address this issue as well.

Cuora flavomarginata

The Secretariat reported that the species (endemic to China) was included in category 2 (possible concern). China was asked for up-to-date export data. China provided information within a week, with export data. Since June 2000, China has suspended all commercial export of all turtles except for 2 unlisted species. There were 3 shipments of *C. flavomarginata*, of only 14 animals, prior to that.

The Working Group agreed:

- this is no longer a concern, and it belongs in category 3 (least concern).
- This issue should be referred to the Turtle and Tortoise Working Group, which is dealing with a resolution, decisions, etc., on freshwater turtles and tortoises.

TRAFFIC asked if there were any illegal trade problems with the species?

IUCN responded that there is some smuggling to Hong Kong, for pet trade, and China was asked to monitor the situation.

Cuora galbinifrons

China: category 2: possible concern: The same questions as above were asked, and China responded on time: 13 animals were exported, and there is now an export ban. **The conclusions were the same.**

Laos: category 2 (possible concern) also. The same information was requested. There was no reply.

Viet Nam: category 2 (possible concern). The same information was requested. There was no reply.

The Working Group concluded that for this species: Viet Nam and Laos should be placed in "category 1", and recommendations issued.

Lissemys punctata

The Secretariat reported that the only country with recommendations was Bangladesh, category 2 (possible concern). The letter sent asked for clarification of the scientific basis of the non-detriment findings, and clarification of why there were few exports reported but importing countries indicated large trade volumes from Bangladesh. No response was received. Exports are about 220/year (for pet trade).

The Working Group recommended that Bangladesh be placed in category 1: urgent concern, and recommendations issued.

Pyxis planicauda: The species has been transferred to Appendix I.

Acipenseriformes

The Secretariat reported that those Eurasian species included in significant trade from AC16 (10 species) are now covered in the Paris Agreement review. In that Agreement, a large number of actions were agreed to by range countries, including: stock assessments, joint quota setting (harvest and export), illegal domestic use (caviar and meat), enforcement collaboration, assessments of needs to combat poaching and illegal trade, and identification.. SC46 agreed to the Paris Agreement in 2001, which concludes 31 December 2003. SC in 2004 will evaluate if all of the commitments have been met. Various reports of the Secretariat on implementation have been submitted to the Standing Committee. In August 2003 the Secretariat will meet with FAO on elements of the Paris Agreement. The Secretariat believes there has been significant, positive progress on the Paris Agreement, with positive impacts on reducing illegal caviar trade, as well as on domestic use and poaching.

The AC Chairman will wait for end of Paris Agreement procedure, and comment to the Standing Committee.

Acipenser baerii: Paris Agreement

Acipenser fulvescens (Lake sturgeon):

The Secretariat reported this was in category 2 (possible concern), then moved to category 1 (urgent concern). The AC believed there were further questions based on information from Canada. Canada considers the information sufficient and has sought clarification on the decision to retain the Canadian population in category 1. There has been much back-and-forth between Canada and the Animals Committee. It is now up to the AC Chairman if the information is sufficient, or if it should go to the Standing Committee.

Canada reported that it was asked for information on basis of how quotas are set and how management measures are determined. For Canada, provinces have delegated management responsibility. Although the timeline was short, Canada responded, and is waiting for a response. The USA shared Canada's concerns, and believes Canada has fully complied.

The Working Group agreed that Canada, the Secretariat, and AC Chairman should meet separately and resolve this issue this week.

Acipenser gueldenstaedtii: Paris Agreement

Acipenser nudiiventris: Paris Agreement

Acipenser oxyrinchus: Atlantic sturgeon. At AC18, it was in category 2 (possible concern). Canada was asked to clarify certain issues, and information was provided. The information received was acceptable.

The Working Group agreed to place the species in "category 3" (least concern).

Acipenser persicus. The species is found in Iran and Azerbaijan. At AC18, Iran was considered least concern (category 3: least concern).

Azerbaijan: AC18 put this in category 1 (urgent concern), with a recommendation that Azerbaijan provide clarification on whether export quotas include *A. persicus*, and how they distinguish *persicus* and *guildenstadii*. The Secretariat noted that Azerbaijan has no quotas for the species and does not harvest it.

Iran noted that *A. persicus* is found in the southern Caspian in Iran. The population has increased due to the long-standing restocking programme of Iran, with data since 1973. There is no quota for Azerbaijan, which should be eliminated from the process. A DNA marker differentiating these species is expected in 6-7 months.

The Working Group agreed to recommend moving this species to the least concern category.

Acipenser ruthenus: Paris Agreement

Acipenser schrencki: Paris Agreement

Acipenser stellatus: Paris Agreement

Acipenser transmontanus: was moved to category 3 (least concern) and removed from process.

