

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



PROCEEDINGS

Sixteenth meeting of the Animals Committee

Shepherdstown (United States of America),
11-15 December 2000

© Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in
Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora

July 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Agenda item	Document No.	Page No.
1. Opening of the meeting	<i>No document</i>	3
2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure	Doc. AC.16.2	3
3. Adoption of the Agenda and Working Programme	<i>No document</i>	3
3.1 Agenda	Doc. AC.16.3.1	
3.2 Working Programme	Doc. AC.16.3.2	
4. Admission of observers	Doc. AC.16.4	3
5. Regional Reports		4
5.1 Africa	Doc. AC.16.5.1	
5.2 Asia	Doc. AC.16.5.2	
5.3 Central and South America and the Caribbean	Doc. AC.16.5.3	
5.4 Europe	Doc. AC.16.5.4	
5.5 North America	Doc. AC.16.5.5	
5.6 Oceania	Doc. AC.16.5.6	
6. Strategic planning	<i>No document</i>	4
6.1 Implementation of the CITES Strategic Vision	Doc. AC.16.6.1	
6.2 Decisions directed to the Animals Committee	Doc. AC.16.6.2	
6.3 Establishment of Animals Committee priorities	Doc. AC.16.6.3	
7. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) (cf. Decision 11.106)	<i>No document (see Inf. AC.16.1, 16.2)</i>	7
7.1 Progress on the implementation of Phase IV of the Review of Significant Trade	Doc. AC.16.7.1	
7.2 <i>Acipenseriformes</i> spp.	Doc. AC.16.7.2	
7.3 <i>Naja</i> spp.	Doc. AC.16.7.3	
7.4 <i>Moschus</i> spp.	Doc. AC.16.7.4	
8. Periodic review of animal taxa in the Appendices	Doc. AC.16.8	13
8.1 Evaluation of species selected at AC15	Doc. AC.16.8.1	
8.1.1 Addendum – Review of <i>Probarus jullieni</i>	Doc. AC.16.8.1.1	
8.2 Selection of additional species for review	<i>No document</i>	
9. Registration and monitoring of animal species bred in captivity (Resolution Conf.11.14 and Decision 11.101)	<i>No document (see Inf. AC.16.3)</i>	16
9.1 Response to Notification No. 2000/044	Doc. AC.16.9.1 (see Inf. AC.16.4 to AC.16.9)	
9.2 Relationship between <i>ex-situ</i> breeding operations and <i>in-situ</i> conservation programmes (Decision 11.102)	Doc. AC.16.9.2	
10. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 10.21 on transport of live animals	<i>No document</i>	11
10.1 Report of the Transport Working Group	Doc. AC.16.10.1	
11. Role and function of the Scientific Authorities	<i>No document</i>	12
12. Trade in hard corals	<i>No document</i>	6
12.1 Report of the Coral Working Group	Doc. AC.16.12.1	
12.2 Mariculture and propagation of coral – application of Resolution Conf. 10.16 to corals	Doc. AC.16.12.2	
13. Implementation of Decision 11.165 on trade in traditional medicines	Doc. AC.16.13	12

14. Trade in alien species	<i>No document</i>	21
14.1 Implementation of Decision 11.100 regarding trade in alien species	Doc. AC.16.14.1 (see Inf. AC.16.10)	
14.2 Other initiatives regarding trade in alien species (CBD Decision V/8 and GISP)	Doc. AC.16.14.2 (see Inf. AC.16.11, 16.12)	
15. Control of captive breeding, ranching and wild harvest production systems for Appendix-II species	Doc. AC.16.15	5
16. Universal labelling of caviar	Doc. AC.16.16	19
17. Trade in <i>Tursiops truncatus ponticus</i> (Decision 11.91)	Doc. AC.16.17	21
18. Trade in freshwater turtles and tortoises in Southeast Asia (Resolution Conf. 11.9; cf. Decision 11.93)	<i>No document</i> (see Inf. AC.16.13)	20
19. Conservation of seahorses and other members of the family Syngnathidae (Decision 11.97)	Doc. AC.16.19	14
20. Implementation of Decision 11.94 on the biological and trade status of sharks	<i>No document</i>	20
20.1 Liaison with other organizations	<i>No document</i>	
21. Trade in time-sensitive research samples (Decision 11.103)	Doc. AC.16.21	15
22. Any other business	<i>No document</i>	21
23. Closing remarks	<i>No document</i>	22
Annex 1 Opening speeches		23
Annex 2 Report of the coral working group		27
Annex 3 Report of the significant trade working group		33
Annex 4 Report of the working group on transport of live animals		39
Annex 5 Report of the working group on the review of the Appendices		43
Annex 6 Report of the working group on seahorses and other Syngnathids		49
Annex 7 Draft report of the working group on cross-border movement in time-sensitive biological samples for conservation purposes		55
Annex 8 Report of the working group on the registration and supervision of operations engaged in captive breeding of CITES species listed in Appendix I (cf. Resolution Conf. 11.14, Decision 11.101 and Decision 11.102)		61
Annex 9 Draft Report of the working group on the universal labelling system for the identification of caviar		63
Annex 10 Report of the freshwater turtle and tortoise working group		65
Annex 11 List of participants		67

PROCEEDINGS¹

Sixteenth meeting of the Animals Committee

Shepherdstown (United States of America), 11-15 December 2000

1. Opening address and welcome to participants

The Chairman, Dr M. S. Hoogmoed, welcomed attendees to the meeting and expressed thanks to Hank Jenkins, the previous Chairman of the Animals Committee, for all his hard work over the preceding eight years. He reminded participants that the meeting was a meeting of a technical committee of CITES, consisting of 10 Regional Representatives who are zoologists. All other persons present had observer status only. He noted that in the past, representation by Parties had been limited when compared to that of non-governmental organizations (NGOs). While not wishing to discourage future representation or attendance by NGOs he hoped that this imbalance could be addressed at future meetings. He stressed that working groups would be established by him, taking into account the interest of Parties and expertise of NGOs (see Annex 1 for the full text of the Chairman's welcoming address).

The meeting was officially opened by the Secretary General of CITES who congratulated the newly elected Chairman and Regional Representatives and wished them every success with the task at hand.

2. Adoption of Rules of Procedure for the Animals Committee's meeting

The Chairman referred participants to document Doc. AC.16.2 and noted that rules 18, 19 and 21 would be amended to show that references to alternate regional members should only apply when regional members are absent. The Rules of Procedure were adopted as amended.

3. Adoption of the provisional agenda and working programme

The Chairman introduced document Doc. AC.16.3.1 and Doc. AC.16.3.2, noting some minor changes to the working programme. The observer from Spain requested that time be allowed for a presentation on the CITES Masters degree course in Spain. The revised provisional agenda and working programme were adopted with this addition under Agenda item 22.

4. Admission of observers

The Chairman referred the Committee and Party observers to document Doc. AC.16.4 which contains the list of observers.

The observer from China drew the attention of the Committee to the national NGO, the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), and to Notification to the Parties No. 2000/60. He reported that in June this year, HSUS had released a statement to the press indicating that several African countries had illegally exported a large amount of ivory to a number of Asian countries, including China, in exchange for weapons. After intensive investigations by both the Secretariat and relevant countries, no evidence had been found to uphold the accusations made by HSUS. The observer from China acknowledged that they had since received an apology from HSUS, but emphasized that such irresponsible actions had the potential to impact permanently on the reputation of the countries concerned. He explained that while they did not intend for the observer status of HSUS to be removed at this meeting, they hoped that such actions would not happen again. The Chairman advised anyone making an allegation against a Party, to direct all initial correspondence

¹ The proceedings are presented in the order in which agenda items were discussed. Paragraph numbering corresponds with the numbering of agenda items (See Doc. AC.16.3.1).

through the CITES Secretariat, before embarking on a publicity campaign, and furthermore to ensure that they have the evidence to back up the allegation. He agreed with China on the permanent negative impact on the reputation of countries falsely accused.

There being no objections from the representatives of Parties, all organizations listed in the document were formally admitted. A list of participants can be found in Annex 11 to this document.

5. Regional reports

The Chairman referred delegates to documents Docs. AC.16.5.4, AC.16.5.5 and AC.16.5.6. Written reports were presented by Dr Hoogmoed, in his capacity as Regional Representative for Europe, by Dr S. Lieberman (Regional Representative for North America) and Dr R. Hay (Regional Representative for Oceania). Dr K. Howell (Regional Representative for Africa), Mr T. Soehartono (Regional Representative for Asia) and Dr S. Inchaustegui (Regional Representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean) all highlighted in their oral reports the continued difficulties they encountered with communicating with all the Parties in their regions. The Chairman emphasized that when Parties do not communicate with their Regional Representatives it makes it very difficult for members of Animals Committee to represent their region effectively. The Chairman secured approval from Animals Committee members for the submission of all outstanding written regional reports by the end of the week (see Inf. AC.16.5.1, Inf. AC.16.5.2 and Inf. AC.16.5.3).

6. Strategic planning

Implementation of the Strategic Vision – Actions and decisions directed to the Animals Committee

The Secretariat introduced Doc. AC.16.6.1 and Doc. AC.16.6.2 and emphasized that the Committee should regard strategic planning by the Committee as an ongoing process, while highlighting the need to identify priorities in response to Decisions, Resolutions and actions directed to it.

The Chairman proceeded to take the delegates through the document, inviting comments from the floor on each goal and associated objectives. Valuable contributions were made and there was general support that the Animals Committee should initiate and/or support the following activities:

- (i) facilitating communication and exchange of information between Scientific Authorities, e.g. sharing of non-detriment findings, existing databases, checklists, postings to websites, identification manuals², innovative technologies, etc.;
- (ii) developing a database of sample CITES permits, so that when a Party receives an import/(re-)export permit they can check it against the sample permits held on the database;
- (iii) developing a directory of species experts and contact details³ (recognizing that the Convention on Biological Diversity has already compiled a similar list);
- (iv) strengthening the relationship between CITES Management and Scientific Authorities through the production of training manuals; capacity-building workshops and regional directories to facilitate communication between Scientific Authorities within the regions;
- (v) identifying objectives that other partners might be able to help with in terms of resources and expertise, e.g. Regional Representatives could help with the translation of key documents and make them more widely available in local languages;

² As an example, the CITES Identification manual for crocodylians, developed by the Canadian Management Authority in conjunction with the IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group, can be found at the following web site address: www.flmnh.ufl.edu/natsci/herpetology/CITEScroc/default.htm

³ IUCN species experts can be contacted through the Web sites of the Sustainable Use Initiative - www.iucn.org/themes/sui/index.htm and the Species Survival Commission - www.iucn.org/themes/ssc/index.htm

- (vi) emphasizing the importance of annual reports and trade data for resource monitoring and management and the implementation of Article IV;
- (vii) promoting greater understanding of the Convention within the scientific community at scientific meetings and conferences, as well as in the field.

Improved coordination between CITES Management and Scientific Authorities and effectiveness of the latter were considered to be of primary importance. The Secretariat, recognizing that there might be duplication of effort in several areas, invited Parties with information and products relevant to the functions of Scientific Authorities that may be useful to other countries, to forward them for consideration with regards to consolidation, endorsement and distribution. The Chairman emphasized, and members agreed, that all future regional reports should reflect the duties of members and their alternates outlined in Decision 11.90.

Establishment of the Animals Committee's priorities

The Chairman introduced document Doc. AC.16.6.3 and asked the Committee to consider adopting the working programme, while recognizing that some actions concerned implementation issues with no relevance to the biological properties of a species. The Secretariat explained that a technical committee had been disbanded in 1987 and its administrative responsibilities subsequently assigned to the Animals, Plants and Standing Committees. A detailed discussion followed on the potential establishment of a new committee charged with aspects of implementation and administrative tasks not falling into the remit of the other technical committees. Dr S. Lieberman (Regional Representative for North America), Dr M.P. Micheletti (Regional Representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean), the observers from Switzerland, International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) and the World Conservation Trust (IWMC) all spoke in favour of establishing an 'implementation committee'.

The Chairman was tasked with writing to the Standing Committee on behalf of the Animals Committee recommending the formation of a new technical committee to address implementation and administrative subjects.

Dr S. Lieberman (Regional Representative for North America) supported the adoption of a mission statement to summarize the role and priorities of the Animals Committee with a small amendment to the last sentence. The mission statement was adopted as amended:

"The mission of the CITES Animals Committee is to provide the Conference of 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."

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

The observer from Creative Conservation Solutions introduced document Doc. AC.16.15 which had been commissioned by the Secretariat to investigate the different production systems dealt with under CITES and the application of appropriate source codes for specimens derived from such operations, as directed at the 15th meeting of the Animals Committee. He explained that the confusion surrounding the correct application of the CITES source codes was most likely to stem from a misunderstanding of closed-cycle captive breeding (C), as defined in Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.) and ranching (R), as defined in Resolution Conf. 11.16. Furthermore, the present range and definitions of source codes contained in Resolution Conf. 10.2 (Rev.) were too inclusive and did not accurately reflect the variety of management systems currently in use for the commercial production of wild fauna listed on the CITES Appendices.

Dr S. Lieberman (regional representative for North America) stressed that having a source code should not be *in lieu* of a non-detriment finding for a species and recommended that cautionary language be required on page 11, paragraph 2. The observer from the United Kingdom remarked that the purpose of the source code was to indicate the origin of a specimen and not to be an indicator of any detriment. He explained that under the current source code definitions, specimens

produced by mariculture would only qualify for source code W and while he wanted to avoid a plethora of source codes, perhaps a subset of codes would help define the different management systems in operation. The observer from Germany noted difficulties in distinguishing between source code D and C as defined in the report and called for further clarification of proposed source codes.

The observer from China requested that examples be included in the report to help clarify the terms used to describe the different management systems.

The observer from the United States of America agreed with the proposed definition of ranching, but remarked that species producing small numbers of offspring were not generally suitable for ranching. He suggested the following modifications to the definition on page 14 paragraph iii of Doc. AC.16.15):

1. insert 'that typically produce large numbers of eggs or offspring and that has' after 'Species' and delete 'with', to read: 'Species that typically produce large numbers of eggs or offspring and that have life stages that exhibit high levels of mortality.....'

The observer from the United States of America stated that it should be explicit in the report that a ranching operation should be designed to either leave sufficient numbers of eggs and/or neonates in the wild or return sufficient numbers of offspring to the wild, to result in a level of recruitment that will sustain the population. He expressed their concern at the dual meaning of source code F, which, as proposed in sub-paragraph ii) of Doc. AC.16.15, should apply to specimens that are either from captive-production systems or captive-rearing systems, which have very different potentials for detriment to wild populations. He advised caution on the concept of captive rearing explaining that this activity had great potential for detriment because it could result in the permanent removal of breeding females and their young. He remarked that, unlike ranching, this scheme did not leave the breeding population intact and created incentives to decimate the adult breeding female population and simultaneously impact on recruitment. Instead of focusing on codes, he recommended the development of guidelines for evaluating the different management and wild-harvest systems for determining non-detriment.

The observer from IWMC noted that code F had not been introduced to describe a particular management system, but, in addition to code D, to qualify cases where captive-bred specimens do not fulfil the criteria, in particular the non-biological ones, related to the source of the parental breeding stock. He suggested that source code F should be revised, as should source code R, while he felt one code for specimens bred in captivity in accordance with Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.), was sufficient.

The observer from Creative Conservation Solutions stressed that he had not intended to replace non-detriment findings, but that the report was intended to indicate the source of the specimen in trade more accurately. If codes were defined more specifically and used more accurately, they could then be an indication of the level of detriment. He acknowledged that he might need to rephrase some of the report to reflect this. The Secretariat requested the consultant to prepare a revised paper for consideration at the next meeting of the Animals Committee, incorporating comments made during the meeting by regional representatives and observers. Furthermore, the Secretariat undertook to identify those Resolutions that contained definitions that would also require revision as a result of this paper.

12. Trade in hard corals

12.1 Report of the coral working group

Dr V. Fleming, as Chairman of the coral working group introduced the draft Terms of Reference for the working group as set out in documents Doc. AC.16.12.1. The observer from Oceania thanked the Chairman for all his work since CoP11 and thought the Terms of Reference were appropriate.

The Chairman re-established a working group to be chaired by Dr V. Fleming comprising Mr T. Soehartono (regional representative for Asia) and observers from Australia, Belgium (on

behalf of the European Union), Fiji, Indonesia, Israel, the United States of America, UNEP-WCMC, TRAFFIC North America, Indonesian Coral, Shell and Ornamental Fish Association (AKKII) and Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association (OATA).

12.2 Mariculture and propagation of coral – application of Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.) to corals

The Chairman of the coral working group introduced document Doc. AC.16.12.2. Dr S. Lieberman (Regional Representative for North America) supported the development of a definition for asexual propagation and suggested that the working group might engage the help of the Plants Committee in this regard. She also requested that the working group should improve the understanding and identification by Parties of corals used in mariculture. The Secretariat proposed that a Notification could be circulated to Parties in 2001 requesting that Parties provide contact details and information on mariculture projects.

The Terms of Reference for the working group were adopted with the addition of tasks outlined in paragraph 5 of document Doc. AC.16.12.2, relating to the definition of production systems and source codes for cultured coral.

Later in the week, (Friday 15 December 2000), Dr Fleming, as Chairman of the working group, presented the summary report (Annex 2) and informed delegates that many of their deliberations had to be considered provisional as some members of the working group were not present at the meeting. The group concluded that the practical guide prepared by the United States of America on identification of hard coral should be disseminated more widely and noted that it lent itself to adaptation to local circumstances, for example by the insertion of vernacular names in local languages. It was also suggested that the guide could be developed to reflect decisions taken as to which coral taxa were to be identified to species or generic level. Subject to assessing the imminent publication by Veron, a full list of coral species (Cairns 1999 and Cairns, Hoeksema & Van der Land 1999) was adopted by the group as an interim standard for coral taxonomic nomenclature. Dr Fleming elaborated on a provisional list of genera which the working group thought should be identified to a particular taxonomic level.

Dr Fleming, on behalf of the United Kingdom, agreed to commission work to distinguish between coral rock in trade and fossilized coral. He noted that the participant from the United States of America had offered to compile an inventory of mariculture operations and the methods employed and species involved. With no interventions from the floor, the Animals Committee adopted the report and requested the working group continue its deliberations intersessionally.

7. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) (cf. Decision 11.106)

7.1 Progress on the implementation of Phase IV of the Review of Significant Trade

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. AC.16.7.1, and urged those countries identified in Annex 1 of the document, that had not yet responded to the primary and secondary recommendations directed to them, to do so by the deadline. Dr K. Howell (regional representative for Africa) and Mr. T. Soehartono (regional representative for Asia) both stated that they would encourage those countries with responses still outstanding in their regions, to respond within the deadline. The Secretariat recognized that some countries may have failed to respond to the recommendations directed to them because they were not sure how they were being expected to reply. He suggested that when updating the 'Guide to the review of the Significant Trade Process', the author, Africa Resources Trust, should address this issue and provide assistance to Parties in how to respond to recommendations directed to them through the significant trade. This suggestion was supported by Dr S. Lieberman (regional representative for North America).

A detailed discussion followed on the primary and secondary recommendations of the Animals Committee of species considered in this Phase IV of the review. The observer from Indonesia noted that *Manis javanica* was completely protected under national legislation with no capture and no trade allowed in Indonesia. Dr S. Tunhikorn (regional representative for Asia) remarked that *M. javanica* and *M. pentadactyla* were protected in Thailand and had never been found in trade. The observer from the United Republic of Tanzania stated that they had planned a series of

projects and surveys to look at the species addressed by the Animals Committee in their recommendations, but explained that they were still waiting for government approval and funding. The Secretariat acknowledged the institutional difficulties experienced by some countries subject to recommendations under the significant trade review process and explained that the Secretariat could provide general assistance to countries where addressing the problem on a species-specific level was not necessarily appropriate.

The observer from Japan noted that Cambodia and Kazakhstan (both subject to primary recommendation in Phase IV), were relatively new Parties and should not be penalized so soon after accession. The Secretariat agreed that it was regrettable when new Parties were subject to recommendations under the Significant Trade Process and urged the regional representatives to provide guidance to counterparts in these countries. The Secretariat urged them to contact non-Party countries within their regions to encourage them to accede to CITES, with particular reference to the efforts made by the Secretariat.

The Secretariat requested that the Committee should determine what should be considered a 'safe level' of net trade over a five-year period, in order that a list of taxa that exceed this 'cut-off point' and that might be subject to significant levels of trade could be produced. The Secretariat recommended that a decision on which species should be reviewed in Phase V should be deferred until the next meeting of the Animals Committee to allow time for following up countries' responses to previous recommendations. He suggested restricting species for further consideration to those identified in Decisions 10.93, 11.95 and 11.109 as an additional task under Phase IV.

The observer from Creative Conservation Solutions concurred with the views expressed by the Secretariat, but urged the working group to proceed with judicious use of the precautionary principle when considering what a 'safe level' of trade is. He reminded the Committee that desk-top studies are time-consuming and take up financial resources that might be better directed to resolving problems already identified, e.g. enhancing the ability of Parties to detect illegal consignments. He remarked that the focus should be on those species where there are known problems and on those species for which suspensions are already in place. Dr Lieberman (regional representative for North America) and the observer from China supported the Secretariat's suggestion that a review of previous recommendations should be conducted and would like to see a summary of which species are, or have been subject to the Significant Trade Process, as well as their current status.

The observer from Chile expressed concern at the high levels of illegal trade of species under review going through South American countries, even when most trade in wildlife is prohibited, and suggested that an organization like TRAFFIC South America could help in identifying problematic areas and flows of illegal traffic, and work with those countries to try and stop illegal trade. The Secretariat noted that it appeared that when legal trade was closed down, illegal trade sometimes increased, and therefore imposing trade bans may not necessarily be the most appropriate solution. Parties were requested to notify the Secretariat when they received evidence of illegal trade so that details could be conveyed to Parties and relevant enforcement authorities.

The observer from African Resources Trust noted that there was a certain amount of ambiguity when looking at Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) and Decision 11.106 together, which needed to be clarified before embarking on Phase V. The Secretariat asked the working group to consider the option of consolidating Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) and Decision 11.106 into a new Resolution, to improve understanding of the process.

After some discussion, the Animals Committee's members agreed to restrict species for further review under the Significant Trade process to additional taxa in the order Acipenseriformes, some Appendix-II freshwater turtles and tortoises, hard corals, and species harvested for the medicinal trade.

7.2 Acipenseriformes – Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.)

The Chairman invited Mr S. Nash, the observer from the TRAFFIC Network, to introduce document Doc. AC.16.7.2. which contains reviews of ten species of Acipenseriformes. Mr Nash reminded delegates that species included in Category 1 are those for which Article IV of the Convention is not being fully implemented. Category 2 comprises species for which it is unclear from the available information whether Article IV is being fully implemented. Category 3 refers to species for which trade is evidently not a problem.

The TRAFFIC Network recommended including the following species in Category 1: *Acipenser gueldenstaedtii*, *A. nudiiventris*, *A. schrencki*, *A. stellatus*, *Huso dauricus*, and *H. huso*. The following species were recommended for inclusion in Category 2: *Acipenser baerii*, *A. fulvescens*, *A. ruthenus* and *Polyodon spathula*. No species were recommended for inclusion in Category 3.

The observer from the Islamic Republic of Iran thanked the TRAFFIC Network for compiling an up-to-date and comprehensive report, but noted some inaccuracies in the data. In particular he noted that domestic consumption was likely to be much higher than reported and that the number of fingerlings released into the wild in some cases was highly exaggerated. The observers from the Islamic Republic of Iran and United States of America expressed a preference for categorization by country. The Secretariat explained that geographical categorization may not be appropriate in the case of migratory species or species occurring as a single population under the jurisdiction of more than one country, but that this aspect should also be considered by the working group.

