

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



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

SUMMARY RECORD

The Animals Committee convened during the first two days of its 21st meeting (AC21) with the Plants Committee, which held its 15th meeting (PC15), and this joint session (PC15/AC21) was chaired alternately by both Chairmen. The present summary record specifies which items were discussed during the joint session.

Where appropriate, documents discussed at AC21 were revised by the Secretariat after the meeting in order to include the amendments adopted and corrections noted by the Committee, as recorded in this summary record. The relevant documents bear a footnote indicating this.

1. Opening of the meeting

The Secretary-General of the CITES Secretariat welcomed participants to the 21st meeting of the Animals Committee. The Animals Committee confirmed its provisionally appointed Chairman and Vice-Chairman, Mr Althaus (representative of Europe) and Mr Medellin (representative of North America) respectively, in their positions by acclamation.

The AC Chairman thanked the members of the Animals Committee for their continued confidence in him and also welcomed the participants.

2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

2.1 Current Rules of Procedure

The AC Chairman introduced document AC21 Doc. 2.1, explaining that the Rules of Procedure of the Animals Committee should be similar to the ones of the Standing Committee as far as practicable. This matter would be addressed in the joined PC15/AC21 session under agenda item 2.2. In the meantime, he proposed to continue operating under the current Rules of Procedure for meetings of the Animals Committee. The Committee agreed with this suggestion.

The Secretariat reminded participants in the meeting of Rule 7, stating that observers from a Party or an organization shall, before making an intervention in the meeting, have been granted powers by a proper authority enabling him or her to represent the Party or the Organization at the meeting.

2.2. Proposed amendments

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC15/AC21 meeting.

The Secretariat introduced documents PC15 Doc. 2.2 and AC21 Doc. 2.2. The Animals and Plants Committees agreed to postpone discussion of this agenda item, given that the Standing Committee was going to discuss it at its 53rd meeting (SC53, June-July 2005).

The Animals and Plants Committees agreed that their two Chairmen would participate in the discussions on Rules of Procedures by the Standing Committee at SC53.

3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme

3.1 Agenda

The AC Chairman introduced document AC21 Doc. 3.1 (Rev. 2) and proposed adding an item concerning the implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.2 regarding the procedure for the approval of externally-funded projects to agenda item 22 on Any other business. With this amendment the agenda was adopted.

3.2 Working programme

The AC Chairman introduced document AC21 Doc. 3.2. It was agreed that items 17 on Sea cucumbers and 19 on Conservation of and trade in great apes would be discussed on Monday 23 May, and that items 2.2 on Proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure and 10.1.2 on Progress on the country-based Review of Significant Trade in Madagascar would be discussed on Friday 20 May during the joint session with the Plants Committee.

It was furthermore clarified that *Strombus gigas* would be discussed under the regional report of Central and South America and the Caribbean (item 5.3) and the Review of Significant Trade (item 10.1.1), and that discussions on the role of the Animals Committee in developing a uniform DNA-based identification system for sturgeon products, referred to in Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP13), would be held under item 6.3.

With these amendments, the working programme in document AC21 Doc. 3.2 was adopted.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), the observers from Denmark, Israel and Honduras, and the zoologist of the Nomenclature Committee.

4. Admission of observers

The Secretariat introduced document AC21 Doc. 4. The Committee noted the organizations that had been invited to attend the 21st meeting of the Animals Committee as observers.

5. Regional reports

The regional representatives presented their reports (documents AC21 Doc. 5.1 to 5.6).

The representative of Africa (Mr Bagine) stressed the problems of communication in his region.

A correction was made to the Asian report (document AC21 Doc. 5.2), page 5, under *Malaysia*, as follows:

The steps are to cooperate with China ~~and (including Hong Kong S.A.R.)~~ in verifying all CITES export permits that are issued by the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP), because China ~~and (including Hong Kong S.A.R.)~~ were chosen because they are the major consumption country in has found some fake permits for export of tortoises and freshwater turtles issued by Malaysia in the last few months.

The alternate representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Velasco) advised that he would send a revised version of his report [document AC21 Doc. 5.3 (Rev. 1)] to the Secretariat within the following two weeks. The AC Chairman commended the quality of the report and the remarkable improvement since AC20. This was echoed by the representative of North

America (Mr Medellín) who offered the help of his region with communication if ever needed. It was also clarified that Mexico was collecting more data on *Passerina ciris* with a view to preparing a new amendment proposal.

The representative of Oceania (Mr Hay) explained that the recent increase in membership in his region probably resulted from a meeting where these countries had heard about CITES and from requests for information made to them in the context of the Review of Significant Trade.

The AC Chairman invited the regional representatives to submit information on meetings in their regions to the Secretariat for inclusion on the CITES website. The Committee noted the reports.

During discussion of these reports, interventions were made by the observers from China, Honduras, Mexico and Humane Society International, and the Secretariat.

6. Strategic planning

6.1 Implementation of the Strategic Vision and Action Plan until 2007

The Secretariat introduced document AC21 Doc. 6.1. Further to some comments on the goals set in the Strategic Vision, the AC Chairman reminded the Committee that its task was not to revise these but to assess their implementation. In this regard, the Secretariat advised the Animals Committee that the Plants Committee had decided to develop indicators of success and it suggested adopting a similar approach. The AC Chairman also clarified that the content of this document as well as of the following one (AC21 Doc. 6.2) were taken up and summarized in document AC21 Doc. 6.3, and that the three sub-items should be looked at globally.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representatives of North America (Mr Medellín) and Oceania (Mr Hay), and the observer from Humane Society International.

6.2 Resolutions and Decisions directed or related to the Animals Committee

The Secretariat introduced document AC21 Doc. 6.2. The representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) expressed strong concerns about the lack of progress with the development of the uniform DNA-based identification system called for in Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP13) on Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish, and with the conservation of sturgeons in general. He suggested that the Secretariat send a Notification to the Parties reminding Parties of the actions required in that respect. Two participants mentioned that their countries (Switzerland and the United States) had already initiated action at the national level (collating DNA information), even though what the Resolution called for was a 'uniform' system. There was general agreement on the importance of addressing this issue. Consequently the Committee agreed to raise the priority given to the implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP13) in document AC21 Doc. 6.3.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) and the observer from the United States of America.

6.3 Establishment of the Animals Committee's priorities

The AC Chairman introduced document AC21 Doc. 6.3 and mentioned that a correction needed to be made on page 10 of the Annex for Action Plan 1.4.5 (addition of 'not' in the *Comments of the Chairman* so that it read "So far, the AC has not addressed this matter."). He asked the Committee to review the tentative priority he had given to each task.

After long and detailed discussions, the following amendments were agreed:

- a) development of a uniform DNA-based identification system for parts and derivatives and aquaculture stocks of Acipenseriformes species [Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP13)]: change priority from Low to High.

Reason: strong concerns on the conservation of sturgeons were expressed here as well as during discussions of agenda item 6.2;

- b) development of a manual specifying the obligations and procedures of the Scientific Authorities; development of practical guidance for making non-detriment findings, including a manual and checklist, and samples of non-detriment findings and case studies; and support to the Secretariat in its work on the development and implementation of a programme to assist Scientific Authorities in making non-detriment findings in accordance with the provisions of Article IV of the Convention [Action Plan (1.7.1, 2.3.1 and 2.3.2) and Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP13)]: change priority from Low to Medium.