Huso dauricus: Paris Agreement

Huso huso: Paris Agreement

Polyodon spathula: was moved to category 3 (least concern), and removed from process.

Scaphirhynchus platorynchus: was moved to category 3 (least concern), and removed from process.

Saiga (*Saiga tatarica*) (refer to AC19 Doc. 8.6), which was discussed in Plenary.

The Secretariat reported that based on an earlier process, the Standing Committee decided for both Russia and Kazakhstan to recommend that trade cease, with no imports (horns, meat, trophies, etc.) until the countries had adopted and implemented a regional conservation strategy for the saiga. The Convention on Migratory Species and CITES worked together, and co-sponsored the May 2002 Elista, Kalmykia workshop (see Doc. 8.6). This resulted in a draft MOU between the range states, including an Action Plan for the species' conservation, restoration, and sustainable use. Many activities are listed in the plan; some are relevant to CMS, some to CITES, and some are domestic in nature. The plan is excellent- but has no strict timeframes, it is unclear who is responsible and by when, and will be costly to implement. It is key that the CITES community assist with key issues in the plan. The Secretariat noted that there is poaching for meat and domestic use as well as illegal trade in horn.

Several participants recommended looking at those recommendations in the Action Plan that concern CITES, and send them to the Standing Committee as a matter of urgency.

Russia noted that the proportion of adult males is dangerously low in the population. Russia noted that it has a great deal of scientific information, which it can share on request. Russia has information on population status, habitat, harvest information, etc. Russia noted that there were internal bureaucratic problems, involving intergovernmental relations. The species is under the authority of the Department of Hunting of the Ministry of Agriculture, although the Ministry of Natural Resources is the CITES Management Authority. The Russian Academy of Sciences has established a working group to develop a strategy for the conservation and sustainable use of saiga. A new inter-institutional group has been set up involving the Russian Academy Sciences, Ministry of Natural Resources, and Department of Hunting. The first meeting will be held the end of September 2003 to discuss a strategy. Russia shared that its Department of Hunting is spending about \$200,000 per year on the species. Hunting and harvest have been prohibited since 1998.

The Secretariat believes that the major problem is Kazakhstan, where although the population is larger it is less well protected, with less work on conservation. Kazakhstan prohibits hunting until 2005.

It is notable that there are debates about the population in Kazakhstan, which may be up to 25,000 (but was 250,000 only 5 years ago).

TRAFFIC expressed concern about the species, on behalf of TRAFFIC and IUCN, and recommended as well that the Standing Committee take up the issue.

IFAW said it is unfortunate if the saiga becomes a scapegoat for bureaucratic problems. There is a need to remain consistent with and implement the recommendations of the Elista Workshop. They recommend that the MOU in the document be signed between the countries, and that funds meant for saiga conservation will actually be spent on saiga. They recommend that an intergovernmental body implement saiga conservation, through the MOU.

There was discussion as to the level of poaching, with responses from Russia that it is for meat consumption right now more than for illegal export of horns. It was suggested by several participants that there is a need to look at trade demand in China and other consumer countries, to help address illegal trade issues.

The Working Group agreed:

- **This is a matter of great conservation urgency.**
- **The issues around saiga should be sent as a matter of urgency to the Standing Committee, for action and follow-up.**
- **This is not an issue for the significant trade review, but pursuant to the mandate of the Animals Committee (under 12.8 and other resolutions), the issue should be sent to the Standing Committee.**
- **Consumer countries, and issues of demand, markets, and illegal trade, should be addressed by the Secretariat and the Standing Committee. Consumer countries should be asked to provide information on what steps they are taking to control illegal trade in this species.**
- **Range states should be encouraged to sign the MOU.**
- **The AC Chairman and Secretariat are asked to evaluate those recommendations in the Action Plan that concern CITES, and send them to the Standing Committee as a matter of priority for action as appropriate.**

Any other business

The Working Group recommends that the Secretariat follow up with UNEP-WCMC regarding the reports it provides to the Secretariat and Animals Committee, in an effort to provide improved, more user-friendly reports.. Those improvements could include graphical analyses, summary information on conservation status, concerns, and other analyses and presentations beyond the provision of raw data.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

CONSERVATION OF & TRADE IN SEA CUCUMBERS

Participants

Oceania (Chair), Asia, Secretariat, China, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association, Ornamental Fish International, Project Seahorse, SWAN International.

Working Group (WG) Members not present: IUCN, TRAFFIC.

