

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

Twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Santiago (Chile), 3-15 November 2002

Strategic and administrative matters

Committee reports and recommendations

Animals Committee

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN

Introduction

1. This report covers the period from 20 April 2000 to 6 June 2002. During this period the Animals Committee (AC) met on three occasions (16th meeting, Shepherdstown, 11-15 December 2000; 17th meeting, Hanoi, 30 July-3 August 2001; 18th meeting, San José, 8-12 April 2002; subsequently referred to as AC16, AC17 and AC18 respectively). The Committee wishes to thank the Management Authorities and Scientific Authorities of the countries concerned for hosting and supporting the meetings as effectively as they did. AC16 was preceded by the second joint meeting of the Animals and Plants Committee (7-9 December 2000) to review the criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II, laid out in Resolution Conf. 9.24.
2. The composition of the AC is tabulated below. Immediately following the closure of the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP11) the (newly elected and continuing) members and alternate members of the AC, and the CITES Secretariat, met on 20 April 2000 in Gigiri, Kenya, and the AC elected Dr Marinus Hoogmoed (of the Netherlands) as its Chairman and Dr Susan Lieberman (of the United States of America) as Vice-Chairman. Because Dr Lieberman accepted a new job in the United Kingdom in the course of 2001, she relinquished her position as regional representative for North America, and after consultation among the North American Parties, was replaced by Dr Kurt Johnson (also of the United States of America). At a closed meeting on July 29, 2001 in Hanoi, Viet Nam, the Committee elected Dr Marco Polo Micheletti (of Honduras) as the new Vice-Chairman.

Region	Regional representative	Alternate
Africa	Mr Michael Griffin (Namibia)	Dr Richard Kiome Bagine (Kenya)
	Prof. Dr Kim Howell (Tanzania)	Dr Edson Chidziya (Zimbabwe)
Asia	Mr Tonny Soehartono (Indonesia)	Mr M Muzammel Hussain (Bangladesh)
	Dr Schwann Tunhikorn (Thailand)	Dr Choo-Hoo Giam (Singapore)
Central & South America and the Caribbean	Mr Sixto Inchaustegui (Dominican Republic)	Mr Roberto Ramos Tangarona (Cuba)
	Dr Marco Polo Micheletti (Honduras)	Mrs Magaly M. Ojeda (Venezuela)

Region	Regional representative	Alternate
Europe	Dr Marinus Hoogmoed (Netherlands)	Dr Vincent Fleming (United Kingdom)
	Dr Katalin Rodics (Hungary)	Dr Thomas Althaus (Switzerland)
North America	Dr Susan Lieberman (United States of America), until July 2001	Dr Rodrigo Medellin (Mexico)
	Dr Kurt Johnson (United States of America), from July 2001	
Oceania	Dr Rod Hay (New Zealand)	Dr Richard John Watling (Fiji)

3. Since CoP11, the AC has addressed all the tasks referred to it at that meeting in addition to its regular responsibilities, and has generated general discussion on some technical matters. Issues were tackled at the three AC meetings, and inter-sessionally by working groups operating under the auspices of the AC through correspondence. In most instances, AC members or alternate members chaired these working groups.
4. All three meetings of the AC were conducted in the three working languages of the Convention, which was possible because an increase of the budget for this purpose had been decided at CoP11. This linguistic emancipation has greatly increased the level of participation of non-English speaking participants in AC discussions. Former AC meetings, where no translation was available, tended to be rather heavily dominated by English-speaking Parties and observers, to the detriment of non-English speaking members of AC and observers.
5. In recent years, the nature of the tasks referred to the AC for more detailed consideration and advice was such that large numbers of non-governmental observers interested in single issues were attracted to meetings of the AC. This created an increasing imbalance between the numbers of observer Parties and non-governmental observers participating in the meetings, so that the former were greatly outnumbered by the latter (see also paragraph 4). Although the participation of NGOs at meetings of the Committee has generally been positive, the AC was first and foremost established as a scientific advisory body to serve the Parties to the Convention. Furthermore, many of the issues dealt with by the AC are either largely 'non-scientific' or politically sensitive, making objective discussions very difficult. In order to restore the balance between observer Parties and NGOs, some rules for NGO participation have been implemented since AC16. NGOs have had to ask the Chairman of AC in writing for an invitation, and had to provide him with the relevant legal instrument (bylaws, statutes, etc.), mission statements, the reasons why they want to attend the meeting, the contribution they think they could make, and a curriculum of the person to represent the NGO. The number of participants per NGO was in principle limited to one. There initially seemed to be some concern about this new procedure, which is based on Resolution Conf. 11.1, Annex 2, first DETERMINES, paragraph f), and some NGOs seemed to be reluctant or unable to provide the requested information, but the system was soon accepted and did not cause further problems. It not only provides a regulatory mechanism, but also gives the Chairman useful information and insight concerning the background of the NGO participants. No NGO was denied access to the meetings, although there has been one questionable application that was nevertheless resolved.
6. The Chairman of the Standing Committee invited the Chairman of the AC to the 45th and 46th meetings of the Standing Committee (SC45 and SC46) to take part in the work of the Standing Committee, and to report directly to it (see documents SC45 Doc. 16 and SC46 Doc. 21). The AC Chairman participated in the working group on the implementation of the Action Plan and the work plan of the Secretariat, and in a further meeting of this group in Geneva on 13-15 February 2002.

Activities of the Committee

General

7. Shortly after CoP11, the Chairman produced a paper on the priorities of the AC, based on the Strategic Vision through 2005 and Action Plan adopted at CoP11, and provided comments in the light of biological relevance of the issues. He also proposed a mission statement, which was amended and adopted at AC16 as follows:

The mission of the CITES Animals Committee is to provide the Conference of the Parties, Parties, other Committees and working groups and the Secretariat, with reliable scientific information and advice on biological matters (including criteria and their application) concerning international trade in animal species included in the Appendices as well as, when applicable, animal species subject to international trade that may be considered for inclusion in the Appendices in the future.