Following discussion on the process for developing recommendations to the range States, it was concluded that the Animals Committee would make recommendations for Category-2 species conditional on responses from the range States concerning the implementation of Article IV. The Secretariat would notify the Committee of the responses received from the relevant Parties as soon as possible.

The observer from TRAFFIC Network proceeded to take the delegates through the document, inviting comments from the floor on each species. Parties were requested to convey corrections and additions to the species accounts and trade data directly to the consultant.

In response to a query from the observer from Israel with regard to terms used for specimens in trade and in particular the use of the term 'body' in the context of trade in sturgeon specimens, the Secretariat requested the working group consider the issue of standardizing terms used to record trade in the drafting of recommendations.

The Secretariat clarified that Decision 11.58 required all Acipenseriformes range States to declare coordinated intergovernmental annual export and catch quotas per basin or biogeographical region as appropriate, for all commercial trade in Acipenseriformes. Parties that failed to inform the Secretariat would automatically be treated as having a zero quota for the following year. In addition, the Secretariat stated that the decision did not specifically exclude captive-breeding operations and the Committee might wish to recommend that this aspect be revised accordingly at CoP12. The observer from the United States of America, supported by the Northeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, opposed the mandatory establishment of quotas and stated that they would supply details of their management regimes to the Secretariat.

The Secretariat requested that the Committee consider the option of recommending that Parties forward copies of (re-)export permits for specimens of Acipenseriformes to the Secretariat at the time of issuance, to facilitate the monitoring of trade. The observer from the Islamic Republic of Iran offered to host a meeting between the Secretariat and representatives of relevant range States to offer assistance and discuss conservation and management of sturgeon in the Caspian Sea region. The Secretariat acknowledged the offer, although noting that other institutions (e.g. the World Bank, proposed Caspian Sea Convention, United Nations Development Programme) are also involved in sturgeon conservation and that various other meetings are being planned as well.

The observer from the Islamic Republic of Iran requested the Secretariat to contact the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to assess hatchery operations in the Caspian Sea region, to assist Parties to do stock assessments and to develop monitoring systems.

The observer from Germany and the Secretariat drew the participants' attention to a future meeting of the IUCN Sturgeon Specialist Group to be held in Moscow in February 2001.

7.3 *Naja* spp. - Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.)

The Chairman invited Mr Inskipp, the observer from UNEP-WCMC, to introduce document Doc. AC.16.7.3. which had been prepared by them in cooperation with TRAFFIC and IUCN. Mr Inskipp noted an error on page 1, point 3, stating that currently there was no standard reference for nomenclature for this genus and explained that the document used taxonomy used since the listing of the species in Appendix II. The observer from UNEP-WCMC remarked that while CITES only recognized one species of *Naja* spp, research on venom and other characters had shown that at least 10 species exist in this genus. He reported that it had been difficult to assess the effect of trade on the different species given all trade was currently reported as *Naja naja*.

Mr Inskipp noted that UNEP-WCMC had not proposed any subspecies of *Naja naja* for Category 1, but recommended the following categorizations: *Naja naja atra* (2 or 1), *N. n. kaouthia* (2 or 1), *N. n. naja* (2 or 3), *N. n. oxiana* (2 or 3), *N. n. philippinensis* (2 or 3), *N. n. sagittifera* (3), *N. n. samarensis* (2 or 3), *N. n. siamensis* (2), *N. n. sputatrix* (1 or 2), and *N. n. sumatrana* (2). The consultant explained that they had been unable to decide on a category for a number of taxa and had therefore provided a choice of categories to be determined by the Animals Committee. Parties were requested to convey corrections and additions to the species accounts directly to the report contractor for inclusion into the final document.

7.4 *Moschus* spp. - Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.)

The observer from UNEP-WCMC introduced the review of *Moschus* spp. which had been prepared by them in cooperation with TRAFFIC and IUCN. The report recommended the following categorizations for the four *Moschus* spp. recognized by CITES: *Moschus fuscus* (1), *M. moschiferus* (1), *M. berezovskii* (2), and *M. chrysogaster* (2). He further noted that a copy of the report had been sent to all range States of the species concerned, but comments from the range States had either not yet been received, or not been incorporated into the document owing to their recent arrival.

The observer from China acknowledged the efforts made by UNEP-WCMC, but noted that the document contained very limited biological information on China's population of musk deer. He also expressed concern at the use of subjective expressions such as 'appears to be' and 'apparently' which he put down to a lack of field data. He stated that only 3% of the Chinese traditional medicine claiming to contain natural musk actually did. The observer from China remarked that efforts should be concentrated on stopping illegal trade and carrying out field surveys.

The observer from the United States of America disagreed with the conclusions of the Consultants' report related to musk deer populations in China, stating that they believed there was strong evidence to show that harvest in China was having a detrimental impact on musk deer populations. He questioned how the requisite non-detriment finding could be made under Article IV given the current uncertainty over population sizes and trends in China. The observer from the United States of America concluded that evidence indicated that Article IV was not being implemented adequately for musk deer, and this taxon should be placed in Category 1 of Decision 11.106. The Secretariat noted that if the status of populations was insufficiently known, then conversely it meant that a non-detriment finding may not be possible either. The observer from China later in the week informed the meeting that funds would be set aside for assessing the population status of musk deer in China.

The observer from India stressed that poaching and illegal trade in musk was threatening the Indian musk deer populations. The observer from the Republic of Korea highlighted his Government's

efforts to conserve the musk deer (*M. moschiferus*) in their country, including the development of a synthetic substitute for musk, which they have actively encouraged as a medicinal ingredient.

The Chairman requested Parties to convey corrections and additional scientific data to the species accounts directly to the consultant.

A working group was established by the Chairman to consider further the reviews of *Acipenseriformes*, *Naja* spp., and *Moschus* spp., to be chaired by the Chairman of the Animals Committee, comprising **AC representatives from Africa and North America**, and observers from Canada, China, Denmark, France, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Russian Federation, the United States of America, IUCN, TRAFFIC Network, UNEP-WCMC, European Commission, ART, NRDC, Tsar Nicoulai Caviar, Inc., the University of Maryland, WCS, Wildlife Trust of India, World Bank, and WWF-Russia.

Later in the week, (Friday 15 December 2000), the Chairman, as chairman of the working group introduced the summary report on significant trade (enclosed as Annex 3). He noted that the working group had agreed that all *Naja* spp. should be placed in Category 2, except for *N. sagittifera* which should be placed in Category 3. The working group recommended that *Moschus moschiferus* be placed in Category 1. The working group agreed that the other three *Moschus* spp. should be placed in Category 2 subject to satisfactory information being provided to the Animals Committee by range States within the six-week deadline, otherwise they would be transferred from Category 2 to Category 1. The Chairman noted that no consensus was reached on *Acipenseriformes* and the Consultants' recommendations would be the default report submitted to the Animals Committee for consideration. He concluded that the language used in Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) needed revising to take account of the biological properties of species which are confused with management issues. He added that categorization should be done on a national level to reflect properly the differences between countries, in terms of management and conservation of the species concerned. The observer from the Islamic Republic of Iran compared his Government's commitment and contribution to the conservation of sturgeon stocks to that of other Caspian Sea range States. He remarked that the exploitation of sturgeon stock in Iranian waters of the south Caspian Sea was conducted in a sustainable manner. He explained that within Iran all activities associated with fishing, transport, processing and export of sturgeon products were under strict government control and in the past five years the number of fingerlings released by Iran had increased six-fold, to 24 million fingerlings. In recognition of their sustainable harvest techniques and stock replenishment schemes, he asked that the Iranian populations of *A. stellatus*, *A. gueldenstaedtii*, *A. nudiiventris* and *Huso huso* be placed in Category 2. Dr Lieberman (regional representative for North America) acknowledged the efforts made by the Islamic Republic of Iran in their management of sturgeon stocks, but noted with concern the status of *Huso huso* in the Caspian Sea.

The report of the working group on significant trade was adopted by the Animals Committee without amendment, recognizing that a consensus had not been reached by the group on categorization of the *Acipenseriformes* species. The working group would not continue its work intersessionally. Recommendations would be drafted by the Animals Committee after the meeting.

10. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 10.21 on transport of live animals

Report of the transport working group

The agenda item was introduced by Dr Irina Sprotte, Chairman of the transport working group which took account of the achievements under the new working programme. The observer from Switzerland remarked that some countries required documents other than a CITES export permit before a shipment was allowed into the country (e.g. health certificates or a CITES import permit). He suggested that shipments should only be sent where the exporter knew the country of destination would accept the shipment. The Chairman asked the Chairman of the working group to consider the issue raised by the observer from Switzerland, when they convened later in the week.

The Chairman re-established the working group, to be chaired by Dr I. Sprotte, comprising Dr K. Rodics (regional representative for Europe) and Mr T. Soehartono regional representative for

Asia, and observers from China, Switzerland, the Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Zimbabwe, EAZA, HSUS, NYZS, PIJAC and RSPCA. The working group was charged with developing terms of reference, based on the role of the Animals Committee outlined in Resolution Conf. 10.21.

Later in the week, (Friday 15 December, 2000), the observer from Germany, Dr I. Sprotte, as Chairman of the working group introduced the draft terms of reference and workplan (enclosed as Annex 4). The report was adopted by Animals Committee without amendment and the working group was requested to continue its deliberations intersessionally.

11. Role and function of the Scientific Authorities

The Secretariat introduced the agenda item, noting the need to strengthen the role of science in CITES. The Secretariat informed the Animals Committee that there would be funds available the following year for two training workshops to strengthen the role and function of Scientific Authorities. The Secretariat identified Southeast Asia and West Africa as potential regions for the first workshops in 2001, and then suggested workshops in South America, Central America and the Caribbean and Central Africa for 2002. Parties were invited to notify the Secretariat of future regional meetings that might provide opportunities for further training on CITES implementation and the making of non-detriment findings. There was general support for the Secretariat's initiative in this matter.

The Secretariat explained that they planned to produce two documents: a manual for use by Scientific Authorities and a document on the structure and function of Scientific Authorities. A project had also been initiated to promote the analysis of trade data by Scientific Authorities to enhance the monitoring of trade and trade patterns.

The observer from the Netherlands, supported by the observers from Israel and Spain, hoped that some resources would be allocated specifically to improve communication between Scientific Authorities, in accordance with the Strategic Plan. The observer from Spain further recommended that the regional representatives play a more pivotal role in facilitating consultation between Scientific Authorities.

The observer from Germany informed the meeting that his Government was preparing to host the first European Regional meeting of the Animals Committee in Bonn next year.

13. Implementation of Decision 11.165 on trade in traditional medicines

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. AC.16.13, noting that a working programme had not yet been developed to implement this Decision, and welcomed suggestions on how to proceed.

Dr R. Hay (regional representative for Oceania) suggested that the Secretariat, in consultation with the technical committees, compile a list of species traded for their medicinal properties and an inventory of operations that breed CITES species for medicinal purposes, before carrying out the remaining actions in Decision 11.165.

The observer from China suggested that international trade in specimens for traditional medicine should not be addressed in isolation of trade in specimens for biomedical research, and suggested that this issue be put on the agenda for the next meeting of the Animals Committee. Additionally, he thought it inappropriate for the Animals Committee to review non-CITES-listed species used in traditional medicine, and recommended that the Secretariat establish formal links with the traditional medicine community under the framework of the World Health Organization.

The observer from IFAW suggested introducing a standard labelling system for traditional medicinal products in international trade, similar to the labelling system currently in use for caviar, and indicated that they had funds available to do the work. The observer from Project Seahorse noted that they had already produced a list of marine species involved in traditional medicine that could be made available. There were additional offers of assistance from the observers from TRAFFIC

Network, IFAW and the Animal Welfare Institute to work with the Secretariat to produce terms of reference and a list of species and products used in traditional medicine.

The observer from the National Trappers Association opposed the expansion of CITES interest and authority into the traditional trade market and non-CITES-listed species. He saw this as an unnecessary and unlawful expansion which could potentially progress into areas other than medicine, such as the fur trade.

The Secretariat requested that interested parties submit written comments to the Secretariat.

8. Periodic review of animal taxa in the Appendices

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. AC.16.8, and explained that it was the responsibility of the Animals and Plants Committees to review species listed in the Appendices periodically. He noted that it had been difficult to find volunteers to undertake desk-based reviews and those reviews that had been submitted had used a variety of formats. The Committee was asked to consider whether the guidelines that accompanied forms to conduct such reviews (in Annex 2 of Doc. AC.16.8), could be amended to facilitate a more uniform response.

8.1 Evaluation of species selected at AC15

The Chairman proceeded to take the delegates through document Doc. AC.16.8.1, inviting the observers from each country coordinating the review of a particular species to summarize their recommendations.

Recommendations provided by the reviewing Parties were as follows:

MAMMALIA

Macaca fascicularis (reviewed by Indonesia). Recommendation: to be removed from the CITES Appendices. General comments did not support this recommendation because of implications for other primates, and supported the retention of this species in Appendix II.

Saiga tatarica (reviewed by the United States of America). Recommendation: to be retained in Appendix II.

AVES

Falco peregrinus (reviewed by the United States of America). Recommendation: to be discussed in the working group, but the observer from the United States of America noted that the North American population appeared to qualify for downlisting to Appendix II. The observer from Spain remarked that it was essential that the reviewing Party considered the size of the population in relation to the habitat available. The observer from Fundación Ara, A.C. noted that in Chihuahua, Mexico, the species was still threatened by habitat destruction and the use of pesticides like DDT. It was noted that feedback had not been received from all range States, and the reviewing Party was prepared to revise the recommendation on the basis of subsequent information.

Macrocephalon maleo (reviewed by Indonesia). Recommendation: to be retained in Appendix I. The observer from the Wildlife Conservation Society informed the Committee that it had set up a captive-breeding programme for this species and with the assistance from the Indonesian Government were hoping to reinstate populations in the wild.

REPTILIA

Dermochelys coriacea (reviewed by the United States of America). Recommendation: to be retained in Appendix I. The observer from the United States of America noted that they had received 16 responses from range States, all of which agreed this species should be retained in Appendix I. There was general support from the floor for this recommendation.

Python anchietae (reviewed by Namibia). Recommendation: to be retained in Appendix II. Mr M. Griffin (regional representative for Africa) noted that the species was protected in Namibia, but that specimens had been found in collections in Germany and the United States of America. The Secretariat requested that Germany and the United States of America investigate the origin of specimens imported and be vigilant when inspecting shipments of pythons from Africa in view of the resemblance between this species and *P. regius*.

PISCES

Scleropages formosus (reviewed by Indonesia). Recommendation: to be retained in Appendix I. The Secretariat noted that captive breeding operations are well organized and that the working group should consider whether it was appropriate to recommend the transfer of the species to Appendix II. This comment was supported by the observer from Singapore.

Probarbus jullieni (reviewed by the United Kingdom). Recommendation: to be retained in Appendix I. The observer from TRAFFIC Network noted with concern the high volume of trade in this species between the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Thailand and hoped that the regional representatives for Asia would work with Thailand to address this issue. Dr S. Tunhikorn (regional representative for Asia) questioned the accuracy of the information in the report, and explained that breeding of this species had been very successful in Thailand and that the species was released into the wild in its millions, negating the need for engaging in illegal trade with its neighbouring country.

ANTHOZOA

Antipatharia spp. (reviewed by the United States of America). Recommendation: to be retained in Appendix II.

The Chairman established a working group, to be chaired by Dr Lieberman (regional representative for North America), comprising the regional representative from Europe (Hungary), and observers from Germany, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Switzerland, the United States of America, IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group, IUCN/SSC Marine Turtle Specialist Group, TRAFFIC Network, the American Museum of Natural History, SCI, IFAW and WAFWA. The working group was asked to consider the nine species reviews submitted to the Animals Committee in document Doc. AC.16.8.1 and to discuss the process for future reviews, including how to standardize reports and recommend candidate species for the next round of reviews.

Later in the week, (Friday 15 December 2000), Dr Lieberman (regional representative for North America) presented the report of the working group on the review of the Appendices (Annex 5) which included a list of species they had identified for review between the 16th and 17th meeting of the Animals Committee. The observer from the United States of America added that they had subsequently been provided with information on the status of *Saiga tatarica* which suggested that numbers in the wild were significantly lower than first thought, possibly as low as 30,000. The Secretariat informed participants that a meeting had been planned for saiga antelope range States and requested that any new information be sent for discussion at this meeting. The observer from Mexico confirmed that they would review *Cynoscion maconaldi*. The Chairman closed discussion on the document and requested the Animals Committee consider formally adopting the working group report after the meeting, by mail.

19. Conservation of seahorses and other members of the family Syngnathidae (Decision 11.97)

The Chairman invited Dr A. Vincent, the observer from Project Seahorse, to introduce document Doc. AC.16.19. Dr Vincent explained that they had been asked by the regional representative from North America to make suggestions to help advance initiatives undertaken by the Parties in relation to the conservation and management of syngnathids. Mr K. Howell (regional representative for Africa) supported by Dr R. Hay (regional representative for Oceania), suggested that contacting fisheries departments might be a more effective way of obtaining trade and status information than sending out notifications to Parties. The Secretariat informed the participants that a technical workshop would be convened in 2001 to address conservation of Syngnathidae, subject to the availability of funds.

The Chairman outlined the terms of reference for a working group to look at a) setting up a workshop, b) considering options for collecting trade and status information other than by sending out detailed questionnaires, and c) preparing a discussion document for CoP12. The Chairman established a working group, to be chaired by Dr Vincent (Project Seahorse), comprising observers from Australia, China, the United States of America, AZA, IFAW, OATA, PIJAC and the Universidad Autónoma de Baja California.

Later in the week, (Friday 15 December, 2000) Dr Hay (regional representative for Oceania), on behalf of Dr Vincent, introduced the report of the working group looking at the conservation of species in the family Syngnathidae (Annex 6). He explained that the group had focused its attention on how and what new scientific information should be obtained, and the nature of the proposed workshop. The group produced a draft notification that the Secretariat could send to Parties to obtain information on biology, catch, by-catch, trade and domestic legislation pertaining to the syngnathids and a tentative timetable of tasks. Dr S. Lieberman (regional representative for North America) thanked the working group for all their hard work, but noted that the funds committed by the United States of America were intended for the Secretariat to implement Decision 11.97 and not to fund NGOs. The Chairman wished it to be noted that the consequence of this remark is that suggestions made under points 7 and 8 of the report could not be accepted unless enough additional funds were made available. The Chairman deferred adoption of the report by the Animals Committee until after the meeting. The Committee subsequently adopted the report with minor amendments.

21. Trade in time-sensitive research samples

Dr T. Althaus, the observer from Switzerland, introduced document Doc. AC.16.21 which had been prepared by a small intersessional working group on invitation by the Chairman of the Animals Committee. Dr Althaus remarked that the problem was not one of making a 'non-detriment finding', but one of the sheer volume of work required by the respective Management Authorities, in terms of processing permits. The Secretariat recommended that instead of exploring ways to exempt time-sensitive research samples from the provisions of CITES, the Committee should concentrate on ways to streamline the permitting process.

The observer from Chile congratulated the working group on their efforts but regretted that only representatives from Europe had been involved. The observers from Mexico and Israel shared his concern that the report concentrated on ways to circumvent the Convention. The observer from Mexico also noted that he had chaired the working group established at CoP11 to look at this issue and would have liked to be involved in the intersessional working group. He suggested that a similar 'labelling system' applied to the transfer of museum specimens could provide a model to control the movement of samples. Dr Althaus explained that he had not intended to preclude discussion, but had produced the report to initiate discussion. He explained that while the intersessional working group had only consisted of representatives from Europe, experts and interested parties had been consulted all over the world. The observer from China remarked that it was quite likely that with technological improvements, 'range States' would also benefit from any mechanisms adopted to allow expeditious transfer of biological samples. The observer from IWMC acknowledged the difficulties raised here and at CoP11, but stressed that there were genuine cases where samples needed to be moved quickly in the interests of conservation and appealed to the Committee to come up with a solution quickly.

The observer from the European Association of Zoo and Wildlife Veterinarians noted that the description used in Decision 11.103 was misleading in that it only referred to *research* samples, and hoped the diversity of terms used to describe the samples under discussion would receive attention in the working group. She highlighted the kind of samples that required expeditious transfer to be those taken from CITES-listed species, namely samples for veterinary diagnosis (to include health treatment and health monitoring), conservation research and management, and law enforcement (identification, etc.). She recognized the importance for some countries to protect their rights to their genetic resources and intellectual property and to control the movement of samples used for biomedical research, but noted that the types of samples referred to in the report were normally intended for non-commercial purposes, are beneficial to CITES animals and conservation.

The Chairman suggested that a working group convene to develop recommendations on procedures for expeditious transfer of biological samples and examine issues relating to trade in time-sensitive research samples, as laid out in Decision 11.103. The Chairman convened a working group, to be chaired by Dr Althaus (alternate regional representative from Europe), comprising observers from Chile, China, Germany, Mexico, the United States of America, the United Republic of Tanzania, EAZWV, IWC and Fundación Loro Parque.

The Secretariat noted that the working group should concentrate on ways to expedite the permitting process for specimens of species for which the impact on the conservation status of wild populations is negligible, rather than seek ways to exempt such specimens from the provisions of CITES. Members agreed.

Later in the week, (Friday 15 December 2000), the observer from Switzerland, Dr Althaus, as Chairman of the working group, reported their conclusions (see Annex 7), noting a change in the title to 'Cross-border movement in time-sensitive biological samples for conservation purposes'. He outlined their recommendations in terms of the four categories specified in Decision 11.103, including:

- a) the identification of various types of samples transferred internationally for purposes of research;
- b) the categorization of purposes for which samples are transferred internationally in terms of their typically commercial, non-commercial and strict conservation elements, e.g. veterinary and diagnostic samples;
- c) the categorization of the recipient institutions and other recipients of such samples; and
- d) the evaluation of the need for expedited transfer of samples in each of the categories.

Dr Althaus identified future actions to include training for enforcement officers in handling such samples and looking at ways of streamlining the process for issuing CITES documents.

After considerable discussion, the report of the working group on trade in time-sensitive biological samples for conservation purposes was adopted with minor amendments to the text. The Secretariat noted that in accordance with Decision 11.104, the finalized report would be submitted to the Standing Committee for consideration.

9. Registration and monitoring of animal species bred in captivity (Resolution Conf. 11.14 and Decision 11.101)

9.1 Response to Notification No. 2000/044

The Secretariat introduced the agenda item and explained that at its 11th meeting, the Conference of the Parties had decided to restrict the registration of operations breeding Appendix-I species in captivity for commercial purposes to those species that are 'critically endangered in the wild and/or known to be difficult to breed or keep in captivity'. The Animals Committee was charged with compiling a list of such species for approval by the Standing Committee, using species nominated by Parties in response to Notification to the Parties No.2000/044.

The Secretariat recommended that the Committee should focus, at this stage of the process, on compiling a list of Appendix-I species that were critically endangered in the wild and subject to trade in specimens bred in captivity for commercial purposes. The Secretariat considered that the IUCN definition of 'critically endangered' was an appropriate starting point for selecting species. The Chairman stated that common sense should prevail when compiling the species lists and urged Parties to concentrate on those species for which commercial activity had the potential to impact on the conservation status of the species in the wild. A detailed discussion followed.