Terms of Reference

Provide comments and guidance to the Secretariat concerning the proposed objectives, agenda, participation and practical arrangements for the workshop (on biology, catch, and bycatch of, and trade in, sea cucumbers Holothuridae and Stichopodidae), which are presented in paragraphs 5 to 13 of AC19 Doc. 17.

Relationship with FAO-sponsored workshop on aquaculture of Holothurians in October 2003

1. The WG considered the suggestion of Japan to take advantage of this FAO-funded workshop in China and agreed that the Secretariat should be asked to explore all possibilities for hosting the workshops jointly or consecutively.

Objectives of the workshop

2. The WG agreed that the objectives of the workshop as outlined in AC19 Doc. 17 were appropriate and comprehensive.

Workshop execution

3. At the request of the Chair, Project Seahorse described the plans, execution and reporting for the CITES workshop on syngnathid conservation, held in May 2002 in the Philippines. The WG agreed that this was a reasonable model for the holothurian workshop. Consequently, background material will be required on (i) holothurian biology, (ii) fisheries and trade, (iii) possible management options and (iv) conservation status.

Agenda

4. The WG agreed that the draft agenda, as outlined in AC19 Doc. 17 Annex, should allow the workshop to meet the objectives set out in the same document. As outlined, the working programme should contain both thematic and country presentations, before breaking into thematic groups to address the need for specific recommendations for CITES action. It was noted that, contrary to the draft agenda, sea cucumbers are not traded for traditional medicine. The workshop should review all elements needed for the AC discussion document due for presentation to CoP13.

Workshop participants

5. The WG agreed that the workshop should be as inclusive as possible within a manageable size. It recommended that the following should be invited: Parties, technical experts, trade interests, conservation NGOs, national Ministries of Fisheries, academics, and resource managers (e.g. FAO, South Pacific Regional Environmental Program, the South Pacific Commission). The contributors to the SPC's Bêche-de-Mer bulletin may help to identify some of the expertise needed at the workshop, as may the FAO.
6. It was suggested that the Secretariat approach all Parties about their level of interest in attending the workshop. Should interest prove too high to accommodate at the small gathering, then regions should be asked to decide on their representation. The USA agreed to help the Secretariat to draft a request to Parties to nominate participants. The following Parties present in the WG expressed a willingness to participate in this workshop: China, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Republic of Tanzania, Singapore and USA.
7. Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association, Ornamental Fish International, Project Seahorse and SWAN International also expressed strong interest in participating in the workshop, directly if possible but indirectly if necessary, through submission of a briefing document. The Chair welcomed such contributions.
8. The WG agreed that the Secretariat would need to identify individuals or groups that could help to implement this workshop, and write the discussion document (e.g. TRAFFIC and FAO).

Timing

9. If the workshop is not held in conjunction with the FAO workshop in October 2003, the WG endorsed the Secretariat's suggestion that the workshop be held in December 2003 or January 2004.

Funding

10. The Secretariat reported that donors had been confirmed for the entire cost of the workshop, with support coming from the United States of America State Department and the United States of America National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Location

11. If this workshop is not to be held in conjunction with the FAO Holothurian workshop, then the Secretariat is encouraged to seek a venue in a nation engaged in major trade of Holothurians.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

TRANSPORT OF LIVE ANIMALS

Participants: European representative of the AC (Acting Interim Chair), Austria, China (absent), Czech Republic, Germany, Israel, Russian Federation, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America (absent), Zimbabwe, Animal Exhibitors' Alliance, AZA, Fund for Animals, HSUS, PIJAC, Pro Wildlife (absent), RSPCA, WAZA (absent), WDCS, WSPA

1. The Transport Working Group (TWG) met once at the 19th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC19).
 2. The Interim Chairman, in the name of the TWG and AC, thanked Irina Sprotte, for her efforts in serving as Chairman of the TWG since 1998.
 3. Setting priorities for the TWG until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP13).
 - a) The TWG will continue to use Resolution Conf. 10.21 as a basis for their work program, taking into account also Decision 12.85 directed to the Animals Committee.
 4. Towards implementation of Decision 12.85, paragraph a). To develop recommendations for rail, road or sea transport.
 - a) IATA is the standard for air-transport, but no single world-wide standard exists for non-air transport. Also IATA standards are sometimes not applicable for other modes of transport.
 - b) CITES has the opportunity to impose a single standard for CITES-listed species as CITES permits could include a requirement for use of such a standard.
 - c) A number of members of the TWG reported knowledge of a variety of studies and standards that are in place already in the United States of America, Europe and elsewhere. In addition some NGO's have access to species-specific standards or requirements for transport (e.g. for marine mammals).
- Agreed:** The TWG will work to collect these various standards and studies, and to distribute them among the members. The Chairman will serve as focal point to collate these with the intention of seeing their applicability (or lack thereof) to transport of CITES-listed species by road, rail and sea.
5. Towards implementation of Decision 12.85, paragraph c). To identify model practices for transport and preparation for shipment of live wild animals.
 - a) The TWG understands identifying a "model", as actually looking at identifying best practices.