Reason: in spite of the Animals Committee being only required to assist the Secretariat with this task, it was deemed important to support Scientific Authorities in every possible way. It was mentioned in particular that the *Guidance for CITES Scientific Authorities: Checklist to assist in making non-detriment findings for Appendix-II exports* published by IUCN in 2002 would need revising as well as better translation and dissemination, even though the Secretariat pointed out that this publication was available on its website in the CoP11 section as document Inf. 11.3. It was agreed to look at progress with this issue at AC22;

- c) evaluation of trade and biological information on currently non-listed species [Action Plan (2.1.4), Decision 13.43 and Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP13)]: change priority from High to Medium.

Reason: report requested for CoP14, although the Animals Committee would have otherwise considered this task of lower importance;

- d) conservation of sea cucumbers (Decision 13.48): change priority from Low to Medium.

Reason: report requested for CoP14, although the Animals Committee would have otherwise considered this task of lower importance;

- e) working group on production systems (Decision 13.68): change priority from Low to Medium;

Reason: importance of the work involved to produce a report for CoP14.

- f) support to the preparation of the Identification Manual [Resolutions Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP13) and Conf. 11.19]: change priority from High to Medium;

Reason: progress has already been made on this issue; and

- g) development of a manual for regional representatives (Decision 13.13): change priority from Medium to High.

Reason: deemed more important in the light of the discussion summarized in the following paragraph.

The Committee also discussed at length the importance that should be given to regional directories, some insisting on the proven usefulness of the equivalent PC directories to ensure good regional communication, whilst others put forward that the time and financial investment they required in development were not justified given how quickly they became out of date, and that other communication channels could fill that role. In the end it was decided to keep this activity as a Low Priority but to include it as a task in the manual for regional representatives.

There was some discussion on the priority to give to the assistance with the preparation of proposals to amend the Appendices; to the inclusion of a species in Appendix III; and to the work with GRASP, but a *status quo* finally prevailed to leave the two former tasks as a Medium Priority and the third one as Low Priority.

It was suggested to create in future a new category of priority that would make a distinction between issues that were intrinsically important and those of lesser importance but required by a certain deadline. There was a general agreement that the Conference of the Parties often gave the Committee strict deadlines to conduct work that the Committee would have otherwise considered of lower importance. These tasks, as well as the ones indicated in the Action Plan, conflicted with other essential work of the Committee at the time of setting priorities.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), Europe (Ms Rodics), North America (Mr Medellín) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the alternate representatives of Asia (Mr Giam) and Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Velasco), the observers from Germany, Mexico, Spain, the United States, Humane Society of the United States, IUCN and Species Management Specialists Inc., and the Secretariat.

The Committee established a working group (AC21 WG1) to look at agenda items 6.1 to 6.3 (see document AC21 WG1 Doc. 1 for membership).

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the Working Group, the AC Chairman, briefly introduced document AC21 WG1 Doc. 1 explaining that WG1 had not had enough time to go through the whole list and that the alternate representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Velasco) would take the lead in collecting further comments from the Committee. He added that all that the Animals Committee needed to do was to evaluate its efforts in relation to the implementation of the existing Strategic Vision and Action Plan and to submit the outcome thereof to the Strategic Plan Working Group of the Standing Committee. The Working Group had faced the same problem as in plenary when setting priorities, namely that of the choice of criteria that should determine such categorization. A suggestion was made to add examples under goals 1 and 2. The Committee took note of the format and wording developed by the Plants Committee in document PC15 WG1 Doc. 1 and discussed under item 6.4, and agreed to use it as a basis to present its recommendations to the Standing Committee.

During discussion of document AC21 WG1 Doc. 1, interventions were made by the representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) and the observers from Mexico and IUCN.

6.4 Strategic Vision and Action Plan until 2013

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC15/AC21 meeting.

The Secretariat introduced documents PC15 Doc. 6.4 and AC21 Doc. 6.4. The PC representative of Oceania (Mr Leach) drew attention of the Animals Committee on the document produced by the Plants Committee on this issue (PC15 WG1 Doc. 1) and on the need for performance indicators to be included in the next Strategic Vision. The AC Chairman commended document PC15 WG1 Doc. 1, which could serve as a useful basis in the further deliberations of the Animals Committee on agenda item 6.

Both Committees nominated their Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen as candidates to represent them on the Strategic Plan Working Group to be established by the Standing Committee at its 53rd meeting.

7. Review of scientific committees

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC15/AC21 meeting.

The AC representative of North America (Mr Medellín) introduced documents PC15 Doc. 7 and AC21 Doc. 7. The Secretariat cautioned against straying from the tasks established in Decision 13.9. It pointed out in particular that point 4 of the draft terms of reference outlined in the Annex to document AC21 Doc. 7 was a matter for the Standing Committee to decide and that, in reference to point 6. c), what was to be reviewed was the way the scientific committees performed their functions and not the 'functions and tasks' themselves. Regarding deadlines [point 6. f)], the draft terms of reference should be ready by the end of 2005. It was further noted that the terms of reference should specifically refer to the Nomenclature Committee as one of the bodies preparing this draft as well as to a study of cost-efficiency. The Committees decided to establish a working group

(PC15/AC21 WG1) and to restrict its membership to members and alternate members of the three scientific committees.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the Working Group, the AC representative of North America (Mr Medellín), introduced document PC15/AC21 WG1 Doc. 1. He confirmed that the points developed in paragraphs 3, 4 and 7 of that document were simply suggestions to the Standing Committee and that the Terms of Reference called for in Decision 13.9 were contained in paragraph 6. The PC Chairman stated that even though it was usual in this type of exercise to have both an internal and an external evaluation, the review should not bring about any expenses, as this would divert funds from other work. The Committees adopted the report of PC15/AC21 WG1 and asked that the points raised during discussion of this item be put on record.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representative of Oceania (Mr Hay), the observer from WWF International and the Secretariat.

8. Regional communication

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC15/AC21 meeting.

8.1 Review of the conditions under which their members and alternate members perform their duties

The AC Chairman introduced documents PC15 Doc. 8.1 and AC21 Doc. 8.1. The Committees established a working group (PC15/AC21 WG2) to look at this issue and decided to restrict its membership to members and alternate members of the three scientific committees.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the Working Group, the AC Chairman, introduced document PC15/AC21 WG2 Doc. 1. He explained that this review was linked to that of the scientific committees, hence the same membership of both working groups. PC15/AC21 Working Group 2 had not had sufficient time to complete its work and would need to carry it on intersessionally by email. There was a request for the Working Group to look at how Parties may help members of the Committees and the AC Chairman agreed that Parties needed to be better informed of the work of their representatives. The Committees noted the report of PC15/AC21 WG2.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representative of Oceania (Mr Hay), the observer from Israel and the Secretariat.

8.2 Manual for regional representatives

The AC alternate representative of Europe (Mr Ibero) introduced this agenda item, explaining that he would make available in the working group a draft plan of actions to fulfil Decision 13.13. The idea of creating a manual was welcomed by all. It was clarified that what was requested by the end of 2005 was a draft simply itemizing the contents of the manual and the time-frame in which it should be developed. Results of other discussions related to the issue of regional communication could therefore still be included afterwards. The Committees decided to establish a working group (PC15/AC21 WG3) to look at this issue [see document PC15/AC21 WG3 Doc. 1 (Rev. 1) for membership].

