

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

---



Thirty-third meeting of the Animals Committee  
Geneva (Switzerland), 12 – 19 July 2024

REPORT OF THE CITES TECHNICAL WORKSHOP ON AQUATIC SPECIES  
LISTED IN THE CITES APPENDICES

This document has been submitted by the Secretariat in relation to agenda item 30.



# Aquatic species listed in the CITES Appendices

Decision 19.189

*Report of the CITES technical workshop on Aquatic species listed in the  
CITES Appendices*

23-24 April 2024

Geneva, Switzerland





Prepared under contract for the CITES Secretariat by Dr. Enric Cortes.

© 2024 Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES).

Report of the CITES technical workshop on Aquatic species listed in the CITES Appendices is freely available at [www.cites.org](http://www.cites.org). Users may download, reuse, reprint, distribute, copy text and data and translate the content, provided that the original source is credited and that the logo of CITES is not used.

The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the CITES Secretariat, the United Nations Environment Programme, United Nations or the Parties to the Convention.

The designations employed and the presentation of material on any map in this work do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the CITES Secretariat, the United Nations Environment Programme or the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Links contained in the present publication are provided for the convenience of the reader and are correct at the time of issue. The CITES Secretariat takes no responsibility for the continued accuracy of that information or for the content of any external website.

Citation: CITES Secretariat (2024). Report of the CITES technical workshop on Aquatic species listed in the CITES Appendices.

**CITES Secretariat**  
**Palais des Nations**  
**Avenue de la Paix 8-14**  
**CH-1211 Genève**  
**Switzerland**

**Tel: +41(0)22 917 8139/40**  
**Fax: +41(0)22 797 34 17**  
**E-mail: [info@cites.org](mailto:info@cites.org)**  
**Web: [www.cites.org](http://www.cites.org)**

## 1. Introduction

At its 19th meeting (CoP19; Panama City, 2022), the Conference of the Parties adopted Decisions 19.189 to 19.191 on Aquatic species listed in the CITES Appendices. The Secretariat issued Notification to the Parties No. [2024/024](#) inviting Parties, Members of the Animals Committee, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization and other relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to the workshop and inviting them to submit additional documentation or information of relevance and subsequently organized a technical workshop in accordance with the Decisions. This workshop was held back-to-back with the workshop on Non detriment findings for specimens of Appendix-II species taken from areas beyond national jurisdiction under Decisions 19.135 to 19.139 (see Notification to the Parties No. [2024/025](#) for more details). The workshop on Aquatic species listed in the CITES Appendices was convened from 23 to 24 April 2024 in Geneva, Switzerland. The workshop considered the application of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) on Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II and footnote 2 found in Annex 5 to that Resolution, with regards to relevant commercially exploited Elasmobranchii and other aquatic species. The workshop and its preparatory work were supported by the generous contribution from the European Union.

## 2. Participation

The workshop was attended by 84 participants, which included five Members of the Animals Committee (the Chair of the Animals Committee, representatives of Africa, Central and South America and the Caribbeans and Oceania and the Nomenclature Specialist), 54 participants from 31 Parties, 25 participants from 20 observer organizations, including representatives from the CMS Secretariat, FAO, the Secretariats of IATTC and ICCAT, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and 15 non-governmental organizations. The workshop participant list is attached as Annex 1.

## 3. Approach to the Workshop and Presentations

The workshop was facilitated by the CITES Secretariat who provided a Provisional Working Program to participants in advance of the meeting (attached as Annex 2). After welcoming remarks by the CITES Secretary-General, Ivonne Higuero, the Secretariat went over the workshop agenda and gave a presentation on the objectives of the workshop and the processes to date on Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II. A list of workshop documents and presentations is attached as Annex 3.

In its presentation, the Secretariat provided information relating to the processes to review and amend the criteria for the amendment of Appendices I and II from the 8th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP8, Kyoto, 1992) to CoP11 to the decisions adopted at the 19th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP19, Panama City, 2022) ([Document](#) – Criteria for the amendment of Appendices I and II: Processes to date). The evolution of the criteria contained in Resolution Conf. 9.24 for Appendix I (Criteria A, B, C and D) and Appendix II listings (Annex 2a and Annex 2b) between CoP12 and CoP13 was presented. The presentation also reflected on the provisions in Annex 5 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) on the *Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II* especially those relating to taxon-specific considerations included in 'Notes', definitions and footnotes. It continued by reflecting on the inclusion of footnote 2 in Annex 5 based on text proposed by FAO as an example for a possible scenario for specific cases.