Several Parties, including the observers from Chile, China, Costa Rica, Germany, Israel and Mexico, stated that because Notification to the Parties No. 2000/044 had not defined the criteria for selecting Appendix-I species to be included in Annex 3 of Resolution Conf. 11.14, they had been unable to

produce appropriate lists. The observer from Chile noted that discussions within the working group at CoP11 had frequently highlighted the potential problems associated with creating what was effectively a list of first-class and second-class Appendix-I species. He stated that he would like to see all Chile's native fauna on Annex 3. Both the observer from Chile and India requested that CITES retain a process by which range States could comment on proposals put forward by Parties to register facilities seeking to trade commercially in captive-bred specimens of Appendix-I species. The Secretariat replied that it was up to the Management and Scientific Authorities of each country to assess the suitability of establishments for registration. The observer from India, supported by HSUS, noted that the effects of illegal trade should also be taken into consideration when considering which species to include on Annex 3. The observer from Mexico underlined the need for countries to evaluate the population status of their native species and take responsibility for their own fauna. Supported by the observers from IWC and the National University of Costa Rica, he remarked that it was inappropriate to use IUCN criteria for critical endangerment because it assessed species on a global rather than a national level. The observer from IUCN apologized for the absence of their colleagues from IUCN/SSC Captive Breeding Specialist Group and noted that of the 400 animal species on Appendix-I, it was unlikely that all would be in demand for commercial trade. She recognized there were differences between the terminology adopted by CITES and that used by IUCN and supported the need for clearer definitions of both criteria set out in Decision 11.101. The observer from Switzerland reminded Parties that they should concentrate on species that are bred for commercial purposes, and therefore Appendix-I species such as whales could be automatically disregarded as unlikely to be ever bred on a commercial scale.

Several Parties expressed concern about the ability to amend the list in Annex 3 once adopted by the Parties. The observer from IWMC drew the delegates' attention to Decision 11.163 directed to the Secretariat which states that Annex 3 of Resolution Conf. 11.14 should be periodically reviewed and amended. The Chairman clarified that this should be viewed as an ongoing process and that Parties would be able to make further recommendations at a later date.

The Chairman outlined the terms of reference for a working group to consider initially clarifying the terms "critically endangered in the wild" and "difficult to breed or keep in captivity," as set out in Decision 11.101 in order to provide the Parties with a set of criteria to allow them to compile a list of species for approval by the Standing Committee and subsequent inclusion in Annex 3 of Resolution Conf. 11.14. The Chairman convened a working group, to be chaired by Dr Micheletti (regional representative for Central and South America and Caribbean), comprising Dr S. Incháustegui (regional representative for Central and South America and Caribbean), and the observers from the Bahamas, Bolivia, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Germany, India, Indonesia, Israel, the Republic of Korea, Mauritius, Mexico, Namibia, the United States of America, Zimbabwe, IUCN, TRAFFIC Network, AFA, AZA, the American Museum of Natural History, DGHT, Fundación Ara, A.C., Fundación Loro Parque, SSN and WCS.

9.2 Relationship between *ex-situ* breeding operations and *in-situ* conservation programmes (Decision 11.102)

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. AC.16.9.2 on the relationship between *ex situ* breeding operations and *in-situ* conservation of wild populations, recognizing that this issue extended beyond biology into socio-economics and rural development. The Secretariat requested that Management Authorities *inter alia* provide information on the relationship between *ex situ* breeding operations and *in situ* conservation of wild populations.

The observer from Oceania explained that Australia was currently developing a detailed approach to interpreting and implementing Resolution Conf. 11.14, with a particular focus on defining a cooperative conservation programme, and a model for allowing for participation of range States. This approach would mean that if a transaction did not adequately meet these terms, then it would be considered commercial; thereby restricting such transactions to institutions registered with the Secretariat. The observer from the IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group informed the Committee that they were conducting a study in conjunction with UNEP-WCMC and the University College of London to examine the economics of the global crocodilian skin trade. This study, funded by the crocodilian skin industry, will examine among other things pricing structures, incentives and disincentives for conservation of different production systems, including captive breeding. This information would be

made available to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and CITES Parties. He informed Parties that IUCN expected to hold a workshop to explore the conservation benefits of the various breeding and rearing systems used, including aquaculture and artificial propagation. While he recognized this project was broader than the scope of Decision 11.102, he would ensure that the outputs of this process were made available to the Animals Committee to assist their consideration of this issue. The observer from the European Commission stressed the importance of this subject and suggested the Animals Committee consider this as a priority. Several Parties highlighted the need to develop the Annex-3 list before addressing the relationship between *ex situ* breeding operations and *in situ* conservation.

The working group was asked by the Chairman to consider this document as part of their terms of reference. It was recognized that it would be necessary for the working group to consult intersessionally if they were going to be able to produce a document in time for CoP12.

The Secretariat suggested advancing this issue, as outlined in document Doc. AC.16.9.2, paragraph 3, by directing it to the trade policy programme of the CITES Secretariat. The suggestion was adopted.

Later in the week (Friday 15 December 2000), Dr Incháustegui (regional representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean), on behalf of the Chairman of the working group, presented their report (included as Annex 8). He noted that the working group had concentrated on defining the terms set out in Decision 11.101, seeing this as an essential task before the other topics in their Terms of Reference could be addressed. He presented the following definitions, which had been produced by consensus within the working group and explained that they had been unable to complete the other tasks assigned to them due to lack of time:

A species should be considered "critically endangered in the wild" if:

- a) the species is protected under national legislation by any range States; or
- b) there is a significant risk of increased levels of illegal trade, as proposed by any Party; and
- c) the species is listed in IUCN categories "Critically endangered", "Endangered" or "Vulnerable".

A species should be considered "difficult to keep" if:

- a) it is a species for which the adult mortality rate in captivity exceeds the estimated adult mortality rate for wild specimens; or
- b) it is a species for which captive husbandry specialists have identified highly specialized requirements for maintaining specimens in captivity.

A species should be considered "difficult to breed" if:

- a) captive-breeding operations are not self-sustaining; or
- b) captive-breeding operations do not routinely produce viable offspring; or
- c) its reproductive biology in captivity has not been determined.

Dr Micheletti (regional representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean) thanked the working group for all their hard work and asked the Animals Committee to accept the definitions they had produced. Dr Lieberman (regional representative for North America), Dr Rodics (regional representative for Europe) and the observers from the Bahamas and Chile supported the definitions as outlined in the working group report.

The Chairman and the observer from the United Kingdom expressed reservations over the definitions produced by the working group, in particular that of "critically endangered". They agreed with Dr Hay (regional representative for Oceania) and the observer from Japan that the proposed criteria as they stood would generate a list of species that was far too long to implement.

The observer from the TRAFFIC Network stated that they had offered an alternative definition for "critically endangered in the wild" to the working group to include:

- any Appendix-I species identified as critically endangered by any range State within that State; or
- any Appendix-I species identified as critically endangered according to the IUCN Red List.

He further mentioned that TRAFFIC did not support the inclusion of the requirement regarding "significant risk of increased levels of illegal trade", as this would be difficult to define or determine. He explained that it was their opinion that the definitions in their present form were too wide in scope and virtually any Appendix-I species could be included. He acknowledged that their view had been a minority view in the working group and they had not wanted to impede the consensus. However, he added that TRAFFIC did not consider the definitions in their present form to be workable and hoped the Committee would reconsider them.

The observer from Israel suggested changing the title of the report to reflect the mandate of the working group, to read: "Registry and supervision of operations engaged in captive-breeding of CITES species listed in Appendix I".

The observer from the United States of America, supported by the observer from the IWC, suggested changing the wording of part a) under the definition of "critically endangered" to:

"any range State proposed it as such, and it is protected under existing legislation by that range State; or"

The Chairman deferred adoption of the report until after the meeting when the Animals Committee would have had an opportunity to consider the amended text. He also concluded that this issue generated extensive discussion and therefore deemed an intersessional existence of this working group not to be desirable.

The Chairman noted with concern that several observers (Parties and NGOs) had attended and contributed to the working group, who had not formally been invited by the Chairman to attend during the plenary session. He reminded delegates, as a point of order, that working groups were established by the Chairman based on technical expertise and once they were closed, no more people could attend.

Note: The Committee engaged in a postal procedure after the meeting to determine if the report of the working group could be adopted by the Committee. Four members supported the report, four opposed it and two abstained. The Chairman of the Animals Committee requested that it be recorded that he was not in favour of the definition of 'critically endangered' proposed by the working group and that adoption would seriously jeopardize the credibility of the Committee. Because of the absence of consensus, the Chairman of the Animals Committee decided to revisit this issue at AC17.

16. Universal labelling of caviar

The observer from TRAFFIC Network introduced document Doc. AC.16.16 and responded to written comments made by the Secretariat.

The observer from TRAFFIC Network noted that, in its comments, the Secretariat gave another interpretation of a 'lot identification number' and that this would not make the number for the primary container (or the corresponding labels) 'unique' as they interpreted paragraph c) in Resolution Conf. 11.13. It was noted that there was a need to come to an unambiguous and workable interpretation of recommendations in this Resolution. The observer from the Islamic Republic of Iran noted that the labelling system for the identification of caviar only relate to caviar entering international trade from the country of origin, but does not apply to re-exports of caviar, including caviar that may have been re-packaged prior to re-export. He added that this had

implications for illegal trade in caviar and labelling should be extended to re-exports as well. There was general support from the floor for extending the labelling requirements to re-exports of caviar.

The Chairman convened a working group, to be chaired by Dr Hay (regional representative for Oceania), comprising observers from China, France, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Russian Federation, the United States of America, TRAFFIC Network, the American Museum of Natural History, the International Caviar Importers Association, IWMC-Switzerland and Tsar Nicoulai Caviar, Inc.

Later in the week, (Friday 15 December, 2000), Dr Hay (regional representative for Oceania), as chairman of the working group, reported on their findings and recommendations with regards to a universal labelling system for caviar exports and re-exports (enclosed as Annex 9). After a brief discussion the report was accepted by the Animals Committee without amendment and the working group was requested to produce a draft resolution intersessionally, to be submitted to the next Conference of Parties.

18. Trade in freshwater turtles and tortoises in Asia and other regions (Resolution Conf. 11.9; cf. Decision 11.93)

The Secretariat referred to documents Inf. AC.16.13 and Inf. AC.16.17 in introducing this agenda item. The Secretariat noted that the Conference of Parties had given a limited mandate to the Animals Committee on this matter. However, Decision 11.93 directed the Animals Committee to look at species appropriate for consideration in the context of the Review of Significant Trade pursuant to Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.), and Decision 11.150 directed the Secretariat to convene a technical workshop.

Dr Lieberman (regional representative for North America) noted that the United States of America had committed USD 22,000 for a technical workshop to be hosted in one of the Southeast Asian range States. The observer from Germany added that they had allocated money to conduct surveys over the next two years but that part of that money could be used for the technical workshop. The observer from the Chelonian Research Foundation also pledged support of USD 10,000. Several observer organizations including TRAFFIC Network, Conservation International (CI), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Herpetologie und Terrarienkunde E.V (DGHT), IFAW and Pro Wildlife, offered to provide assistance and support.

Dr Tunhikorn (regional representative for Asia) suggested that to reduce costs, the technical workshop could be convened immediately before or after the proposed capacity-building workshop for Scientific Authorities in Southeast Asia. The Chairman, also on behalf of the Secretariat, expressed gratitude for this suggestion.

The Chairman convened a working group, to be chaired by Mr Soehartono (regional representative for Asia), to comprise Dr Howell (regional representative for Africa), and the observers from China, Germany, Indonesia, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, the Chelonian Research Foundation, CI, DGHT, IWC, Pro Wildlife and WCS.

Later in the week (Friday 15 December, 2000) Mr. Soehartono (regional representative for Asia), presented the summary report (enclosed as Annex 10) and informed delegates that they had carried out three main tasks: establishing a framework for a second workshop on trade in freshwater turtles and tortoises in Asia as mandated by Resolution Conf. 11.9; determining conservation priorities for action on the turtle trade issue in Asia under the terms of Decision 11.150; and identifying species of freshwater turtles and tortoises in trade with respect to the Review of Significant Trade as required by Decision 11.93. He noted that the working group had identified *Cuora amboinensis*, *C. flavomarginata*, *C. galbinifrons* and *Lissemys punctata* as potential candidates for Phase V of the Review of Significant Trade. The Working Group agreed with the suggestion made by the Chairman to add *Pyxis planicauda* to the four species already suggested for inclusion in Phase V. The Animals Committee adopted the report as amended.

20. Implementation of Decision 11.94 on the biological and trade status of sharks

The Chairman introduced the agenda item and summarized the current status of the FAO International Plan of Action on sharks. He explained that the Action Plan, which is voluntary and does not require ratification by Member States, had been adopted by COFI and approved by the FAO Council. The information currently available to FAO showed that the following countries have undertaken a first assessment of their shark stock: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ecuador, Gambia, Japan, Peru, Seychelles and the United States of America. A few countries have also stated that they hoped to have completed a national shark plan before the 24th session of COFI in 2001. The European Commission has reported to FAO that they also intended to prepare such a plan in 2001. In addition the Chairman reported that some of the Regional Fishery Management Organizations have taken action. The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (I-ATTC) has responded to the IPOA on sharks in a Commission resolution on by-catch, and the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tuna (ICCAT) has begun an assessment of the pelagic sharks within its mandated area. The Chairman stated that he would maintain contact with FAO on this issue.

17. Trade in *Tursiops truncatus ponticus* (Decision 11.91)

The observer from the United States of America introduced document Doc. AC.16.17, noting that this document was prompted by Decision 11.91, which directed the Animals Committee to evaluate the biological status of and trade in this species using data from range States gathered by the CITES Secretariat. The Chairman asked that the present contact group, with the addition of the observers from Israel, Greenpeace and WDCCS, should continue reviewing the available data and develop a plan for obtaining additional information and undertaking the review requested of the Committee. There was general support for this initiative and continued coordination with the relevant international organizations, specifically the Bern Convention and the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS). Once the relevant information had been received by the Secretariat in response to the request under Decision 11.139, a working group could be established to review the issues relating to conservation of and trade in *Tursiops truncatus ponticus*.

14. Trade in alien species

The Secretariat introduced documents Doc. AC.16.14.1 and Doc. AC.16.14.2 and informed the Committee that IUCN/SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) had finalized the IUCN guidelines for the prevention of biodiversity loss caused by alien invasive species (provided as document Inf. AC.16.10). The document made reference to international trade although it did not really address what role CITES can play. The Committee was requested to consider what form of cooperation could be established.

The Chairman noted that the Secretariat had already been in contact with IUCN/SSC ISSG who confirmed that none of the world's top 100 most invasive species were listed on CITES. Discussion followed and there was general support expressed for maintaining contact with the IUCN/SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group and CBD. Dr Incháustegui (regional representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean), speaking on behalf of the Dominican Republic, noted that invasive species were of particular concern to small island states. Dr Lieberman (regional representative for North America) and Dr Hay (regional representative for Oceania) both suggested developing a list of potentially invasive CITES-species and reporting progress on this effort at regional meetings. The Chairman asked the observer from IUCN/SSC to contact the IUCN/SSC ISSG to request that they develop condensed guidelines in plain language for distribution to all CITES Parties.

The Chairman convened an intersessional working group to make progress with the issue, to be chaired by Dr Hay (regional representative for Oceania), comprising Dr Incháustegui (regional representative for Central and South America and Caribbean) and the observers from the Bahamas, Canada, Chile, the Republic of Korea, Spain, the United States of America, Care for the Wild, IWC, the Northeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and PIJAC. The working group was asked to report back at the next meeting of the Animals Committee.

22. Any other business

Master's course in management, conservation and control of species traded internationally

The observer from Spain gave a brief update on the third Masters course which had started in October 2000 and had involved 34 participants from 25 countries including: Bolivia, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Greece, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Mozambique, Namibia, Peru, Saint Lucia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe. He explained that the course consisted of 400 hours in the classroom and a dissertation (100 hours), and that the tuition and lodging fees had been covered almost exclusively by scholarships. He added that the course had been simultaneously interpreted into Spanish and English.

23. Closing remarks of the Chairman

The Chairman expressed sincere thanks on behalf of the Secretariat and all participants to the Government of the United States, represented by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, for providing the venue and, in particular Dr Sue Lieberman and all her colleagues for their hard work. He extended his thanks to the staff of the National Conservation Training Centre (NCTC) for supplying a surplus of food, drink and 'ready smiles' and expressed his appreciation to the interpreters and technical staff on whom the success of the meeting depended so much. He thanked the Secretariat staff, making specific mention to Dr Malan Lindeque for his guidance, to Paula Henry and Victoria Zentilli for making sure everyone had the right documents and to the three rapporteurs, Alison Littlewood, Anne St. John and Charlie Hamilton for working long hours when many of the rest of the participants were relaxing after the sessions of the meeting. The Chairman also thanked the staff from Earth Negotiations Bulletin for producing the daily bulletin. He concluded by thanking all participants, the members of Animals Committee, the observer Parties and observer NGOs for all their hard work during the week and hoped that the spirit of cooperation would continue into the future. Dr Sue Lieberman took the opportunity to thank all her staff and the staff at NCTC. Dr Rod Hay saluted Dr Marinus Hoogmoed for his chairmanship, dealing with matters which at times he said "had been as difficult as nailing a jellyfish to a tree!" The Chairman wished everyone a safe journey home to their respective countries and a good holiday season.

Opening speechesDr Marinus Hoogmoed, Chairman of the CITES Animals Committee

Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. Welcome to this meeting of the Animals Committee (AC). I guess we all have to get used to me sitting here instead of Hank Jenkins who did this job more or less for as long as I can remember. This is not due to my faulty memory but more to the long period Hank has been chairing these meetings (8 years I guess). Hank has a special style of chairing, with a lot of lateral thinking and breaks for topping up nicotine levels. My style certainly will be different, if alone for the fact that I will not need to break for topping up the nicotine level, although I could think of many other valid reasons. I want to take this opportunity to thank Hank for all the good work he has done in his past 11 years for the AC and I ask you to give him some applause for that.

We are here with 10 participants to the meeting, 38 observer Parties and about 70 observer NGOs, which is more than the numbers attending the 15th meeting of the AC in Madagascar. Thus, there are distinctly more, actually nearly twice as many, NGOs than Parties present at a meeting of a Committee of a convention between Parties.

Let me begin by reminding you what kind of meeting this really is: This is a meeting of a technical committee of CITES, consisting of 10 regional representatives with knowledge on biological matters concerning animals. No more. All the rest of the persons present here are observers, of course apart from the Secretariat, which generally want to be classified as Servants of the Parties, although this is not an official CITES classification. The regional representatives are supposed to represent the Parties in the region that has elected them, but practice has shown that gradually over the past few years, Parties have preferred to bring matters of interest to them, or their position on specific matters on the Agenda, to the meeting of the AC themselves, not going through the regional representatives any longer. I wonder what could be the reason for that. When, in 1998, a country did go through its regional representative, it was reproached by the meeting of the AC for not bringing those matters to the meeting itself. The result is that this Party, which shared my opinion about representatives, has been represented in the meetings of AC since then. Thus, meetings of AC have tended to grow into mini-CoPs with a number of affluent Parties (those that can pay for the attendance of their representatives) always represented, but many other Parties not able to attend because of financial constraints. This brings me to the attendance of NGOs. Because of their nature, most (but certainly not all) are well-off financially and do not have problems attending meetings, not only the present one which for many is on their home-turf, but even meetings in far away places. This results in a skewed ratio in the representation, with the NGOs being over-represented in relation to Parties and even be present here in Shepherdstown in larger numbers than Parties. I wonder if this is as should be. I think that the system as it is now developing is not fair to a number of Parties that cannot be represented at meetings of AC, except through the Regional Representatives, and that apparently does not work well. In my opinion this is not correct, and this matter should be addressed in the near future. Not during this meeting though.

You probably have heard, or have noticed that we have tried to better structure the process of invitation of NGOs, by asking information about the NGOs, their mission and the CV of the persons representing them. While we went through this process I have had several surprises. I learned a lot about NGOs, their interrelations, their considerable spread of interest in CITES matters and their motives. Also of the philosophies that drive them. Most NGOs were quite cooperative in providing the information requested, some were hesitant and needed some nudging, and I even received some, let's say, suggestive questions about my motives. Well, let it be clearly and openly stated here that I only tried to establish what kind of expertise was said to be available and whether there really was some amount of CITES relevance. Let's see how it works out here and if necessary re-adjust next time.

To some NGOs this may sound as a speech against attendance of NGOs, but it is not. On the contrary, it is meant to promote co-operation and involvement in a positive way. Some NGO's are indispensable to the work of CITES and its Committees, and we are grateful for their involvement. Others have special knowledge on items on the Agenda which AC wants to tap and use. A number of NGOs wanted to be present here just because they think they should and because they have not yet missed any meeting in

the previous x number of years. I really do not think this is a valid reason, although no NGO was refused an invitation this time on that basis.

Attending this meeting as an observer NGO is not a right as will be clear from the Terms of Reference and the Rules of Procedure of the AC, although some may have started regarding it as such. It is a privilege, and I expect you all to honour that privilege by actively co-operating with members of the AC in a positive way. And co-operation should be based on expertise in biology in its broadest sense mainly, considering the original brief of the AC. Just being an onlooker, wanting to be able to report back to your members what happened here according to you is not enough. AC is not interested in all kinds of reports (and I have seen several) reporting on apparently completely different meetings that took place during the same event. After this meeting there only will be one report that really tells what happened here and that will be the consolidated minutes approved by the members of the AC.

This is not the place to try and realise just your own Agendas, or shower us with rhetorics. This is a week in which to co-operate and work on substance. And I assure you, there is plenty to do in this respect. I may remind you that CITES in essence is, and now I am loosely speaking, about endangered species, about international trade in them and about sustainability. All other aspects are secondary to CITES and should be taken care of elsewhere. I am not going to tell you now what CITES is not about. It might take too long.

I want to re-iterate that the tasks of the AC have been outlined in Resolution Conf. 11.1 and by decisions and other resolutions of CoP 11. I would like to stress that the field of expertise of members of the AC is limited to biological aspects of fauna (they have been elected on that basis), but that all kinds of matters not in the realm of biology have been referred to AC as well. This matter will be addressed during this meeting to some extent.

I have the impression that many persons think that the AC is the yearly meeting of the AC. Let it be clear that this is not the case. The AC is elected to work during the period in between CoPs and that is a continuing process. Members have their duties for the entire period between CoPs and will make decisions in between meetings of the AC as well. Before meetings they try to get feedback from their constituency (the regions), but not very successful up to now I must say. The meetings of the AC are just a moment of up-dating, of getting our starting points right, and when the time is there, also reach conclusions on substance and format of matters that should be reported to the Standing Committee or CoP.

To reach those conclusions we need assistance from outside the Committee from other experts. But make no mistake, decisions are taken by the committee and not by the entire meeting assembled here.

I hope that with this introduction I have more or less laid out the rules by which to play during the coming week. I wish members of the AC and observers alike a fruitful meeting.

Thank you.

Jamie Rappaport Clark, Director, US Fish and Wildlife Service
at the CITES Animals and & Plants Committee meeting

7 December, 2000: National Conservation Training Center, Shepherdstown, West Virginia

It is my pleasure to welcome the Animals and Plants Committees to their very first meeting in the United States. We at the Fish and Wildlife Service are delighted to host this gathering at our state-of-the-art National Conservation Training Center. The staff here has worked hard to prepare the center for your arrival. And the Service's International Affairs Program, particularly the Division of Scientific Authority, has worked equally as hard to make this event possible. Please join me in giving them a round of applause.