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the Working Group, the AC alternate representative of Europe, introduced document PC15/AC21 WG3 Doc. 1, apologizing for overlooking to specify the membership of the Working Group in the report. He suggested opening the working group to external input, for example from the Secretariat. Regarding the point on *Sources of information*, he clarified that the issue was to point the representative to the relevant references in the masses of information available. A participant mentioned that the point on *Support and requirements* should refer to the CD-ROM version of the CITES website and specify that all material should be available on that website. The Chairman of PC15/AC21 WG3 requested from the Plants Committee that it allow those members of PC15/AC21 WG3 who would stay on after the end of the joint meeting to revise document PC15/AC21 WG3 Doc. 1. The Committees

adopted the report of PC15/AC21 WG3¹, acknowledging the possibility that a draft revision may be prepared during the rest of AC21. However the item was not discussed again thereafter.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representative of North America (Mr Medellín) and the observer from the Netherlands.

9. Export Quota Working Group

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item, explaining that the Standing Committee had established a working group to look at the management aspects of quotas, with a view to report at CoP14, and that the Animals Committee would receive a document for review before the end of 2005. The Secretariat also indicated that this working group, chaired by Cameroon, would be meeting at SC53 and could receive input on that occasion. The observer from Mexico added that his country would also be submitting a document on zero export quotas at SC53. The Committee stated that it would provide the input needed by the Standing Committee when it would receive such a request.

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

10.1 Report on progress in the implementation of the Review of Significant Trade

10.1.1 Species-based Review of Significant Trade

The Secretariat introduced document AC21 Doc. 10.1.1 (Rev. 1), adding that it would distribute CD-ROM copies of the database created by TRAFFIC to some Parties for testing, and the responses received from range States of species listed in Annex 2 of that document to the working group. The representative of Europe (Ms Rodics) advised that a revised version of document AC21 Inf. 1 on *Monodon monoceros* would be distributed in the relevant working group. She also pointed out that Slovakia should be listed amongst the range States of *Falco cherrug* in document AC21 Doc. 10.1.1 (Rev. 1). The AC Chairman accepted her offer to distribute the draft European Action Plan for this species in the working group, which he added would tackle both agenda items 10.1.1 and 10.2.

In response to queries, the Secretariat clarified that implementation of the recommendations of the Animals Committee by range States was evaluated by the Secretariat, the AC or PC Chairmen and ultimately the Standing Committee. In particular the responses to AC Significant Trade recommendations communicated by Honduras with regard to *Strombus gigas* were not included here as they would be addressed by the Standing Committee. Likewise, in response to the representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) who described the conservation status of sturgeons as catastrophic and requiring immediate action, the Secretariat explained that the Animals Committee had done everything it could do within the current Review of Significant Trade in sturgeons species in the Caspian Sea and referred to Resolution Conf. 12.7 which had been revised and strengthened at CoP13. It added that the Standing Committee was now the right forum to address new concerns as it would look at the Review of Significant Trade at SC53 (see document SC53 Doc. 25). This was confirmed by the AC Chairman. The Secretariat was further asked to provide the references of the documents on which it had based its statement in document AC21 Doc. 10.1.1 (Rev. 1), paragraph 10, that "recommendations for sturgeon stocks of the Amur River, the Azov Sea and the Black Sea had been complied with by the relevant range States in 2002", as this did not seem to reflect the records of previous Standing Committee meetings. The Secretariat said it would verify this.

In reference to paragraph 14 of document AC21 Doc. 10.1.1 (Rev. 1), the observer from Japan explained that his country had not received the communication from the

¹ NB: when discussing agenda item 6.3, the Animals Committees also agreed to include the compilation of regional directories as a task in the manual for regional representatives.

Secretariat and asked that it be sent again. The observer from the United Republic of Tanzania also clarified that his country had imposed a ban on trade in *Psittacus erithacus*. As for *Phelsuma dubia*, the figures used were based on permits issued and not on real exports which were actually lower. He concluded that there was no problem with the implementation of Article IV with either species.

The AC Chairman mentioned that the Plants Committee had devised a very useful table format to assess progress with species selected in the Review of Significant Trade and he asked the Secretariat to prepare a similar one for animal species.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Jolon), and Europe (Ms Rodics), the alternate representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Velasco), and the observers from Honduras, Japan, the United Republic of Tanzania and the United States.

10.1.2 Progress on the country-based Review of Significant Trade in Madagascar

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC15/AC21 meeting.

The Secretariat introduced documents PC15 Doc. 10.1.2 and AC21 Doc. 10.1.2. After apologizing for the lateness in submitting her report, the observer from Madagascar gave an oral report on progress with the implementation of the Action Plan previously established by the Committees. This report was widely commended but also raised many queries, especially since it did not make it clear whether the objectives of the Action Plan had been met and consequently did not allow assessing progress with implementation. The importance of this review was stressed and it was recalled that the study to evaluate the effectiveness of the Review of Significant Trade decided at CoP13 had been postponed until after CoP14 to allow for the inclusion of the results of this pilot country-based review. It was also confirmed that the country-based review did not preclude the parallel inclusion of specific Malagasy species in the Review of Significant Trade. The observer from Madagascar answered some of the queries directly, confirming *inter alia* that the fact that other Parties did not always reply to Madagascar's requests for information was one of the problems they were facing. However she added that what she had read was a summary of a more detailed report which included a table providing information against each target of the Action Plan. Finally she thanked all those who had supported her country. The Secretariat welcomed the use of a table that followed the Action Plan and reminded the observer from Madagascar that her country still needed to set and submit deadlines for the accomplishment of medium- and long-term actions. The AC Chairman remarked that it was the Standing Committee that would now decide on how to proceed and whether the action plan was being implemented satisfactorily.

The Animals and Plants Committees noted the report and requested Madagascar to submit it to the Secretariat, so that it could be made available as an information document for PC15 and AC21, and to produce a written report by the set deadline for AC22 and PC16 clearly delineating progress against the different Action Plan targets and time-frames.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the PC representative of North America (Mr Gabel), the observers from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States, David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation, Humane Society International, Species Management Specialists Inc., TRAFFIC and WWF International, and the Secretariat.

10.2 Selection of species for trade reviews after CoP13

The Secretariat introduced document AC21 Doc. 10.2 and the observer from UNEP-WCMC introduced the Annex to that document. The AC Chairman cautioned that, given the number of species already under review, only those of urgent concern should be added to the list.

The idea to include common names in the UNEP-WCMC tables was rejected as it would be very complicated and time-consuming to produce the document in the three working languages. Questions arose on quotas and several interventions were made on the necessity for UNEP-WCMC to include trade data concerning ranched specimens in its analysis. One observer pointed out that it sometimes happened that, as soon attention was drawn to a species, all specimens thereof that were in trade were suddenly declared as 'ranched'. The AC Chairman asked that these questions be raised in the working group and the Committee moved on to establish a working group (AC21 WG2) to look at both agenda items 10.1.1 and 10.2 [see document AC21 WG2 Doc. 1 (Rev. 1) for membership].

With regard to agenda item 10.1.1, the mandate of AC21 WG2 was to address the tasks set out in paragraphs 9, 13 and 15 of document AC21 Doc. 10.1.1.

