

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



Twenty-first meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 20-25 May 2005

Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species

Report on progress In the IMPLEMENTATION of the review of significant trade

SPECIES BASED REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.
2. Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) on Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species directs the Secretariat, for the purpose of monitoring and facilitating the implementation of that Resolution and the relevant paragraphs of Article IV, to report at each meeting of the Animals Committee on the implementation by the range States concerned of the recommendations made by the Committee. The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairman of the Animals Committee, has to determine whether the recommendations have been implemented by the range States and report to the Standing Committee, which decides on appropriate action. This report therefore contains information on recent decisions of the Standing Committee on species in the Review of Significant Trade, and gives brief updates on ongoing reviews.

Species selected before 2000

3. The Secretariat reported to the Standing Committee at its 51st meeting (SC51; Bangkok, 2004) that, in consultation with the Chairman of the Animals Committee, it had determined that Canada and Denmark (Greenland) had complied with recommendations concerning *Monodon monoceros* and consequently no action was required from the Standing Committee. The recommendations had been formulated by the Animals Committee in 1996 and were updated in 2004 with a deadline for compliance of 31 July 2004.
4. The Animals Committee formulated recommendations regarding *Saiga tatarica* in 1999, which resulted in a recommendation by the Standing Committee in 2001 to suspend import of all specimens of *Saiga tatarica* exported from Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation. This decision is still in effect. At its 19th meeting (AC19; Geneva, 2003), the Animals Committee concluded that the conservation status of *Saiga tatarica* remained a matter of urgent concern. At the committee's request, the Secretariat conveyed this concern in detail to the Standing Committee at its 50th meeting (SC50; Geneva, 2004). Furthermore, the Conference of the Parties adopted Decisions 13.27 to 13.35 in relation to that species at its 13th meeting (CoP13; Bangkok, 2004), which complement the recommendations of the Animals Committee because many of the threats to *Saiga tatarica* are not strictly related to the implementation of Article IV, which is the focus of the Review of Significant Trade.

Species selected following the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP11; Gigiri, 2000)

5. The table below shows the species that the Animals Committee selected for its Review of Significant Trade following CoP11. The Committee reviewed information on the conservation of and trade in all of these species, categorized the species for the different range States and, unless indicated otherwise, formulated recommendations. For the large majority of species, the Animals Committee has thereby completed its tasks under the relevant Resolution. Where the table indicates that the Review of Significant Trade is ongoing for a species, the time-limits for implementing the recommended actions have not yet elapsed, or compliance with the recommendations has not yet been determined and brought to the attention of the Standing Committee. The Animals Committee should finalize its recommendations for one species of Testudines.

Species	Species report document	Status of the Review of Significant Trade
Artiodactyla		
<i>Moschus</i> spp. <i>selected pursuant to Decision 11.92</i>	Doc. AC.16.7.4	Ongoing
Serpentes		
<i>Naja naja</i> spp.	Doc. AC.16.7.3	Completed
Testudines <i>selected pursuant to Decision 11.93</i>		
<i>Cuora amboinensis</i>	AC18 Doc. 7.1	Ongoing – AC to finalize recommendations
<i>Cuora flavomarginata</i>	AC18 Doc. 7.1	Completed
<i>Cuora galbinifrons</i>	AC18 Doc. 7.1	Ongoing
<i>Lissemys punctata</i>	AC18 Doc. 7.1	Ongoing
<i>Pyxis planicauda</i>	AC18 Doc. 7.1	Completed (included in Appendix I)
Acipenseriformes <i>selected pursuant to Decision 11.95</i>		
<i>Acipenser baerii</i>	Doc. AC.16.7.2	Completed
<i>Acipenser fulvescens</i>	Doc. AC.16.7.2	Completed
<i>Acipenser gueldenstaedtii</i>	Doc. AC.16.7.2	Ongoing for Caspian Sea stocks from Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan (Paris agreement)
<i>Acipenser nudiventris</i>	Doc. AC.16.7.2	Ongoing for Caspian Sea stocks in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan (Paris agreement)
<i>Acipenser oxyrinchus</i>	AC18 Doc. 7.1	Completed
<i>Acipenser persicus</i>	AC18 Doc. 7.1	Completed
<i>Acipenser ruthenus</i>	Doc. AC.16.7.2	Ongoing for Caspian Sea stocks in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan (Paris agreement)
<i>Acipenser schrencki</i>	Doc. AC.16.7.2	Completed
<i>Acipenser stellatus</i>	Doc. AC.16.7.2	Ongoing for Caspian Sea stocks in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan (Paris agreement)
<i>Acipenser transmontanus</i>	AC18 Doc. 7.1	Completed
<i>Huso dauricus</i>	Doc. AC.16.7.2	Completed
<i>Huso huso</i>	Doc. AC.16.7.2	Ongoing for Caspian Sea stocks in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan (Paris agreement)
<i>Polyodon spathula</i>	Doc. AC.16.7.2	Completed
<i>Scaphirhynchus platyrhynchus</i>	AC18 Doc. 7.1	Completed
Gastropoda		
<i>Strombus gigas</i>	AC19 Doc. 8.3	Ongoing