The National Conservation Training Center is a learning institution not only for those of us in the Fish and Wildlife Service, but also for the entire conservation community here in the U.S. Thanks to your presence, we are now proud to say that our training center also serves the international conservation community. At the Service, we consider this place our home. I hope that during your stay here, you will consider it yours as well.

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the entry into force of the CITES treaty. During this first quarter century the convention has become the cornerstone of sustainable trade in plants and wildlife throughout the world. There are now 152 party-nations to CITES. Working together, we have accomplished much. CITES is now the largest international conservation treaty there is, and I believe it is the most effective one, as well. But there remains much more for us to do.

In the coming days, we have a great opportunity to move forward on many issues vital to sustainable trade and to the conservation of biodiversity. Your review of the CITES listing criteria — the first review since the criteria were established in 1994 — is a pivotal part of this effort. The effectiveness of CITES depends first and foremost on making sure we have the right species listed for the right reasons and that those decisions are based on the best available science.

There are other challenges to face, too. We must also find innovative ways to conserve species that are subject to international trade and to better judge whether and where action must be taken to save a species from extinction. Through the use of sound biological principles, we can all work together more effectively to preserve the diversity of life on Earth.

At the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, we have a vested interest in your work. Our agency is the part of the U.S. government that strives to protect biodiversity. This is a job that is too big for any one agency — indeed, for any one nation — to take on by itself. After all, as we like to say, wildlife lives without borders. The fate of wide-ranging species lies not with any single nation but rather with many nations. We must work together and share the responsibility. That is what CITES is all about. For the past 25 years, we have met throughout the world to share vital information and to work for a common goal. In the days to come, the CITES family — from committee members, to government representatives, to representatives of non-governmental organizations — will work together once again, this time to make certain that the treaty meets the challenges of the new century. I wish you the best as you move forward and I look forward to seeing the results of your efforts here.

Rick Lemon, Director, National Conservation Training Center

Thank you Susan. Director Clark, Mr. Secretary General, distinguished delegates and guests, on behalf of the staff here at the National Conservation Training Center, I would like to welcome you to our Center.

The National Conservation Training Center represents our government's commitment to ensuring that the men and women who have dedicated their careers and their lives to the conservation of natural resources, have the skills they need to succeed. We have been open for just three years and in that time over 35,000 professionals have gathered here to learn from one another. They come from all agencies and all levels of government. They come from environmental groups such as the World Wildlife Fund and The Nature Conservancy. And they come from companies such as International Paper and Weyerhaeuser. They gather here for continuing education in the technical aspects of their profession. They gather here to learn management and leadership skills. And they gather here to discuss the policy and natural resource issues of the day and to learn the conflict resolution and consensus building skills they will need to address those challenges.

We are honored to welcome you to our Center as you continue your important work. We wish you a productive meeting and an enjoyable stay with us. If there is anything that we can do to assist you in any way while you are here, please do not hesitate to ask and we will do our best to meet your needs.

As you walk through our halls and sit down for your meals you will see many photographs on our walls. These are our conservation ancestors and our heroes. Just as you have your heroes in your country. There are famous faces like Aldo Leopold and Rachel Carson. But mostly they were common people who had an uncommon passion for conservation.

Their presence inspires us and we honor their memory. More importantly they remind us that what we do today will also be judged by those that follow us - our children and grandchildren. They will judge us on the diversity of life we leave to them.

It is our time now. We have much to do and our time is short.

Good luck with your important efforts. I wish you much success.

Report of the coral working group

1. The group met three times over the period of AC16. Attendance at the group included T. Soehartono, Regional Representative of Asia and representatives of Indonesia, Israel, United Kingdom (Chair) and the United States with observers from TRAFFIC, AKKII and OATA. Some members of the group were not present at AC16 and, accordingly, many of the deliberations have to be considered provisional. Group members not attending will be consulted for their views immediately after the close of Animals Committee meeting.
2. A representative of the United States of America presented an overview on the trade in hard corals and on work they have initiated on a practical guide to corals. Existing guides to coral identification, their benefits and limitations were assessed. The general difficulties of identifying corals to species level were noted. The guide produced by the United States of America focuses on providing a reliable guide to identification at generic level and is intended as a practical guide for enforcement officials, those involved in the trade and other stakeholders.
3. The group concluded that this guide should be more widely adopted and congratulated the United States of America on this excellent initiative. The group urged that this guide be disseminated more widely and noted that it lent itself to adaptation to local circumstances, for example by the insertion of vernacular names in local languages.
4. The United States of America distributed the guide to all members of the group (this will be mailed to absent members) for their comments on its application. It was also suggested that the guide could be developed to reflect decisions taken as to which coral taxa were to be identified to species or generic level only (see table).
5. The group also noted that producing such a guide was only part of the process. Training in its use and in basic coral identification would considerably enhance the effort of Parties to accurately identify corals in trade. The group again commended the United States of America on its initiative to use the guide as part of a coral workshop they are organizing in 2001. Such training might also form part of capacity building workshops for Scientific Authorities being organized by Secretariat.
6. The United States of America guide might also be supported by more comprehensive standard reference texts, by Internet based identification and distribution checklists. The United Kingdom agreed to distribute the checklist for corals that they have produced and which is currently being revised.
7. Identification guides are only one approach in relation to ensuring a common approach by Parties to coral identification and reporting. A standard nomenclature and interpretation of the species concept is equally important. The group noted the impending publication of a further edition of Veron's book on corals. However, this is not yet available for review or assessment by the group. Accordingly, a full list of coral species (Cairns 1999 and Cairns, Hoeksema & van der Land 1999) was adopted by the group as an interim standard for taxonomic nomenclature. A final decision on any possible standard reference to coral nomenclature is deferred.
8. The group examined the issue of which taxa of corals should be identified to species level and which might acceptably be identified to genus level only. The group noted the difficulties of identifying corals to species level, including their plastic growth forms, considerable variation within and between species from different areas and when growing in different environmental conditions and the need to identify their skeletons microscopically for a definitive identification. Even within a single colony, there can be marked variations in skeletal structure and form. In addition some species are only reliably separated with dead specimens (or in other cases with live specimens) and a number of species are capable of hybridization.
9. Possible approaches to this issue were discussed, including distinguishing between corals from the Caribbean and Indo-Pacific, but these were considered to be impractical.

10. Based on submissions made by group members prior to AC16, a series of recommendations on which genera should be identified to which taxonomic level is provided in the table below. This list is provisional and requires comment by the entire group and also revision to ensure its conformity with the interim standard on nomenclature. The group felt that in most cases it was far more preferable to have accurate identification to genus level than to have inaccurate information at the species level.
11. It was noted that identifying some taxa to genus level only had implications for the application of Article IV paragraph 2a and for monitoring patterns of trade. The group discussed the merits of identifying a few complex genera to sub-genus level. This approach might more accurately reflect the growth forms of corals seen in the wild (and in trade) and might provide more meaningful data in relation to the application of Article IV paragraph 3.
12. The group briefly considered the problems in relation to distinguishing between coral rock in trade that may, or may not, be fossilized. It was agreed that this subject needed further work and a better understanding of what constituted a fossil coral. The United Kingdom agreed to commission work on this and to provide a report to the group in due course.
13. Preliminary exploration of Article IV paragraph 3 as an alternative to IV paragraph 2a was undertaken. It was felt that the ecosystem approach, to which Article IV paragraph 3 might be directed, needed greater emphasis with respect to corals. However, this was not an alternative to Article IV paragraph 2a though it was recognized that if some corals were only identified to genus level then making a non-detriment finding to species level, as defined by the Convention, was not possible. Nevertheless, the group felt that Article IV paragraph 2a could be applied at the genus level and that greater flexibility in the application of Article IV paragraph 2a was desirable with respect to corals. Papers from the CBD on the ecosystem approach were distributed. The United Kingdom agreed, with an anticipated input from Australia, to provide a discussion paper on this subject for a future meeting.
14. Finally, the group began to address the issue of coral mariculture. A variety of production methods were known to members of the group. It was agreed that a first step would be to compile an inventory of mariculture operation, the methods used and species involved. The United States of America volunteered to undertake this task for the group. This information would be compiled from information known to group members and from any responses to a proposed Secretariat notification. Subsequently, further discussion of the application of source codes and on a definition of coral mariculture would be addressed.
15. The group recognized other complementary initiatives underway by, amongst others, the International Coral Reef Initiative, the Marine Aquarium Council and the Convention on Biological Diversity, and will attempt to explore opportunities for synergy and collaboration.
16. The Chairman thanked the participants for their constructive contributions and noted the work to be done between now and CoP12.

References

- Cairns, S.D. 1999. Species richness of recent Scleractinia. Atoll Research Bulletin No 459. National Museum of Natural History, Washington DC.
- Cairns, S.D., Hoeksema, B.W. & van der Land. 1999. Appendix: list of extant stony corals. Atoll Research Bulletin No 459. National Museum of Natural History, Washington DC.

Coral taxa identifiable to species or genus level - preliminary recommendations of the coral working group

Taxa	No. of spp in genus	Identifiable to species (S) or genus (G) level, supported by representatives						Comments	Working group recommendation
		ID	US	EC	FJ	Sec	OATA		
<i>Heliopora coerulea</i>	1		S	S					S
<i>Tubipora musica</i>	1		S	S	S				S
<i>Millepora</i>	17			G					G
<i>Stylaster</i>	75			G					G
<i>Distichopora</i>	23			G					G
<i>Acanthastrea</i>	16	G		G					G
<i>Acrhelia horrescens</i>	1	S							S
<i>Acropora</i>	127	G		G	S	G	G		G
<i>Agaricia</i>	7	G					G		G
<i>Alveopora</i>	15	G		G					G
<i>Anacrapora</i>	5	G		G					G
<i>Anomastrea irregularis</i>	1		S					Caribbean	S
<i>Astreopora</i>	11	G		G					G
<i>Asteosmilia connata</i>	1	S							S
<i>Australogyra zelli</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Australomussa rowleyensis</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Balanophyllia</i>	56			G					G
<i>Barabattoia</i>	3	G							G
<i>Blastomussa</i>	2	S		S			S*		G
<i>Boninastrea boninensis</i>	1	S	S						S
<i>Catalaphyllia jardinei</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Caulastrea</i>	4	S		G	S		S*		G
<i>Cladocera arbuscula</i>	1	S	S						S
<i>Coeloseris mayeri</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Colpophyllia</i>	3	S							G
<i>Coscinaraea</i>	12	G		G					G
<i>Ctenactis</i>	3	G							G
<i>Ctenella chagius</i>	1	S	S						S
<i>Cynarina lacrymalis</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Cyphastrea</i>	9	G		G					G
<i>Dendrogyra cylindricus</i>	1	S	S					Caribbean	S
<i>Dendrophyllia</i>	21						S		G
<i>Dichocoenia</i>	2	S						Caribbean	S
<i>Diploastrea heliopora</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Diploria</i>	3	S						Caribbean	S

<i>Duncanopsammia axifuga</i>	1	S	S						S
<i>Echinophyllia</i>	8	G		G					G
<i>Echinopora</i>	7	G		G					G
<i>Erythrastea flabellata</i>	1		S						S
<i>Euphyllia</i>	9	G		G (dead)	S		S		G
<i>Eusmilia fastigiata</i>	1	S	S					Caribbean	S
<i>Favia</i>	30	G		G	S		G		G
<i>Favites</i>	15	G		G	S		G		G
<i>Fungia</i>	25	G		G	S		G	Includes <i>Cycloseris</i> & <i>Diaseris</i>	G
<i>Galaxea</i>	4	S					S		G
<i>Gardineroseris planulata</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Goniastrea</i>	12	G		G			G		G
<i>Goniopora</i>	30	G		G	S		G		G
<i>Gyrosmitia interrupta</i>	1	S	S						S
<i>Halomitra</i>	2	S		S					G
<i>Heliofungia actiniformis</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Helioseris cucullata</i>	1							Caribbean	S
<i>Herpolitha limax</i>	1	S		S					S
<i>Heteropsammia</i>	2			S					?
<i>Horastrea indica</i>	1	S	S						S
<i>Hydnophora</i>	7	S / G		S	S		S*		G
<i>Indophyllia macassarensis</i>	1	S							S
<i>Isophyllastrea rigida</i>	1	S	S					Caribbean	S
<i>Isophyllia sinuosa</i>	1	S						Caribbean	S
<i>Leptastrea</i>	8	G		G					G
<i>Leptoria phrygia</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Leptoseris</i>	14	G		G			G		G
<i>Lithophyllon</i>	4	G							G
<i>Lobophyllia</i>	9	G		G	S	G	S*		G
<i>Madracis</i>	4	G		G					G
<i>Manicina areolata</i>	1	S	S						S
<i>Meandrina meandrites</i>	1	S						Caribbean	S
<i>Merulina</i>	3	S		S	S		G		G
<i>Montastrea</i>	13	G		G		G	G		G
<i>Montigyras kenti</i>	1	S		S					S
<i>Montipora</i>	56	G		G	S		G		G
<i>Moseleya latistellata</i>	1	S	S	S					S

<i>Mussa angulosa</i>	1	S	S						S
<i>Mussismillia</i>	3	G							G
<i>Mycedium elephantotus</i>	1	S		S	S		S*		S
<i>Mycetophyllia</i>	5	G							G
<i>Nemenzophyllia turbida</i>	1		S					Genus recognised by Cairns	S
<i>Oculina</i>	5	G							G
<i>Oulastrea crispata</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Oulophyllia</i>	3	G		G			S		G
<i>Oxypora</i>	3	G		G (live)					G
<i>Pachyseris</i>	2	S		S	S		S*		S
<i>Palauastrea ramosa</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Paraclavarina triangularis</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Parasimplastrea simplicitexta</i>	1	S	S						S
<i>Pavona</i>	22	G		G	S		S*		G
<i>Pectinia</i>	7	S / G			S		S*		G
<i>Physogyra</i>	3	S		S / G		G	G		G
<i>Physophyllia ayleni</i>	1	S	S						S
<i>Platygyra</i>	9	G		G	S		G		G
<i>Plerogyra</i>	4			G (dead)					G
<i>Plerogyra</i>	4			S (live)	S		G		G
<i>Plesiastrea versipora</i>	1	S		S					S
<i>Pocillopora</i>	10	G		S	S		G		G
<i>Podabacia</i>	2	S		S					?
<i>Polyphyllia</i>	3	S		S			S		S
<i>Porites</i>	80	G		G			G		G
<i>Psammocora</i>	15	G		G			G		G
<i>Pseudosiderastrea tayami</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Sandolitha</i>	2	S		S					G
<i>Scapophyllia cylindrica</i>	1	S	S	S					S
<i>Schizoculina fissipara</i>	1	S							S
<i>Scolymia</i>	4	S		G			S*		G
<i>Seriatopora</i>	5	G		S	S		S*		G
<i>Siderastrea</i>	5	G							G
<i>Simplastrea vesicularis</i>	1	S							S

<i>Solenastrea</i>	2	S						Caribbean	G
<i>Stephanocoenia intersepta</i>	1	S	S					Caribbean	S
<i>Stylarea punctata</i>	1	S	S						S
<i>Stylocoeniella</i>	3	S							G
<i>Stylophora</i>	5	G		G / S	S		S*		G
<i>Symphyllia</i>	6	G					G		G
<i>Trachyphyllia geoffreyi</i>	1	S	S	S				Includes <i>Wellsophyl lia radiata</i>	S
<i>Tubastrea</i>	6			G			S*		G
<i>Turbinaria</i>	15	G		G	S	G	S*		G
<i>Zoopilus echinatus</i>	1	S	S	S					S

Notes:

S/sheet derived from contributions below to which reference should be made for any additional comments provided by the author(s).

Indonesian contribution from Suharsono.

Secretariat contribution derived from Notification to the Parties 1999/44

European Commission contribution from P. Jouk and C. Massin with comments from M. Best and B. Hoeksema

Unites States of America contribution from A. Bruckner

Fiji contribution from M. Sovaki

OATA contribution from K Davenport – genera marked S* indicate identification to specific level is difficult and may depend on expertise available.

Report of the significant trade working group

Chairman: Dr M. Hoogmoed

Participants: Animals Committee Representative from North America, Animals Committee Representative from Africa, Canada, China, Islamic Republic of Iran, India, France, Russian Federation, Denmark, United States of America, TRAFFIC, Wildlife Conservation Society, Wildlife Trust of India (WTI), Petrossian Caviar, Tsar Nicoulai Caviar, University of Maryland, IUCN, WCMC, CITES Secretariat

The Chair opened the meeting on 13 December, indicating that he preferred to deal with the *Naja* spp. and *Moschus* spp. first, and deal with Acipenseriformes later. Participants agreed.

1) ***Naja naja***

The Consultant's report included the following recommended categories for *Naja naja* subspecies:

<i>N. n. sputatrix</i>	1 or 2
<i>N. n. atra</i>	2 or 1
<i>N. n. kaouthia</i>	2 or 1
<i>N. n. siamensis</i>	2
<i>N. n. sumatrana</i>	2
<i>N. n. oxiana</i>	2 or 3
<i>N. n. naja</i>	2
<i>N. n. philippinensis</i>	2 or 3
<i>N. n. samarensis</i>	2 or 3
<i>N. n. sagittifera</i>	3

The Chairman explained that the Consultant was unable to recommend a specific category for a number of taxa and therefore provided a choice of categories. The Chairman proceeded to explain the Review of Significant Trade process, and to read the definition of the three categories. Germany mentioned that large numbers of *Naja naja* in trade are not identified to the subspecies level, therefore four subspecies classified as 2 or 3 by the Consultant should, for precautionary reasons, be placed in category 2 rather than 3. WCMC indicated that certain taxa could be excluded from being in trade based on the reported country of origin. Since there is virtually no reported trade from India and Philippines, it is possible to exclude taxa that only occur in these countries. WTI (India) mentioned that the export of *Naja naja* is not allowed from India, but that there is believed to be substantial smuggling of skins from southern India to elsewhere in southeast Asia.

The Chairman stated that the main issue appears to be with *N. n. sputatrix*, because of the large numbers exported from Indonesia and Singapore. In addition, there is uncertainty about the role of this taxon in the ecosystem. The Animals Committee could possibly address questions to Indonesia on sustainability of harvest of this taxon. Indonesia confirmed that catch quotas are the same as export quotas for this species.

The Chairman suggested that all taxa be placed into category 2, except for *N. n. sagittifera*, which should be in category 3. This would allow Animals Committee to ask exporting countries to provide the basis for the non-detriment finding in a general way. After further discussion the suggestion of the Chairman to place all taxa into category 2, except for *N. n. sagittifera* which should be in category 3, was adopted.

The United States suggested that *N. n. sputatrix* be given an asterisk or other form of emphasis to indicate that most concern is focused on this taxon. The Chairman responded that *N.n. sputatrix* only occurs in Indonesia, so it will be possible to direct more questions to Indonesia to cover the greatest concerns.

It was agreed to place all taxa into category 2, except for *N. n. sagittifera* in category 3. Thus, the Working Group's recommendation for *Naja naja* is as follows:

<i>N. n. sputatrix</i>	2
<i>N. n. atra</i>	2
<i>N. n. kaouthia</i>	2
<i>N. n. siamensis</i>	2
<i>N. n. sumatrana</i>	2
<i>N. n. oxiana</i>	2
<i>N. n. naja</i>	2
<i>N. n. philippinensis</i>	2
<i>N. n. samarensis</i>	2
<i>N. n. sagittifera</i>	3

2) **Moschus** spp.

The Consultants report included the following recommended categories for *Moschus* spp.:

<i>M. fuscus</i>	1
<i>M. moschiferus</i>	1
<i>M. berezovskii</i>	2
<i>M. chrysogaster</i>	2

The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

The United States of America recommended that all taxa of *Moschus* be placed in category 1, re-iterating its comments made during the meeting, and noting that it is impossible to distinguish among the products in trade and that there is no scientific consensus on the proper classification for musk deer taxa. India noted that the Republic of Korea has imported large quantities of musk of questionable origin, and wondered what that country is doing to improve control measures. China mentioned the use of synthetic musk in patented medicines. Denmark stated that the European Union has an import suspension currently in affect for musk and musk products from China and the Russian Federation. Discussion followed on the basis of this suspension. TRAFFIC stated that the import prohibition came about largely as a result of an increase in export quotas for wild musk from the Russian Federation from 1998 to 1999, without a substantial explanation of the basis for the increase.

The Secretariat inquired if a category 1 listing for *Moschus* spp. from China would result in a recommendation that all trade be suspended, in view of the uncertainty about the wild or synthetic origin of musk in trade. The United States of America stated that its preference was to formulate strong primary and secondary recommendations in order to directly address the issues of concern related to Article IV implementation in the countries of concern (China and the Russian Federation), with the goal of making satisfactory progress in addressing these issues.

The Animals Committee Representative from Africa inquired if the different species had different population levels, warranting different categories. WCMC related the current population estimates for all species, noting that *M. fuscus* is considered to be the least abundant.

The Chairman asked the representative from China for her thoughts on the proper categorization of musk deer taxa. She said that the condition of wild population is not clear because the data from different sources differ substantially. She felt that it was better to put all taxa in category 2. The Secretariat noted that placement in category 2 would still allow the Animals Committee to ask the countries of concern to inform us about their Article IV implementation. If a satisfactory response is not submitted, the category can be changed. WCMC noted that the Consultant report indicates that exports of natural musk have been prohibited from China since 1997. The question arose whether synthetic musk needs to be reported on CITES documents. WCMC said that it does not. Thus, all musk in exported derivatives referenced on CITES documents must be considered to be natural musk.

China commented that the percentage of musk derivatives in traditional Chinese medicines is very small, and that should be considered in the analysis of trade data. China also mentioned that the main threat on *Moschus* spp. in China is habitat decrease. The United States of America noted that musk produced from musk deer farms does not come close to satisfying demand for musk.

In response to an inquiry, the Chairman re-iterated that countries would need to submit a satisfactory response within six weeks, or the category could be changed and more questions could be asked. India stated that all the *Moschus* spp. should be in category 1.

The Secretariat stressed that the important issue was to formulate targeted recommendations that were pertinent to the situation on the ground. It is important to avoid questions that allow general responses such as are contained on page 3 of the Consultants report in order to make progress. The United States of America stressed that the questions need to be focused and well thought out to address the issues of concern, and that a very high standard has to be set in terms of the quality and quantity of information accepted as satisfactory in any response to the questions. The Chairman re-iterated that we need to formulate the questions well and only accept high-quality answers. If not, the Animals Committee can decide on a higher category.

The Chair asked the participant from the Russian Federation if he wanted to comment. The participant declined, stating that no Russian specialists on this issue were at the meeting.

The Working Groups recommendation for *Moschus* spp. is as follows, with the caveat that the Committee will ask well-formulated questions to the countries concerned (China and the Russian Federation), and set a high standard for the quality and quantity of information that will be accepted as satisfactory. If a satisfactory response is not received by the 6-week deadline, then the category will be changed to 1, and primary and secondary recommendations will be formulated.