In addition, the Secretariat presented an overview of proposals of commercially exploited aquatic species submitted for listing in Appendix I and II showing proposals that had been approved, rejected, or withdrawn since CoP12 in 2002 to CoP19 in 2022 with the criteria used in the proposals. Information on the number of proposals submitted since CoP14 using different criteria for listing under Appendix II were also presented as well as those species that had been proposed more than once and the criteria used as indicated in the

proposals. Finally, in terms of taxonomic diversity, it was reported that 42 species of Anthozoa, Bivalvia, Cephalopoda, Coelacanthi, Dipneusti, Actinopteri, Holothuroidea, Hydrozoa, Elasmobranchii, and Gastropoda have been listed in Appendix I and 2,330 species have been listed in Appendix II to date.

Following the Secretariat's presentation, Senegal presented an overview of CoP19 Doc. 87.2 summarizing its main points. In essence, Senegal stated that CITES listing criteria may not be appropriate for some low-productivity species such as many species of sharks and rays and that consequently the CITES guidelines for listing of marine species should be revised. Senegal also stated that increased scrutiny for listing of shark species and the strict interpretation of footnote 2 in Annex 5 has led to the application of higher requirements to CITES listings for sharks than to most other taxa, a situation that results in species being proposed and listed when their conservation status has already deteriorated to the point where their sustainable use is no longer feasible and other multilateral bodies (CMS, RFMOs) have already put in place prohibition measures. The presentation ended by proposing that the definition of decline in the main text of Resolution Conf. 9.24 be used when considering listing sharks and rays rather than referring to the footnote.

A presentation on the background document ("Variability of life history parameters and productivity in elasmobranchs and other commercially exploited aquatic species") prepared by the Secretariat provided a brief background on the life history of cartilaginous and bony fishes showing how sharks, skates, and rays tend to be "K-selected" whereas commercially exploited teleost fishes tend to be "r-selected", but that there is a continuum of life-history trait values in both taxa. After identifying the datasets used in the study and defining life-history traits, examples of the extreme variability in life-history traits of sharks, batoids and teleosts as well as several potential life-history strategies were presented. A framework for identifying vulnerable aquatic species and associated decline thresholds according to different levels of productivity (high, medium, low, and very low) based on several life-history traits (the growth completion rate, age at maturity, maximum age, and maturity) was then presented and applied to data for sharks, batoids, and teleosts. The same framework was further used to classify sharks, batoids, teleosts and marine mammals into the four productivity categories using a direct measure of productivity ( $r_{max}$ ). The distribution of  $r_{max}$  for sharks was also examined according to their CITES listing, showing that while listed sharks tended to have lower productivity, there was no clear pattern, and that listed batoids (rays) also tended to have lower productivity, but no clear pattern. Another measure of productivity (the position of the inflection point of population growth curves, which is related to the capacity of a species to withstand population declines) was applied to the shark species included in the analysis showing a large degree of variability in this metric. The presentation ended by concluding that while elasmobranchs tend to be less productive than teleosts there is considerable overlap, in particular between skates and teleosts. It also noted that the productivity classification framework used indicated that only a small proportion of batoids would fall in the "low" and "very low" categories and about half of sharks would fall in those categories. In all, it was noted that since "one-size-does-not-fit-all" it is challenging to group all sharks and rays into a single entity for management purposes.

Several questions were raised after the presentation. Two Parties noted that two slides showing the productivity of sharks and rays according to CITES listing and a slide showing the position of the inflection of population growth curves for sharks would be more informative if they differentiated between species that were listed for meeting the criteria in Annex 2a and species that were listed for meeting the criteria in Annex 2b (lookalike reasons). These changes were incorporated in the final background document (Figures 21, 22, and 25), which was submitted to the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee (AC33, July 2024) as document [AC33 Doc. 30](#) Annex1. Questions were also raised about whether the computation of productivity ( $r_{max}$ ) through the life table/Leslie matrix approach included all age groups and whether different values of natural mortality ( $M$ ) were used for different age groups, to which the author responded that indeed all age groups and age-specific values of  $M$  were used in the computation. A similar question about whether fishing mortality ( $F$ ) was included in the models was asked, to which the author responded that  $F$  is not included

since the productivity computed is the intrinsic rate of increase, a maximum quantity obtained after a population has been reduced by exploitation and exploitation has ceased.