6. Progress with the implementation of the reviews for the species in the table above was discussed at the 19th and 20th meetings of the Animals Committee, and presented at the regular meetings of the Standing Committee.
7. With regard to *Moschus spp.*, the Review of Significant Trade for the four species resulted in recommendations for two range States, China and the Russian Federation. The Russian Federation complied with all recommendations by 2002. The initial 12-month time-frame that was given to China to implement the recommendations extended until the end of 2003. The required actions are very comprehensive, including the establishment of a management and conservation strategy, targeted law enforcement efforts, the setting up of registration and labelling systems, and enhanced collaboration with neighbouring countries to improve musk deer management and conservation and strengthen border controls. China informed the Secretariat about a considerable number of measures that it had taken or was initiating in response to the recommendations. But it also indicated that some were simply too complicated to be accomplished within one year. The Secretariat reported this to the Standing Committee, and discussed it with representatives from China, Mongolia, the Russian Federation, the Chairman of the Animals Committee and TRAFFIC during CoP13. The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairman of the Animals Committee, is considering appropriate actions to recommend to the Standing Committee in compliance with paragraphs q) to s) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13).
8. The Standing Committee approved the Secretariat's recommendations contained in the Annex to document SC50 Doc. 23 in relation to a suspension of imports of *Naja spp.* from the Lao People's Democratic Republic. The two other countries where the status of the species had been found to be of urgent concern, Malaysia and Thailand, provided additional information and agreed to a reduction of their voluntary export quotas, thereby complying with the recommended actions and consequently no further action was required by the Standing Committee.
9. The Reviews of Significant Trade for two of the five selected species of **Testudines** were completed. The Animals Committee drafted recommendations for the three remaining species prior to AC20. However, those concerning *Cuora amboinensis* in Indonesia and Malaysia should be finalized by the Committee in the light of the information that these two range States submitted to CoP13 (see document CoP13 Doc. 33).
10. In the case of the **Acipenseriformes**, recommendations for sturgeon stocks of the Amur River, the Azov Sea and the Black Sea had been complied with by the relevant range States in 2002. Regarding the recommendations in the 'Paris agreement' on Caspian Sea stocks of Acipenseriformes shared by Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan, the Secretariat considers that the requirements of the Agreement have been embodied and strengthened in Resolution Conf 12.7 (Rev. CoP13) on Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish. The Paris agreement seems to have served its purpose and in the view of the Secretariat could be considered accomplished. The Standing Committee decided that a decision to conclude the Paris agreement should be based on a written report from the Secretariat, which should be brought before the Committee at its 53rd meeting.
11. The Secretariat reported at SC51 that the review of *Strombus gigas* was generally progressing well, although several range States (the Bahamas, Colombia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) had not yet provided information on the actions that they were expected to take by certain deadlines in response to recommendations made by the Animals Committee (at the time of writing of this report, only Cuba had submitted information while Honduras had not reported on actions that it should have undertaken by an agreed deadline in 2005). The Secretariat was seeking clarifications on trade in *Strombus gigas* that seems to have occurred in 2004 from one or more range States that had agreed to suspend the issuance of export permits. Such trade would be contrary to the Animals Committee's recommendations endorsed by the Standing Committee.

Species selected following the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP12; Santiago, 2002)

12. At AC19, the Animals Committee included *Falco cherrug* in the Review of Significant Trade on the basis of paragraph c) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 whereby in exceptional cases where new information

indicates an urgent concern, the Committee may add species to its list of taxa to be reviewed. At its 20th meeting (AC20; Johannesburg, 2004), the Committee identified range States where the species could be eliminated from the review in compliance with paragraph f) of the Resolution. The Animals Committee also indicated where the species was of urgent concern and of possible concern. In accordance with paragraphs g) to j), the Secretariat provisionally categorized the species and transmitted this to the relevant range States in the context of a consultative meeting on trade in falcons for falconry (Abu Dhabi, May 2004; see summary record and lists of participants on the CITES website). The Secretariat has not received comments from range States since then.