8. At AC16, the implementation of the non-biological and administrative aspects of the work of the Committee was discussed. It was concluded that the appropriate knowledge and experience on these issues was not available among the AC members or their alternates, who are predominantly zoologists, and that another group should preferably be tasked with non-biological CITES implementation aspects. Unfortunately, the term 'implementation committee' was used at that time to indicate this group. The Chairman was asked to bring up this proposal with the Chairman of the Standing Committee.
9. The Standing Committee discussed the proposed 'implementation committee' at SC45 and SC46 (see documents SC45 Doc. 8. and SC46 Doc. 6), but did not provide a solution, although it became clear that the terminology had led to a misunderstanding of what the AC had originally intended to convey.
10. At SC46, document SC46 Doc. 6 was presented by the Secretariat and discussed. The Chairman of the AC explained that there was no need for a new technical committee, but that the AC should be able to refer certain technical questions regarding CITES implementation and administration to a small group of experts functioning as a temporary working group, and reporting either to the AC or to the Standing Committee. There would be no need for equal regional representation in such a working group, and all the financial and administrative implications that the establishment of a new technical committee would imply could be avoided. This view was clearly expressed by the Chairman at SC46 and reported to AC18, where no comments to the contrary were made.
11. The regional reports, provided in writing at each AC meeting, gave a good overview of developments in the different regions. It became clear that communication in the regions with a large number of Parties (Africa, Asia, Europe, and Central and South America and the Caribbean) remained problematic, with still only limited numbers of Parties providing information on requests from representatives, even though generally, the response rate was increasing. Meetings of observer Parties and AC representatives or alternates from the same region during the regular AC meetings helped to improve the regional reports and to bring them up to date.
12. In addition to the specific tasks entrusted to the AC by CoP11, the activities of the Committee focused on the following ongoing issues (references to relevant documents that provide full background and recommendations on specific items are provided in brackets):
 - a) Phases IV and V of the review of Appendix-II listed animal species subject to significant levels of international trade, pursuant to Resolution Conf 8.9 (Rev.);
 - b) the periodic review of animal species included in the Appendices;
 - c) trade in invasive alien species;
 - d) trade in animal species used in traditional medicines (see document CoP12 Doc. 64); and

- e) transport of live animals (see document CoP12 Doc. 25).
13. Certain items that were addressed by the Committee led to the development of draft resolutions, to be finalized by the Secretariat for consideration at the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP12), and are dealt with under separate agenda items. They will therefore not be dealt with in detail in the present report, except in cases where they relate to broader issues considered by the Committee. These draft resolutions concern the following:
- a) Revision of Resolution Conf. 11.9 on the Conservation of and trade in trade in freshwater turtles and tortoises in Asia and other regions (see document CoP12 Doc. 39);
 - b) Revision of Resolution Conf. 10.12 (Rev.) on the Conservation of sturgeons and of Resolution Conf. 11.13 on a Universal labelling system for the identification of caviar, resulting in a draft resolution combining these two resolutions (see document CoP12 Doc. 42.2);
 - c) Revision of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) on the Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species taken from the wild (see document CoP12 Doc. 48); and
 - d) Revision of Resolution Conf. 9.24 on the Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II (see document CoP12 Doc. 58);
14. The above-mentioned draft resolutions represent the product of considerable considerations by the AC (with the exception of Resolution Conf. 9.24, for which a special process was adopted) and, in the case of the review of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) and Resolution Conf. 9.24, of consultation and cooperation with the Plants Committee.

European regional meeting

15. At the invitation of the German Government, the first European regional meeting, attended by representatives of European CITES Management and Scientific Authorities, met in Bonn on 14-16 November 2001 to discuss matters of common interest. There was a large participation of eastern European countries thanks to the generous financial support of the German government. Seventy-eight delegates from 31 European Parties and one Asian Party attended the meeting, as well as a representative of the CITES Secretariat and of three NGOs. The meeting was considered a success because it gave a much-needed opportunity for closer contact than is generally possible at CoPs. The meeting was held back-to-back with a training seminar of the Secretariat for European Scientific Authorities.

Major issues

Review of the Criteria (Decision 11.2)

16. The Conference of the Parties adopted Decision 11.2 (including Annex 2) at its 11th meeting and agreed on the establishment of a Criteria Working Group (CWG) under the Chairmanship of Mr Hank Jenkins.
17. In accordance with Decision 11.2, Annex 2, paragraph 7, the following representatives and alternate representatives of the AC were invited by the Chairman to participate in the work of the CWG: Richard Bagine (alternate for Africa), Marco Polo Micheletti (representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean region), Schwann Tunhikorn (representative for Asia), Rod Hay (representative for Oceania), Susan Lieberman (representative for North America) and Marinus Hoogmoed (representative for Europe). They participated in the first meeting of the CWG. At the second meeting of the CWG, Kim Howell (representative for Africa) took part on behalf of Africa while Schwann Tunhikorn was unable to attend. The CWG met on 24 August 2000 in Canberra, Australia. The report of the meeting was circulated to the Parties with Notification to the Parties No. 2000/51 of 31 August 2000 with a request

for comments, which were compiled in a document that was presented at the 2nd Joint Meeting of the AC and the Plants Committee in Shepherdstown, United States of America, on 7-9 December 2000.

18. It was agreed during that joint meeting that the CWG should meet again for a detailed discussion of the definitions, notes and guidelines in Annex 5 to Resolution Conf. 9.24, since new or amended definitions could only be proposed once the amendments to the text of the other Annexes had been agreed upon. The second meeting of the CWG was held in Sigüenza, Spain on 21-23 May 2001.
19. As announced at the joint meeting, the Chairmen of the Plants and Animals Committees and of the CWG met in Geneva from 19 to 21 April 2001 to prepare a report, including an amended draft of Resolution Conf. 9.24, based on comments received from Parties in response to Notification to the Parties No. 2000/51, and discussions during the joint meeting. This report, including the definitions proposed by the second meeting of the CWG, was circulated to the Parties and interested organizations with Notification to the Parties No. 2001/37 of 31 May 2001, seeking their comments.
20. The Chairmen agreed to meet in Geneva from 17 to 21 November 2001 to prepare the final report. However, the Chairman of the Plants Committee was unable to attend. The comments provided by 22 of the 156 Parties and by 13 interested organizations were considered in detail. The draft of the resulting report was sent to the Chairman of the Plants Committee on 21 November 2001, seeking her comments.
21. The Chairman of the Plants Committee informed the Chairmen of the AC and of the CWG that she did not agree with the document presented and that she would provide a separate document at SC46. A teleconference between the Chairmen and the Secretariat could not resolve the problem, and consequently two documents were presented at SC46.
22. The Chairmen of the AC and the CWG presented a final document at SC46, and believe that this document (SC46 Doc. 14, Annex 4) presents a balanced set of criteria for amending Appendices I and II of the Convention, taking into account most of the comments and concerns expressed during meetings of the CWG and the joint meeting of the AC and the Plants Committee. It compiles all written comments that were received. Although not suggested by any of the respondents, additional paragraphs were proposed for the preamble and operative part of the revised resolution, linking it more directly to the general overlaying principles and objectives contained in the CITES Action Plan and Strategic Vision through 2005. The revised draft resolution retains the precautionary approach and removes ambiguities in the text of the present Resolution. The two Chairmen are convinced that the text, as presented in document CoP12 Doc. 58, Annex 5a, will prove to be a useful tool in the forthcoming years to decide objectively and scientifically how and when to amend Appendices I and II of the Convention.