- b) IATA is considered generally as the best standard, and the idea is to build a model of how an exporter should prepare its animals for transport.
- c) The TWG needs to work to offer improvements to the IATA standard.
- d) As a starting point it may be useful to consult reliable and experienced animal exporters.
- e) In the past, the TWG has tried to do get information on best practices, but it is hard to collect data (as most shippers won't report bad methods).
- f) Tanzania has offered to collect information from some African animal-exporting companies who have much experience in preparing wild animals for shipment.
- g) Other members will also try to gather information from other sources on best practices for preparation of wild animals for transport.

Agreed: The Chairman will collect this and other information on this issue. At the next meeting of the TWG, the members will discuss this information to try to develop a model in accordance with the Resolution.

- 6. Towards implementation of Decision 12.85, paragraph b). To investigate cost-effective options for packing materials that may be recommended to IATA.

- a) Like paragraph c), this part is also related to identifying best practices.

Agreed: The collection of information for the "model" in paragraph b), will also include looking at best practice for use of cost-effective packing materials, too.

- 7. The Interim Chair sees the TWG as including in its Terms of Reference also the issue of reduction of mortality during capture and storage before international transport, as included in Objective 1.1.6 in the CITES Strategic Vision.

- a) Some members felt that mortality before international transport is a domestic issue only, and the TWG should be involved only in those animals ultimately in international trade.
- b) Other members felt that this issue is related to the management of the species and it is thus to the survival of the species in the wild and non-detriment findings.
- c) Other members felt that it is an animal welfare issue more than a non-detriment issue.

Agreed: The TWG will approach the AC for advice about including the issue of reducing mortality before international transport into the TWG's Terms of Reference, or perhaps that it should be addressed in the issue of non-detriment findings.

- 8. Decision 12.86 is also related to animal transport, and is directed to the Secretariat in consultation with the Animals Committee. The TWG wishes to continue to be involved with the Secretariat in negotiating the MOU with IATA and WAZA.

- 9. Election of a new Chairman of the TWG.

- a) The Parties in the TWG unanimously propose Peter Linhart, the delegate from Austria, to serve as the new Chairman of the TWG.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

Report of the working group

TRADE IN HARD CORALS

Present: United Kingdom (Chairman), Regional Representative for Oceania, Switzerland, United States of America, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association, Ornamental Fish International

1. The Group addressed the terms of reference, namely to consider how to implement Decision 12.62, which directs the Animals Committee to consider and recommend a practical means of distinguishing fossilised corals from non-fossilised corals in international trade and report to CoP13.
2. The Group agreed the approach outlined below as a means of taking this work forward recognizing that many members of the previous working group (e.g. Australia, Belgium for European Community, Fiji, Indonesia, AKKII and TRAFFIC) were not present.
 - a) The Chairman would invite participants to suggest approaches to defining fossilized corals by the end of September 2003.
 - b) Participants in the working group would then be invited to consider the approaches, if necessary, through consultation with relevant expertise, and to provide comments by the end of October 2003.
 - c) Working group participants would then be asked to:
 - i) test the different approaches for the practicality of implementation (at relevant stages in the process from collection through export to import); and
 - ii) comment on the implications of adopting the different approaches (e.g. on conservation of coral reefs, implications for traders, etc.) and suggest risks and benefits of different approaches.
3. The group will provide progress report to AC20 when the group will consider and prepare a final report to be considered by the Animals Committee.
4. As some members of the group were new to the issue, the Chairman agreed to provide a brief history of the previous work of the group on this issue. Work will continue intersessionally by email.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

BIOLOGICAL AND TRADE STATUS OF SHARKS

Members of the Working Group

The representative of Asia and the observers from China, Republic of Korea, Greece, the United Kingdom, the United States of America (Vice Chair and Rapporteur), the European Commission (Chair), IUCN, Defenders of Wildlife, IFAW, WildAid and WWF (UK).

Terms of Reference

Establish a process to:

- continue activities specified under Decision 11.94 (carried over to Decision 12.47) beyond the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and report on progress at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties;
- critically review progress towards IPOA-Sharks implementation (NPOA-Sharks) by major fishing and trading nations, by a date one year before the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES;
- examine information provided by range States in shark assessment reports and other available relevant documents, with a view to identifying key species and examining these for consideration and possible listing under CITES;
- make species-specific recommendations at the 13th meeting and subsequent meetings of the Conference of the Parties if necessary on improving the conservation status of sharks and the regulation of international trade in these species.