<i>M. fuscus</i>	2
<i>M. moschiferus</i>	1
<i>M. berezovskii</i>	2
<i>M. chrysogaster</i>	2

3) **Acipenseriformes**

The Consultant report included the following recommended categories for the Acipenseriformes reviewed:

<i>Acipenser baerii</i>	2
<i>A. fulvescens</i>	2
<i>A. gueldenstaedtii</i>	1

<i>A. nudiventris</i>	1
<i>A. ruthenus</i>	2
<i>A. schrencki</i>	1
<i>A. stellatus</i>	1
<i>Huso dauricus</i>	1
<i>H. huso</i>	1
<i>Polyodon spathula</i>	2

Considerable discussion took place on biological issues related to sturgeon, primarily in the Caspian Basin, including interventions by participants from the University of Maryland, Islamic Republic of Iran, Wildlife Conservation Society, Petrossian Caviar, Tsar Nicoulai Caviar, and the Russian Federation. The Chair indicated that the group should consider species in the following groupings:

A. gueldenstaedtii, *A. nudiventris*, *A. stellatus* and *H. huso*

A. schrencki and *H. dauricus*

A. baerii, *A. fulvescens*, *A. ruthenus* and *Polyodon spathula*

The Chair suggested that categorization should be on a country-by-country basis for each species, because management is at the country level and therefore compliance with Article IV is at the country level. This initiated a long discussion, during which participants expressed confusion over the Significant Trade process and about the significance of a category 1 versus category 2 designation.

TRAFFIC indicated that their remit was to categorize on a species-by-species basis, but that primary and secondary recommendations could be at the country level. The Regional Representative from North America supported TRAFFIC's perspective. The Russian Federation said that categorization should be by species, not by country.

The Islamic Republic of Iran made several interventions in support of categorization by country, repeatedly drawing a distinction between their management system and management by other Caspian basin countries. They stressed the difference between countries that managed their populations well, and countries that did not. They invited members of the group and/or TRAFFIC to visit Iran to see their management in person.

WCS said that, based on available information, some species belong in category 1, and that there can be different, country-by-country recommendations. The Secretariat stated that there is no scientific basis for dividing populations in a shared water body or drainage system, and that the working group may be criticized if it accepted arbitrary divisions of populations.

Tsar Nicoulai Caviar mentioned that illegal catches are up to four times greater than legal catches. The Chairman said that illegal catch and trade could be addressed through questions directed at countries of concern. The Secretariat said that it would be good to have more information from the Islamic Republic of Iran about its management system so that other countries of the region can be informed and perhaps use the same example.

At this point, discussion focused on the Review of Significant Trade process, and views expressed indicated that participants had a different understanding of that process. Tsar Nicoulai Caviar said that categorization into category 1 or 2 did not really matter, what is necessary is to get the best information from the countries, and decide what to do based on that. China stated that it would be best to keep the relevant species in category 2 and use cautious quotas. WCS stated that there is a time differential between categories 1 and 2 in that category 2 allowed for up to a 2-years status assessment, while category 1 allows more immediate action. The Secretariat stated that in addition to the 2-year period for status assessments, Parties have six weeks in which to respond to questions about the implementation

of Article IV for category 2 species. If the country provides information in response to questions that satisfies the AC, then they are out of the process. However, if the answer is not satisfactory, the species can be moved to category 1 with primary and secondary recommendations. A participant asked the practical question of who writes the recommendations and when are they written. The Chairman responded that the AC prepares the recommendations, and that should be done at this meeting.

The Secretariat suggested a compromise, namely to place all species in category 2 pending receipt of information from countries in response to the Secretariat's inquiry regarding the basis of their non-detriment determinations. The Secretariat recently sent out a letter requesting this information, and the deadline for response is in the next few weeks. Based on the quality of information in the response, the categories could be changed. This approach was eventually supported by the Islamic Republic of Iran, China, Tsar Nicoulai, and Petrossian.

The United States of America noted that this approach would mean that the group was rejecting six out of 10 (60%) of the consultants recommendations, and this sends the wrong message about the quality of the report. The Secretariat said that was an incorrect interpretation of the compromise and detracted from the spirit of the new approach. The Regional Representative for North America suggested an alternative compromise, namely to accept the recommendations made in the Consultants report. The two compromises were discussed. TRAFFIC emphasized that the Secretariat is unlikely to get better information than that contained in the Consultants report, because that report was based on communication with Management Authorities and Scientific Authorities in the affected countries, plus work since CoP10 on this issue, plus IUCN experiences with sturgeon. After further discussion of issues such as stock assessments, primary and secondary recommendations the Regional Representative for North America amended her proposed compromise by suggesting that the Working Group adopt the Consultant's recommended categories, with an additional statement to the effect that the Group recognizes that there are differences in the level of Article IV compliance among range countries for certain species. This approach was eventually supported by France, the Russian Federation, WCS, Canada, and Denmark.

After more repetitive discussion, the Chair decided that the group was not reaching consensus, and that the consultants recommendations would be the default report to the Animals Committee. These are as follows:

<i>Acipenser baerii</i>	2
<i>A. fulvescens</i>	2
<i>A. gueldenstaedtii</i>	1
<i>A. nudiiventris</i>	1
<i>A. ruthenus</i>	2
<i>A. schrencki</i>	1
<i>A. stellatus</i>	1
<i>Huso dauricus</i>	1
<i>H. huso</i>	1
<i>Polyodon spathula</i>	2

Report of the working group on transport of live animals

The following persons attended the group meeting:

Members: (see the list included in the attached "Terms of Reference" document.)

Guests: V. Bachraz, CITES Management Authority of Mauritius, R. Gnam, American Museum of Natural History as Rapporteur

1). Membership

The group welcomed a new Party member, China. The Chairman noted that for some Parties and some NGOs, there were new individuals representing these Parties and organizations. Introductions to the working group were made. Since the NGO member, EAZA has not participated in the group for the past two years and not responded to the Chairman's inquiries on their participation in the working group, the Chairman proposed that this organization no longer be considered a member of the working group and the group concurred.

2). Discussion of the Chairman's Report submitted to the AC16 meeting

The group agreed to the report. Additionally, it was noted that shipments in transit are a special problem and should be further addressed by the group. The group discussed the responses to the Notification to the Parties 1999/48 and the lack of responses to the questionnaire on transport mortality by major importing countries. PIJAC brought questionnaire responses to this meeting from the reptile importers in the United States of America and provided this information to the Chairman. The Working Group discussed the need to review the CITES Guidelines for Transport and its applicability.

3) Terms of Reference and Workplan

Following the request and instructions from the Chairman of the Animals Committee, the group developed draft Terms of Reference (see below). The Group used Conf. Resolution 10.21 as the basis for drafting its terms of reference. This document also addresses the further work and activities of this working group.

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE TRANSPORT WORKING GROUP

Objective

The Transport Working Group, on behalf of the Animals Committee, deals with matters related to the transport of live animals (Resolution Conf. 10.21).

Tasks

This working group of the Animals Committee is charged in Resolution Conf. 10.21 with the following mandatory tasks:

- to establish the format for the presentation of data on mortality and injury or damage to health in transport; and
- to conduct a systematic review of the scope and causes of the mortality and injury or damage to health of animals during the shipment and transport process and of means of reducing such mortality and injury or damage to health:
 - the review should include a process for making recommendations to the Parties designed to minimize mortality, on the basis of consultation with exporting, importing, re-exporting and transit countries, IATA and AATA, and additional information from scientists, veterinarians, zoological institutions, trade representatives, carriers, freight forwarders and other experts; and

- these recommendations should be focused on individual species and countries of export, import, re-export or transit where appropriate, particularly those that have significant high mortality rates in transport, and should be designed to provide solutions to identified problems.

Additional discretionary tasks the working group may also consider, in order to address various priorities identified by the working group (for which there is no formal mandate to the Transport Working Group from the Conference of the Parties), the following:

Following on from the second bullet point above:

- review Resolution Conf. 10.21 on the Transport of Live Animals and the activities of the Transport Working Group, and make recommendations with respect to the implementation and effectiveness of Resolution Conf. 10.21;
- regarding IATA, make recommendations for improvement of the Live Animals Regulations, liaise with the Live Animals Board and other appropriate organizations, promote full and effective use of the Live Animals Regulations by Parties, carriers, freight forwarders, exporters and importers, coordinate with IATA to identify ports with animal holding facilities and information available from such facilities, encourage IATA to expand its education programs on live animal transport, and explore ways to enhance implementation of the Live Animal Regulations by Parties, including adoption of appropriate recommendations and measures;
- offer assistance to the Secretariat and Regional Representatives of the Animals Committee to incorporate live animal transport into training workshops, regional and other appropriate meetings;
- conduct an evaluation of the CITES Guidelines for Transport and Preparation for Shipment of Live Wild Animals and *Plants* (Note from Chairman of the Animals Committee: An evaluation concerning plants cannot be taken on by a working group of AC) for transport by means other than air and make recommendations to the Secretariat as to their improvement and applicability;
- address Objective 1.1.6 of the Strategic Vision for CITES adopted by the Conference of Parties at its 11th meeting which directs the Animals Committee to assist Parties to “develop further regulations to prevent unnecessary loss during catching, storage and transportation of live animals;” and
- address paragraph e) in Resolution Conf. 11.9, on the Conservation and Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia and other Regions, which calls on “all Parties involved in the trade in freshwater turtles and tortoises to examine their national legislation to ensure treatment of these animals during transport is in accordance with the provisions of the Convention and, where relevant, with IATA regulations, and to take immediate action to correct any deficiencies in such legislation.”

Outline of time scale and means of working

Prior to the 17th Meeting of the Animals Committee:

- a) encourage Parties to provide data requested in Notification No. 1999/48, analyze data received and prepare a draft report for consideration at the 17th Animals Committee Meeting;
- b) continue liaison with IATA to pursue relevant tasks set forth above and, attend, when appropriate, the Live Animals Board meetings in March and October each year;

- c) submit recommendations in February 2001 to the IATA Live Animals Board for amendments to the Live Animals Regulations at its March 2001 meeting and continue review of Live Animals Regulations;
- d) participate in CITES training workshops as requested;
- e) conduct an evaluation of the CITES Guidelines for Transport; and
- f) report to the 17th Animals Committee.

(Note: Several of the above items will be finalized by CoP12)

Prior to CoP12:

- a) conclude data gathering and analysis on the scope and causes of mortality and injury and prepare a report for COP12;
- b) continue liaison with IATA;
- c) continue other tasks outlined above as time permits; and
- d) submit a report to CoP12 on activities undertaken by the Transport Working Group.

Membership of the Transport Working Group:

- Irina Sprotte, Management Authority of Germany, Chair of TWG (Sprottel@bfn.de)
- Katalin Rodics, Regional Representative of Europe, Management Authority of Hungary (rodics@mail2.ktm.hu)
- Tonny Soehartono, Regional Representative of Asia, Scientific Authority of Indonesia (tonynuki@indo.net.id)
- Thomas Althaus, Alternate Regional Representative of Europe, Management Authority of Switzerland (Thomas.Althaus@bvet.admin.ch)
- Edson Chidziya, Alternate Regional Representative of Africa, Management Authority of Zimbabwe (research@qta.gov.zw)
- Juma A. Kayera, Management Authority of Tanzania (wildlife-division@twiga.com)
- Andrea Gaski, Management Authority of the United States of America (Andrea_Gaski@fws.gov)
- Zhihua Zhou, Management Authority of China (zzh0@yahoo.com)
- Robert Atkinson, Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ratkins@rspca.org.uk)
- Donald Bruning, Wildlife Conservation Society (dbruning.wcs@mcimail.com)
- Marshall Meyers, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council (pjac@pipeline.com)
- Teresa Telecky, Humane Society of the United States (ttelecky@hsus.org)

Report of the working group on the review of the Appendices⁴

Terms of reference:

Recommendations to the Animals Committee regarding Resolution Conf. 9.1(Rev.), Annex 2, paragraph v), and Agenda item 8 of the 16th meeting of the Animals Committee:

The Working Group meeting was attended by:

Members of the Animals Committee:

Dr Sue Lieberman (Regional Representative for North America (Chairman of the working group))

Dr Rod Hay (Regional Representative for Oceania)

Tonny Soehartono (Regional Representative for Asia)

Parties:

Dr Harald Martens (Germany)

Sulaeman Kusumahnegara (Indonesia)

Samedi (Indonesia)

Dr Yoshio Kaneko (Japan)

Eduardo Iñigo (Mexico)

Javier Alvarez (United States of America)

Andy Bruckner (United States of America)

Non-governmental organizations:

Dr Rosemarie Gnam (American Museum of Natural History: Center for Biodiversity)

Dr Perran Ross (IUCN Crocodile Specialist Group)

Alberto Abreu (IUCN Marine Turtle Specialist Group)

Karen Steuer (International Fund for Animal Welfare)

Dr Bill Wall (Safari Club International)

Steve Nash (TRAFFIC)

Conal True (Universidad Autonoma de Baja California)

Bruce Taubert (Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies)

⁴Amended on 15 December 2000, based on input in Plenary session (and corrections provided from participants)

Terms of Reference:

The working group discussed the goals and objectives of the meeting. Tasks identified were to:

- a) discuss and evaluate the nine species reviews submitted for discussion at the 16th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC16), in Doc. AC.16.8.1. The group agreed to make recommendations to the Animals Committee on whether or not to ask the Depositary Government to submit a proposal to CoP12. The Group agreed to discuss those reviews and see if additional recommendations for action should be made to the Animals Committee, or the Secretariat;
- b) discuss the process for future reviews, including how to standardize reports and questionnaires and other requests for information; and
- c) discuss and recommend to the Animals Committee species for the next round of review, and criteria for selection of species.

Species reviews in Doc AC.16.8.1

The working group discussed each of the species reviews and made the following recommendations:

Macaca fascicularis (review conducted by Indonesia): There was discussion and consensus that the species does not qualify for inclusion in Appendix II pursuant to Article II.2.a., but does qualify due to Article II.2.b., under the inclusion of the entire Order: Primates. Although some participants felt the species should be removed from the Appendices, others recognized similarity of appearance problems. There was some discussion of the trade in meat, which has potential to increase.

Saiga tatarica (review conducted by the United States of America): The Working Group agreed that the species should be retained in Appendix II. The Working Group agreed that the species, which is traded for traditional medicine, is a good candidate for special labelling requirements. It was noted that the Kalmykia population of the Russian Federation is declining due to hunting, poaching, fires, and smuggling through Mongolia. It was agreed that the reproductive biology of the species should allow it to recover quickly, although it is very vulnerable to increased poaching at this time. It was agreed that the Animals Committee should support additional efforts for the conservation of the species including a workshop among the range States.

Falco peregrinus (review conducted by the United States of America): The working group discussed the information on this species extensively. It was agreed to request additional information on illegal trade, additional information from major range countries that did not provide information, and information from experts including the Raptor Research Foundation. Participants noted that the species is recovering world-wide, except possibly in parts of Europe, and is naturally of low density. Most participants agreed that the species qualifies globally for Appendix II, although some countries in Europe do not agree. It was noted that many respondents to the survey conducted by the United States of America were small countries with very small populations, and more information should be solicited from larger countries. Members concurred that even if the species is moved to Appendix II, range countries would of course still be able to strictly regulate exports. The group agreed to continue the review, particularly soliciting information from large range countries (particularly Mexico), with an updated report submitted to AC17. At that time, the Committee will decide whether to recommend transfer to Appendix II.

Macrocephalon maleo (review conducted by Indonesia): One participant noted that the species is not in trade, and illegal trade is not a threat. The group agreed however with the statement of the Secretariat at AC16 that if a species qualifies biologically for Appendix I, even if there is no trade threat it may be appropriate to retain it in Appendix I. (Note: *The rapporteurs recorded the Secretariat as stating that it may be appropriate to retain the species in Appendix I if it meets the biological criteria for Appendix I because the absence of the species from trade is likely to be due to its Appendix-I status*). The working group agreed that the species meets the biological criteria for Appendix I and should be retained there.

Dermodochelys coriacea (review conducted by the United States of America): The chairman of the Marine Turtle Specialist Group noted that the IUCN listing is being upgraded to Critically Endangered, and noted that the review provides very useful information for the specialist group. The Group agreed to retain the

species in Appendix I, but noted that the situation facing the species is bleak, particularly in the Pacific. It was agreed to recommend that the causes for that precipitous decline need urgent exploration.

Python anchietae (review conducted by Namibia): The working group agreed to recommend retention of the species in Appendix II. With reference to information presented about trade in this species in Germany and the United States of America, the Secretariat requested those countries to determine the origin of specimens on their domestic markets. The United States of America and Germany agreed to inform their enforcement officials of problems with smuggling of the species, and the need to be particularly vigilant in inspection of shipments of live pythons from Africa.

Sclerophagus formosus (review conducted by Indonesia): There was a very lengthy discussion relevant to this species. There was discussion that only one of the three colour morphs of the species may qualify for Appendix I, and 16 facilities are registered pursuant to Resolution Conf. 8.15(Rev.). Several participants noted that efforts for captive breeding of the species are successful, although there were concerns that those efforts have yet to provide benefit for the conservation of the species in the wild (recovery efforts etc.). There was discussion of various options for the species, including downlisting to Appendix II with a zero quota for export of wild specimens, a complete downlisting, a split-listing based on the colour varieties, split-listing by country, or retention in Appendix I. It was noted that a recent evaluation showed that the three colour morphs are not subspecies, but geographic variants, and that juveniles cannot be differentiated as to colour morph. Furthermore, there was no evaluation of the status of the species in countries other than Indonesia. After thorough discussion, there was consensus that populations had not recovered and wild populations still meet the biological criteria for Appendix I.

Probarbus jullieni (review conducted by the United Kingdom). The working group agreed that the species should be retained in Appendix I.

Order: Antipatharia (review conducted by the United States of America): There was discussion of this order, and consensus that all species in the order should be retained in Appendix II. Concern was raised that most exports in international trade are from Taiwan, province of China, which does not have any harvestable specimens. It was agreed to refer this issue to the Secretariat and Standing Committee for further evaluation. It was also agreed to recommend that the taxon be included in future in the Review of Significant Trade. Furthermore, concerns were raised about possible exports from Honduras to the Cayman Islands and it was agreed to refer this to the Regional Representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean. It was also agreed that the Cayman Islands is also a significant exporter, and the United Kingdom should be alerted to these concerns.

Process for future reviews

The Working Group recommends that:

- i) future reviews should be handled as a two-tiered process;
- ii) for all species subject to future reviews, the table used in Doc. AC.16.8 Annex 2 should be filled in;
- iii) it is highly advisable as well, for future reviews, to use the questionnaire utilized by the United States of America in its submissions, particularly for species for which sufficient information is available;
- iv) in some cases, the Animals Committee may request that the review be expanded, but in other cases the table mentioned above may suffice;
- v) in all cases, a Party or member of the Animals Committee should be responsible for submission of a species review, but a Party can always request that a non-governmental organization or individual scientist provide the review. The review must be submitted to the Animals Committee, however, through a Party or Regional Representative;
- vi) reviewers are urged to solicit input from range country Scientific and Management Authorities, but are also urged to conduct a literature review, and to seek information from relevant experts, scientists, and conservation organizations; and

- vii) it was agreed as well that if Resolution Conf. 9.24 is amended at CoP12, it is likely that the format for proposals (Annex 6) in that resolution may result in a format that will be useful for these reviews as well.

In terms of the goals and objectives of this process, the Working Group recommends to the Animals Committee that:

- i) the goal of this process is to determine if species that were listed before Resolution Conf. 9.24 was adopted are in the correct Appendix, or if it should be recommended to submit a proposal to transfer the species within or off the Appendices, and
- ii) when the reviewing Party or Regional Representative obtains other information of serious concern, that goes beyond the issue of whether or not the species is listed in the correct Appendix, it is recommended to submit that information to the Animals Committee, the Secretariat, or the Standing Committee, as appropriate, for their consideration.

Species for future reviews

The Working Group had a productive discussion, and agreed to the following criteria for all species to be subject to future reviews, pursuant to Resolution Conf. 9.1 (Rev.), Annex 2, paragraph v):

- i) 'high visibility' species should not be included (e.g. elephants, whales, sea turtles);
- ii) species that have already been evaluated for listing pursuant to Resolution Conf. 9.24 should not be included (at this time, that is, species for which proposals to amend the Appendices were considered at CoP10 and CoP11);
- iii) higher priority should be given to species that were listed early in the Convention's history;
- iv) species that have been subject to the significant trade review (Resolution Conf. 8.9(Rev.)) should not normally be considered. The Secretariat is requested to provide a list of those species to the next meeting of the Animals Committee;
- v) for Appendix II species, priority should be given to species with very little trade;
- vi) species reviewed should reflect geographic diversity, both Appendix I and II species, and diversities of life history strategies.

The Working Group recommends the following species for review between AC16 and AC17, noting that some of these species were agreed to at AC15, and several reviews are underway. Others were selected using the above criteria. Dates when the species was first listed in the Appendices are included.

Mammals

Cephalophus sylvicultor Appendix II; W. Africa; listed 29/7/83 (agreed to at AC15, but no range country or Regional Representative volunteered).

The Working Group will try to find a Party or Regional Representative to do the review, and will consult the relevant IUCN Specialist Group. This species was also retained since it is found in the cross-border bushmeat trade.

Birds

Caloenas nicobarica Appendix I; Asia; listed 28/6/79 (agreed to at AC15, but no range country or Regional Representative volunteered)

Anas aucklandica Appendix I; New Zealand; listed 1/7/75

Oceania offered at AC15 to review the species, and the Regional Representative has agreed to conduct the review.

Ara macao Appendix I; Mexico, Central America, S. America; first listed 28/10/76

Guatemala offered at AC15 to conduct the review; Mexico now offers to conduct the review for the species throughout its range, in coordination with Guatemala and/or the Regional Representatives for Central and South America and the Caribbean.

Agapornis fischeri Appendix II; E. Africa; first listed 6/6/81

Switzerland and the United Republic of Tanzania offered at AC15 to conduct the review, and it is hoped they will continue to be able to do so.

Reptiles

Dermatemys mawii Appendix II; Mexico and Central America; first listed 6/6/81

Guatemala offered at AC15 to conduct the review; Mexico now offers to conduct the review, in coordination with Guatemala and/or the Regional Representatives for Central and South America and the Caribbean.

Crocodylus lacertinus Appendix II; S. America; first listed 4/2/77

The Netherlands offered at AC15 to conduct the review, and it is hoped they will continue to be able to do so.

Cnemidophorus hyperythrus (new inclusion) Appendix II; N. America; first listed 1/7/75

The United States of America offers to conduct the review; the species meets all of the criteria stated above for inclusion in the review process

Amphibians

Dyscophus antongilli Appendix I; Madagascar; first listed 22/20/87

The Netherlands offered at AC15 to conduct the review, and it is hoped they will continue to be able to do so.

Bufo superciliaris Appendix I; W. Africa; first listed 1/7/75

The Netherlands offered at AC15 to conduct the review, and it is hoped they will continue to be able to do so.

Ambystoma mexicanum Appendix II; Mexico; first listed 1/7/7

Mexico offered at AC15 to conduct the review, the review is underway and will be submitted by Mexico to the next meeting of the Animals Committee

Hoplobatrachus tigerinus (syn: *Rana tigerina*) Appendix II; Indian subcontinent; first listed 1/1/85

The Netherlands offered at AC15 to conduct the review, and it is hoped they will continue to be able to do so.

Fishes

Cynoscion maconaldi Appendix I; Mexico; first listed 4/2/77

Mexico offered at this meeting to conduct the review.

Invertebrates

Ornithoptera alexandrae Appendix I; first listed 4/2/77

New inclusion: the Working Group recommends that a Party or Regional Representative be sought for this review

Given the considerable work involved in reviewing species with wide distributions, the working group recommends that 2 or more partners be involved in conducting such reviews. The working group agreed to also develop a list of Appendix I and II species to submit to the 17th meeting of the Animals Committee, that meet the above criteria, for potential selection by the Committee of additional species to review. The working group agreed to share the above criteria with IUCN/SSC Specialist Groups for their suggestions on species that could be reviewed. As this will be an ongoing process, Parties and Regional Representatives should also be encouraged to volunteer to perform additional reviews of these species.