#### **4. Summary of the Discussions**

Subsequent to the presentations, the workshop participants reflected on the material presented. The Animals Committee representative of Oceania then moderated a discussion to develop topics to be covered in smaller breakout groups, an approach that was intended to facilitate input and an exchange of ideas from a greater number of workshop participants.

In the afternoon session of the technical workshop, the participants discussed the following questions in three separate breakout groups:

*Based on document CoP19 Doc. 87.2, the background document and other scientific information, when considering Elasmobranchii and other aquatic species:"*

- a) *Share experiences with past proposals*
- b) *Has the wording in footnote 2 and relevant provision in Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) (e.g. use of precautionary measures) enhanced or hindered proposing and listing of species?*
- c) *Have there been any challenges/issues in applying footnote 2 and relevant provision in Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17)?*
- d) *Is there a need for further clarification of footnote 2?*

Each of the breakout groups discussed the four topics in parallel and, upon reconvening in plenary session, reported out on the observations of group members as well as recommendations for potential consideration by the Animals Committee.

#### **5. Discussion Points and Observations**

Since there was overlap in the concepts/issues examined under each question, in particular questions related to footnote 2, rather than addressing each discussion question separately the summary of the discussion is organized in two main sections: experiences with past proposals and issues in the wording, application, and possible clarification of footnote 2.

##### **5.1 Experiences with past proposals**

###### Proposal Preparation and Review

Some Parties stated that they can work within the existing criteria to bring successful proposals to the CoP and find that there is enough flexibility in the wording of the footnote to propose the listing of sharks and other aquatic species. In contrast, other Parties stated that, for example for requiem sharks (*Carcharhinidae* spp.), the criteria did not provide enough flexibility for some species to be proposed for listing in Appendix I because some of the language in footnote 2 appears to prevent it based on lack of data and information on numerical thresholds. It was noted that Parties in general want to list species in Appendix II based on the precautionary approach. The porbeagle (*Lamna nasus*) was cited as an example of applying the precautionary approach having been proposed twice unsuccessfully before the proposal was adopted even though data availability had not improved.

There was also a comment on improving the overall system in terms of submission of proposals. Proposals vary in quality and extent, but they should all be considered if they meet the aims of the Convention. In that respect, training on preparation of amendment proposal for Parties could be helpful and Parties could also be encouraged to submit proposals ahead of the 150-day deadline before the meeting of the Conference of Parties.

One of the working groups in particular made comments related to data availability and how lack of data is often the biggest bottleneck in submitting successful proposals. It was noted that while fisheries stock assessments are available for many teleost species, they are not available for most sharks and rays. It was argued that stock assessments have high data requirements, but that many of the shark and ray species are data poor and consequently trade is not being regulated because of lack of stock assessments. In that respect, it was noted that alternative methodologies and data sources for understanding the population/stock dynamics of these species should be investigated. In contrast, another breakout group noted that while good quality data on all elements in the criteria of Resolution Conf. 9.24 are not always available, Parties nevertheless find enough flexibility in the Resolution and footnote 2 to overcome these challenges. However, it was also noted that trade reported in specific product forms and the application of HS (Harmonized System) codes together with the lack of availability of many conversion factors (e.g., length to length, weight to weight, length to weight, fin to weight conversion factors for elasmobranchs) hinder collection of species-specific information to inform listing proposals.

One Party noted that in assessing proposals for low productivity species, they still considered that some proposals that fell outside the numerical thresholds qualified for listing. Several other Parties supported this approach, commenting that they also judge the proposals holistically, not only rigidly based on the numerical thresholds. An Observer also noted that they do not find the thresholds to be a constraint since Annex 4 states that you should act in the best interest of the conservation of the species.

One Observer noted that if Parties do not exclusively consider footnote 2, then one should question its value. Other Parties responded that in the absence of information to the contrary it is still a useful yardstick, but that if other qualitative information is available, it is also considered. A question was also raised about whether the system for reviewing proposals works for other (non-shark) species, to which it was answered that it does.