Summary of discussions and recommendations

1. The Working Group addressed the four Terms of Reference from the Animals Committee listed above. It also discussed formulation of a response to a letter from the World Customs Organisation.
2. *TOR 1. Establish a process to continue activities specified under Decision 11.94 (carried over to Decision 12.47) beyond the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and report on progress at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties;*

- a) The Working Group did not believe that this agenda item required much discussion at this time because the activities specified under Decision 11.94 / 12.47 are ongoing. However, members of the Working Group highlighted the lack of communication between CITES management authorities and national counterparts in fisheries, and the need to improve this situation. The Working Group also stressed the importance of CITES continuing to pursue negotiation of an MOU with FAO.
3. *TOR 2. Establish a process to critically review progress towards IPOA-Sharks implementation (NPOA-Sharks) by major fishing and trading nations, by a date one year before the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES;*
- a) The Working Group noted that the CITES Secretariat has only just (15 August) issued a Notification to the Parties on “Conservation and Management of Sharks” (2003/051), and that the deadline for comments is 30 September 2003.
- b) The Working Group requested that the IUCN Shark Specialist Group produce a report summarizing the results of Notification 2003/051 that are received by the Secretariat, and the IUCN Shark Specialist Group agreed. However, the Working Group felt that the information requested in the Notification to the Parties was too broad and that it would greatly assist the Parties if more specificity and structure could be provided. Accordingly, the Working Group recommended that a questionnaire prepared by the IUCN Shark Specialist Group and modified by the WG be sent to the Parties as part of a follow-up notification. Recognizing the workload faced by the Secretariat, the Working Group has drafted a proposed Notification (see draft appended at Annex I). Regional representatives on the Animals Committee are encouraged to bring the new Notification to the Parties to the attention of relevant national bodies.
- c) While it will not be possible to meet the exact completion date envisaged in Res. Conf. 12.16 (3 October), the IUCN Shark Specialist Group will attempt to complete an initial synthesis by the end of October. The format of the document will be similar to AC18 Doc. 19.2 and Notification to Parties No. 2002/042, with the addition of new materials, as available.
- d) The Working Group agreed that for many Parties, particularly developing nations, implementing the IPOA is a daunting prospect. The requirements are difficult to meet except in cases where extremely detailed information and adequate management capacity are available. Therefore, the Working Group recognized that, in some cases, the IPOA can only be implemented in stages, resulting in incremental progress. The proposed questionnaire aims to identify stages in progress towards full implementation. The Working Group emphasized that continuing failure to adequately implement the IPOA will be detrimental to sustainable trade in the long term.
- e) The Working Group recommended that an inter-sessional working group be established to review the IUCN Shark Specialist Group report and further address the second (and third) term(s) of reference. The proposed membership of the Working Group is: Oceania (Chair), United Kingdom, United States of America, China, Republic of Korea, Australia (by invitation), Ecuador (by invitation), European Commission, IUCN, TRAFFIC, WWF, IFAW, Defenders of Wildlife, WildAid and other Parties or observers that wish to participate can do so at the discretion of the Chair.
- f) The IUCN Shark Specialist Group further reported that some of its members, contracted to APEC (the Asia Pacific Economic Communities), have been developing a technical handbook for the management of shark fisheries; this is now very close to completion. The handbook should include guidelines for the incremental implementation of the IPOA-Sharks by shark fishing states, in order to assist managers who lack the capacity initially to fully implement the IPOA as outlined in FAO’s Technical Guidelines.
4. *Establish a process to examine information provided by range States in shark assessment reports and other available relevant documents, with a view to identifying key species and examining these for consideration and possible listing under CITES;*
- a) The IUCN Shark Specialist Group agreed to compile an initial draft list of key species based on the survey detailed under the second term of reference, as well as other relevant reports and reviews; such information to be considered further by the intersessional group and at AC 20.

- b) The working group noted the deadline for posting of documents for AC 20 and the need to allow time for translation prior to that.

5 *Establish a process to make species-specific recommendations at the 13th meeting and subsequent meetings of the Conference of the Parties if necessary on improving the conservation status of sharks and the regulation of international trade in these species.*

- a) The Working Group agreed that it was not possible to offer firm recommendations on this issue at this time, prior to completion of the IUCN Shark Specialist Group's review. However, it was recommended that Parties that have other information not covered by the proposed questionnaire (Annex I) should make such information available for AC 20.
6. It was acknowledged that completion of the tasks assigned to the IUCN Shark Specialist Group was conditional on the availability of human resources within the short timeframe available.