With regard to agenda item 10.2, the mandate of AC21 WG2 was to decide whether new species should be included in the review or whether the Committee should focus its attention on the five groups of species that had been selected as candidate species at AC20, with the understanding that the latter option did not preclude the addition of species considered of urgent concern at a later date.

It was clarified once more that decisions regarding the ongoing Review of Significant Trade in sturgeons of the Caspian Sea were now in the hands of the Standing Committee and that the Review of Significant Trade in other sturgeons species had come to an end, but the AC Chairman stated that he would pass on to the Standing Committee the concerns voiced by the representative of Europe (Ms Rodics) on the conservation of these species, which followed those expressed earlier in the meeting by the representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi).

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the Working Group, the AC Chairman, introduced document AC21 WG2 Doc. 1, mentioning that paragraph a) under *Indonesia* on page 2 needed to be corrected from as follows:

- a) *The Indonesian Management Authority should ~~maintain~~ review the annual export quota for *Cuora amboinensis* at the 2002 level unless field studies for this species would justify different levels; and*

The list of participants in AC21 WG2 also needed the addition of the representative of Europe (Ms Rodics) and the alternate representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Velasco), and of the observers from China, Honduras and David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation. The AC Chairman advised the Committee that a verbatim report of the Working Group meeting was also available and asked for comments on each section of the document.

Regarding *Cuora amboinensis*, the Secretariat reminded the Committee that the time-frame of 90 days mentioned in the original recommendations directed to Indonesia and Malaysia no longer appeared and suggested re-including it.

A clarification was sought on the query made during discussion of item 10.1.1 by the observer from Belgium on the information on Acipenseriformes provided in paragraph 10 of document AC21 Doc. 10.1.1. The observer from Belgium explained in detail why that document seemed inaccurate and, at the request of the AC Chairman, provided the following statement in writing:

During a preliminary consultation, the Secretariat answered that SC47 was the basis for the report made at the present meeting.

However, the only document submitted at SC47 (November 2002) on the Review of Significant Trade on Acipenseriformes was SC47 Doc. 11 on Caspian Sea sturgeons, and the SC47 Summary Report does not include any statement or decision made by the SC regarding Acipenseriformes species or populations of the Amur River, the Azov Sea

or the Black Sea. It only provides an update on actions needed for Caspian Sea Sturgeon stocks, namely:

- a) funding from EU/TACIS for technical assistance in collaboration with FAO;
- b) collaboration between EU/TACIS, FAO and CITES to i) assess and monitor stocks and ii) derive catch and export quotas from stock monitoring data;
- c) review of quotas; and
- d) extension of the deadline for the implementation of their external agency dependent recommendations by a further 12 months.

Additionally, at AC19 (August 2003), no written report was submitted by the CITES Secretariat on progress in the implementation of the Review of Significant Trade, only a verbal report was provided. In contradiction to the report provided in paragraph 10 of Doc. 10.1.1, the Summary Report on AC19 states: "The Secretariat reported that those Eurasian species included in the significant trade from AC16 (10 species) are now covered in the Paris Agreement review." and presents a detailed list of the status of each species within the Review of Significant Trade.

If this assessment is correct, the table on page 2 and paragraph 10 of Doc. 10.1.1 should be corrected as follows:

- In the table of page 2: Change, in the column "**Status of the Review of Significant Trade**", and for the following species, *Acipenser baerii*, *A. gueldenstaedtii*, *A. nudiventris*, *A. schrenckii*, *A. stellatus*, *Huso dauricus* and *H. huso*, replace "Completed" or "Ongoing for the Caspian Sea stocks from Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan (Paris agreement)" by "Ongoing for all Eurasian stocks from relevant range States in Europe and Asia (Paris agreement)" in accordance with the Summary Report of AC19.
- In paragraph 10: "~~In the case of the **Acipenseriformes**, recommendations for sturgeon stocks of the Amur River, the Azov Sea and the Black Sea had been complied with by the relevant range States in 2002.~~the recommendations in the 'Paris agreement' ~~on Caspian Sea stocks that, since 2003 (ref. AC19 Summary Report), cover all Eurasian stocks of Acipenseriformes shared by Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan,~~ range States of the Amur River, the Azov Sea, the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea and other relevant basins such as Siberian rivers, the Secretariat considers ...".

The Secretariat agreed to look further into this matter.

Regarding *Falco cherrug*, the Working Group was particularly concerned about Parties that did not respond to the Secretariat's letter and the Committee agreed to add the same sentence at the end of paragraph ii) a) as that which appeared at the end of paragraph ii) b), namely "; informing the country that lack of response to requests for information could result in re-categorization into category i)". Nevertheless the Secretariat pointed out that the lack of response did not necessarily mean that there was a problem with the implementation of Article IV. It went on to add that the report constantly referred to "import of captive-bred specimens" but that since such specimens did not fall under the provisions of Article IV but of Article VII, they should be addressed through another procedure, such as the Falcon Task Force which would convene as soon as funding becomes available. The Animals Committee acknowledged this and asked the Secretariat to provide alternative language and to bring the attention of the Falcon Task Force to the problem of laundering of wild-caught specimens through captive-breeding operations.

Regarding *Article IV implementation*, the Committee agreed to a request to explain systematically in the column entitled *Comments* of the table in the Annex to document

AC21 WG2 Doc. 1 why species had been excluded from the review. The Secretariat said that it would revise the document accordingly.

Regarding *Selection of new species*, the AC21 WG2 Chairman explained that the *Mantella* species from Madagascar were already included in the review through the country-wide review but that Madagascar had agreed that the taxon be also included in the species-specific review. The European representative (Ms Rodics) then advised that no consensus had been reached in the subworking group on *Monodon monoceros* except that the concerns regarding this species did not apply to Canada, but that because of the population shared with Greenland, some participants felt that Canada would have to be drawn in if there was a review. She added that the observer from Denmark had criticized document AC21 Inf. 1 for having been produced without consultation with the range States and for presenting misleading information. The representative of North America (Mr Medellín), supported by the representative of Oceania (Mr Hay), suggested to postpone a decision to the following meeting by which date currently on-going scientific research would have provided clearer data. The observer from Canada also favoured this approach given that, should the narwhal be included in the review, the 60-day deadline set in the Review of Significant Trade would not allow his country to provide any new information compared to that which they had submitted on 8 July 2004 when the first review of that species had been completed. The AC Chairman contended that there was no certainty that new information would be available at AC22 and that Canada would be under obligation to submit information only if *M. monoceros* was selected now. The observer from Denmark echoed the views of the observer from Canada explaining that they would have new information on science, trade and quotas after October 2005. A long debate ensued between those for whom it was pointless to re-include *M. monoceros* in the Review of Significant Trade at this stage and those who thought it should be done now for fear of losing two years. The Committee finally decided to include the narwhal once more in the Review of Significant Trade, which it was reminded was now based on different criteria from those under which *M. monoceros* had been previously reviewed. Some participants regretted this decision which they opined had been taken on weak scientific grounds.

Finally the Committee agreed to delete the sentence "The WG identified *Pandinus* spp. and *Testudo horsfieldii* as possible candidates for further review" on page 3 of the WG report as it was deemed not to reflect accurately the discussions that had taken place in the Working Group.