## **5.2 Footnote 2 and relevant provision in Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17): wording, issues in its application, need for further clarification**

### Wording of Footnote 2 and Challenges in its Application

One breakout group noted that overall Parties were broadly satisfied with the wording of footnote 2, but some concerns were expressed:

- There is a mismatch between listings on the CMS and CITES Appendices: some CMS Appendix I-listed species are listed in CITES Appendix II.
- The inclusion of many more species in CITES has increased the workload in terms of non-detriment findings, legal acquisition findings, issuance of timely permits, specimen identification, reporting, and others.
- A view was expressed that the Appendix II listing criteria, both for listing on the basis of conservation need or for lookalike reasons, were too broad. While it was acknowledged that there might not be agreement on cases where this was a problem, it was agreed that a lot depended on the extent to which the precautionary principle in Annex 4 of the Resolution is balanced against the direction to

take “measures that are proportionate to the anticipated risks to the species”. A review of the application of the Annex 2b criteria across the board could be considered.

Some additional comments from that breakout group were that the FAO Expert Advisory Panels do not adequately take the precautionary principles into account in their assessments, which may be due to changes in panel composition through time, although it was noted that precautionary measures are very much up to the Parties to decide. One Party noted that the treatment of proposals has been even-handed, but there was disagreement by another Party which argued that the pendulum has swung in favor of conservation citing the case of Blue Shark (*Prionace glauca*), which had been proposed to be excluded from the amendment proposal to list all requiem sharks (Carcharhinidae spp.; CoP19 Prop. 37) but Parties voted against it at CoP19. Also, there has not been any marine species that has been removed from the Appendices and no periodic review of aquatic species other than marine mammals has been undertaken.

Another breakout group indicated that the current criteria and footnote provide sufficient flexibility to propose the listing of sharks and other aquatic species and that precautionary measures are used by Parties when data are lacking as well as when data available for species proposed for listing do not address all the elements in the Resolution. In terms of the application of footnote 2, it was noted that it is not relevant for certain aquatic species, but that the overall criteria were used in the past to propose listings (e.g. for the sea cucumber).

It was also noted that the term “Commercially Exploited Aquatic Species” is not defined and that the FAO definition could be considered to clarify the scope. The following definitions were shared by FAO:

- o *Commercially-exploited aquatic species* refer to fish and invertebrate species found in marine environments or in large freshwater bodies and subject to commercial exploitation” (FAO 2001<sup>1</sup>)

- o *Fish*: Fish, crustaceans, molluscs, and other aquatic animals, excluding mammals, reptiles, as well as seaweeds and other aquatic plants

A question was raised about the rationale for 5% as a lower limit in the general guideline for a marked historical extent of decline. In Annex 5 in the definition of ‘Decline’ it is stated that a marked historical extent of decline is a percentage decline to 5% - 30% of the baseline, depending on the biology and productivity of the species. It was explained that the idea was to set a threshold below which a decline would be a marked decline taking into consideration the productivity of the species, i.e. a decline below 5% for high productivity species could be considered a marked decline while a decline below 30% for low productivity species could be considered a marked decline. It should be noted that Annex 5 also states the following: “The extremes of 5% and 30% will be applicable to only a relatively small number of species, but some species may even fall outside of these extremes. However, both these figures are presented only as examples, since it is impossible to give numerical values that are applicable to all taxa because of differences in their biology”.

#### Need for further clarification of footnote 2

One breakout group indicated that while experiences writing amendment proposals were shared, no specific needs for amendment of the footnote were identified. Another breakout group also made no proposals for amendments, with the exception that Senegal proposed that footnote 2 be amended as reflected in paragraph 62 of document CoP19 Doc. 87.2. Finally, the third breakout group opined that the

---

<sup>1</sup> The scope of “commercially exploited aquatic species” can be found in the *Review of the CITES Listing Criteria For Species Exploited by Fisheries in Marine and Large Freshwater Bodies* (COFI/2001/6; COFI24, Rome, 2001).



problem is not in the wording of the footnote but in the interpretation and that it needs to be further explained and simplified so that Parties are clear within their fisheries management departments on how to correctly interpret the Convention criteria. The differences in interpretation of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) have resulted in different assessment conclusions by Parties, CITES Secretariat, FAO, IUCN and NGOs, thus some potential solutions were proposed. In terms of guidance, the following three options were suggested and options 1 and 2 were considered as possible recommendations, while option 3 did not receive broad support from workshop participants:

1) The interpretation of footnote 2 could be clarified through tools such as guidance or a set of webinars. The Secretariat noted that is planning on providing general capacity building materials on Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) and can consider additional information on its application to aquatic species.