Transport of live animals (Resolution Conf. 10.21)

23. At its 10th meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopted Resolution Conf. 10.21, which mandated the AC to deal with matters related to the transport of live animals. Annex 2 of Resolution Conf. 9.1 was amended accordingly. The Committee established a working group to collaborate with the Secretariat in implementing Resolution Conf. 10.21, which *inter alia* directs the Secretariat to monitor implementation of the recommendations contained therein and to report to the Conference of the Parties.
24. The activities and progress of the working group were presented at AC16, AC17 and AC18, and summary reports are available on the CITES web site. Major issues are reflected in document CoP12 Doc. 25.

Regarding the biological and trade status of sharks (Decision 11.94)

25. In accordance with the provisions of Decision 11.94, the Chairman liaised regularly with the Secretary of the Commission on Fisheries of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in order to follow implementation of the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management

of sharks (IPOA-Sharks) by members of FAO. These contacts took place shortly before the AC meetings to provide members with the most up-to-date information.

26. At AC16 and AC17, the Chairman reported the responses received from FAO, and these were noted.
27. At AC18, the Chairman provided the written response of FAO to his questions concerning the IPOA-Sharks (see document AC18 Inf. 7). Two other documents on the matter were submitted by Australia, and by the IUCN/SSC Shark Specialist Group and TRAFFIC (see documents AC18 Doc. 19.2 and AC18 Inf. 10). The discussions were referred to a working group. From the documents available to the Committee, it became apparent that little progress has been made in the development of the IPOA-Sharks, and that the number of Parties that have implemented National Plans of Action remains very limited. The voluntary nature of the IPOA-Sharks was considered to be the main reason for this unsatisfactory situation. The AC reached consensus on the following:
 - a) Concerns should be raised with FAO over the lack of progress in implementing the IPOA-Sharks, and FAO should be urged to take steps to encourage the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks by States and regional fisheries management organizations.
 - b) The Chairman of the AC should be instructed to continue the activities specified under Decision 11.94 beyond CoP12.
 - c) CITES Management Authorities should be encouraged to obtain information on the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks from their national government agencies responsible for fisheries, and report directly on progress at future meetings of the AC.
 - d) Parties should discuss the potential role for CITES in assisting FAO members in the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks, especially regarding international trade in sharks and parts and derivatives thereof.
 - e) Shark trade and conservation should not be just part of the report of the Chairman of the AC to the CoP12, but should preferably be dealt with under a separate Agenda item at CoP12. Since the time of writing this report, Australia and Ecuador submitted documents on shark conservation and management (see documents Cop12 Doc. 41.1 and Doc. 41.2).
28. Regarding the conservation of sharks, the Committee recommends the replacement of Decision 11.94 with the draft decisions proposed in Annex 2.

Trade in alien species (implementation of Decision 11.100)

29. Alien invasive species have been identified as one of the principal causal factors in loss of biodiversity, together with habitat fragmentation and destruction.
30. The regional representative of Oceania has, on behalf of the Committee, established and maintained contact and cooperation with the chairman of the IUCN/SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) on the implementation of their guidelines concerning alien invasive species. These guidelines were prepared for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The ISSG has expressed interest in helping to prepare a list of CITES-listed invasive species, provided that it was informed about the purpose and use of such a list. No deadline by when this list could be compiled was provided. The AC decided that the purpose of such a list was to provide Parties with information on examples of CITES-listed species that have become invasive, and to provide guidance to Management and Scientific Authorities when considering the overall impacts of trade in these or similar species.
31. Clearly, the problems associated with alien species are an area of common interest between CITES and the CBD. The control of international trade in specimens of CITES-listed species that are identified by the AC and ISSG as being potentially invasive in particular environments has the potential to contribute

positively to the objectives of the CBD initiative. However, under CITES Parties have currently no specific mechanisms in place to control the trade in such species other than through stricter domestic measures.

32. It should be noted that CBD, at its 5th and 6th meetings, adopted comprehensive guidelines concerning alien species, and subsequently initiated a wide range of activities concerning their implementation. It may therefore be more appropriate to support the implementation of the interim guiding principles for the prevention, introduction and mitigation of impacts of alien species, adopted by CBD, than to pursue further parallel actions through CITES.

Captive breeding of Appendix-I species for commercial purposes (Resolution Conf. 11.14 and implementation of Decision 11.101)

33. The manner in which the Parties have interpreted and implemented the provisions of Article VII, paragraphs 4 and 5, of the Convention regarding specimens of animal species included in Appendix I that are bred in captivity for commercial purposes has, over the years, proven to be particularly problematic, and the current reporting period has not been an exception.

34. Decision 11.101 regarding operations that breed Appendix-I animal species for commercial purposes has tasked the AC to develop a list of Appendix-I species that are:

- a) critically endangered in the wild; and/or
- b) known to be difficult to breed or keep in captivity.

35. Resolution Conf. 11.14 was designed to repeal and replace Resolution Conf. 8.15 but the latter will be formally repealed only when the Standing Committee has approved a list of species for which commercial captive-breeding operations should be registered. The procedure for registration described in these two Resolutions however is different, the procedure in Resolution Conf. 11.14 being slightly simplified. Since this Resolution is the most recent one on this subject, it is taken as expressing the current intention of the Conference of the Parties. Consequently, the Secretariat is now applying the procedure for registration that is specified in Resolution Conf. 11.14. However, until the list of species to be included in Annex 3 to that Resolution is approved by the Standing Committee, it will continue to be possible to include in the Register breeding operations for any Appendix-I species.