The report was noted with the amendments above and the action points in it were adopted.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), Europe (Ms Rodics), North America (Mr Medellín) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the alternate representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Velasco), and the observers from Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Honduras, Japan, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates, the United States, the United Republic of Tanzania, David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation, Humane Society International, IWMC-World Conservation Trust and UNEP-WCMC.

11. Periodic review of animal species included in the CITES Appendices

11.1 Selection of species

The Secretariat introduced document AC21 Doc. 11.1 (Rev. 1), explaining that the guidelines developed by the Animals Committee at AC20 to select species had turned out to be too vague to produce a workable result, since their strict application by UNEP-WCMC still resulted in millions of records. It sought the opinion of the Committee on the recommendations made in paragraphs 7 to 9 in order to find a way forward. The AC Chairman remarked that the Plants Committee had not faced such problems for selecting new species as it had used an empirical approach.

The Committee decided to establish a working group (AC21 WG3) to look at this issue.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Europe (Ms Rodics) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the observers from Mexico, the United Kingdom, the United States, Humane Society International, Species Management Specialists Inc. and UNEP-WCMC, and the Secretariat.

11.2 Previously selected species

The Secretariat introduced document AC21 Doc. 11.2 and Mexico presented the studies on *Ambystoma mexicanum* and *Dermatemys mawii* annexed to this document, seeking comments from the Committee on the recommendations it had formulated. Opinions diverged on whether the serious threats to the former species warranted its inclusion in Appendix I, or whether this was a case for inclusion in Appendix III given that the only natural population occurred in Mexico. It was also suggested to postpone discussing this issue until AC22 in order to have time to study it in details. Regarding *Dermatemys mawii*, the observer from Mexico explained that it had been very difficult to obtain data from other range States and welcomed any new information from those. With the agreement of the observer from Mexico, the Committee included discussions of these two studies in the work of AC21 Working Group 3.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Jolon), the alternate representative of Asia (Mr Giam) and the observers from Mexico, the United Kingdom, the United States, the European Commission and Humane Society International.

11.3 Review of Felidae

The observer from the United States introduced document AC21 Doc. 11.3. It was pointed out that the review being undertaken for Felidae could serve as a model for other taxa. The Committee deferred discussion of the strategy proposed in the Annex to that document to AC21 Working Group 3.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the observers from the European Commission and WWF US, and the Secretariat.

The committee established AC21 Working Group 3 [see document AC21 WG3 Doc. 1 (Rev. 1) for membership].

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the Working Group, the observer from the European Commission, introduced document AC21 WG3 Doc. 1.

Regarding *Selection of species*, he explained that there were problems with two boxes in the flow chart and that furthermore it did not seem to address the issue of look-alike species. Additionally UNEP-WCMC might unearth more problems as it ran its analysis. The Secretariat pointed out that a review of the guidelines and flowchart would have to be conducted in collaboration with the Plants Committee and be approved by the Standing Committee. It was agreed that UNEP-WCMC would submit a selection of species for AC22 based on the 'filters' devised by AC21 WG3.

Regarding *Previously selected species*, the following corrections were made: Spain and the United States had agreed to review *Hirudo medicinalis*; *Goniopora* spp. should be removed from the table in Annex 3; and the reference number of that Annex needed to be added. The Chairman of AC21 WG3 urged Parties to consider conducting the review of the remaining species and let the Committee know of any development at AC22. He clarified that the draft Notification to the Parties in Annex 1 was open to editorial changes and that Annex 3 was meant to be appended to that Notification. With regard to the two Mexican studies, the observer from Mexico said he would develop a set of specific questions based on the discussions that had taken place in AC21 Working Group 3 to gather feedback from the Committee intersessionally. The Committee asked the Secretariat to issue that Notification and to specify time-frames for conducting the reviews.

Regarding *Felidae*, the sentence "The Working Group recommended excluding all populations of *Panthera pardus* from the review of the Felidae complex, and not only the populations of Asia as

recommended in document AC21 Doc. 11.3" needed to be added. It was agreed that the email contact group conducting this review would include all range States involved in AC21 WG3 as well as Canada, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and IUCN, and that other Parties or bodies could be contacted on an *ad hoc* basis.

The Committee took note of the report and adopted the actions specified therein.

During discussion of document AC21 WG3 Doc. 1, interventions were made by the representative of Europe (Ms Rodics), the observers from Mexico, the United Kingdom, the United States, the European Commission, Humane Society International and Species Management Specialists Inc., and the Secretariat.

12. Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC15/AC21 meeting.

The PC representative of North America introduced documents PC15 Doc. 12 and AC21 Doc. 12, pointing out to a mistake in paragraph 5. d) which should have read "... 16th meeting of the Plants Committee and 22nd meeting of the Animals Committee ...", instead of "17th" and "23rd" respectively. It was confirmed that NGOs could join a working group on this topic, and delegates from Parties in Asia, Africa and Central and South America and the Caribbean as well as plant experts were also urged to participate. The Committees established a working group (PC15/AC21 WG4) to look at this issue [see document PC15/AC21 WG4 Doc. 1 (Rev. 1) for membership].

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the Working Group, the PC representative of North America (Mr Gabel), introduced document PC15/AC21 WG4 Doc. 1, stressing the divergence in views in the Working Group, for example on the scope of application of ranching and the use of code 'R'. This meant that ultimately the different viewpoints may have to be presented to the Conference of the Parties, asking it to make a decision. The Committees adopted the report of PC15/AC21 WG4, acknowledging that the Working Group would need to carry on working intersessionally. It was also noted that PC15/AC21 WG4 would retain the membership indicated in the report, with the addition of the observer from Humane Society International.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the observers from Germany, Israel, Mexico, the Netherlands and Humane Society International, and the Secretariat.

13. Synergy between CITES and CBD

13.1 Addis Ababa principles and guidelines for the sustainable use of biodiversity

This agenda item was mostly discussed during the joint PC15/AC21 meeting.

The AC representative of Asia (Ms Prijono) introduced documents PC15 Doc. 13.1 and AC21 Doc. 13.1, which were well received as a first concrete example of synergy between CITES and CBD. The Secretariat explained that it was waiting for a delivery of copies of the *Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity* from CBD to fulfil Decision 13.7, paragraph a). It also asked for guidance on the format of the case studies called for in Decisions 13.6 and 13.7. Several participants warned that the Committees should not go beyond what was requested in the Decisions, referring *inter alia* to the end of the second paragraph under *Application* on page 5, and should ensure that the information asked from Parties would be relevant to CITES. It was further pointed out that the Standing Committee was also working on synergy between the two conventions and that the scientific committees should therefore be careful not to duplicate this work. In addition concern was expressed about the risk to duplicate the discussion that had led to the adoption of those principles in CBD and to address them separately while they were interlinked. In that regard it was mentioned that documents PC15/AC21 Doc. 13.1 did not include all the principles.

The AC Chairman reminded participants that the debate should not focus on the principles which had already been adopted and that documents PC15/AC21 Doc. 13.1 were simply a

basis for work. The issue currently at stake was to obtain case studies from Parties. The Committees moved on to establish a working group (PC15/AC21 WG5) to look at this issue [see document PC15/AC21 WG5 Doc. 1 (Rev. 1) for membership].