2) As a first step, the Secretariat could collate information on work previously conducted on interpretation, for example the 'decline' vs. 'reduce' interpretations from the Secretariat found in CoP15 Doc. 63 from paragraph 24 onwards and the background document for this workshop, and then see what further information is needed in terms of a guidance document. The Secretariat responded that it can provide a collation of the work done on the interpretation of the criteria that has been considered by the CoP as it relates to application of criteria Annex 2a criterion B and make it available on the CITES website (Sharks and rays portal) and submit it to the Animals Committee. The Animals Committee could consider the collated information and discuss the need for draft decisions to be submitted for consideration by the Standing Committee and CoP20 to a) review the collated/existing information and b) determine the need for further guidance on the application of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) and its footnote 2 to Elasmobranchii and other aquatic species.

3) A guidance document would be useful for Parties, organizations, FAO, and IUCN to consider in their assessments. A guidance document can also be cited more easily than webinars, and is helpful to address high staff-turnover in Governments. The Secretariat reiterated that a review of the existing/collated material is needed before discussing whether a guidance document is needed or what would be included in the guidance document.

There was also a proposal for new text to be inserted into Annex 2a relating to Annex 2a B of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) [proposed addition shown in underlined text]:

The following criteria must be read in conjunction with the definitions, explanations and guidelines listed in Annex 5, including the footnote with respect to application of the definition of 'decline' for commercially exploited aquatic species. The definition of decline in Annex 5 does not apply to proposals for inclusion of species in Appendix II pursuant to Annex 2a B.

## **6. Main summarized observations**

The following key observations were made by participants (some of the views below are of certain Parties and Observers only).

1. Parties indicated that although the current criteria and footnote provide sufficient flexibility to propose the listing of sharks and other aquatic species, footnote 2 is more challenging for certain aquatic species, but the overall criteria have been used in the past to propose listings (e.g. corals, sea cucumbers).

2. Parties have considered and used the precautionary approach provided in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) and its footnote 2 and, in some instances, this enhanced the proposals.
3. Good quality data on all elements in the criteria in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) are not always available, but there is enough flexibility in the Resolution and its footnote 2 to overcome these challenges.
4. The differences in interpretation of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) have resulted in different assessment conclusions by Parties, the CITES Secretariat, FAO, IUCN and non-governmental organizations.
5. Footnote 2 recognizes that in terms of marked historical extent of decline, some aquatic species fall outside the ranges specified in the footnote: *"In marine and large freshwater bodies, a narrower range of 5-20 % is deemed to be more appropriate in most cases, with a range of 5-10 % being applicable for species with high productivity, 10-15 % for species with medium productivity and 15-20 % for species with low productivity."* It was noted that these numerical ranges are not necessarily rigidly adhered to especially when there are other factors and information that justify departure from them.
6. Additional guidelines on a more precautionary approach in the interpretation of criteria for taxa with slow growth rates, long lifespans, and low reproductive output could assist Parties.
7. It was noted that there have been very few Appendix I proposals submitted, even when proponent Parties or others believed that the Appendix I criteria would be met, but it was unclear to what extent footnote 2 or wider political factors influenced this.
8. A view was expressed that the Appendix II listing criteria, both for listing on the basis of conservation need or for lookalike reasons, were too broad. While it was acknowledged that there might not be agreement on cases where this was a problem, it was agreed that a lot depended on the extent to which the precautionary approach of the Resolution is balanced against the direction to take "measures that are proportionate to the anticipated risks to the species". A review of the application of the Annex 2b criteria could therefore be considered.
9. Taking into consideration that any potential amendments to Annex 2a criterion B would have an impact on all taxonomic groups, it was noted that the application of the definition of decline to Annex 2a criterion B may benefit from further consideration.
10. The way trade in the specific product forms is reported and HS codes are applied together with the inconsistent availability of conversion factors hinders the collection of species-specific and precise information needed for listing proposals.
11. The potential difficulties and benefits of stock assessments were considered. In data poor situations, best available scientific information could be used. It is noted that Annex 6 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) provides guidance on sources of information that can be used including "relevant published and unpublished sources of information" and acknowledge that "for some species the amount of scientific information will be limited".
12. The inclusion of many more aquatic species in CITES has increased the workload of CITES Authorities in terms of non-detriment findings, legal acquisition findings, issuance of timely permits, specimen identification, reporting and others.