36. At AC16, a list of species nominated by Parties to be included in Annex 3, in response to Notification to the Parties No. 2000/044 of 31 July 2000, was presented and discussed. The AC decided that before developing a list of species for inclusion in Annex 3 to Resolution Conf. 11.14, the parameters mentioned in Decision 11.101 should be defined. A working group presented the AC members with several definitions. The proposed definitions for 'difficult to breed' and 'difficult to keep in captivity' were agreed upon. However, it was not possible for members of the AC to reach consensus on the proposed definition for 'critically endangered in the wild' (i.e. "Species that are 'critically endangered in the wild' are any species that are in IUCN Red List categories 'critically endangered in the wild', 'endangered in the wild' or 'vulnerable'"), which in the opinion of several members was too inclusive, illogical and not scientifically justifiable. It became apparent that several Parties tried to bring up matters in the AC discussion that should better be dealt with under CBD, and not CITES. Although recognizing that the property of genetic resources could be an issue, it was acknowledged that it could not be addressed through this CITES mechanism. This might be a point for further discussion between CITES and CBD.

37. At AC17, it was decided that, before trying to make a final decision on the definition of 'critically endangered in the wild', a pilot project on Appendix-I listed species of reptiles should be undertaken. The purpose was to see what consequences it would have for Annex 3 of the Resolution if this were to be composed of Appendix-I reptile species that were difficult to breed or to keep, and that were in accordance with IUCN Red List categories critically endangered in the wild, endangered in the wild, or

vulnerable. The IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group (CSG) was contracted by the Secretariat to undertake this pilot study.

38. At AC18, the study of the CSG was received with much appreciation because of the wealth of data it provided on the species covered, but concerns were raised about the use of IUCN Red List categories, the treatment of national populations of subspecies that are critically endangered, and whether the methodology could be applicable to other taxa.
39. Discussions in a working group at AC18 continued to be centred on the definition of 'critically endangered in the wild' and the implications of using the IUCN Red List categories for national populations. Concern was expressed that the autonomy of individual countries to determine the level of protection needed for populations of their native species might be compromised.
40. The working group came to the conclusion that by adopting all criteria mentioned in Decision 11.101 in their most inclusive sense, all reptile species (and by inference all other animal species) listed in Appendix I would end up in Annex 3 to Resolution Conf. 11.14. It was felt that this had not been the intention of Resolution Conf. 11.14 or Decision 11.101.
41. The AC recommends to the Conference of the Parties to retain the method currently in operation for registration of captive-breeding facilities of Appendix-I listed animal species, viz. continue working with Resolution Conf. 8.15 (Rev.). The Committee did however not take into consideration that by the adoption of Resolution Conf. 11.14, the Parties had already decided that the procedures for registration contained in Resolution Conf. 8.15 needed to be improved (see paragraph 35). The Committee confined its discussions to the scope of application of the list of animal species in Annex 3, and concluded that all Appendix-I species should be covered. The logical conclusion, according to its Chairman, of trying to put the advice of the Committee into practice therefore is that the registration of commercial captive-breeding operations for all Appendix-I animal species should be conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in Resolution Conf. 11.14.

Relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation (Decision 11.102)

42. At AC16, a document on the relationship between *ex situ* breeding operations and *in situ* conservation programmes, prepared by the Secretariat, was discussed (see document Doc. AC.16.9.2). The Secretariat recognized that this relationship extended beyond scientific and biological aspects, and involved also for instance socio-economics and rural development.
43. On 19 December 2001, the Secretariat issued Notification to the Parties No. 2001/091, inviting all Parties and organizations to provide any information on the relationship between *ex situ* production systems and *in situ* conservation programs for any CITES-listed species. At the time of writing of this report, only two Parties had responded, and this does not provide the AC with a good basis to fulfill the requirements of Decision 11.102.
44. At AC18, members of the AC and the Secretariat agreed that this issue is of considerable importance and should be explored further, and that more efforts should be made to gather relevant information from the Parties and interested organizations.
45. The AC recommends to the Conference of Parties that work continue on the relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation after CoP12, and that this be undertaken in close collaboration with the Plants Committee and with IUCN. Decision 11.102 should be amended accordingly, and be extended to CoP13. During discussions at AC meetings, many Parties and organizations expressed interest in the subject, but failed to respond to the request of the Secretariat to provide information. The AC hopes that these Parties and organizations will be able to provide the Secretariat with the information requested in Notification to the Parties No. 2001/091 in the near future.

Musk deer (Decision 11.92)

46. At AC16, the trade in musk deer, raw musk and products containing musk was considered in the context of the Review of Significant Trade, as required in Decision 11.92 (see paragraph 58).
47. At AC16, the species of *Moschus* were categorized in accordance with the provisions of Decision 11.106 (three species were placed in Category 2, and *Moschus moschiferus* in Category 1). For the species in category 1, possible Article-IV implementation problems were formulated for the range States concerned (China and the Russian Federation).
48. On 19 March 2001, recommendations were made to China and the Russian Federation concerning *Moschus moschiferus*. The responses from China to these recommendations were evaluated during AC18 and the conclusion was that there was insufficient evidence that the primary and secondary recommendations had been met.
49. In response to the secondary recommendations regarding *M. moschiferus*, the Russian Federation responded by means of a letter to the Secretariat, but this letter contained insufficient information to assess the implementation of the recommendations. On 2 May 2002, the Secretariat asked for further details to be provided before the end of May 2002.
50. At AC16, *M. fuscus*, *M. berezovskii* and *M. chrysogaster* were placed in Category 2, pending additional information from China within 6 weeks. If such information was not received within that period, the taxa would be placed in Category 1.
51. At AC18 it was decided that the response received from China concerning the three species mentioned in the preceding paragraph was not satisfactory and that the species should be placed in Category 1. It was also decided that the regional representative of North America and the Secretariat, with input from China, collaborate to develop in a timely manner a practical, detailed and precise series of recommendations with a specific time-frame for implementation. It was felt that this collaborative initiative would be beneficial to the conservation of musk deer in China and in the region.
52. The AC does not recommend further action other than the completion of its Review of Significant Trade concerning *Moschus* species. Therefore the AC recommends that Decision 11.92 be repealed.

Review of Significant Trade: sturgeons and paddlefish, and freshwater turtles and tortoises [Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) and Decisions 11.93, 11.95, 11.96 and 11.106]

53. The AC initiated Phase IV of the review of trade in Appendix-II animal species, pursuant to Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.). It evaluated desk-based reviews of 10 species of sturgeons and paddlefish provided by TRAFFIC, and of four species of *Moschus* (see paragraphs 46-52) and 10 subspecies of *Naja naja* provided by UNEP-WCMC. The AC categorized each taxon, and depending on the categorization, recommendations or requests for further information were formulated and sent to the range States, or taxa were taken out of the process (if placed in Category 3).
54. Sturgeon species of the Caspian Sea region required in particular the formulation of precise and comprehensive recommendations, which were later also used for formulating recommendations to the Black Sea range States of sturgeons. The recommendations were developed in close collaboration with the Secretariat and sent to the range States early in 2001.
55. At AC16 *Acipenser fulvescens* and *Polyodon spathula* were placed in Category 2, and information was requested from the range States. The replies were not evaluated at AC17 but intersessionally, resulting in the assignment of *P. spathula* and *A. fulvescens* for the United States of America to Category 3. The information received from Canada concerning *A. fulvescens* was deemed not to be sufficient, and this species for Canada was moved to Category 1. Recommendations were formulated and forwarded to Canada.