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the Working Group, the AC representative of Asia (Ms Prijono), introduced document PC15/AC21 WG5 Doc. 1. The Committees complimented PC15/AC21 WG5 on the result that it had achieved. Suggestions were made to allow the Secretariat to amend the format for presenting case studies to make it more user-friendly and to change the deadline for submitting them, so that they could be discussed at the next meeting. The Secretariat confirmed that the Notification to the Parties it would send to request case studies would include all necessary background information and set deadlines that would enable their compilation for AC22. Concerns were expressed about the vagueness of the terms "appropriate candidate species" and the number of Parties that might be willing to undertake this work. It was therefore suggested to give guidance for their selection, thereby ensuring a wide spectrum of species. However the AC Chairman reminded participants that this was not a core-CITES issue and that it was not meant to be a big-scale exercise. The idea to start with a sample case study that could illustrate what was required was welcomed. Clarification was also sought as to whether the review was supposed to show case studies that were examples of good application of the principles or whether they would be used to analyse those. The AC Chairman explained that the Plants Committee had been able to select four candidate taxa during its meeting and he invited suggestions for animal species before the end of the present meeting, to be forwarded to the representative of Asia (Ms Prijono).

The Committees adopted the report and decided or clarified the following:

- a) As a first step, one Party could produce a model case study to illustrate what was requested;
- b) The exercise was voluntary and it was hoped that Parties would respond positively to the invitation to participate in it;
- c) The dates mentioned in the report of PC15/AC21 WG5 would need to be modified to enable submission of the case studies in time for discussion at the next meetings of the AC and PC;
- d) The point of the exercise was to assess whether the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines were relevant in the context of CITES and not to provide a series of examples where these Principles and Guidelines had been applied to trade in CITES-listed species;
- e) *Cyclamen* spp., *Galanthus* spp., *Hoodia* spp. and *Panax quinquefolius* were proposed as candidate plant species for case studies;
- f) The Secretariat should distribute by Notification to the Parties the section in document PC15/AC21 WG5 Doc. 1 starting with *Format for case studies on Application of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines and linkages to exports of Appendix-II specimens*, down to the end.
- g) The observer from IFAW should be included in the list of members of PC15/AC21 WG5.

Later in the meeting, the AC representative of Asia (Ms Prijono) informed the participants that the following animal taxa had been selected: black corals (study to be conducted by the United States), the African elephant (Namibia), crocodiles (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) and butterflies (no country had volunteered yet). The Secretariat clarified that it would still issue a Notification requesting case studies and that this list was not exhaustive.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representatives of Asia (Ms Prijono), Europe (Ms Rodics) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the PC representatives of Africa

(Ms Khayota) and Oceania (Mr Leach), the observers from Austria, Israel, Japan, Mexico, Namibia, the United States, Conservation Force, David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation, Humane Society International, IFAW, Species Management Specialists Inc. and WWF US, and the Secretariat.

14. Trade in alien invasive species

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item, thanking the representative of Oceania (Mr Hay) for establishing contact at a CBD workshop on this topic that was being held in New Zealand in parallel with the present meeting. The Secretariat sought ideas from the Animals Committee as to ways to establish cooperation with the CBD Secretariat and the IUCN/SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group with regard to alien invasive species, as mandated under Resolution Conf. 13.10. The Committee felt that CITES's long experience was more likely to benefit CBD than vice-versa. Nevertheless it was suggested that a watch list of potentially invasive species that may have an impact on CITES species could be kept. Invasive species could also be accidentally spread with specimens of CITES-listed species and this was linked to the issue of transport. Based on their own experience, the observer from the European Commission also added that from a legislative point of view, merging lists of CITES-listed species and of invasive species in the same legislation could prove counter-productive as it could lead to protecting the very species that turned out to be pests. The observer from IUCN stated that her organization would keep the Committee informed of development in this field. Finally the AC Chairman suggested that Parties could perhaps send information to the Secretariat on how they dealt with invasive species at the national level.

The Secretariat thanked the participants for their input and advised that it would report on any progress at the next meeting.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) and Oceania (Mr Hay), and the observers from the United States, the European Commission, IUCN and Species Management Specialists Inc.

15. Progress report from the Co-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee

The Secretariat briefly introduced this agenda item on behalf of the zoologist of the Nomenclature Committee who had had to leave the meeting early. It explained that it would produce the minutes of the three NC meetings that had just been held and would circulate them within 60 days.

16. Transport of live animals

The representative of Europe (Ms Rodics) introduced documents AC21 Doc. 16.1 and Doc. 16.2. With a reminder from the AC Chairman that this issue could only be looked at in the context of transboundary transport, the Committee established a working group (AC21 WG4) to look at this issue [see document AC21 WG4 Doc. 1 (Rev. 1) for membership].

Later in the meeting, the representative of Europe (Ms Rodics) explained that the observer from Austria would be taking over the chairmanship of the Working Group on Transport of Live Animals and gave him the floor to introduce document AC21 WG4 Doc. 1. A sentence would need to be added in the working group report to reflect this and the last sentence of the introductory paragraph was amended for clarification purposes to read "The Secretariat noted that Resolution Conf. 10.21 may be usefully revised to ensure that less follow-up is required between meetings of the Conference of the Parties". A suggestion was made to reintroduce in the report the issue of mortality during transport, but given that mortality mainly occurred before or after transport itself, it was felt that it was sufficient to address it on a case-by-case basis. It was also clarified that what was meant by "feedback on the OIE (World Organisation for Animal Health) initiative" was to assess whether CITES Parties found the website portal to be launched by OIE useful and to forward this information to OIE. The Committee asked the Secretariat to rewrite this paragraph to make this clearer. The Committee also agreed that the intersessional Working Group on Transport would comprise the same membership as AC21 WG4. It took note of the report and adopted the actions specified therein, with the amendments mentioned above.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the European representative (Ms Rodics), the observers from Austria, South Africa and Humane Society International, and the Secretariat.

17. Sea cucumbers

The representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) introduced document AC21 Doc. 17. The AC Chairman added that Decision 13.48 gave a clear mandate to the Committee, which was to review the proceedings of the two workshops that had been organized on sea cucumbers. He doubted that the Committee would be able to prepare the discussion paper called for in paragraph b) of that Decision by the end of the present meeting, but added that what the Committee could do was to give guidelines on what should be included in that paper, indicating in particular the key issues to be considered; decide on the nature of the recommendations (country-specific or generic); give the Secretariat suggestions on how to produce terms of reference, which would help with fundraising; and suggest how range States could be involved. He reminded the Committee that only one species of sea cucumbers was CITES-listed and therefore only a limited amount of time could be spent on these taxa. Acknowledging the importance of FAO in this process, its observer was asked to join the working group. The Secretariat said it would make a draft of the technical workshop proceedings available to the working group. The Committee established a working group (AC21 WG5) to look at this issue [see document AC21 WG5 Doc. 1 (Rev. 1) for membership].

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the Working Group, the representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), introduced document AC21 WG5 Doc. 1 which was well received. The observer from Mexico mentioned that he had participated in the Working Group as this had not been recorded. The Secretariat pointed out that the programme of work needed to specify that it was dependent on the availability of funds. It acknowledged that the proceedings were taking a long time in the making and explained that it had received just before the start of the present meeting the draft which had been distributed to the Working Group. A suggestion was made that the future consultant identify the most important commercial species given the large number of species in these taxa, but it was not adopted. The Committee took note of the report and adopted it with the amendments mentioned above.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representative of Oceania (Mr Hay), the alternate representative of Asia (Mr Giam), the observers from Mexico, Japan and Humane Society International, and the Secretariat.