13. There is mismatch between listings on the CMS and CITES Appendices - some CMS Appendix I-listed species for which taking is prohibited, are listed in CITES Appendix II and are reported to be in international trade by CMS Parties.

## **7. Recommendations to be considered by the 33rd Meeting of the Animals Committee**

The technical workshop on Aquatic species listed in the CITES Appendices generally agreed that Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) on *Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II* and its footnote 2 provides sufficient flexibility to apply it to relevant commercially exploited Elasmobranchii and other aquatic species and does not require text amendments or clarification.

The technical workshop on Aquatic species listed in the CITES Appendices recommends that the Animals Committee:

1. Note the background document prepared by the Secretariat *Variability of life history parameters and productivity in elasmobranchs and other commercially exploited aquatic species*.
2. Invite the Secretariat to consider including information on the application of footnote 2 to commercially exploited aquatic species when developing general capacity building materials on Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) on Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II.
3. Invite the Secretariat to provide a collation of the work done on the interpretation of the criteria that has been considered by the CoP as it relates to application of criteria Annex 2a criterion B to the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee and make it available on the CITES website.
4. Consider the collated information and discuss the need for draft decisions to be submitted for consideration by the 78th meeting of the Standing Committee and 20th meeting of the Conference of Parties to:
  - a. review the collated information and determine the need to develop further guidance;
  - b. if so determined, develop further guidance on the application of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) and its footnote 2 to Elasmobranchii and other aquatic species.
5. Consider the need to define the term “commercially exploited aquatic species”.

## **8. Next Steps**

The Secretariat will submit findings and recommendations of the technical workshop to the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee for its consideration. As appropriate, the Animals Committee may then make recommendations to the Standing Committee for its consideration. The Standing Committee may then consider recommendations for referral to the 20th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

### Annex 1 - List of Participants

<b>First name</b>	<b>Last name</b>	<b>Party / Institution</b>
Hilroy	Simon	Government of Antigua and Barbuda
Vanesa	Tossenberger	Government of Argentina
Rhedyn	Ollerenshaw	Government of Australia
Jessica	Hoey	Government of Australia
Luana	Arruda Sêga	Government of Brazil
Luiz Roberto	Louzada Junior	Government of Brazil
Michel	Babale	Government of Cameroon
Xiaoge	Ping	Government of China
Jiang	Zhu	Government of China
Jie	Zhang	Government of China
Gustavo Andres	Lara Rodriguez	Government of Colombia
Bernald	Pacheco Chaves	Government of Costa Rica
José Miguel	Carvajal Rodríguez	Government of Costa Rica
Marco Antonio	Herrera Cabrera	Government of Ecuador
Victor Eduardo	Chocho Sanchez	Government of Ecuador
Barbara	Soto-Largo Meroño	Government of European Union
Arnaud	Horellou	Government of France
Marco	Ciambelli	Government of France
Lise	Cransac	Government of France
Camille	Dubos	Government of France
Rosa Liliana	Hernandez Tecu	Government of Guatemala
Antony	Johnson	Government of India
Bineesh	Kinattumkara	Government of India
Selvia	Oktaviyani	Government of Indonesia
Risris	Sudarisman	Government of Indonesia
Hideki	Moronuki	Government of Japan
Hidetada	Kiyofuji	Government of Japan
Kyutaro	Yasumoto	Government of Japan
Ismail	Bin Ibrahim	Government of Malaysia
Aishath Sarah	Hashim	Government of Maldives
Saikou Oumar	Kide	Government of Mauritania
Patricia	Walker	Government of Netherlands
Carlos	Polo	Government of Panama
Frida Cecilia	Rodriguez Pacheco	Government of Peru