Report of the working group on seahorses and other Syngnathids

1. The working group on Seahorses and other Syngnathids met twice, for a total of 3.5 hours. It included (a) the Regional Representative for Oceania, (b) representatives from observer Parties including China, Indonesia, Japan, and the United States of America, and (c) representatives from NGOs including American Zoo and Aquarium Association, International Fund for Animal Welfare, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, and the Universidad Autonoma de Baja California, Mexico. The group was chaired by Project Seahorse.
2. The working group recognized that Decision 11.153 directed the Secretariat to (1) convene a technical workshop, subject to funds, to consider current knowledge about seahorses and other syngnathids, their trade and conservation status; (2) request Parties to contribute existing information about their syngnathid species, fisheries, trade, and applicable domestic legislation; (3) encourage scientific research on this family; and (4) explore ways to involve interested parties in the management of syngnathids. Decision 11.97 then directed the Animals Committee to review outcomes from the proposed technical workshop in order to prepare a discussion document for CoP12.
3. The syngnathid working group decided to focus its efforts on (a) deciding what and how new scientific information should be obtained and (b) the nature of the proposed technical workshop. Examination of a tentative timeline (see Annex 6A) revealed that information gathering needed to begin at once, and that any technical workshop would need to be held in July to September 2001, if documents were to be ready in time to feed into the CITES preparatory process towards CoP12.
4. The group decided to draft a Notification with a request for information on biology, catch, boycott, trade and domestic legislation, that the Secretariat could send to the Parties. This document (see Annex 6B) emerged as a much simplified version of Doc. AC.16.19, with seven straightforward questions, with amplification encouraged if the Party should be willing and able. While encouraging Parties to contribute existing information, the working group decided that it should also and simultaneously identify other networks of experts (e.g. FAO, South Pacific Regional Environment Programme) and interested parties (fishers, traders, and consumers) who might have knowledge on syngnathids, and invite them to submit information. A web-based approach may help to encourage responses. Information received from Parties and other sources will need to be compiled and returned to the Parties for their comment, and/or presented to AC17 and AC18, in a series of feedback loops intended to increase the reliability and flow of information.
5. The Syngnathid working group next turned to the technical workshop, one destination for the newly-collected information. Participants felt that this meeting would offer an opportunity for Parties to gather and (perhaps to a lesser extent) offer biological and trade information, and should comprise invited presentations, contributed papers, small group discussions, and training modules (perhaps on taxonomy and tagging). It was agreed that we needed to consider modelling the syngnathid workshop on previous workshops related to CITES-listed species, for (i) freshwater turtles and tortoises and (ii) swiftlets. The expected outcome of the syngnathid meeting would be a technical report presenting current information on biology and trade of seahorses and other syngnathids.
6. The workshop would probably need to last three days during July, August or September 2001, preferably in Asia, where range states and traders are concentrated. The group's hope was that Regional Representatives on the Animals Committee would be able to help identify and invite interested Parties from their regions. The syngnathid workshop could perhaps be associated with AC17, if appropriate. Specialist biologists, trade researchers and other stakeholders / interested parties would also be invited.
7. Assuming that adequate funds could be raised, the working group felt that a researcher would be needed to (i) obtain, collate, and analyse data from a wide variety of sources, (ii) write briefing reports for AC17 and AC18, (iii) write reports on the technical workshop, and (iv) produce a draft discussion document. The budget for full funding, Option A, therefore, includes a researcher's

salary, his/her communication and travel expenses, occasional in-country researchers' stipends and their expenses, a workshop for 50-60 people (with full costs provided for many invited developing country nationals and experts), and the production, printing and dissemination of a report.

8. If funds proved inadequate for the full slate of activities, then the working group felt that it would be possible to defer the workshop. The researcher would, instead, gather information and write a technical report from contributed papers and additional surveys. The group felt that this Option B would allow for valuable analysis and dissemination even if a physical meeting were unaffordable. Indeed, some participants felt that the workshop might in any case be better postponed until Parties have collated and co-ordinated more research and information-gathering.⁵
9. A very crude budget calculation made it clear that the three confirmed or tentative offers of funding so far received – and very gratefully acknowledged - will not yet cover full costs for the implementation of these Decisions. It should, moreover, be noted that some of this money is only available to support participants' travel to a workshop.
10. The working group agreed that the relationship between CITES and Project Seahorse needed to be discussed formally with the Secretariat, in order to determine the relative roles and responsibilities of the two organizations with respect to information gathering and dissemination, and report preparation. Issues of intellectual property would also need to be resolved.
11. The syngnathid working group plans to stay in informal contact between meetings of the Animals Committee and welcomes involvement from other Parties and NGOs. We encourage the Secretariat to transmit our draft Notification to the Parties, asking for information about seahorses and other syngnathids. Our great thanks to any Parties and NGOs for any and all responses.

⁵ *Note from the Chairman of the Animals Committee: Points 7 and 8 go beyond the brief of the working group and contain many more elements than Dec. 11.153. Only the aspect of the organization of a workshop can be addressed, no other actions can be taken under the aegis of the Animals Committee. This should be kept in mind when adopting this report. Also note that budgets for Options A and B have not been included, keeping the brief of the working group in mind.*

Working group on seahorses and other Syngnathids
Terms of Reference

Objective

An informal Syngnathid Working Group, on behalf of the Animals Committee, will help implement Decision 11.97 and 11.153, on the conservation of seahorses and other members of the family Syngnathidae.

The 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties of CITES decided on 20 April 2000 in Nairobi to initiate action on behalf of seahorses and other syngnathids. Decision 11.153 directs the Secretariat to (1) convene a technical workshop, subject to funds, to consider current knowledge about these species and their trade and conservation status; (2) request Parties to contribute existing information about their syngnathid species, fisheries, trade, and applicable domestic legislation; (3) encourage scientific research on this family; (4) explore ways to involve stakeholders in the management of syngnathids. Decision 11.97 directs the Animals Committee to review outcomes from the technical workshop in order to prepare a discussion document for CoP12.

Tasks

This working group of the Animals Committee is charged in support of Decisions 11.97 and 11.153 with the following tasks:

- To advise the Secretariat on preparation of a Notification requesting the Parties to provide information on seahorses and other syngnathids, in accordance with Decision 11.153.
- To assist the Secretariat in identifying funds to support data gathering and analysis and to support a technical workshop of relevant experts on the conservation of seahorses and other syngnathids.
- To assist the Secretariat to plan for such a technical workshop, to consider and review biological and trade information that would assist in establishing conservation priorities and actions to secure the conservation status of seahorses and other syngnathids.
- To review outcomes of the technical workshop convened by the Secretariat and other available information, and advise on appropriate recommendations.
- To prepare a discussion paper for consideration at the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties on the biological and trade status of seahorses and other syngnathids to provide scientific guidance on actions needed to secure their conservation status.

Outline of timeline and means of working toward CoP 12

(with dates dependent on meeting schedules)

- Encourage Parties and other relevant bodies (e.g. intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations, industry organisations, and other interested parties) to provide financial support for the technical workshop (January 2001).
- Encourage Parties to offer to host the technical workshop (January 2001).
- Develop the format of the technical workshop (January 2001).
- Draft a Notification with a request for information to be sent to the Parties (January 2001).
- Assist as required and requested to distribute the Notification expeditiously (February 2001).

- Identify other networks of experts (e.g. Convention on Biodiversity Roster of Experts, FAO) and stakeholder groups (fishers, traders, and consumers) who might have knowledge on syngnathids, and invite them to submit information to the working group (February 2001).
- Encourage Parties to provide information requested in this Notification.
- Encourage experts and other interested parties to participate in the technical workshop.
- Undertake web-based and e-mail based information gathering from all sources, in support of formal hard copy requests.
- Communicate responses from the Notification to the Secretariat.
- Contact Parties that reply to the first Notification, and other respondents, with requests for more detailed information as indicated by their response.
- Undertake an interim analysis of available information for consideration at the technical workshop (July 2001).
- Report to the 17th meeting of the Animals Committee (August 2001).
- Guide and support the technical workshop (July, August or September 2001).
- Continue liaison with Parties and other individuals and bodies who might have knowledge on syngnathids.
- Collate information from the technical workshop (October to December 2001).
- Analyse information received and prepare a draft report for the 18th Animals Committee meeting (Feb 2002).
- Prepare a discussion paper on syngnathids for CoP 12 (drafted by March 2002).
- Report on discussion paper to 18th meeting of the Animals Committee (March 2002 ?)
- Finalise the discussion document on syngnathids and submit for CoP 12 (June 2002 ?).
- Submit a report to CoP 12 on activities undertaken by the working group (by June 2002 ?).
- Help formulate any future plans at CoP 12 (November 2002 ?)

Other sources of information

The working group brainstormed in order to produce a first tentative list of other possible sources of information on the biology, fisheries and trade of seahorses and other syngnathids, to be consulted. Many more individuals, institutions and organizations may also have information.

AZA (American Zoo and Aquarium Association)

CBD (Convention on Biodiversity) rosters of experts

FAO (UN Food and Agriculture Organisation)

MAC (Marine Aquarium Council)

OATA (Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association)

Pacific Island networks

PIJAC (Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council)

SEAFDEC (Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Centre)

South African sustainable fisheries workshop (April 2001)

SPREP (South Pacific Regional Environment Programme workshop on the ornamental aquarium trade
– February 2001)

TCM (traditional Chinese medicine) associations in Hong Kong

US bilateral accords with Southeast Asian nations

WCMC (World Conservation Monitoring Centre – UNEP)

Membership of the informal Syngnathid Working Group

Amanda Vincent, Project Seahorse, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

Rod Hay, Regional Representative of Oceania, Scientific Authority of New Zealand

Suharsono, Directorate General of Protection and Nature Conservation, Indonesia

Takashi Mori, Resources and Environment Research Division, Japan

Meng Xian Lin, Endangered Species Import and Export Management Office, Authority of the People's
Republic of China

Nancy Daves, National Marine Fisheries Service, United States of America

Kristin Vehrs, American Zoo and Aquarium Association, United States of America

Steven Olson, American Zoo and Aquarium Association, United States of America

Karen Steuer, International Fund for Animal Welfare, United States of America

Keith Davenport, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association, United Kingdom

Marshall Meyers, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, United States of America

Michael Maddox, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, United States of America

Conal David True, Universidad Autonoma de Baja California, Mexico

Draft Notification to request information from the Parties

We are writing to ask for information on seahorses and other members of the family Syngnathidae (pipefishes, pipehorses and seadragons), as mandated under Decision 11.153. The 11th Conference of the Parties directed the Secretariat to *request Parties to provide ... all relevant available information concerning the status, catches, bycatches and trade in seahorses and other syngnathids and on any domestic measures for their conservation and protection, and to review the adequacy of such measures.* We are currently asking for a subset of this information.

We recognise that formal understanding of seahorses and other syngnathids may be scarce. However, our knowledge of these fishes is so limited that all quantitative and qualitative input (including anecdote and traditional knowledge) will be valued. In your reply, please distinguish, where possible, between seahorses and other syngnathids. More detailed breakdown of information by species would be welcome but is not necessary.

For your reply, it would be helpful to contact other individuals, institutions and organisations in your country who may have knowledge of seahorses and other syngnathids. Suggestions include fisheries management authorities and regulatory bodies, customs authorities, fishers' organisations, traders in dried seafood, traders in traditional medicines, traders in aquarium and ornamental fishes, universities, museums, and public aquaria.

The information you provide will be considered at a technical workshop on seahorses and other syngnathids to be held, subject to funding, before the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties. It will also be incorporated into the Syngnathid Working Group report to the Animals Committee, and into a discussion document on seahorses and other syngnathids to be prepared by the Animals Committee for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

1. What government agencies and other institutions in your country might or do have information on the biology, catch, bycatch, and trade of seahorses and/or other syngnathids? Please provide contact details.
2. What research is currently being undertaken in your country on seahorses and/or other syngnathids? We are interested in all studies, including biological, fisheries, trade, and market studies. Please provide contact details for the researchers.
3. What species of seahorses and other syngnathids are found along your country's coastline, and where? Please indicate the distribution of each species on a map, if possible.
4. Are you aware of any population data on seahorses and/or other syngnathids, particularly those indicating known or inferred changes in number over time (yes/no)? Please provide such data if possible.
5. Does your country monitor landings or trade in seahorses and/or other syngnathids (yes/no)?
If so, please provide any fisheries or customs codes used, and any available data on catch, import, export, re-export, and domestic trade.
6. Are any seahorses and/or other syngnathids included in domestic lists of species of special conservation concern (yes/no)? If so, please give details of this conservation status and explain why seahorses and/or other syngnathids are included.
7. Are seahorses and/or other syngnathids protected in any way in your country (yes/no)? If so, please give details of the legislation and explain why seahorses and/or other syngnathids are protected.

Draft report of the working group on cross-border movement
in time-sensitive biological samples for conservation purposes

Chair: Tom Althaus

Rapporteur: Pam Hall

Participants: Regional Representative from Africa, Regional Representative from South and Central America and the Caribbean, Chile, China, El Salvador, France, Germany, Mauritius, Mexico, United States of America, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, European Association of Zoos and Wildlife Veterinarians, Fundación Loro Parque, International Wildlife Coalition, Care for the Wild

With reference to Decision 11.103, the working group decided that they would concentrate on procedures to expedite the transfer of time-sensitive research samples rather than concentrating on ways to exempt such samples from the provisions of CITES.

Identification of various types of samples transferred internationally

Type of Sample	Typical Size of Sample	Use of Sample
blood liquid	drops or 5 ml of whole blood in a tube with anticoagulant; may deteriorate in 36 hours	haematology and standard biochemical tests to diagnose disease; taxonomic research; biomedical research
blood dry (smear)	a drop of blood spread on a microscope slide, usually fixed with chemical fixative	blood counts and screening for disease parasites
blood clotted (serum)	5 ml of blood in tube with or without a blood clot	serology and detection of antibodies for evidence of disease; biomedical research
tissues fixed	5mm ³ pieces of tissues in a fixative	histology and electron microscopy to detect signs of disease; taxonomic research; biomedical research
tissues fresh (excluding ova, sperm and embryos)	5mm ³ pieces of tissues, sometimes frozen	microbiology and toxicology to detect organisms and poisons; taxonomic research; biomedical research
swabs	tiny pieces of tissue in a tube on a swab	growing bacteria, fungi, etc. to diagnose disease
hair, skin, feathers, scales	small, sometimes tiny pieces of skin surface in a tube with or without fixative	genetic and forensic tests and detection of parasites and pathogens and other tests
cell lines	no limitation of sample size	cell lines are artificial products cultured either as primary or continuous cell lines that are used extensively in testing the production of vaccines or other medical products and taxonomic research (e.g. chromosome study and extraction of DNA)

DNA	small amounts of blood, hair, feather follicle, muscle and organ tissue (e.g. liver, heart, etc.), purified DNA, etc.	sex determination; identification; forensic investigations; taxonomic research; biomedical research
secretions, (saliva, venom, milk), does not include excretions (urine and faeces)	1-5 ml in vials	phylogeny research, production of anti-venom, biomedical research

Categorization of purposes for which samples are transferred internationally in terms of their typically commercial, typically non-commercial (see Resolution Conf. 5.10), and strict conservation elements

Purpose of Sample Transfer	Commercial Purpose	Non-commercial Purpose	Strict Conservation Elements
veterinary diagnosis		X	X
forensic and law enforcement purposes		X	X
taxonomic purposes and identification		X	X
genetic and ecological research		X	X
genetic engineering	X		X
biomedical research	X	X	X
pharmaceutical purposes	X		
education and training	X	X	X

Categorization of the recipient institutions and other recipients of such samples

Categorization of Types of Recipient
veterinary laboratory
government agencies for non-commercial purposes (laboratories, law enforcement, forensics)
universities
museums and herbaria
private forensics laboratories
individual scientists and veterinarians
private research institutions, including conservation organizations
zoological parks, aquariums, botanical gardens
pharmaceutical and biomedical companies

Evaluation of the need for expedited transfer of samples in each of the categories

To qualify for expedited processing the purpose must:

- 1) be non-commercial, and
- 2) have conservation elements under any of the following situations
- 3) urgency in the interest of the individual animal
- 4) urgency in the interest of this species or other CITES listed species
- 5) urgency for judicial law enforcement purpose
- 6) urgency with regards to transferable diseases (within animals)

Proposals to expedite the process of trade in time-sensitive biological samples

Annexes 7A and 7B consist of proposals by Switzerland and the United States of America for expediting the process of trade in time-sensitive biological samples.

Future actions

Include instruction on the handling of time-sensitive biological samples by enforcement agents in training seminars.

Secretariat should send out a Notification asking Parties for their implementation regimes to streamline the process of issuing CITES documents. The United States of America offered to analyze the responses and prepare a document for the next meeting of the Animals Committee.

Put on the agenda an item at the next meeting of the Animals Committee meeting called 'Streamlining the process for issuing CITES documents' or if a technical committee is formed, then refer it to them.

The United States of America offered to draft a summary of implementation systems from parties and draft a resolution on streamlining the process of issuing CITES documents for Standing Committee for consideration at the next meeting of Animals Committee.

Methods to facilitate the import/export of time-sensitive samples (proposal by Switzerland)

Import

- Have a system of registration for (professional) importers (e.g. firms) and/or scientific institutions. Let them subscribe to specific conditions and pledge them to specific obligations and responsibilities (non-compliance will not only mean loss of the registration but also penalties). Issue annual (or biennial) import-permits that specify among others the sample(s) for which the permit is valid. Renew the permits automatically each year or every two years (or have a renewal process by which the importer has to sign his pledge again).
- Issue permits for specified samples to individual importers, which are valid for “multiple shipments” for a specified time period (6 months, one year). Accept each shipment of such series of “multiple shipments” with a certified copy of the original re-export certificate or export-permit, under the condition that the last shipment of the series will be accompanied by the original, which covers all shipments. (This implies that the exporting country agrees to issues such an export document and is willing to certify the respective copies).
- Issue import permits (Note: Switzerland issues import permits for Appendix II specimens) for single shipments for sensitive samples as quickly as possible. When possible make use of fax.
- Make the controls not at the border, but look for a solution that allows you to make the controls at the premises of the importer.

Export

- Issue the export-permits, re-export certificates within a maximum of 24 hours after having received the application.
- Have a system where applications can be submitted electronically.
- Also a solution (but not very advisable): Have pre-issued documents ready (for cases where the same sample is exported or re-exported repeatedly).
- For “multiple shipments”: Issue one document for several shipments for the same samples and certify copies for each shipment (see above).
- Make sure that the Scientific Authority approves your procedure and gives you a general consent to the specific procedure(s). The Scientific Authority may approve simpler procedures only for certain types of samples.

Recognition of scientists

Set – after approval of such action by the Scientific Authority - a process in action where the Management Authority may issue an official document of recognition for identified individual scientists and for the time period of a specified research project (including the type of samples they wish to collect and export abroad and the purpose of the research), which can be presented to the CITES Management Authority abroad and should help to facilitate and speed up the issuing process for CITES export documents. Instruct the scientist to contact a registered institution in the country abroad. Have the sample sent as scientific specimen under the article VII 6. exemption.

General

Inform the scientific community about CITES regulations and procedures. Inform control agents about the sensitivity of those samples and how to treat them

An example of general non-detriment findings for export and import of tissue samples of Appendix-I species (provided by the United States of America)

On an institution-by institution basis, the Scientific Authority of the United States of America makes a general non-detriment finding for the export and import of tissue samples collected from living or dead captive-held, wild, and museum specimens of Appendix-I species based on the following:

1. The researcher has the appropriate expertise to accomplish the research.
2. The purpose of the research will be for the conservation of the species.
3. Samples will be collected in full cooperation and collaboration of host-country biologists and government.
4. Samples from living free-ranging animals will be collected incidentally to other activities, and no animals will be captured for the sole purpose of collecting samples for import or export. No remuneration can be offered for the taking of animals from the wild to obtain samples for import or export.
5. All of the samples from living animals will be collected by veterinarians, field biologists, and technicians who have extensive training in such techniques.

The Scientific Authority finds that the export or import is non-detrimental because the researcher is qualified to conduct the proposed research, the purpose of the research is conservation of the species, the specimens will be legally taken, the proposed activity will not result in the death or removal of any CITES species from the wild or the loss or removal of additional CITES species from the wild; and there are no more reasonable alternative uses of these specimens that are more likely to contribute to the conservation of these species.

A general finding applied to samples from multiple CITES species (in some cases all Appendix-I species) that are collected in multiple countries (in some cases world-wide) for an unlimited quantity of samples. The permittee is responsible for meeting specific permit conditions and providing an annual report to ensure that the imports are non-detrimental.

Report of the working group on the registration and supervision of operations engaged in captive breeding of CITES species listed in Appendix I (cf. Resolution Conf. 11.14, Decision 11.101 and Decision 11.102)

Chair: Dr Marco Polo Micheletti Bain (Regional Representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean)

Rapporteur: Sixto J. Inchaustegui Bain (Regional Representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean)

Participants: Observers from the Bahamas, Bolivia, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Germany, India, Indonesia, Israel, the Republic of Korea, Mauritius, Mexico, Namibia, [Spain], the United States of America, Zimbabwe, IUCN, TRAFFIC Network, AFA, AZA, American Museum of Natural History, DGHT, Fundación Ara, A.C., Fundación Loro Parque, SSN and WCS.

During AC16 the registration and supervision of animal species bred in captivity, according to Resolution Conf. 11.14 and Decision 11.101, was an important agenda item. Also included Decision 11.102. These were first introduced into plenary by the president of AC, Dr Hoogmoed. After a brief introduction, which raised a high controversy in plenary, a previously planned working group was structured. The group met during afternoon hours, December 12, 2001.

Three main items constituted the essentials of the work to be carried by the working group:

- A. The development of a list of Appendix I species that are critically endangered in the wild and/or known to be difficult to breed or keep in captivity. Submissions were requested from Parties by 1 October 2000 by means of the Notification to the Parties No. 2000/044. (Few parties did submit it).
- B. Production of definitions of:
 - Critically endangered in the wild
 - Difficult to keep in captivity
 - Difficult to breed in captivity
- C. Relationships between ex-situ breeding establishments and in-situ conservation programs.

It had been agreed that the definitions were crucial for the achievements of points A and C. For this, the group started to work on the production their production.

During the 3 working hours, the following definitions were produced by general consensus:

A species is considered "critically endangered in the wild" if:

1. any range State proposed it as such, and it is protected under existing national legislation by that range State; or
2. a) there is a significant risk of increased levels of illegal trade, as proposed by any Party; and
2. b) the species is listed in IUCN categories "Critically Endangered", "Endangered" or "Vulnerable".

A species is considered "difficult to keep" if:

1. it is a species for which the adult mortality rate in captivity exceeds the estimated adult mortality rate for wild populations; or

2. it is a species for which captive husbandry specialists have identified highly specialized requirements for maintaining specimens in captivity.

A species is considered "difficult to breed" if:

1. captive breeding operations are not self-sustaining; or
 2. captive breeding operations do not routinely produce viable offspring; or
- its reproductive biology in captivity has not been determined.

The delegation of Spain clarified that points 1 and 2 immediately above should be based on "practical experiences", not on hypothetical analysis. This was considered and understood, and was not formally approved to be included in the definitions by the working group. Nonetheless, they wanted it to be written in this report, as the specific understanding of the Spanish delegation.