Customs Codes

7. The Working Group examined a letter received by the CITES Secretariat from the World Customs Organization (WCO) requesting information on scientific names and product categories for sharks in trade. The Working Group was unable to completely address this issue at this time because it lacked information on systems already in place and the harmonized system (HS) used by WCO. In addition, the Working Group felt that this issue warranted more thorough research in order to do an adequate job, rather than rushing to get something in place to meet the deadline for the WCO's next meeting (September 2003).
8. In particular, the Working Group felt that it was essential to examine Hong Kong's classification system, which is believed to provide accurate and complete statistics. Hong Kong volunteered to provide details on their classification system to the Secretariat. The Working Group also identified the need to develop an approach that is consistent with that for seahorses and other relevant species-groups. It is also essential to coordinate and consult with FAO.
9. The observer from Defenders of Wildlife agreed to read relevant HS chapters and develop a list of likely product categories and codes for sharks in trade. This list would be completed in time for presentation at AC 20.
10. The IUCN Shark Specialist Group volunteered to develop a draft list of sharks for this purpose, at appropriate levels of taxonomic groupings, for further consideration (Annex II). The proposed list includes high-volume or high-value species, and species of special concern, grouped at the order, family, genus or species level, depending on the level of detail needed for data collection.
11. While it was agreed that trade data supplied by WCO would be useful, other sources of information would also be needed.

Draft Notification to Parties no. 2003/??, further to Notification 2003/051 dated 15 August 2003

Notification 2003/051 dated 15 August 2003 invited the Management Authorities of the Parties to seek information from their fisheries departments on the implementation of IPOA-Sharks, particularly with regard to the establishment of National Plans of Action, and to submit this information to the Secretariat by 30 September 2003.

A working group on sharks was established by the 19th Meeting of the Animals Committee in order to implement the elements of Resolution Conf. 12.6 directed to the Animals Committee. This Working Group considered, *inter alia*, how best to undertake the critical review of progress towards IPOA-Sharks implementation. Based on the report of the Working Group, the Animals Committee concluded that it would be helpful to Management Authorities if Notification 2003/051 was clarified. The Animals Committee recommended the attached structure for a response to that Notification.

Questionnaire on progress with implementation of the UN FAO IPOA-Sharks

Name of respondent State:

Key contact person and agency for further enquiries on Shark Assessment Reports and National Plans of Action

Name:

Agency:

Address:

Telephone/fax nos:

Email:

1) Information on Fisheries

Does your State land sharks?	From target fisheries?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	From bycatch fisheries?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Does your State have any regulations specifically for shark fisheries?		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

If yes, please provide details.

2) Information on Trade

Does your state export shark products?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Does your state import shark products?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Does your state have customs codes for these products? Yes No

If you have customs codes, what are these?

3) Information on data collection

Data collected on catches

- Including discards Yes No
- Excluding discards Yes No

Data collected on landings Yes No

Fishery-independent research underway (e.g. biology, ecology, distribution, abundance) Yes No

Fleet data collected (e.g. vessels, fishers, gear used, areas fished) Yes No

Catch and effort data collected Yes No

Habitat research or data collection underway Yes No

4) Shark fisheries assessment report (SAR)

Has your state produced a SAR (as required under the FAO IPOA-Sharks)? Yes No

If you have produced a SAR, please provide title, date of release, where available and provide copy to Secretariat for review by Animals Committee (as required under Resolution Conf. 12.6).

If no, please clarify:

Is your state planning to produce a SAR? Yes No

If yes, what stage has this reached?

- No action yet taken Yes No
- Initial discussions, undertaken, draft not yet available Yes No

Please indicate month/year when draft will become available and/or brief comments.

- Draft produced Yes No

Please provide information (e.g. title; date; review due month/year).

- Public/industry consultation on draft underway Yes No
- Workshop planned to discuss preparation, Yes No

Please provide dates (month, year) when workshop(s) or other activities will take place.

- Draft SAR finalised, but awaiting official Governmental adoption.

Please provide the date (month, year) when SAR is expected to be formally adopted

5) National Plan of Action for Sharks (NPOA)

Has your state produced an NPOA (as required under the FAO IPOA-Sharks)? Yes No

If you have produced an NPOA, please provide title, date of release, where available and provide copy to Secretariat for review by Animals Committee (as required under Resolution Conf. 12.6).

Has the NPOA been implemented? Yes No

If not implemented, on what date is implementation anticipated?

If no NPOA has been produced, please clarify:

Is your state planning to produce an NPOA? Yes No

If yes, what stage has this reached?

- No action yet taken Yes No
- Initial discussions, undertaken, draft not yet available Yes No

Please indicate month/year when draft will become available and/or brief comments.