13. In compliance with paragraphs k) to o) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the Animals Committee is invited to review the preliminary categorization proposed by the Secretariat, eliminate range States where the species is of least concern, and formulate, in consultation with the Secretariat, recommendations for the remaining ones. In support of this task, the Secretariat requested updated data on the trade in *Falco cherrug* from UNEP-WCMC (see Annex 1).
14. At AC20, the Animals Committee selected a limited number of species for review on the basis of trade data supplied by UNEP-WCMC, pursuant to paragraph a) of Resolution Conf. 12.8. In compliance with paragraphs d) and e) of the Resolution, the Secretariat consulted range States concerning their implementation of Article IV for trade in the selected species. Annex 2 gives an overview of the responses that were received from the different range States. Hard copies of all responses (in the language in which they were received) were forwarded to the members of the Animals Committee 40 days before the present meeting of the Committee.
15. In accordance with paragraphs f) and g) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the Animals Committee is to review the available information (responses from range States; documents AC20 Doc. 8.5, AC20 Inf. 12; AC20 Inf. 13; AC20 WG 1 Doc. 1) to determine whether it is satisfied that Article IV is correctly implemented. If being so, the species shall be eliminated from further review with respect to the range State concerned. In the event that the species is not eliminated, the Secretariat will proceed with the compilation of information regarding the species.

Issues for consideration

16. The Animals Committee is invited to address the tasks mentioned in paragraphs 9, 13 and 15 above.

PROVISIONAL CATEGORIZATION OF *FALCO CHERRUG* BY THE SECRETARIAT IN ACCORDANCE WITH PARAGRAPHS G) TO I) OF RESOLUTION CONF, 12.8 (REV. COP13)

The categorizations are based on information contained in documents Doc AC20 Doc. 8.1 and AC20 WG1 Doc. 1.

- i) Range States where *Falco cherrug* is categorized as of 'urgent concern' and where the available information indicates that the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a), are not being implemented

Range States where the information in the report from the United Arab Emirates and recent data on legal and illegal trade indicate serious problems with the implementation of Article IV:

Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan

- ii) Range States where *Falco cherrug* is categorized as of 'possible concern' and where it is not clear from the available information whether the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a), are being implemented

Range States that have not responded to the initial request for information by the Secretariat in accordance with paragraph d) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13):

Afghanistan, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bulgaria, China, Cyprus, Egypt, Georgia, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Mauritania, Moldova, Nepal, Oman, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine and Yemen.

- iii) Range States where *Falco cherrug* is categorized as of 'least concern' and where the available information appears to indicate that the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a) are being implemented

Range States that responded to the initial request for information by the Secretariat in accordance with paragraph d) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13):

Belarus, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Malta, Tunisia and United Arab Emirates

GLOBAL GROSS DIRECT EXPORTS OF *FALCO CHERRUG*
(COMPILED BY UNEP-WCMC – APRIL 2005)

Exporter (Range States are indicated in bold)	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	10 year total
Pakistan	378	401	454	261	153	33	40	76	17	8	1821
Russian Federation	2	4	25	60	72	117	120	118	183	312	1013
Germany	82	33	32	159	36	66	72	79	137	184	880
United Arab Emirates	11	131	4	22	107	84	130	62	37	65	653
Mongolia	0	0	25	154	25	61	50	187	0	0	502
China	20	0	27	65	61	65	46	7	21	17	329
United Kingdom	12	3	7	29	18	16	18	18	67	17	205
Kazakhstan	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	2	42	101	201
Uzbekistan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	64	141
Kuwait	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	113	115
Austria	36	8	4	14	13	2	5	1	10	15	108
Czech Republic	10	14	16	8	11	19	10	4	1	0	93
Saudi Arabia	0	0	0	53	0	7	0	0	20	9	89
Canada	10	0	4	6	16	12	8	7	7	9	79
Sudan	0	0	0	0	0	12	18	8	0	0	38
Serbia and Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	24
Belgium	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5	0	23
Qatar	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	23
Ukraine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	1	21
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	10	17
Australia	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Slovakia	2	0	0	5	1	1	0	1	0	0	10
United States	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	0	9
Switzerland	1	2	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	8
France	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	4	8
Morocco	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	8
South Africa	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	3	0	8
Mauritania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Tajikistan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Bahrain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Iran	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Denmark	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Gibraltar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Namibia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Oman	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Peru	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Slovenia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Jordan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Tanzania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Notes:

Pakistan	all birds reported as wild.
Russian Federation	most birds either source 'C' or 'F' apart from 32 in 1998, 15 in 1999 and 10 in 2001.
Germany	all birds reported as captive-bred.
United Arab Emirates	data may possibly include some re-exports. Some 37 birds were reported as exports to Kyrgyzstan in 1998, and 50 birds in 2003 were reported as exports to Iran, with purpose reported as 'N', introduction/re-introduction to the wild.
Mongolia	all birds reported as wild. No annual report received from Mongolia for 2002 or 2003.
China	all birds reported as wild.
United Kingdom	all birds reported as captive-bred.
Kazakhstan	in 2000, 49 birds were reported by KZ as source 'R' and 7 as source 'W'. All have been reported as source 'C' subsequently.
Uzbekistan	the figure for 2003 is misleading as it includes 40 birds reported by UAE as a direct import in 2003 which were almost certainly a re-export of captive-bred birds from the Russian Federation reported by Uzbekistan in 2002.
Kuwait	CITES only entered into force in late 2002 so the 2003 annual report is the first available. The 107 birds reported as exports were mostly source 'W' with 26 source 'U', however this may be a reporting error. In 2000 and 2001 Mongolia reported exporting 152 wild-caught birds to Kuwait and it seems probable that the exports from Kuwait in 2003 included some of these.

RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM RANGE STATES TO CORRESPONDENCE SENT
BY THE SECRETARIAT IN 2004 CONCERNING THE SPECIES SELECTED
BY THE ANIMALS COMMITTEE AFTER COP12 FOR THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE

<i>Psittacus erithacus</i>	
Range State	Response
Angola	No reply
Benin	No reply
Burundi	No reply
Cameroon	Reply received
Côte d'Ivoire	Reply received
Central African Republic	No reply
Congo	No reply
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Reply received
Equatorial Guinea	No reply
Gabon	Reply received
Ghana	Reply received
Guinea	No reply
Guinea-Bissau	Reply received
Kenya	Reply received
Liberia	No reply
Mali	No reply
Nigeria	No reply
Rwanda	No reply
Sierra Leone	No reply
Togo	Reply received
Uganda	No reply
United Republic of Tanzania	No reply

<i>Poicephalus senegalus</i>	
Range State	Response
Benin	No reply
Burkina Faso	No reply
Cameroon	No reply
Chad	No reply
Côte d'Ivoire	Reply received
Gambia	No reply
Ghana	No reply
Guinea	No reply
Guinea-Bissau	Reply received
Liberia	No reply
Mali	No reply
Mauritania	No reply
Niger	No reply
Nigeria	No reply
Senegal	No reply
Sierra Leone	No reply
Togo	Reply received

<i>Gracula religiosa</i>	
Range State	Response
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received
Bangladesh	No reply
Bhutan	No reply
Brunei Darussalam	No reply
Cambodia	No reply
China	Reply received
India	No reply
Indonesia	Reply received
Malaysia	Reply received
Myanmar	No reply
Nepal	No reply
Philippines	Reply received
Singapore	Reply received
Sri Lanka	No reply
Thailand	No reply
Viet Nam	Reply received

<i>Callagur borneoensis</i>	
Range State	Response
Brunei Darussalam	No reply
Indonesia	Reply received
Malaysia	Reply received
Thailand	No reply

<i>Phelsuma dubia</i>	
Range State	Response
French Polynesia, Mayotte, Wallis and Futuna Islands (France)	No reply
Kenya	Reply received
Madagascar	No reply
Mozambique	No reply
United Republic of Tanzania	No reply

<i>Phelsuma v-nigra</i>	
Range State	Response
Comoros	No reply
French Polynesia, Mayotte, Wallis and Futuna Islands (France)	No reply

<i>Phelsuma comorensis</i>	
Range State	Response
Comoros	No reply

<i>Uromastix acanthinura</i>	
Range State	Response
Algeria	No reply
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	No reply
Morocco	Reply received
Tunisia	No reply

<i>Uromastyx benti</i>	
Range State	Response
Oman	No reply
Saudi Arabia	No reply
Yemen	No reply

<i>Uromastyx dispar</i>	
Range State	Response
Algeria	No reply
Chad	No reply
Mali	No reply
Mauritania	No reply
Sudan	No reply

<i>Uromastyx geyri</i>	
Range State	Response
Algeria	No reply
Mali	No reply
Niger	No reply