56. The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairman, and based on information obtained from UNEP-WCMC, concluded that of the remaining 17 species of Acipenseriformes that had not been reviewed, only four (*Acipenser oxyrinchus*, *A. transmontanus*, *A. persicus* and *Scaphirhynchus platorynchus*) were internationally traded in significant numbers, and merited further attention. The four desk-based reviews were made by TRAFFIC and discussed at AC18. *A. oxyrinchus*, *A. transmontanus*, *S. platorynchus* were assigned to Category 3, and *A. persicus* for Iran to Category 3 and for Azerbaijan to Category 1.
57. The AC recommended that in response to Decision 11.93, desk-based reviews concerning the status of and trade in three species of *Cuora*, and *Lissemys punctata* and *Pyxis planicauda* should be undertaken. These reviews by IUCN became available at AC18 and were categorized as follows: *Cuora amboinensis* in Category 1, *C. flavomarginata* in Category 2 for China and Category 3 for Japan, *C. galbinifrons* and *L. punctata* in Category 2, and *P. planicauda* in Category 1.
58. At AC17, the AC decided that under phase V of the Review of Significant Trade, a new desk-based review on the status of and the trade in *Strombus gigas* in the Caribbean region would be warranted. This species has already been the subject of an earlier review. The choice of species was limited by the available budget. The desk-based review was not yet available at AC18.
59. By reviewing tortoises and freshwater turtles and Acipenseriformes in the context of the Review of Significant Trade, the AC has fulfilled the tasks assigned to it and recommends that Decisions 11.93 and 11.95 be repealed.

Review of Significant Trade: country-based review [Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.)]

60. The AC discussed the possibility of initiating a country-based Review of Significant Trade because in many instances, the same countries are involved in reviews of significant trade and the subject of AC recommendations, suggesting that there might be problems at the national level to implement Article IV in general. It was made clear that such a country-based review should not replace the species reviews, but should be undertaken in addition to these reviews. It was suggested that Madagascar, with its largely endemic fauna and flora, would be a good test case. The Plants Committee reached the same conclusion.
61. The terms of reference for the country-based review project were drafted by the Secretariat in consultation with the Animals and the Plants Committees.
62. At AC18 the Secretariat reported that a consultant had been contracted and that work on the project started at the end of 2001. Owing to changes in personnel in the Malagasy Management Authority and a breakdown of communications between the Secretariat and the Malagasy Authorities, the planned research activities in Madagascar has mostly remained on hold. The AC feels that this situation is rather worrisome and that action should be taken as soon as possible. The AC realizes however that at the time of writing of this report, the political situation in the country is not very conducive for making progress on this project.

Review of Significant Trade: revision of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.)

63. The AC initiated a review of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) because problems in understanding and implementing the process it describes. The Secretariat contracted Africa Resources Trust (ART) to review Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.), to identify discrepancies between the Resolution and relevant Decisions, and to produce a discussion document that could provide the basis for further discussion. This document was discussed and amended at AC17. At AC18, the Secretariat presented a consolidated draft text, which, after having been amended and adopted by the AC and subsequently by the Plants Committee, is being presented at CoP12 as a draft resolution by the Secretariat (see Agenda item 48).

Conservation of sturgeons and paddlefish (Decisions 11.59, 11.96 and 11.152)

64. As directed in Decision 11.152, the Secretariat prepared for consideration by the AC a document on the conservation of Acipenseriformes (see document AC18 Doc. 21). The AC provided a number of amendments, and accepted the general content of the document that will be presented at CoP12 (see documents CoP12 Doc. 42.1 and Doc. 42.2). It advised that work to improve the understanding of the population structures and genetic variations of different stocks should be carried out further. The collection of voucher specimens and the cooperation with the IUCN/SSC Sturgeon Specialist Group was considered essential in this regard.
65. The AC has fulfilled the task directed to it in Decision 11.96 and therefore recommends its repeal.

Conservation of sturgeons and paddlefish: universal labelling of caviar (Resolution Conf. 11.13)

66. After the adoption of Resolution Conf. 11.13, it was realized that there were problems in its interpretation and implementation that needed to be addressed. At the request of the Chairman, TRAFFIC prepared a document outlining the perceived problems to be discussed at AC16.
67. At AC16, a working group involving interested Parties and NGOs was established. This working group continued working interessionally and presented its final report at AC18. The AC adopted the report and the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.13, which include the extension of labeling requirements to re-exports and to all caviar containers, and the limitation of the labelling system to caviar (and not to sturgeon and paddlefish meat). A draft resolution, incorporating elements of Resolution Conf. 11.13, has been prepared by the Secretariat for presentation at CoP12 (see document CoP12 Doc. 42.2).

Review of the Appendices (Resolution Conf. 11.1, Annex 2, paragraph h) under RESOLVES

68. At its 15th meeting in Madagascar (Antanarivo, 5-9 July 1999), the AC started reviewing the Appendices using the criteria laid down in Resolution Conf. 9.24, and a number of taxa had been selected for review. Several countries volunteered to undertake these reviews. During the subsequent meetings of the AC, it became clear that these reviews were produced at a very low rate, and it was concluded that the voluntary system should preferably be replaced by a more systematic approach. Funds should therefore be made available for hiring consultants to undertake these reviews.
69. To date, 12 taxa have been reviewed and for only one (*Cnemidophorus hyperythrus*) has a deletion from Appendix II been proposed (see Proposal 34 from the United States of America). All other species were considered to be included in the correct Appendix, either because they met the criteria, or because downlisting a single species included in a higher taxon would cause enforcement problems, for instance *Macaca fascicularis*. In the case of *Falco peregrinus* it was recognized that the species did not meet the biological criteria for inclusion in Appendix I, but because of concerns about the status of subspecies and small populations, the AC did not want to propose a transfer to Appendix II. It was however recognized that this conclusion should not prevent any Party from preparing and submitting a proposal for the species as a whole or a biogeographically separate population.
70. A draft proposal on guidelines to assist in the identification of species for review, and in the process for conducting those reviews was discussed by the AC. An amended version, which only covers the objectives of the reviews and the identification of species, was adopted. The AC still needs to finalize its discussions on the process for future reviews.