- Draft produced Yes No

Please provide information (e.g. title; date; review due month/year).

- Public/industry consultation on draft underway Yes No
- Workshop planned to discuss preparation, Yes No

Please provide dates (month, year) when workshop(s) or other activities will take place.

- Draft NPOA finalised, but awaiting official Governmental adoption. Yes No

Please provide the date (month, year) when NPOA is expected to be formally adopted

6) Other species-level conservation and management activity

Key commercial species identified/managed

Yes

No

If yes, please provide details.

Key species of conservation concern identified/managed

Yes

No

If yes, please provide details.

CITES-listed shark species managed or monitored

Yes

No

If yes, please provide details.

7) Other information/comments:

Preliminary draft list of scientific names of sharks (and their relatives) for submission to the World Customs Organisation

This list is certainly not exhaustive (there are over 1,000 species). Those orders, families, genera or species named are thought to be present in international trade in significant quantities, or are of importance for other reasons. Additional taxa may need to be added when this list is reviewed.

The scientific classification used follows that of L.J.V. Compagno, in Fowler *et al.* 2003 in press.

CLASS CHONDRICHTHYES.

SUBCLASS HOLOCEPHALII.

ORDER CHIMAERIFORMES. Chimaeras, rabbit fishes, spookfishes.

SUBCLASS ELASMOBRANCHII

ORDER SQUALIFORMES. Dogfish Sharks.

Squalus acanthias. Piked/Spiny dogfish, Spurdog.

Squalus sp.

Centrophorus sp. Gulper sharks

Deania sp. Gulper sharks

Centroscyllium sp. deepwater dogfish

Centroscymnus coelolepis. Portugese dogfish.

Centroscymnus sp. Deepwater dogfish.

Dalatias licha. Kitefin shark.

ORDER SQUATINIFORMES. Angel Sharks.

Squatina sp.

ORDER PRISTIOPHORIFORMES. Sawsharks.

Pristiophorus sp.

ORDER RAJIFORMES, Batoids.

SUBORDER PRISTOIDEI. SAWFISHES.

Anoxypristis cuspidata. Knifetooth, pointed, or narrow sawfish.

Pristis clavata. Dwarf or Queensland sawfish.

Pristis microdon. Greattooth or freshwater sawfish.

Pristis pectinata. Smalltooth or wide sawfish.

Pristis perotteti. Largetooth sawfish.

Pristis pristis. Common sawfish.

Pristis zijsron. Green sawfish.

SUBORDER RHYNCHOBATOIDEI. WEDGEFISHES.

Rhynchobatus sp.

SUBORDER RHINOBATOIDEI. GUITARFISHES.

Rhinobatos typus Giant shovelnose ray.

Rhinobatos sp.

SUBORDER TORPEDINOIDEI. ELECTRIC RAYS.

SUBORDER RAJOIDEI. SKATES.

Amblyraja radiata Thorny skate.

Amblyraja sp.

Dipturus sp. Long-nosed skates

Leucoraja sp.

Okamejei sp.

Raja sp

Rajella sp.

Rostroraja alba. White skate.

Anacanthobatis and *Cruriraja* sp. Legskates

SUBORDER MYLIOBATOIDEI. STINGRAYS.

This suborder enters trade in the form of stingray leather, possibly also as meat, and as live specimens for aquaria (particularly small species and young individuals).

FAMILY UROLOPHIDAE. STINGAREES.

FAMILY UROTRYGONIDAE. ROUND STINGRAYS.

FAMILY POTAMOTRYGONIDAE. RIVER AND FANTAIL STINGRAYS.

(Note: these are primarily ornamental live trade species. The number of listed species could be reduced through consultation with Brazil.)

Paratrygon aireba Discusray.

Plesiotrygon iwamae Longtailed river stingray.

Potamotrygon brachyura Shorttailed river stingray.

Potamotrygon castexi Vermiculate river stingray.

Potamotrygon constellata Thorny river stingray.

Potamotrygon dumerilii Anglespot river stingray.

Potamotrygon falkneri Largestspot river stingray.

Potamotrygon henlei Bigtooth river stingray.

Potamotrygon hystrix Porcupine river stingray.

Potamotrygon humerosa Roughback river stingray.

Potamotrygon leopoldi Whiteblotched river stingray.

Potamotrygon magdalenae Magdalena river stingray.

Potamotrygon motoro Ocellate river stingray.

Potamotrygon ocellata Redblotched river stingray.

Potamotrygon orbignyi Smoothback river stingray.

Potamotrygon schroederi Rosette river stingray.

Potamotrygon schuemacheri Parana river stingray.

Potamotrygon scobina Raspy river stingray.