After the production of the above definitions, allowable time had been already spent. Points A and C referred at the beginning of this report were not covered.

The Chair and Rapporteur thanked all participants for the cooperative atmosphere that prevailed during the working hours.

Draft report of the working group on the universal labelling system for the identification of caviar

Chairman: **Dr R. Hay**, Regional Representative for Oceania

Participants: China, France, Islamic Republic Iran, Russian Federation, United States, International Caviar Importers Association, IWMC, Tsar Nicoulai Caviar, TRAFFIC

With reference to Resolution Conf. 11.13, a brief summary by TRAFFIC and further explanation by the Secretariat, the group decided that the scope of its work should include not only the labelling and permitting from exporting countries to countries of first import, but also re-export (including re-packing).

The group's primary work was the implementation of Resolution Conf 11.13. Most of the recommendations in this paper relate to the paragraphs a) – e) of the Resolution. The group agreed that the intent of the Resolution was to apply only to commercial shipments. However there is still some confusion because the document does not make this explicit. The group recommends that the Secretariat should make this information available when it sends out a Notification.

Paragraph a:

We recognized that the phrase "more than 249 grams" had caused confusion, but that because this is in the text of the Resolution, it could only be finally resolved by an amendment at the next CoP. The group agreed that any containers that contained 250 grams or more of caviar required labelling. Exporters present advised the group that a non re-useable label as described in the Resolution would not be a problem. The working group recommended that the precise type of label should be left up to the exporting country to determine.

Paragraph b:

The Secretariat recommendations on labels to be attached to secondary containers as noted in paragraph 28 of the document were agreed upon by the group. We noted the working precedent of the crocodile tagging system.

Paragraph c:

The unique number is the only way to reference a permit to a particular item to be exported. There was considerable debate as to whether the number needed to be unique. However it was agreed that a non-unique system could lead to greater opportunities for illegal trade. There were no problems with grade, species code, country code and year as outlined in the resolution. It was also agreed that processing plant (acknowledging that an exporting agent may be classified as a processing plant) was acceptable. For lot identification, it was agreed that the codes used in the different management systems by each country should be accommodated. The Notification should include examples of these systems. Exporting Parties should inform the Secretariat of the lot identification system they will use.

Paragraph d:

This paragraph was determined not to be a problem if the elements of paragraph c were agreed to.

Paragraph e:

It was agreed that the label information could be attached as an annex to the export permit in the manner used for crocodile tagging.

The issue raised by the Secretariat in paragraph 32 of Doc AC. 16.16, regarding the control of labels, was not discussed by the working group.

The working group agreed that application of a labelling system to re-exports should also be considered. The group recommends that an intersessional working group be established to produce a draft resolution on this matter and any relevant amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.13 for CoP12.

Report of the freshwater turtle and tortoise working group

The working group first considered the question of its terms of reference. The group recommends to the Animals Committee that it be constituted as an intersessional body, to work until CoP 12. The group agreed that its overall mandate was not restricted to any one geographic region, but decided to concentrate at this session on the Asian turtle trade. For the purposes of this meeting of the Animals Committee, the group considered that it had three main tasks: establishing a framework for a second Workshop on Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia as mandated by Resolution Conf.11.9; determining conservation priorities for action on the turtle trade issue in Asia under the terms of Decision 11.150; and addressing the issue of freshwater turtle and tortoise trade with respect to the Review of Significant Trade as required by Decision 11.93.

Technical Workshop on Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia

The group noted that although the workshop organized by TRAFFIC, WWF and WCS in Cambodia brought together southeast Asian countries involved in the supply side of the trade, there was less representation from the consumer side, including the pet trade. There was also an under-representation of government officials from all sides. The group felt that the technical workshop should therefore encourage importer, exporter and government participation. In particular, we felt that more officials involved in the administration of CITES should attend, including if possible representatives of both the Management and Scientific Authorities. The technical workshop could therefore address capacity building, enforcement, training, research and field information, public awareness, implementation, legislation, and other issues.

The group noted that the first workshop took over six months to organize, and therefore there was no chance that the technical workshop could be held within the deadline of 12 months after COP 11 set in Resolution Conf. 11.9. However, it was felt to be important to hold the workshop in time so that its recommendations could go forward as draft documents, where applicable, to CoP 12. It was therefore felt that a date of October or November 2001 would be appropriate for the Workshop. It was also noted that the cost of the Cambodia workshop was approximately US\$ 75 000, with a further US\$ 30 000 required for publication of the Proceedings. Cost estimates are tentative at this time and need to be further evaluated. Assuming a similar cost for the second workshop, the group noted that pledges of \$62,000 have already been received.

The group recommends that the Secretariat should issue a Notification to the Parties asking them to approach suppliers for potential contributions for additional funding as necessary, as noted in Decision 11.150.

The Working Group suggested that it would be desirable to hold the Workshop in a relevant country, but also agreed to explore alternative venues should this not be possible. TRAFFIC and the Chelonian Research Foundation agreed to assist the Secretariat in convening the Workshop. The Group felt that the list of invitees should be drawn up by all group members, with outside consultation where necessary.

Conservation Priorities

The group considered a number of possibilities for further action in addition to the workshop. These included an informal review of currently unlisted Asian turtle species to determine if any of these would benefit from a future listing on the CITES Appendices. In particular, there may be further data available since the workshop in Cambodia that may affect the status of a number of species. The Chelonian Research Foundation undertook to produce a list of endangered or threatened turtle species for which there is evidence of trade in order to assist this informal review.

The group strongly supported the need for the development and circulation of appropriate identification materials for use by Customs authorities. We noted the existing manual published by the CITES Authority of Canada, which has been translated into Chinese by TRAFFIC. In particular, the Canadian guide needs to be expanded to include other relevant species. TRAFFIC will undertake a review of available identification materials and assess feasibility of use by enforcement authorities.

The group also identified the need for capacity building and training, noting that identification materials by themselves would be insufficient if officials were not trained in their use. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service has a regular process for soliciting funds for capacity-building and training in other countries, and will specifically endeavour to locate funding in this area. The Group noted the Secretariat's initiative with respect to capacity building sessions in mega-biodiversity countries, and recommended that specific training for dealing with trade in turtle species could be incorporated into this process. Conservation International noted that such techniques have been used to educate park officers in an ongoing project in Cuc Phong National Park, Vietnam, funded by FFI and AZA.

Significant Trade Review

The working group examined currently listed Asian turtle species on Appendix II to determine if any of these were appropriate candidates for the Review of Significant Trade process. The group concluded that the following four species should be considered as candidates for Phase V of the review: *Cuora amboinensis*, *Cuora flavomarginata*, *Cuora galbinifrons* and *Lissemys punctata*. The Group expressed serious concern about the status of other Appendix II species and further recommended that the Animals Committee undertake a review of other Asian turtle species on Appendix II.

Additionally, the working group agrees with the suggestion of the Regional Representative for Europe to the Animals Committee that the tortoise *Pyxis planicauda* be added to the species to be reviewed in Phase V. The working group strongly recommends that this consideration and process be expedited.

Participants at the Meeting of the Working Group

Tonny Soehartono (Representative of Animals Committee for Asia), Chair.

Dr Kim Howell (Representative of Animals Committee for Africa).

Party observers from China, Germany, Indonesia, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America.

NGO observers from Chelonian Research Foundation, Conservation International, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Herpetologie und Terrarienkunde, International Wildlife Coalition, Pro Wildlife, TRAFFIC, Wildlife Conservation Society.

*Members of the Committee/Miembros del Comité/Membres du Comité**AFRICA/AFRIQUE*

GRIFFIN Michael
Ministry of Environment and Tourism
Private Bag 13306
WINDHOEK
Namibia/Namibie

T: (26461) 237553
F: (26461) 237552
E: ssaurus@iafrica.com.na

HOWELL Kim
University of Dar es Salaam
Department of Zoology and Marine Biology
P.O. Box 35064
DAR-ES-SALAAM
United Republic of Tanzania/República Unida de
Tanzanía/République-Unie de Tanzanie

T: (25522) 2410462
F: (25522) 2410393
E: khowell@twiga.com

ASIA/ASIE

SOEHARTONO Tonny R.
Ministry of Forestry
Directorate General of Protection and
Nature Conservation
CITES Scientific Authority
Dep. Kehutanan Lt. 8
Jalan Gatot Subroto
JAKARTA 10270
Indonesia/Indonésie

T: (6221) 5720227; 5734818
F: (6221) 5720227; 5734818
E: tonymuki@indo.net.id

TUNHIKORN Schwann
Director, Bureau of Natural Resources Conservation
Wildlife Conservation Division
Royal Forest Department
Paholyothin Road, Jatujak
BANGKOK 10900
Thailand/Tailandia/Thailande

T: (662) 5795964
F: (662) 5797048

*CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA & CARIBBEAN/AMÉRICA CENTRAL, DEL SUR
Y EL CARIBE/AMÉRIQUE CENTRALE ET DU SUD ET CARAÏBES*

INCHÁUSTEGUI Sixto
Autoridad Científica CITES
Grupo Jaraguá
El Vergel 33, El Vergel
SANTO DOMINGO
Dominican Republic/República
Dominicana/République dominicaine

T: (1809) 4721036
F: (1809) 5313508
E: emys@tricom.net

MICHELETTI BAIN Marco Polo
Vicepresidente
Banco Nacional de Desarrollo Agrícola
COMAYAGÜELA
Honduras

T: (504) 2378505
F: (504) 2378506
E: vipres@david.intertel.hn

EUROPE/EUROPA/EUROPE

HOOGMOED Marinus
Chairman of the CITES Animals Committee
National Museum of Natural History
Postbus 9517
NL-2300 RA LEIDEN
Netherlands/Paises Bajos/Pays-Bas

T: (3171) 5687618
F: (3171) 5687666
E: hoogmoed@nrm.nl

RODICS Katalin
Nature Conservation Department
Környezetvédelmi Minisztérium
(Ministry for Environment)
Költő u. 21
H-1121 BUDAPEST XII
Hungary/Hungria/Hongrie

T: (361) 3952605; 3957458; 3956857
F: (361) 2008880; 3957458
E: rodics@mail2.ktm.hu

NORTH AMERICA/AMÉRICA DEL NORTE/AMÉRIQUE DU NORD

LIEBERMAN Susan
Office of the Scientific Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Vice-Chairman of the CITES Animals Committee
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Room 750
ARLINGTON, VA 22203
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1703) 3581708
F: (1703) 3582276
E: susan_lieberman@fws.gov

OCEANIA/OCEANÍA/OCÉANIE

HAY Rod
Scientific Authorities Committee
Department of Conservation
Private Bag 4715
CHRISTCHURCH
New Zealand/Nueva Zelandia/Nouvelle-Zélande

T: (643) 3799758
F: (643) 3651388
E: rhay@doc.govt.nz

CITES Secretariat/Secretaría CITES/Secrétariat CITES

International Environment House
15, chemin des Anémones
CH-1219 CHÂTELAINE, GENEVA
Switzerland/Suiza/Suisse

T: (+ 41-22) 9178139/40
F: (+ 41-22) 7973417

WIJNSTEKERS Willem
Secretary General

T: (+ 41-22) 9178149
E: willem.wijnstekers@unep.ch

LINDEQUE Malan
Chief, Scientific Coordination Unit
Regional Coordinator for Africa

T: (+ 41-22) 9178123
E: malan.lindeque@unep.ch

VAN VLIET Ger
Senior Scientific Officer (Plants)
Regional Coordinator for Europe
Scientific Coordination Unit

T: (+ 41-22) 9178120
E: ger.van-vliet@unep.ch

HENRY Paula
Unit Secretary
Scientific Coordination Unit

T: (+ 41-22) 9178121
E: paula.henry@unep.ch

ZENTILLI Victoria
Research Assistant
Scientific Coordination Unit

T: (+ 41-22) 9178122
E: victoria.zentilli@unep.ch

Rapporteurs/Relatores

LITTLEWOOD Alison
United Kingdom CITES Scientific Authority
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House
Peterborough
CAMBRIDGE PE1 1JY
United Kindom/Reino Unido/Royaume-Uni

T: (441733) 866814
F: (441733) 555948
E: Alison.Littlewood@jncc.gov.uk

HAMILTON Charlie
United States Management Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 N. Fairfax Drive, Room 700
ARLINGTON, VA 22203
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1703) 3582104 ext. 5437
F: (1703) 3582281
E: charles_hamilton@fws.gov

ST-JOHN Anne
Division of management Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 N. Fairfax Drive, Room 700
ARLINGTON, VA 22203
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1703) 3582104 ext. 4008
F: (1703) 3582298
E: anne_stjohn@fws.gov

Earth Negotiations Bulletin

International Institute for Sustainable Development
212 East 47th St.
NEW YORK, NY, 10017
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1212) 6440204
F: (1212) 6440206

DIMITROV Rado
Bulgaria/Bulgarie

E: rado@iisd.org

FERNAU David
South Africa/Sudáfrica/Afrique du Sud

E: david@iisd.org

LACLOCHE Violette
France/Francia

E: violette@iisd.org

MEGATELI Nabiha
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

E: nmegateli@iisd.org

ORMSBY Alison
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

E: alison@iisd.org

SCHULMAN Mark
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

E: markschulman@iisd.org

Party/Parte/Partie

BAHAMAS

ISAACS Maurice
Veterinary Officer
Dept. of Agriculture
P.O. Box N3704
NASSAU

T: (1242) 2351173
F: (1242) 3285874
E: maurice@batelnet.bs

PHILLIPS Eleanor
Fisheries Officer
Dept. of Fisheries
P.O. Box N3028
NASSAU

T: (1242) 3931777
F: (1242) 3930238
E: eifisheries@batelnet.bs

BARBADOS/BARBADE

PARKER Christopher
Fisheries Division
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Princess Alice Highway
BRIDGETOWN

T: (246) 4263745
F: (246) 4369068
E: fishbarbados@caribsurf.com

BOTSWANA

THEOPHILUS Isaac Kaumana
Department of Wildlife and National Parks
P.O. Box 131
GABORONE
Botswana

T: (267) 371405
F: (267) 312354
E: itheophilus@gov.bw

CANADA/CANADÁ

CHAMBERLAND Paul
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
OTTAWA
Ontario, K1A 0H3

T: (1819) 9531156
F: (1819) 9536283
E: paul.chamberland@ec.gc.ca

CHILE/CHILI

IRIARTE Agustin
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero
Avda. Bulnes 140
SANTIAGO

T: (562) 6721394
F: (562) 6992778
E: deproren@sag.minagri.gob.cl

MERLET BADILLA Horacio
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero
Avenida Bulnes 140
SANTIAGO

T: (562) 6731256
F: (562) 6992778
E: hmerlet@sag.minagri.gob.cl

CHINA/CHINE

FAN Zhiyong
CITES Affairs Division
Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
Import and Export Administrative Office of China
Hepingli East Street 18
BEIJING

T: (8610) 84239014
F: (8610) 84256388
E: zhiyongfan@21cn.com

JIANG Zhigang
The Endangered Species Scientific
Commission of the People's Republic of China
19 Zhongguancun Lu
Haidian District
BEIJING 100080

T: (8610) 62639067
F: (8610) 6256480
E: jiangzg@panda.ioz.ac.cn

MENG Xianlin
The Endangered Species Import and Export
Management Office
State Forestry Administration
Hepingli East Street 18
BEIJING 100714

T: (8610) 84239003
F: (8610) 84239003
E: xlmeng@public.fhnet.cn.net

SZE Wai-Chung
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Dept.
6/F Cheung Sha Wan Government Offices
303 Cheung Sha Wan Road
HONG KONG SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE REGION

T: (852) 21506982
F: (852) 23763749
E: phoebe_wc_sze@afcd.gov.hk

ZHOU Zhihua
The Endangered Species Import and Export
Management Office of the People's Republic of China
Hepingli East Street 18
BEIJING

T: (8610) 84239001
F: (8610) 64214180
E: zzh0@yahoo.com

COSTA RICA

MATAMOROS HIDALGO Yolanda
Coordinadora
Consejo de Representantes de Autoridades
Cientificas - CITES
Parque Zoológico Simón Bolívar
Apartado 11594-1000
SAN JOSÉ

T: (506) 2560012
F: (506) 2231817
E: fundazoo@sol.racsa.co.cr

CZECH REPUBLIC/REPÚBLICA CHECA/RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE

SVEC Petr
Ministry of the Environment
Vrsovicka 65
100 10 PRAGUE

T: (4202) 67122450; 67310309
F: (4202) 67311096; 67310208
E: petr_svec@env.cz

DENMARK/DINAMARCA/DANEMARK

MUNK Maj
Danish Forest and Nature Agency
Haraldsgade 53
DK-2100 COPENHAGEN

T: (4539) 472428
F: (4539) 472312
E: mfm@sns.dk

EL SALVADOR

ARÉVALO CASTILLO Luís Rafael
Dirección General de Sanidad Vegetal y Animal
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería
Final 1a. Avenida Norte y Avenida Manuel Gallardo
NUEVA SAN SALVADOR

T: (503) 2885220
F: (503) 2289029
E: reg.fis@salnet.net

FRANCE/FRANCIA

JACQUET-POUILLAUDE Stéphanie
Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire
et de l'environnement
Direction de la nature et des paysages
20, avenue de Ségur
75302 PARIS 07 S.P.

T: (331) 42191916
F: (331) 42191981
E: stephanie.jacquet@environnement.gouv.fr

RIGOULET Jacques
Muséum national d'histoire naturelle
57, rue Cuvier
F-75005 PARIS

T: (331) 40794831
F: (331) 40793816
E: rigoulet@mnhn.fr

GERMANY/ALEMANIA/ALLEMAGNE

MARTENS Harald
Federal Agency for Nature Conservation
Konstantinstrasse 110
53179 BONN

T: (49228) 8491103
F: (49228) 8491119
E: martensh@bfn.de

SPROTTE Irina
Bundesamt für Naturschutz
Konstantinstrasse 110
53179 BONN

T: (49228) 8491441
F: (49228) 8491470
E: sprottei@bfn.de

HONDURAS

ARIAS BRITO Marco Vincio
AFE-COHDEFOR
Colonia Carrizal Comayaguela
TEGUCIGALPA

T: (504) 2238810
F: (504) 2233348
E: marcovab@itsnetworks.net

PALMA Jorge
AFE-COHDEFOR
Colonia Carrizal Comayaguela
TEGUCIGALPA

T: (504) 2238810
F: (504) 2233348
E: procajon@hondutel.hn

PINEDA OCCHIENA M. Gabriela
Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura y Ganadería
Boulevard Miraflores
Avenida La FAO
TEGUCIGALPA

T: (504) 23285924
F: (504) 2315914
E: mpao2@hotmail.com

INDIA/INDE

SEN P.K.
Director Project Tiger
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Government of India
Paryavaran Bhawan, C.G.O. Complex
Lodi Road
NEW DELHI - 110003

T: (9111) 4362785
F: (9111) 4363918

INDONESIA/INDONÉSIE

KUSUMAHNEGARA Sulaeman
Directorate General of Protection and Nature
Conservation
CITES Management Authority
Manggala Wanabakti Bld. Block 7, 7th Floor
JL.Gatot Subroto
Senayan
JAKARTA

T: (6221) 5720227
F: (6221) 5720227
E: cites@dephut.cbn.net.id

SAMEDI

Directorate General of Protection and Nature
Conservation
CITES Management Authority
Manggala Wanabakti Bld. Block 7, 7th Floor
JL.Gatot Subroto
Senayan
JAKARTA

T: (6221) 5720227
F: (6221) 5720227
E: sam.phpa@dephut.cbn.net.id

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)/IRÁN (REPÚBLICA ISLÁMICA DEL)/IRAN (RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D')

HOSSEINI Mohammad Reza
Managing Director
Shilat Trading Company
CITES Management Authority for Sturgeon
No. 181 - Qaem Maqam Farahani Ave Motahari Rd.
P.O. Box 15875-4538
TEHRAN 15868

T: (9821) 8742006/8
F: (9821) 8754171
E: stcshilat@yahoo.com

POURKAZEMI Mohammad
International Sturgeon Research Institute
CITES Scientific Authority for Sturgeon
P.O. Box 41635-3464
RASHT

T: (98131) 2239033, 2235812
F: (98131) 2235971
E: pkazemi_m@yahoo.com

ISRAEL/ISRAËL

NEMTZOV Simon
Israel Nature and Parks Authority
3 Am Ve'Olamo Street
JERUSALEM 95463

T: (9723) 7762227
F: (9722) 6529232
E: simon.nemtzov@nature-parks.org.il

JAPAN/JAPÓN/JAPON

ISHII Nobuo
Japan Wildlife Research Center
Shitaya 3-10-10 Taito-ku
TOKYO 110-8676

T: (813) 58240966
F: (813) 58240968
E: nishii@jwrc.go.jp

KANEKO Yoshio
Office of Ecosystem
Resources and Environment Research Division
Resources Development Department
Fisheries Agency
1-2-1 Kasuazaseki, Chiyada-ku
TOKYO

T: (813) 35020736
F: (813) 1682

MORI Takashi
Office of Ecosystem
Resources and Environment Research Division
Resources Development Department
Fisheries Agency
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
TOKYO

T: (813) 35020736
F: (813) 35021687
E: takashi_mori1@nm.maff.go.jp

MAURITIUS/MAURICIO/MAURICE

BACHRAZ Vishnuduth
National Parks and Conservation Services
Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources
REDUIT

T: (230) 4644016; 4642993
F: (230) 4651184
E: npcsagr@intnet.mu

MEXICO/MÉXICO/MEXIQUE

ABREU GROBOIS F. Alberto
Chair, IUCN/SSC Marine Turtle Specialist Group
Unidad Mazatlán
Instituto de Ciencias del Mar y Limnología
Calz. Joel Montes Camarena s/n
MAZATLÁN, SINALOA

T: (5269) 852848
F: (5269) 826133
E: abreu@ola.icmyl.unam.mx

BENITEZ DÍAZ Hesiquio
Dirección de Servicios Externos
Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento
y Uso de la Biodiversidad (CONABIO)
Liga Periférico-Insurgentes Sur 4903
Col. Parques del Pedregal
Tlalpan
MEXICO, D.F.