Trade in time-sensitive research samples (Decisions 11.103-11.105)

71. Decision 11.103 tasked the AC to look into the matter of trade in biological samples, to identify the types of samples involved in international transport, to categorize the purpose for which these samples were used, to categorize the recipient institutions and to evaluate the need for expedited transfer of

samples in each category. Decision 11.105 requires that the AC include input from relevant organizations and experts in its deliberations (see note from the Secretariat to Decision 11.105). Decision 11.104 directs the AC to submit its conclusions to the Standing Committee.

72. The AC extensively discussed this issue with the participation of many experts in this field, and a document with the required information was produced and presented at SC45. It should be noted that the AC agreed that the full title of the document submitted would be: "On cross-border movement in time-sensitive biological samples for conservation purposes". This change of title actually limited the scope of the document considerably by restricting it to conservation purposes only, but the amendment was made because concerns regarding intellectual property rights had been brought up. The Standing Committee has addressed the matter further (see document CoP12 Doc. 51).
73. By providing its report at SC45, the AC has completed its task and recommends that Decisions 11.103-105 be repealed.

Trade in hard corals (Decisions 11.98 and 11.99)

74. Decision 11.98 tasked the AC to consider whether Article IV, paragraph 3, of the Convention could be used as an alternative to Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), when making non-detriment findings for corals in trade, and report on this at CoP12. Decision 11.99 requires the AC to advise the Secretariat for which genera of hard corals it is practical to recognize specimens in trade to the species level, and for which genera identification to genus level only is acceptable for the purpose of implementing Resolutions Conf. 10.2 (Rev.) and Conf. 11.17.
75. The AC established a working group on corals the terms of reference of which were agreed to be wider than just addressing the issues mentioned in Decisions 11.98 and 11.99, and also included the possibility on advising the Nomenclature Committee on adopting a standard reference for corals; trying to identify ways of distinguishing between recent and fossil corals; and exploring CITES requirements regarding different coral production systems. The working group submitted its final recommendations at AC18.
76. A list of coral genera that could be identified to species level, and of those that could be identified to genus level only was adopted by the AC and will be distributed by the Secretariat as a Notification to the Parties.
77. It was felt that it was important to retain non-detriment findings at the level of individual species or genera. It was agreed, however, that greater emphasis should be placed on assessing the impacts of harvesting corals from their ecosystems. Indeed, the nature of hard corals, forming the structure of reefs and the basis for entire ecosystems, means that their role in the ecosystems is significantly greater than for many other CITES-listed species. It was however concluded that it was not practical to assess whether a specific species was being maintained at a level consistent with its role in the ecosystem by monitoring exports alone (as specified in Article IV, paragraph 3). It was agreed that a more ecosystem-based approach to the management of corals that are harvested for export was desirable, and that Parties should be encouraged to do this. A few amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.10 (which also includes some minor editing) are therefore proposed and presented as Annex 1 to this document.
78. A number of possible taxonomic standard references for hard corals were identified, but it was also recognized that there were problems using the current versions. The most likely candidate standard reference will be revised shortly and might be considered subsequently by the Nomenclature Committee as a possible standard reference for adoption by the Conference of the Parties.
79. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland commissioned a report, which aimed to define fossilized corals and provided a practical assessment of how such corals could be distinguished from non-fossilized corals in trade. The working group could not reach consensus on the approach proposed in the report, although a majority within the working group supported it. However, the AC was not able

to recommend its general use. The report is available on the CITES website of the United Kingdom (www.ukcites.gov.uk). The AC recommends maintaining this item on its agenda until CoP13 to try and reach a final solution.

80. At the request of the Secretariat, which had received some communications on the issue, the coral working group also studied the matter of coral mariculture.
81. The working group on corals produced a useful document on coral production systems, containing definitions and advice on the use of source codes. This document was adopted by the AC, which recommended distributing it to the Parties.
82. Concerning trade in hard corals, the Committee therefore recommends that CoP12 adopts the revised text of Resolution Conf. 11.10, and that Decisions 11.98 and 11.99 be repealed.

Trade in traditional medicines (Decision 11.165 directed to the Secretariat)

83. The Secretariat asked the AC for assistance in implementing Decision 11.165 regarding trade in traditional medicines. The AC focused mainly on paragraph c) of the decision, and at AC17 and AC18, a list of species known to be traded in part or whole for use in traditional medicine was presented and commented upon. Questions were raised concerning the purpose, scope and further use of this list. A small contact group was established at AC18 to discuss the issue further intersessionally, but the group did not reach consensus on how to proceed. The Secretariat will present a report on the work outlined in Decision 11.165 at CoP12 (see document CoP12 Doc. 64).

Tursiops truncatus ponticus (Black Sea bottlenose dolphin) (Decision 11.91)

84. Decision 11.91 directed the AC to review the conservation of and trade in *Tursiops truncatus ponticus*, to evaluate the information received by the Secretariat as a result of its actions under Decision 11.139, and to request range States to cooperate with experts to examine the genetics of this population and evaluate its distinctiveness, through the collection and analysis of tissue samples.
85. At AC16 no new information had become available since CoP11, and the Chairman established a contact group to try and obtain more information on the issue, particularly because part of the task of the AC depended on actions to be taken by the Secretariat and reactions from range States. At that time, the Secretariat had not yet been able to initiate action on this issue.
86. With Notification to the Parties No. 2001/32 of 18 May 2001, the Secretariat requested the information specified in Decision 11.91. Only two range States responded to this Notification.
87. Based on the information received by the Secretariat from the range States and UNEP-WCMC trade data, a document prepared by the contact group, and an information document provided by ACCOBAMS (Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area), the AC discussed the conservation status of and trade in this taxon at AC18. However, the AC members could not reach a consensus on the best way forward because of the sometimes contradictory and rather vague information available. The absence of experts from the range States was a distinct handicap, as queries could not be answered.
88. It was decided that after AC18, the Secretariat should approach the range States at a meeting on sturgeons later in April and would ask for further information. Because no dolphin experts were present at the sturgeon meeting, the Secretariat forwarded letters to the range States, also asking additional information from exporting countries concerning their non-detriment findings for this subspecies/population. Only one range State (Romania) had responded in writing at the time of writing of this report.