<i>Uromastyx ocellata</i>	
Range State	Response
Djibouti	No reply
Egypt	No reply
Eritrea	No reply
Ethiopia	Reply received
Somalia	No reply
Sudan	No reply

<i>Furcifer cephalolepis</i>	
Range State	Response
Comoros	No reply

<i>Hippopus hippopus</i>	
Range State	Response
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received
Australia	No reply
China	Reply received
Comoros	No reply
Fiji	No reply
India	No reply
Indonesia	Reply received
Japan	No reply
Kenya	No reply
Kiribati	No reply
Malaysia	No reply
Marshall Islands	No reply
Mauritius	No reply
Micronesia	No reply

Myanmar	No reply
New Caledonia (France)	Reply received
Palau	No reply
Papua New Guinea	No reply
Philippines	Reply received
Solomon Islands	Reply received
Somalia	No reply
Thailand	Reply received
Tonga	No reply
Vanuatu	No reply
Viet Nam	No reply

<i>Tridacna crocea</i>	
Range State	Response
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received
Australia	No reply
China	Reply received
Fiji	No reply
India	No reply
Indonesia	Reply received
Japan	No reply
Malaysia	No reply
New Caledonia (France)	Reply received
Palau	No reply
Papua New Guinea	No reply
Philippines	Reply received
Singapore	Reply received
Solomon Islands	Reply received
Thailand	Reply received
Vanuatu	No reply
Viet Nam	No reply

<i>Tridacna derasa</i>	
Range State	Response
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received
Australia	No reply
Comoros	No reply
Cook Islands	Reply received
Fiji	No reply
Indonesia	Reply received
Marshall Islands	No reply
Micronesia	No reply
New Caledonia (France)	Reply received
Palau	No reply
Papua New Guinea	No reply
Philippines	Reply received
Solomon Islands	Reply received
Tonga	No reply
Vanuatu	No reply
Viet Nam	No reply

<i>Tridacna gigas</i>	
Range State	Response
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received
Australia	No reply
China	Reply received
Comoros	No reply
Fiji	No reply
Indonesia	Reply received
Japan	No reply
Kiribati	No reply
Malaysia	No reply
Marshall Islands	No reply
Micronesia	No reply
Myanmar	No reply
Palau	No reply
Papua New Guinea	No reply
Philippines	Reply received
Seychelles	Reply received
Solomon Islands	Reply received
Thailand	Reply received
Tonga	No reply
Vanuatu	No reply
Viet Nam	No reply

<i>Tridacna maxima</i>	
Range State	Response
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received
Australia	No reply
China	Reply received
Comoros	No reply
Cook Islands	Reply received
Egypt	No reply
Fiji	No reply
French Polynesia, Mayotte, Wallis and Futuna Islands (France)	No reply
India	No reply
Indonesia	Reply received
Japan	No reply
Kenya	No reply
Kiribati	No reply
Madagascar	No reply
Malaysia	No reply
Marshall Islands	No reply
Mauritius	No reply
Micronesia	No reply
Mozambique	No reply
Myanmar	No reply
New Caledonia (France)	Reply received
Niue	No reply
Palau	No reply
Papua New Guinea	No reply
Philippines	Reply received
Pitcairn Islands (United Kingdom)	No reply
Réunion (France)	No reply

Saudi Arabia	No reply
Seychelles	Reply received
Singapore	Reply received
Solomon Islands	Reply received
Somalia	No reply
South Africa	No reply
Sri Lanka	No reply
Thailand	Reply received
Tonga	No reply
United Republic of Tanzania	No reply
Vanuatu	No reply
Viet Nam	No reply

<i>Tridacna squamosa</i>	
Range State	Response
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received
Australia	No reply
China	Reply received
Comoros	No reply
Cook Islands	Reply received
Egypt	No reply
Fiji	No reply
India	No reply
Indonesia	Reply received
Japan	No reply
Kenya	No reply
Kiribati	No reply
Madagascar	No reply
Malaysia	No reply
Marshall Islands	No reply
Mauritius	No reply
Micronesia	No reply
Mozambique	No reply
Myanmar	No reply
New Caledonia (France)	Reply received
Niue	No reply
Palau	No reply
Papua New Guinea	No reply
Philippines	Reply received
Pitcairn Islands (United Kingdom)	No reply
Saudi Arabia	No reply
Seychelles	Reply received
Singapore	Reply received
Solomon Islands	Reply received
Somalia	No reply
South Africa	No reply
Sri Lanka	No reply
Thailand	Reply received
Tonga	No reply
United Republic of Tanzania	No reply
Vanuatu	No reply
Viet Nam	No reply