Faridah	Tayib	Government of Saudi Arabia
Turlei	Anzan	Government of Saudi Arabia
Mamadou	Diallo	Government of Senegal
Dairou	Diallo	Government of Senegal
Charlotte	Malatji	Government of South Africa
Ignacio	Aransay Fernández	Government of Spain
Jose Carlos	Baez Barrionuevo	Government of Spain
Andrea	Fernández Fernández	Government of Spain
Tania	Rampersad	Government of Suriname
Pia	Norling	Government of Sweden
Jennifer	Viron	Government of the Philippines
Michael	Andayog	Government of the Philippines
Julian	Mcalpine	Government of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Alison	Prince	Government of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Lara	Turtle	Government of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Jack	Collier	Government of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Bigeyo	Neke Kuboja	Government of United Republic of Tanzania
Laura	Cimo	Government of United States of America
Angela	Somma	Government of United States of America
Debra	Abercrombie	Government of United States of America
Matthias	Loertscher	Government of Switzerland
Ngalié	Maha	Committee Member - Africa
Mauro Eduardo	Gongora	Committee Member - Central & South America & Caribbean
Peter Paul	Van Dijk	Committee Member - Nomenclature specialist
Hugh	Robertson	Committee Member - Oceania
Melanie	Virtue	Convention on Migratory Species
Andrea	Pauly	Convention on Migratory Species
Kim	Friedman	UN Food and Agriculture Organization
Salvador	Siu	Inter American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)
Nathan	Taylor	The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
Rima	Jabado	International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
Xiao	Yingjia	China Biodiversity Conservation & Green Development Foundation
Samantha	Sherman	Deakin University
Alejandra	Goyenechea	Defenders of Wildlife
Manon	Dene	Florida International University
Rebecca	Regnery	Humane Society International

Cat	Bell	International Fund for Animal Welfare
Jaques	Berney	IWMC-World Conservation Trust
Eugene	Lapointe	IWMC-World Conservation Trust
Chris	Wold	Lewis & Clark – Global Law Alliance for Animals and the Environment
Randall	Arauz	Marine Watch International
Jose Luis Pedro	Funes Izaguirre	Marine Watch International
Zak	Smith	Natural Resources Defense Council
Sarah	Fowler	Save our Seas Foundation
Daniel	Fernando	The Blue Resources Trust
Glenn	Sant	TRAFFIC
Dana	Tricarico	Wildlife Conservation Society
Colman	O Criodain	World Wide Fund for Nature
Shaleyla	Kelez Sara	World Wide Fund for Nature
Simone	Niedermueller	World Wide Fund for Nature

## Annex 2 – Draft agenda

### **DAY 1 – Tuesday 23 April 2024**

#### **08:00 – 09:00 Registration**

#### **09:00 – 12:00 Plenary (Facilitated by the Secretariat)**

- Welcoming remarks - [Ivonne Higuero, CITES Secretary-General](#)
- Conduct of the workshop - [CITES Secretariat](#)
- Objectives of the workshop and overview of processes to date on Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II - [CITES Secretariat](#)
- Presentation on Document CoP19 Doc. 87.2 with Q & A session– [Senegal](#)
- Presentation on scientific information on life history parameters of aquatic species with Q & A session – [CITES Secretariat](#)

#### **12:00 – 14:00 Lunch**

#### **14:00 – 17:00 Plenary (Facilitated by the Secretariat)**

- Moderated discussion to agree on topics to be covered in breakout groups - [Facilitated by Hugh Robertson, Animals Committee representative of Oceania](#)
  - Decision 19.189 – consider the application of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP 17) and its footnote 2, with regards to relevant commercially exploited Elasmobranchii and other aquatic species, taking into account available scientific information and data
- Establishment of breakout groups and group discussions

### **DAY 2 – Wednesday 24 April 2024**

#### **9:00 – 12:00 Breakout groups**

- Discussions in breakout groups
- Presentation from each breakout group

#### **12:00 – 14:00 Lunch**

#### **14:00 – 17:00 Plenary (Facilitated by the Secretariat)**

- Observations and recommendations
- Next steps
- Closing

## Annex 3 - List of Workshop Documents/Presentations

### Documents

[Workshop Background Document](#)

[Document](#) - Criteria for the amendment of Appendices I and II: Processes to date

### Presentations

[Processes to date on criteria for the amendment of Appendices and II](#)

[Document CoP19 Doc. 87.2 - Senegal](#)

[Background document \(Variability of life history parameters and productivity in elasmobranchs and other commercially exploited aquatic species\)](#)