89. Although Decision 11.91 does not require the AC to advise on a possible transfer of this taxon to Appendix I, or on any other change in its management regime, some Parties and NGOs seem to have interpreted the Decision as such, and have pressed for advice along these lines. However, the AC is not in a position to advise on any change in listing of this particular taxon, or on specific measures such as quotas, because the scientific information appears to be deficient. The fact that ACCOBAMS requested CITES to transfer this taxon to Appendix I does not imply that the CITES criteria for including the species in Appendix I have been fulfilled. CITES needs to conduct its own assessment of whether the criteria for transfer to Appendix I have been fulfilled. The alternative view that the conservation of the species can and should instead be addressed through adequately implementing its listing in Appendix II should also be considered.
90. Discussions in AC18 did not lead to a consensual opinion among members of the AC about the conservation status of and trade in this taxon, but it was agreed to present the available information (i.e. responses of range States and the ACCOBAMS report) at CoP12.
91. The Secretariat, on behalf of the AC, requested range States to assist in the collection of tissue samples for genetic research. Most range States reacted positively. The samples obtained will be analyzed by the Southwest Fisheries Science Center of the National Marine Fisheries Service and San Diego State University (both in the United States of America). Work on these samples is still in progress, and the AC cannot provide comments about the distinctiveness of the Black Sea bottlenose dolphin at this stage.
92. To enable the AC to make a sensible decision on this issue, it seems that first and foremost the genetic distinctiveness of the Black Sea bottlenose dolphin should be established. It is therefore recommended to Parties to wait until the results of the genetic research mentioned in paragraph 91 above have become available before undertaking further actions.
93. In the light of the actions taken, the Committee is of the opinion that it has fulfilled its task and therefore recommends that Decision 11.91 be repealed.

Control of captive-breeding, ranching and wild harvest production systems for Appendix II species

94. At AC15 in Madagascar, the European and African AC members requested that an inventory be made of the different systems used to produce specimens of Appendix-II species. It became very clear that the diversity of these systems was increasing and that for many countries it was no longer clear which source code should be used for particular specimens.
95. The Secretariat contracted a consultant to inventory the different systems. The first draft report was received with appreciation and provided a good amount of information. At AC17, a new draft was discussed. The new source codes proposed therein, e.g. sub-codes within the source code 'W' to indicate more precisely which system had been used for producing the specimens, received a lot of attention. Some Parties were very much in favour of such a refinement of source codes, while others feared that subdivisions would only complicate matters. It was agreed that source codes needed better definitions, but that this would have to await finalization of the definitions and the terminology of the different production systems. It was also agreed that source codes could not be used *in lieu* of non-detriment findings as required under Article IV.
96. The issue was also discussed in the Plants Committee. The Secretariat contracted IUCN to look into wildlife production systems from both the animals and plants perspectives. The draft report was not available at AC18 and further discussion of the matter was deferred to future meetings of the AC.

Trade in tortoises and freshwater turtles (Decision 11.150 directed to the Secretariat)

97. In compliance with Decision 11.150, paragraph a), the Secretariat convened a technical workshop to establish conservation priorities and actions to achieve sustainable trade in freshwater turtles and tortoises, and invited several members of the AC, including the Chairman, to participate.

98. The findings and recommendations of the workshop were presented at AC18, and resulted in a proposal to amend Resolution Conf. 11.9, which is submitted by the Secretariat at CoP12 in document CoP12 Doc. 39. Based on the workshop recommendations, the AC expressed its support for a number of listing proposals for freshwater turtles to be submitted and discussed at CoP12.
99. The AC recommended that its working group on tortoises and freshwater turtles be continued beyond CoP12, in order to monitor the implementation of the Resolution and to follow up on the recommendations and findings formulated at the technical workshop referred to above.

Trade in seahorses and other members of the family Syngnathidae (Decision 11.97 directed to the AC and Decision 11.153 directed to the Secretariat)

100. In compliance with Decision 11.153, the Secretariat convened a technical workshop to discuss all relevant available information concerning the status, catches and bycatches of and trade in seahorses and other syngnathids, and any domestic measures for their conservation and protection, and to review the adequacy of such measures. One of the two regional representatives of Asia and the Chairman of the AC attended this workshop. The workshop endorsed the draft proposal to include the genus *Hippocampus* in Appendix II. The AC reviewed the outcome of the technical workshop, and prepared a discussion paper for consideration at CoP12 on actions needed to secure the conservation status of seahorses and other syngnathids (see document CoP12 Doc. 43).
101. Given the results of the workshop, the Committee is of the opinion that it has fulfilled its task and recommends that Decision 11.97 be repealed.

AC budget

102. At CoP11, the Parties approved an annual budget of CHF 90,000 for the operation of the AC for the years 2000, 2001 and 2002. This allowed simultaneous interpretation into the three working languages of the Convention at the Committee's regular meetings.
103. The Chairman reported on the expenditure in 2000 and in 2001 of this budget at SC45 and SC46. The Table below shows the annual expenditures, including the estimated expenditure for 2002.

	2000 (in USD)	2001 (in USD)	2002 (in USD)
Logistic costs for the AC meeting	20,000	36,839	19,500
Translation of documents	22,134	9,323	10,500
AC members travel and daily allowance costs	24,301	19,403	14,500
Rapporteur	1,902	4,709	2,100
Experts travel and daily allowance costs		2,395	
Secretariat staff and daily allowance costs		8,490	12,000
TOTAL	70,337	81,159	58,600
Annual budget (in USD)	60,000	60,000	60,000

104. The expenditures in 2001 and 2002 include budget items (Secretariat staff costs; translation costs) that were not included in previous years. This is the result of a decision by the Standing Committee at SC45, requiring the Secretariat to provide a breakdown of the true costing of the support provided to the technical committees.

105. For the next triennium, 2003-2005, the AC requires as a minimum the same support as in the previous three years, allowing simultaneous translation during its regular meetings. Taking into account the decision of the Standing Committee concerning the inclusion of the cost incurred by the Secretariat, this status quo support requires USD 91,000 annually, which would enable the AC to simply continue organizing its regular meetings as in the last three years. To carry out its work and accommodate costs related to activities other than the regular meetings adequately, an additional budget of USD 15,000 would be necessary. As explained in the closing remarks, the Chairman also recommends considering allocating funds (for example USD 30,000) to assist the work of the Chairman in case this individual would not be able to benefit from government or institutional financial or technical support, such as may be expected in certain developing countries.