18. Conservation and management of sharks

The representative of Oceania (Mr Hay) introduced document AC21 Doc. 18, which included a draft work plan in paragraph 11. The observer from FAO informed the Committee that his organization had agreed to hold the workshop called for in Decision 13.42 but that the date and venue had not been decided yet. He invited CITES Parties to contact fishery agencies in order to ensure that their concerns be raised at that workshop. The Committee established a working group (AC21 WG6) to look at this issue [see document AC21 WG6 Doc. 1 (Rev. 1) for membership].

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the Working Group, the representative of Oceania (Mr Hay), introduced document AC21 WG6 Doc. 1, explaining that WG6 had focussed on setting up a process and identifying key-players. He also introduced the appended draft Notification to the Parties and explained that it still needed to be formatted by the Secretariat. He added that the result of the FAO workshop would be made available in the three working languages. Finally he gratefully acknowledged the offer by the observer from Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd to contribute to the work of the Working Group. The observers from Belgium, Canada and the European Commission, the latter on behalf of Ireland, asked that their countries be included in the intersessional Working Group. A request to change "species potentially threatened by trade" to "species of management concern" in paragraph b) ii), page 3, triggered a lengthy debate on the respective scope of each term. It was finally agreed to change the relevant paragraphs as follows:

This part of the Decision concerns both ~~two separate issues~~:

i) ~~The selection of a series of case studies covering a range of trade-related threats to sharks.~~

~~These include such as fin trade, curio trade, aquarium trade, and other impacts meat trade, including impacts of trade on freshwater species, but are not species specific and the~~

~~ii) The identification of the key shark species potentially threatened by this trade.~~

The AC Chairman also pointed out that the report needed to specify that the holding of an intersessional meeting depended on the availability of funding. The Committee also agreed to change question 6 of the questionnaire on page 6 from "What other specific information might Parties share to help in enabling your State to implement these listings?" to "What materials / other assistance might be helpful in enabling your State to implement these listings?". With these amendments and the addition of new members to the working group, the Committee took note of the report and adopted the actions therein.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representative of Oceania (Mr Hay), the alternate representative of Asia (Mr Giam), the observers from Belgium, Canada, China, the United States, the European Commission, FAO, Humane Society International, IUCN, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd. and Species Management Specialists Inc., and the Secretariat.

19. Conservation of and trade in great apes

The Secretariat introduced document AC21 Doc. 19 giving an update on recent developments, particularly that GRASP would organize a meeting at the end of 2005 and that the United Kingdom had pledged a donation of GBP 20,000 towards the conservation of great apes. The Secretariat welcomed suggestions on further collaboration with GRASP. The Committee established a working group (AC21 WG7) tasked with exploring the measures referred to the Committee in Resolution Conf. 13.4 [see document AC21 WG7 Doc. 1 (Rev. 1) for membership].

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the Working Group, the representative of Africa (Mr Bagine), introduced document AC21 WG7 Doc. 1. The list of participants in the Working Group was corrected to replace Humane Society International with Humane Society of the United States. The Secretariat asked who was supposed to make contact with the Interim Scientific Committee of GRASP in point 7 of the report, queried the fact that in point 9 a representative of GRASP was asked to report on the work mentioned in paragraph 2 whereas that work did not involve GRASP, and remarked that most recommendations in the report were not directed to the Animals Committee. Finally it suggested that the AC Chairman himself present those recommendations to the Standing Committee at SC53. Several interventions were made echoing the concern about the lack of actions involving the Animals Committee. The Working Group was therefore asked to recommend further actions that the Committee could pursue, for instance in terms of awareness-raising. A suggestion was also made that the AC Chairman invite more range States, such as Asian Parties, to join the Working Group, regardless of their participation in GRASP. The observer from IATA welcomed the suggestion made in point 6 but remarked that his organization was not an enforcement agency. Following on the comment by the AC Chairman that some actions in the report had financial implications for which there was no provision in the AC budget, the Secretariat advised that Germany had pledged EUR 30,000 for the Intergovernmental Meeting on Great Apes mentioned in point 5 of the report, and that the meeting was now likely to take place and would be a good forum for discussion. The Chairman of AC21 WG7 added that issue of funding was addressed in point 4 of the report. He explained that particular geographical areas had been selected as being the most problematic but that the list could be expanded. He clarified that this report was intended as a basis for intersessional work and that the Working Group was open to new members. The AC Chairman welcomed the suggestion that the Working Group continue gathering suggestions, especially those arising from technical missions, and offered to relay them to the Standing Committee. The Chairman of AC21 WG7 confirmed that he would strive to draw more African Parties in the Working Group and that he could be reached by email without problems. The representative of Asia (Ms Prijono) asked to be included in the Working Group, as did the observers from the United Republic of Tanzania, TRAFFIC and WWF. The Committee eventually adopted the report after declining an offer by the AC Chairman to submit this adoption to a vote.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Africa (Mr Bagine), Asia (Mr Pourkazemi and Ms Prijono) and North America (Mr Medellin), the alternate representatives

of Asia (Mr Giam) and Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Velasco), the observers from the United Republic of Tanzania, Born Free USA, Humane Society International and IATA, and the Secretariat.

20. Progress report on the Identification Manual

The Secretariat briefly introduced this agenda item and referred the Committee to document CoP13 Doc. 54 (Rev. 2), explaining that there had been no development since this document had been produced. The Committee noted the report of the Secretariat.

21. Time and venue of the 22nd meeting of the Animals Committee

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC15/AC21 meeting.

The Secretariat introduced documents PC15 Doc. 21 (Rev. 1) and AC21 Doc. 21 (Rev. 1), reminding the Committees that the Conference of the Parties had decided that their meetings should now be held back to back. The AC Chairman specified that the next meeting would probably have to be held in late August or early September 2006. The Secretariat added that the deadline for submitting documents for CoP14 would probably be around January 2007. The Committees took note of Indonesia's and Peru's offers to host the next meetings of the Plants and Animals Committees. They thanked them and asked for an official offer. They also decided to follow the Secretariat's suggestion to issue a Notification to the Parties inviting offers to host the meetings. The Chairmen would then make a choice on the basis of the offers received. The Secretariat advised the participants that it would provide a list of requirements for holding the meetings on request and reminded them that, by accepting to host a meeting, a Party committed itself to accept delegates from all Parties.

22. Any other business

As agreed under agenda item 3.1, the Committee discussed the implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.2 regarding the Procedure for approval of externally funded projects. The AC Chairman regretted that Parties did not take enough advantage of the process to raise funds laid out in that Resolution and stressed that the Animals Committee could give input in this regard. He suggested making *Funding research projects* a standing agenda item of the meetings of the Committee and this was agreed.

23. Closing remarks

At the end of the joint meeting, the AC Chairman declared that meeting with the Plants Committee had been a very useful exercise. This was echoed by the PC Chairman, although she noted that the exercise had reduced the amount of time available for discussion of purely botanical matters.