Potamotrygon signata Parnaiba river stingray.

Potamotrygon yepesi Maracaibo river stingray.

Taeniura lymma Ribbontailed stingray, Bluespotted ribbontail or fantail ray.

FAMILY DASYATIDAE. WHIPTAIL STINGRAYS.

Dasyatis sp.

Himantura sp.

FAMILY GYMNURIDAE. BUTTERFLY RAYS.

FAMILY MYLIOBATIDAE. EAGLE RAYS.

Aetobatus sp.

Aetomylaeus sp.

Myliobatis sp.

Pteromylaeus sp.

FAMILY RHINOPTERIDAE. COWNOSE RAYS.

FAMILY MOBULIDAE. DEVIL RAYS.

Manta birostris Manta.

Mobula sp. Devil rays

SUPERORDER GALEOMORPHII. GALEOMORPH SHARKS.

ORDER HETERODONTIFORMES. Bullhead Sharks.

Enter ornamental fish trade (small, hardy and colourful). Meat may also be traded.

ORDER ORECTOLOBIFORMES. Carpet Sharks.

Enter ornamental fish trade (many are small, hardy and colourful). Meat may also be traded.

FAMILY PARASCYLLIIDAE. COLLARED CARPETSHARKS.

FAMILY BRACHAELURIDAE. BLIND SHARKS.

FAMILY ORECTOLOBIDAE. WOBEGONGS.

FAMILY HEMISCYLLIIDAE. LONGTAILED CARPETSARKS.

FAMILY GINGLYMOSTOMATIDAE. NURSE SHARKS.

Ginglymostoma cirratum Nurse shark.

Nebrius ferrugineus. Tawny nurse shark.

Pseudoginglymostoma brevicaudatum . Shorttail nurse shark.

FAMILY STEGOSTOMATIDAE. ZEBRA SHARKS.

FAMILY RHINCODONTIDAE. WHALE SHARKS.

***Rhincodon typus*. Whale shark. Listed on Appendix II**

ORDER LAMNIFORMES. Mackerel Sharks.

FAMILY ODONTASPIDIDAE. SAND TIGER SHARKS.

Carcharias taurus Sand tiger, spotted raggedtooth, or gray nurse shark.

Odontaspis sp.

FAMILY MEGACHASMIDAE. MEGAMOUTH SHARKS.

Megachasma pelagios Megamouth shark.

FAMILY ALOPIIDAE. THRESHER SHARKS.

Alopias pelagicus Pelagic thresher.

Alopias superciliosus Bigeye thresher.

Alopias vulpinus Thresher shark.

FAMILY CETORHINIDAE. BASKING SHARKS.

***Cetorhinus maximus* Basking shark. Listed on Appendix II**

FAMILY LAMNIDAE. MACKEREL SHARKS.

***Carcharodon carcharias* Great white shark. Listed on Appendix III**

Isurus sp. mako sharks.

Lamna ditropis Salmon shark.

Lamna nasus Porbeagle shark.

ORDER CARCHARHINIFORMES. GROUND SHARKS.

FAMILY SCYLORHINIDAE. Catsharks.

Cephaloscyllium sp. Swellsharks.

Galeus sp.

Scyliorhinus sp.

FAMILY LEPTOCHARIIDAE. BARBELED HOUND SHARKS.

FAMILY TRIAKIDAE. HOUND SHARKS.

Galeorhinus galeus Tope, soupfin or school shark.

Mustelus antarcticus. Gummy shark or rig.

Mustelus sp. Smoothhound or gummy shark

Triakis sp.

FAMILY CARCHARHINIDAE. REQUIEM SHARKS.

Carcharhinus brachyurus Bronze whaler.

Carcharhinus brevipinna Spinner shark.

Carcharhinus falciformis Silky shark.

Carcharhinus galapagensis. Galapagos shark.

Carcharhinus leucas Bull shark.

Carcharhinus limbatus Blacktip shark.

Carcharhinus longimanus Oceanic whitetip shark.

Carcharhinus obscurus Dusky shark.

Carcharhinus plumbeus Sandbar shark.

Galeocerdo cuvier. Tiger shark.

Prionace glauca Blue shark.

FAMILY SPHYRNIDAE. HAMMERHEAD SHARKS.

Sphyrna sp.

Compagno, L.J.V. 2003 (in press). Checklist of Living Chondrichthyes. *In*: Fowler, S.L., Camhi, M., Burgess, G.H., Cailliet, G.M., Fordham, S.V, Cavanagh, R.D., Simpfendorfer, C.A. and Musick, J.A. (Eds) In press (2003). *Sharks, rays and chimaeras: the status of the chondrichthyan fishes*. IUCN SSC Shark Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.