106. The AC therefore recommends that the Conference of the Parties, at its 12th meeting, approve an annual budget of USD 136,000 for the next triennium.

Closing remarks

107. As indicated in the Chairman's reports at SC45 and SC46, and to the Committee, the chairmanship of the AC is very time-consuming. Without adequate financial and other support by the Chairman's country or institution, it will be almost impossible to do the work for the Committee efficiently and expeditiously.

108. It is this Chairman's concern that these constraints might effectively prevent AC representatives from certain developing countries from being elected Chairman of the Committee, or operating effectively in this position.

109. It is therefore suggested that the budget subcommittee of the Standing Committee look into the possibilities of allocating funds that, if necessary, can be used on a case-by-case basis to compensate for the time of a Chairman when this individual comes from a developing country that cannot provide the necessary financial support. This suggestion does certainly not imply that financial assistance should be provided to each Chairman of the AC, particularly when this concerns persons from developed countries.

Acknowledgements

110. The considerable assistance from and the cooperation with my fellow members of the Committee and all personnel of the Secretariat, especially the Scientific Support Unit, are gratefully acknowledged. I also would like to thank the members of the Committee, and Malan Lindeque and Tom De Meulenaer of the Secretariat's SSU for their support and friendship, which helped me deal with difficult and sometimes delicate issues. I also want to thank the representatives of the Scientific and Management Authorities of observer Parties, and representatives from NGOs who, by providing their expertise at the meetings of the AC, were of considerable help to the members of the Committee in performing their tasks and making decisions.

111. Finally, but by no means least, I would like to acknowledge the considerable financial support provided by the Dutch Government, through the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, Directorate of Nature Management, and the consent of my employer, the Dutch National Museum of Natural History in Leiden, the Netherlands, to devote a considerable part of my working time to CITES matters and thus enable me to fulfill my role as Chairman of the Animals Committee.

DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

NB: Amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.10 provided by the Animals Committee are shown in **bold** and deletions in ~~striethrough~~.

Trade in **stony hard** corals

AWARE that ~~stony hard~~ corals (**in the orders Scleractinia, Stolonifera, Coenothecalia, Milleporina and Stylasterina**) are in international trade as intact specimens for aquaria and as curios;

RECOGNIZING also that coral rock, fragments, sand and other coral products are also traded;

NOTING the unique nature of corals, namely that their skeletons are persistent, that they may become mineralized in time and that they are the foundation of reefs, and that, following erosion, fragments of coral may form part of mineral and sedimentary deposits;

NOTING also that coral rock may act as an important substrate for the attachment of live corals and that the removal of rock may have a detrimental impact on reef ecosystems;

AWARE, however, that coral rock cannot be readily identified other than to the order Scleractinia and that accordingly non-detriment findings under Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), of the Convention cannot be readily applied;

NOTING that Article IV, paragraph 3, of the Convention requires the monitoring of exports of specimens of each species in Appendix II, in order to assess whether the species is being maintained at a level consistent with its role in the ecosystem;

NOTING that assessments under Article IV, paragraph 3, of the impacts of harvesting corals on the ecosystems from which they are derived cannot be adequately by monitoring exports alone;

ACCEPTING that coral fragments and coral sand cannot be readily recognized;

RECOGNIZING also that it is frequently difficult to identify live or dead corals to the species level owing to the lack of a standard nomenclature and the lack of comprehensive and accessible identification guides for the non-specialist;

RECOGNIZING that corals that are fossilized are not subject to the provisions of the Convention;

NOTING that it has been difficult to apply and enforce the provisions of the Convention to trade in corals;

THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

RESOLVES to adopt the working definitions of coral sand, coral fragments, coral rock, live coral and dead coral provided in the Annex to this Resolution; ~~and~~

RECOMMENDS that Parties give much greater emphasis to the implementation of Article IV, paragraph 3, when permitting the export of corals and that they adopt the principles and practice of an ecosystem approach, rather than relying on the monitoring of exports alone; and

URGES:

- a) interested Parties and other bodies from range and consumer States to collaborate and provide support, coordinated by the Secretariat, to produce as a priority accessible and practical guides to recognizing corals and coral rock in trade and to make these widely available to Parties through appropriate media; and
- b) Parties to seek synergy with other multilateral environmental agreements and initiatives to work for the conservation and sustainable use of coral reef ecosystems.

Annex

Definitions

Coral sand – material consisting entirely or in part of finely crushed fragments of dead coral no larger than 2 mm in diameter and which may also contain, amongst other things, the remains of Foraminifera, mollusc and crustacean shell, and coralline algae. Not identifiable to the level of genus.

Coral fragments (including gravel and rubble) – unconsolidated fragments of broken finger-like dead coral and other material between 2 and 30 mm in diameter, which is not identifiable to the level of genus.

Coral rock¹ (also live rock and substrate) – hard consolidated material, > 3 cm in diameter, formed of fragments of dead coral and which may also contain cemented sand, coralline algae and other sedimentary rocks. 'Live rock' is the term given to pieces of coral rock to which are attached live specimens of invertebrate species and coralline algae not included in the CITES Appendices and which are transported moist, but not in water, in crates. 'Substrate' is the term given to pieces of coral rock to which are attached invertebrates (of species not included in the CITES Appendices) and which are transported in water like live corals. Coral rock is not identifiable to **the level of** genus but is recognizable to **the level of** order. The definition excludes specimens defined as dead coral.

Dead coral – pieces of coral that are dead when exported, but that may have been alive when collected, and in which the structure of corallites (the skeleton of the individual polyp) is still intact; specimens are therefore identifiable to the level of species or genus.

Live coral – pieces of live coral transported in water and that are identifiable to the level of species or genus.

¹ Rock that does not contain any corals or in which the corals are fossilized is not subject to the provisions of the Convention.

DRAFT DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

Directed to the Secretariat

- 12.xx The Secretariat should transmit to FAO the concerns of the Conference of the Parties regarding the lack of progress in implementing the IPOA-Sharks, and urge FAO to take steps to encourage the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks by States and regional fisheries management organizations.
- 12.xx The Secretariat should encourage CITES Authorities of Parties to obtain information on the IPOA-Sharks implementation from their national fisheries departments and report on progress to future meetings of the Animals Committee.

Directed to the Animals Committee

- 12.xx The Chairman of the Animals Committee should maintain the liaison established with the Secretary of the Committee on Fisheries of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, to monitor the implementation of the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks). The Chairman of the Animals Committee should report on progress with the implementation of IPOA-Sharks at CoP13.