T: (525) 5289125
F: (525) 5289185
E: hbenitez@xolo.conabio.gob.mx

MEDELLÍN Rodrigo A.
(*Alternate members/Miembros suplentes/Membres
suppléants*)

Instituto de Ecología
Departamento de Ecología Funcional y Aplicada
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Apartado postal 70-275
MEXICO, DF

T: (525) 6229042
F: (525) 6228995
E: medellin@miranda.ecologia.unam.mx

NAMIBIA/NAMIBIE

LINDEQUE Pauline
Ministry of Environment and Tourism
Private Bag 13306
WINDHOEK

T: (26461) 263131
F: (26461) 259101
E: permdsss@iafrica.com.na

NETHERLANDS/PAÍSES BAJOS/PAYS-BAS

SCHÜRMANN Chris
National Museum of Natural History
CITES Scientific Authority
Postbus 9517
NL-2300 RA LEIDEN

T: (3171) 5687591
F: (3171) 5687666
E: c.l.schurmann@n.agro.nl

NORWAY/NORUEGA/NORVÈGE

JOHANSEN Halvard P.
Royal Norwegian Embassy
2720 34th Street, 1.W
WASHINGTON, DC, 20008-2714

T: (1202) 9448981
F: (1202) 3370870
E: halvard.johansen@mfa.no

REPUBLIC OF KOREA/REPÚBLICA DE COREA/RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE

KIM Hye-Sook
Ecosystem Conservation Division
Nature Conservation Bureau
Ministry of Environment
1, Joongang-dong
Gwachon-shi, Kyunggi-do
GWACHON

T: (822) 5004263
F: (822) 5049207

KIM Jeong-yeon
Pharmaceutical Safety Division
Korea Food and Drug Administration
#5 Nokbun-dong
Eunpyung-ku
SEOUL

T: (822) 3801824
F: (822) 3596965
E: hillarki21@korea.com

LEE Sang-Koon
Pharmaceutical Safety Division
Korea Food and Drug Administration
#5 Nokbun-dong
Eunpyung-ku
SEOUL

T: (822) 3801824
F: (822) 3596965
E: lee2409@kfda.go.kr

NOH Hee-Kyong
Global Environment Office
Ministry of Environment
1, Joongang-dong
Gwachon-shi, Kyunggi-do
GWACHON

T: (822) 5004255
F: (822) 5049206
E: louie@me.go.kr

WON Chang-man
Office of the Scientific Authority
Wildlife Division
National Institute of Environmental Research
Environmental Research Complex
Kyungseo-dong
Seo-ku
INCHON

T: (8232) 5607088
F: (8232) 5682037
E: wonkorea@chollian.net

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION/FEDERACIÓN DE
RUSIA/FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE**

KRETOVA Tatyana S.
State Committee of the Russian Federation
for Fisheries
Department of Production and Marketing
Development
12, Rozhdectvenskii Blvd
103031 MOSCOW

T: (7095) 9283344
F: (7095) 9288349

NIKONOROV Sergei I.
Vice-President
The Inter-Department Ichthyological Commission
27, Tverskaya Str.
103009 MOSCOW

T: (7095) 2990274
F: (7095) 2992221
E: interdepichthyocom@mtu-net.ru

SHEVLYAKOV Vladimir N.
Fisheries Attache
Embassy of the Russian Federation
1609 Decatur Street N.W.
WASHINGTON D.C. 20011

T: (1202) 7263838
F: (1202) 7260090
E: rusfishatt@starpower.net

SINGAPORE/SINGAPUR/SINGAPOUR

GIAM Choo-Hoo
78 Jalan Haji Alias
SINGAPORE 268559

T: (65) 466486
F: (65) 4634853
E: giamch@pacific.net.sg
**(Alternate member of the Committee/Miembro
suplente del Comité/Membre suppléant du Comité)**

LEONG Hon Keong
City Veterinary Centre
CITES Management Authority
25 Peck Seah Street
SINGAPORE 079315

T: (65) 2270670
F: (65) 2276403
E: LEONG_Hon_Keong@ava.gov.sg

SPAIN/ESPAÑA/ESPAGNE

IBERO SOLANA Carlos
Asesor para Fauna de la Dirección General
de la Conservación de la Naturaleza
Autoridad Científica CITES
ATECMA
Isla de la Toja 2-3° A
E-28400 VILLALBA
Madrid

T: (3491) 8490804
F: (3491) 8491468
E: cites@atecma.es

SWITZERLAND/SUIZA/SUISSE

ALTHAUS Thomas
Office vétérinaire fédéral
Schwarzenburgstrasse 161
CH-3097 LIEBEFELD

T: (4131) 3238508
F: (4131) 3238522
E: thomas.althaus@bvet.admin.ch

UNITED KINGDOM/REINO UNIDO/ROYAUME-UNI

FLEMING Vincent
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House
City Road
PETERBOROUGH
PE1 1JY

T: (441733) 866870
F: (441733) 555948
E: vin.fleming@jncc.gov.uk

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA/REPÚBLICA UNIDA DE TANZANÍA/RÉPUBLIQUE-UNIE DE TANZANIE

KAYERA Juma A.
Wildlife Division
CITES Management Authority
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Nyerere Road, P.O. Box 1994
DAR ES SALAAM

T: (25522) 2866408; 2866376
F: (25522) 2863496; 2865836
E: wildlife-division@twiga.com

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA/ETATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE

ALVAREZ Javier
Division of Scientific Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Room 750
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

T: (1703) 3581708 ext. 5055
F: (1703) 3582276
E: javier_alvarez@fws.gov

BECKER Lillian
National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East West Highway
SILVER SPRING, MD

T: (301) 7132319
F: (301) 7130376
E: Lillian.Becker@noaa.gov

BRUCKNER Andrew
National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA/NMFS
Office of the Protected Resources
1315 East West Highway
SILVER SPRING, MD 20910

T: (301) 7132319
F: (301) 7130376
E: andy.bruckner@noaa.gov

DAVES Nancy
National Marine Fisheries Service
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Department of Commerce
1315 East-West Highway
SILVER SPRING, MD 20910

T: (1301) 7132319 ext. 143
F: (1301) 7130376
E: nancy.daves@noaa.gov

EINSWEILER Sheila
Office of Law Enforcement
US Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 North Fairfax Drive
Room 500
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

T: (1703) 3581949
F: (1703) 3582271
E: sheila_einsweiler@fws.gov

FIELD John
Division of Scientific Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Room 750
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

T: (1703) 3581708
F: (1703) 3582276
E: john_field@fws.gov

GABEL Roddy
Chief Consultation and Monitoring Branch
Division of the Scientific Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Room 750
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

T: (1703) 3581708
F: (1703) 3582276
E: roddy_gabel@fws.gov

GASKI Andrea
Division of Management Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Room 700
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

T: (1703) 3582095
F: (1703) 3582298
E: andrea_gaski@fws.gov

HALL Pamela
Division of Scientific Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Room 750
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

T: (1703) 3581708
F: (1703) 3582276
E: pamelahall@fws.gov

JOHNSON Kurt
Division of Scientific Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Room 750
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

T: (1703) 3581708
F: (1703) 3582276
E: kurtjohnson@fws.gov

KREGER Michael
Division of Scientific Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Room 750
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

T: (1703) 3581708
F: (1703) 3582276
E: michaelkreger@fws.gov

LE BOEUF Nicole
National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Protected Resources
1315 East West Highway #13736
SILVER SPRING, MD 20910

T: (301) 7132322
F: (301) 7134060
E: nicole.leboeuf@noaa.gov

NAMMACK Marta
National Marine Fisheries Service
6404 Pima Street
ALEXANDRIA, VA

T: (301) 7131401 ext. 116
F: (301) 7130376
E: marta.nammack@noaa.gov

TIEGER Maggie
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Division of Management Authority
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Room 700
ARLINGTON, VA 22033

T: (1703) 3582104
F: (1703) 3582280
E: maggie_tieger@fws.gov

VAN NORMAN Timothy
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Division of Management Authority
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Room 700
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

T: (1703) 3582104
F: (1703) 3582280
E: Tim_vannorman@fws.gov

WEISSGOLD Bruce
Division of Management Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Room 750
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

T: (1703) 3582095
F: (1703) 3582298
E: bruce_weissgold@fws.gov

ZIMBABWE

CHIDZIYA Edson
Department of National Parks
and Wild Life Management
P.O. Box CY 140
Causeway
HARARE

T: (2634) 792786-9; 723154
F: (2634) 724914; 792782
E: E: research@gta.gov.zw

(Alternate member of the Committee/Miembro suplente del Comité/Membre suppléant du Comité)

CHIMUTI Tapera
Department of National Parks
and Wild Life Management
P.O. Box CY 140
Causeway
HARARE

T: (2634) 792786-9
F: (2634) 724914; 792782
E: E: research@gta.gov.zw

UNO/ONU

**UNEP WORLD CONSERVATION MONITORING
CENTRE**

INSKIPP Tim
219 Huntingdon Road
CAMBRIDGE CB3 0DL
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland/Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del
Norte/Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande
du Nord

T: (441223) 277314
F: (441223) 277136
E: tim.inskipp@unep-wcmc.org

***Intergovernmental Organization/Organización intergubernamental/
Organisation intergouvernementale***

EUROPEAN UNION

MORGAN David
EUROPEAN COMMISSION Env. A.4
Rue de la Loi 200
(BU-9 05/111)
B-1049 BRUXELLES
Belgium/Bélgica/Belgique

T: (322) 2968712
F: (322) 2969557
E: davidhuw.morgan@cec.eu.int

IUCN-THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION

ROSS Perran
Crocodile Specialist Group
Florida Museum of Natural History
Dickenson Hall, Box 117800
University of Florida
GAINESVILLE, FL 32611
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1352) 8462566
F: (1352) 3929361
E: prosscsg@flmnh.ufl.edu

ROSSER Alison
IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme
219c Huntingdon Road
CAMBRIDGE CB3 0DL
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland/Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del
Norte/Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande
du Nord

T: (441223) 277966
F: (441223) 277845
E: alison.rosser@ssc-uk.org

International NGO/ONG internacional/ONG internationale

AFRICA RESOURCES TRUST

HUTTON Jonathan
219 Huntingdon Road
CAMBRIDGE CB3 0DL
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland/Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del
Norte/Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande
du Nord

T: (441223) 277314
F: (441223) 277136
E: hutton@artist-force9.co.uk

**CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL
LAW**

WOLD Chris
10015 SW Terwilliger Boulevard
PORTLAND, OREGON
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1503) 7686734
F: (1503) 7686671
E: chris@elaw.org

**EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF ZOO AND WILDLIFE
VETERINARIANS**

COOPER Margaret E.
Wildlife Health Services
P.O. Box 153
WELLINGBOROUGH
NN8 2ZA
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland/Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del
Norte/Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande
du Nord

T: (44(0)7940) 571340
F: (441483) 797552
E: ngagi@compuserve.com

**EUROPEAN BUREAU FOR CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT**

PYROVOLIDOU-SYMONS Despina
Rue de la Science 10
1000 BRUSSELS
Belgium/Bélgica/Belgique

T: (322) 2303070
F: (322) 2308272
E: ebcd@skynet.be

GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL

DRIEMAN Geert
Keizersgracht 176
NL-1016 DW AMSTERDAM
Netherlands/Paises Bajos/Pays-Bas

T: (3120) 5236245
F: (3120) 5236200
E: geert.drieman@ams.greenpeace.org

**INTERNATIONAL CAVIAR IMPORTERS
ASSOCIATION**

PETROSSIAN Armen
189 rue d'Aubervilliers
75018 PARIS
France/Francia

T: (331) 44896767
F: (331) 40354750
E: armen.petrossian@wanadoo.fr

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR ANIMAL WELFARE

STEUER Karen
411 Main Street
YARMOUTH PORT, MA 02675
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1508) 7442195
F: (1508) 7442129
E: ksteuer@ifaw.org

INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE COALITION

ORENSTEIN Ronald
1825 Shady Creek Court
MISSISSAUGA, ONTARIO
L5L 3W2
Canada/Canadá

T: (1905) 8207886
F: (1905) 5690116
E: ornstn@home.com

IWMC-WORLD CONSERVATION TRUST

LAPOINTE Eugene
3, passage de Montriond
CH-1006 LAUSANNE
Switzerland/Suiza/Suisse

T: (4121) 6165000
F: (4121) 6165000
E: iwmc@iwmc.org

ORNAMENTAL AQUATIC TRADE ASSOCIATION

DAVENPORT Keith
Chief Executive
5 Narrow Wine Street
TROWBRIDGE
Wiltshire BA14 8YY
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland/Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del
Norte/Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande
du Nord

T: (441225) 777177
F: (441225) 7755523
E: keith@oata.demon.co.uk

PEAT INSTITUTE

AQUILINO John
611 Pennsylvania Avenue SE
PMB 372
WASHINGTON, DC20003
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1202) 5449748
F: (1202) 5449749
E: PEATIns@compuserve.com

PET INDUSTRY JOINT ADVISORY COUNCIL (PIJAC)

MADDOX Michael P.
1220 19th Street, NW
Suite 400
WASHINGTON, DC 20036
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1202) 4521525
F: (1202) 2934377
E: mmaddox@meyersalterman.com

MEYERS Marshall
1220 19th Street, NW
Suite 400
WASHINGTON, DC 20036
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1202) 4521525
F: (1202) 2934377
E: mmeyers@meyersalterman.com

SAFARI CLUB INTERNATIONAL

WALL William
441-E Carlisle Drive
HERNDON, VA 20170
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1703) 7092293
F: (1703) 7092296
E: bwall@sci-dc.org

SPECIES SURVIVAL NETWORK

MICHELS Ann
2100 L Street, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1301) 5487769
F: (1301) 2583080
E: annmichels@hotmail.com

SWAN INTERNATIONAL

YUAN Hsiao-Wei
Department of Forestry,
National Taiwan University
Taipei
TAIWAN
China/Chine

T: (8862) 23660235
F: (8862) 23660235
E: hwuyuan@ccms.ntu.edu.tw

TRAFFIC NETWORK

BARDEN Angela
TRAFFIC International
219c Huntingdon Rd
CAMBRIDGE CB3 0DL
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland/Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del
Norte/Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande
du Nord

F: (441223) 277237
E: angela.barden@trafficint.org

DE MEULENAER Thomas
TRAFFIC Europe - Regional Office
Waterloosteenweg, 608
B-1050 BRUSSELS
Belgium/Bélgica/Belgique

T: (322) 3438258
F: (322) 3432565
E: tdemeulenaer@traffic-europe.com

HOOVER Craig
TRAFFIC North America - Regional Office
1250 24th Street, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1202) 8223452
F: (1202) 7758287
E: craig.hoover@wwfus.org

NASH Stephen
TRAFFIC International
219c Huntingdon Road
CAMBRIDGE CB3 0DL
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland/Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del
Norte/Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande
du Nord

T: (441223) 277427
F: (441223) 277237
E: stephen.nash@trafficint.org

RAYMAKERS Caroline
TRAFFIC Europe - Regional Office
Waterloosteenweg, 608
B-1050 BRUSSELS
Belgium/Bélgica/Belgique

T: (322) 3438258
F: (322) 3432565
E: craymakers@traffic-europe.com

**WHALE AND DOLPHIN CONSERVATION SOCIETY
(WDCS)**

FISHER Sue
Alexander House
James Street West
BATH BA1 2BT
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland/Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del
Norte/Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande
du Nord

T: (441225) 334511
F: (441225) 480097
E: suef@wdcs.org

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION SOCIETY

BRUNING Donald
2300 Southern Boulevard
BRONX, NY 10460
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1718) 2205159
F: (1718) 7337300
E: dbruning.wcs@mcimail.com

LAUCK Elizabeth
2300 Southern Boulevard
BRONX, NY 10460
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1718) 2202151
F: (1718) 3644275
E: llauck@wcs.org

PIKITCH Ellen
2300 Southern Boulevard
BRONX, NY 10460
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1718) 2205885
F: (1718) 3644275
E: llauck@wcs.org

**WORLD CONSERVATION TRUST FOUNDATION -
FISHERIES COMMITTEE**

WILLS David
611 Pennsylvania Avenue SE
PMB 372
WASHINGTON, DC 20003
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1202) 5449748
F: (1202) 5449749
E: PEATIns@compuserve.com

**WORLD SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF
ANIMALS**

WILSON Philip
WSPA, 14th Floor
89 Albert Embankment
LONDON SE1 7TP
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland/Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del
Norte/Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande
du Nord

T: (4420) 77930540
F: (4420) 77930280
E: philipwilson@wsipa.org.uk

National NGO/ONG nacional/ONG nationale

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF AVICULTURE, INC.

JORDAN Rick
111 Barton Bend
DRIPPING SPRINGS
Texas 78620
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1512) 8587029
F: (1512) 8587029
E: stirrup@texas.net

AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

GNAM Rosemarie
Center for Biodiversity and Conservation
Central Park West at 79th Street
NEW YORK, NY 10024
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1212) 3137076
F: (1212) 7695292
E: rgnam@amnh.org

AMERICAN ZOO AND AQUARIUM ASSOCIATION

OLSON Steve
8403 Colesville Road # 710
SILVERSPRING, MD 20910
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1301) 5620777, ext. 249
F: (1301) 5620888
E: solson@aza.org

VEHRS Kristin
8403 Colesville Road
Suite 710
SILVER SPRING, MD 20910
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1301) 5620777, ext. 229
F: (1301) 5620888
E: kvehrs@aza.org

ANIMAL PROTECTION INSTITUTE

MAAS Barbara
Wildlife Consultant
11 Sheldon Road
Edmonton
LONDON, N18 1RQ
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland/Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del
Norte/Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande
du Nord

T: (44120) 82454126
F: (44120) 82454126
E: barbara.maas@btinternet.com

ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE

ROBERTS Adam
P.O. Box 3650
WASHINGTON, DC
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1202) 3372332
F: (1202) 3389478
E: adam@awionline.org

CARE FOR THE WILD

SIMMONDS Mark
c/o Alexander House
James Street West
BATH BA1 2BT
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland/Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del
Norte/Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande
du Nord

T: (441225) 334511
F: (441225) 480097
E: marks@wdcs.org

CENTER FOR ELEPHANT CONSERVATION

REIFSCHNEIDER Laura
International Environmental Resources
4427 South 36th Street
ARLINGTON, VA 22206
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1202) 4785177
F: (1202) 4785177
E: IEResources@aol.com

CONSERVATION FORCE

JACKSON, III John J.
3900 N. Causeway Blvd.
Suite 1045
METAIRIE, LA 70002
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1504) 8371233
F: (1504) 8371145
E: JJW-NO@att.net

CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL

BUHLMANN Kurt A.
University of Georgia
Savannah River Ecology Laboratory
Drawer E
AIKEN, SOUTH CAROLINA 29802
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1803) 7255293
F: (1803) 7253309
E: buhlmann.srel.edu

CREATIVE CONSERVATION SOLUTIONS

JENKINS Hank
Principal
P.O. Box 390
BELCONNEN ACT 2617
Australia/Australie

T: (612) 62585164; cel. 61-414-809729
F: (612) 62598757
E: hank.jenkins@consol.net.au

DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE

MUFFETT William Carroll
International Counsel
1101 14th Street, NW
Suite 1400
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1202) 6829400
F: (1202) 6821331
E: cmuffett@defenders.org

**DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR HERPETOLOGIE
UND TERRARIENKUNDE E.V.**

PAULER Ingo
DGHT
Im Sandgarten 4
D-67157 WACHENHEIM
Germany/Alemania/Allemagne

T: (496322) 64962
F: (496233) 68529
E: I-w-pauler@t-online.de

ENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATION AGENCY

BANKS Debbie
P.O. Box 53343
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1202) 4836621
F: (1202) 9868626
E: debbiebanks@hotmail.com

SAVEDGE Jennifer
P.O. Box 53343
WASHINGTON, DC
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1202) 4836621
F: (1202) 9868626
E: jennsavedge@eia-international.org

FUNDACIÓN ARA, A.C.

IÑIGO ELÍAS Eduardo Eugenio
Antiguo Camino al Diente # 3333
Apartado Postal 2275, suc. J
C.P. 64988
MONTERREY, NUEVO LEON
Mexico/México/Mexique

T: (528) 3490795
F: (528) 3178502
E: ElnigoFUNARA@compuserve.com

FUNDACIÓN LORO PARQUE

DE SOYE Yves
38400 PUERTO DE LA CRUZ
Spain/España/Espagne

T: (34922) 374081
F: (34922) 375021
E: dir.cientifica@loroparque-fundacion.org

GREENPEACE - GERMANY

PUESCHEL Peter
Grosse Elbstrasse 39
22767 HAMBURG
Germany/Alemania/Allemagne

T: (4940) 30618-0; -334
F: (4940) 30631; -134
E: joerg.siepmann@greenpeace.de

HUMANE SOCIETY OF CANADA

O'SULLIVAN Micheal
347 Bay Street, Suite 806
TORONTO
Ontario, M5H 2R7
Canada/Canadá

T: (1416) 3680405
F: (1416) 3681948
E: michael@humanesociety.com

HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES

TELECKY Teresa
2100 L Street, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1301) 2583142
F: (1301) 2583080
E: ttelecky@hsus.org

**INDONESIAN CORAL, SHELL AND ORNAMENTAL
FISH ASSOCIATION (AKKII)**

BATARA Rudy
Jl. Raya Boulevard Blok RA 19 No.15
Kelapa Gading
JAKARTA
Indonesia/Indonésie

T: (6221) 45845970
F: (6221) 45846114
E: akkii@cbn.net.id

IWMC-CH

BERNEY Jaques
3, Passage de Montriond
1006 LAUSANNE
Switzerland/Suiza/Suisse

T: (4121) 6165000
F: (4121) 6165000
E: iwmcch@iwmc.org

MOTE MARINE LABORATORY

GALVIN Joan
1600 Ken Thompson Parkway
SARASOTA, FL
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1941) 3884441, ext. 316
F: (1941) 3884242
E: jgalvin@mote.org

NATIONAL TRAPPERS ASSOCIATION

BEERS James
15436 Eagle Tavern Lane
CENTREVILLE, VA 20120
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1703) 8307229
F: (1703) 8307229
E: jimbeers@juno.com

**NORTHEASTERN ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND
WILDLIFE AGENCIES**

ROBERTSON Gordon
Rm # 842 Building # 3, Capitol Complex
1900 Kanawha Blvd., East
CHARLESTON, WV 25305
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1304) 5582771
F: (1304) 5583147
E: grobert@dnr.state.wv.us

PRO WILDLIFE

FREYER Daniela
Löfflerstr. 5a
D-80999 MUENCHEN
Germany/Alemania/Allemagne

T: (4989) 81299507
F: (4989) 81299706
E: mail@prowildlife.de

PROJECT SEAHORSE, MCGILL UNIVERSITY

VINCENT Amanda
Dept of Biology
McGill University
1205 Avenue, Dr. Penfield
MONTREAL, QUEBEC
H3A 1B1
Canada/Canadá

T: (1514) 3985112; 3986455
F: (1514) 3985069
E: amanda_vincent@maclan.mcgill.ca

**ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF
CRUELTY TO ANIMALS**

ATKINSON Robert
RSPCA
Causeway
HORSHAM
West Sussex RH12 1HG
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland/Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del
Norte/Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande
du Nord

T: (441403) 264181
F: (441403) 218042
E: ratkins@rspca.co.uk

THE FUND FOR ANIMALS, INC.

WOLF Christine
Director of Government and International Affairs
World Building
8121 Georgia Avenue
Suite 301
SILVER SPRING, MD 20910
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1301) 5852591, ext. 208
F: (1301) 5852595
E: cwolf@fund.org

TSAR NICOULAI CAVIAR, INC.

ENGSTROM Mats
2171 Jackson Street
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1415) 5678917
F: (1415) 5678253
E: beluga@tsarnicoulai.com

UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE BAJA CALIFORNIA

TRUE Conal David
Carretera Tijuana-Ensenada Km #103
ENSENADA, BAJA CALIFORNIA
Mexico/México/Mexique

T: (1526) 1744570, ext. 121
F: (1526) 1744103
E: ctrue@bahia.ens.uabc.mx

UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE COSTA RICA

DREWS Carlos
Universidad Nacional de Costa Rica
Apdo. 1350
3000 HEREDIA
Costa Rica

T: (506) 2773600
F: (506) 2377036
E: cdrews@una.ac.cr

**WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
AGENCIES**

TAUBERT Bruce
Arizona Game and Fish Dept
2221 W. Greenway Road
PHOENIX, AZ 85023
United States of America/Estados Unidos de
América/Etats-Unis d'Amérique

T: (1602) 7893301
F: (1602) 7893363
E: btaubert@gf.state.az.us

WILDLIFE TRUST OF INDIA

KUMAR Ashok
P.O. Box 3150
NEW DELHI - 110003
India/Inde

T: (9111) 6326025/26
F: (9111) 6326027
E: ashok@wildlifetrustofindia.org