At the end of the Animals Committee meeting, the AC Chairman thanked all participants, Parties, IGOs and NGOs alike, and in particular new members of the Committee. He also thanked the interpreters and the Secretariat. The representative of Oceania, on behalf of the Committee and the observers, congratulated the Chairman on his renewed nomination and his chairmanship. With this, the AC chairman closed AC21.

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

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

STRATEGIC PLANNING

COMPOSITION: Members and alternate members of the Animals Committee; Chair: Thomas Althaus

GENERAL

Lessons learned so far:

- Many tasks given to the AC by CoPs/Parties through Resolutions or Decisions do not 'fit' the Strategic Plan and its Action Points.
- Several Action Points directed to the AC seem not very appropriate: AC should concentrate on scientific aspects of implementing the Convention.
- Wording of several Action Points needs to be made clearer and less ambiguous.
- Assignments for the AC should be clearly linked to objectives or Action Points in the new Strategic Plan to ensure continuity, timely implementation of the priorities in the Plan, and avoid that the AC is overloaded with tasks outside the Plan.
- In case Action Points are directed to different CITES bodies, the level of input required from the AC should be clarified as well as who is expected to take the 'lead'.
- Need to identify clear indicators of success and expected outputs in the new Action Point.
- See some specific suggestions in **bold** in the table.

Completion of this document and the Table:

Alvaro Velasco Barbieri, Representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean will be focal point for completing the table and collating comments from AC Representatives.

- Will have to consider reports of AC Chairman to CoP11 CoP12 and CoP13 to assess progress.
- Review regional reports from representatives and AC documents produced since 2000.
- Look at wording in document produced by PC on this matter (PC15 WG1 Doc. 1) of reported progress in relation to Action Points; consider wording and prioritization in document AC21 Doc. 6.3.

**ACTION POINTS IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN 2000-2005 DIRECTED TO THE ANIMALS COMMITTEE:
PROGRESS SINCE 2000 AND PRIORITY FOR REMAINING PERIOD TILL 2007**

Action Point	Priority	Action by	Progress
GOAL 1: ENHANCE THE ABILITY OF EACH PARTY TO IMPLEMENT THE CONVENTION			
Objective 1.1			
To assist in the development of appropriate domestic legislation and policies that encourage the adoption and implementation of social and economic incentives allied to legal instruments that:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Promote and regulate sustainable management of wild fauna and flora; – Promote and regulate responsible trade in wild fauna and flora; – Promote the effective enforcement of the Convention. 			
Unclear – need to redefine objective, make it more targeted and redefine who this is directed to			
1.1.4 Ensure adequate review and adoption of policies and legislation (e.g. land tenure; access to natural resources; harvesting; transporting, handling and housing of live specimens; and effective seizures, fines and penalties) which may be having a significant impact on the conservation status of species or implementation of the Convention.	L	Parties, Secretariat, Animals Committee	Participation in economics and trade workshop, 2003 No major actions undertaken. Role of AC unclear.
1.1.6 Develop further regulations to prevent unnecessary loss during catching, storage and transportation of live animals.	M	Parties, Secretariat, Animals Committee	Ongoing input provided through Transport Working Group [eg development of guidelines; revision of Resolution]
Objective 1.4			
To facilitate development and use of appropriate technologies and information management systems that enhance and expedite the collection, submission and exchange of accurate information.			
Need to clarify this objective. If this includes communication of information between AC reps and their region, and amongst each other, this would be a high priority.			
1.4.1 On the basis of information from Parties, evaluate needs, capabilities and opportunities related to information technologies and management.	H	Secretariat, with three permanent Committees Indicator: Evaluation of information technology and management needs.	Activities to improve regional communication; manual for representatives; ...

1.4.4 Develop a simple guide to the Review of Significant Trade.	L	Secretariat, Animals and Plants Committees Indicator: Training material(s) on the review of significant trade available in the three languages of CITES in appropriate media.	Lead with the Secretariat. Suggestions: Guide should be very simple, clear and accessible; envisage more language versions than the three official ones; include with correspondence to Parties more information on what Parties should consider submitting as responses (checklist?); ..
1.4.5 Develop and enhance databases that include information related to species in trade, CITES Decisions and procedures.	L	Secretariat, Animals and Plants Committees Indicator: Provision of information to databases and awareness of databases and availability; hits and use of databases.	AC has not taken specific actions; AC provides information or advice as and when required; consultative role.
<p>Objective 1.7 To improve the coordination between CITES Management and Scientific Authorities, and increase the effectiveness of the latter.</p> <p>Coordination between AC members and their region, and between AC members and other CITES bodies should be added here</p>			
1.7.1 Develop a manual specifying the obligations and procedures of the Scientific Authorities in order to encourage the development of specific training courses for them.	L	Secretariat with Animals and Plants Committees Indicator: Assistance provided to the Secretariat.	Lead with the Secretariat. AC has not taken particular actions; AC provides information or advice as and when required; consultative role.
1.7.2 Develop regional directories that list the botanists and zoologists in each region who are experts in CITES-listed species.	L/M	Plants Committee, Animals Committee Indicator: Current regional directories on CITES website.	AC members have not taken action so far. Priority depends on the region, and representatives should decide if they want to develop a regional directory in addition to existing address lists (principally of Scientific Authorities on the CITES website)
<p>Objective 2.1 To ensure that the Convention's Appendices correctly reflect the conservation and management needs of species.</p>			
GOAL 2: STRENGTHEN THE SCIENTIFIC BASIS OF THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES			
2.1.2 Regularly review the Appendices to ensure that listed taxa satisfy the relevant criteria.	H	Animals and Plants Committees Indicators: Relevant criteria for listing species in the Appendices. Methodology for reviewing species in the Appendices to ensure listed species satisfy the relevant criteria. Recommendations regarding the Appendix listing (transfer,	Ongoing activity Developed new listing Criteria Development of new guidelines for conducting periodic reviews Reviewed xxx species, resulting in yyy CoP proposals

		maintenance, or deletion).	
2.1.3 Continue the Review of Significant Trade as initiated by the Parties in Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) ² .	H	Animals and Plants Committees Indicator: Species and countries involved in significant trade review.	Ongoing Revised Resolution Reviewed xxx species, resulting in actions regarding yyy range States
2.1.4 Evaluate trade and biological information on currently unlisted species subject to significant international trade to determine whether they would qualify for and benefit from CITES listing.	M	Animals and Plants Committees Indicator: Studies on biology and trade of internationally traded non-CITES species.	Ongoing Revised trade and conservation issues of sea cucumbers, sea horses, sharks, and tortoises and freshwater turtles with the following results:...
Objective 2.2			
To ensure that decisions to amend the Convention's Appendices are founded on sound and relevant scientific information and meet agreed biological and trade criteria for such amendments.			
2.2.2 Encourage Parties to consult with the Animals and Plants Committees as appropriate to assist in the preparation of proposals to amend the Appendices.	M	Secretariat, Animals and Plants Committees Indicator: Proposals for amending the Appendices are brought before the Committee.	AC has not taken particular actions, but provided comments as required. AC commented on xx proposals, which were decided upon at CoP as follows:...
2.2.3 For identified commodities, develop standardized units of measure for permits, trade analysis and reporting.	M	Secretariat, Animals and Plants Committees	AC has undertaken a number of activities concerning seahorses (size limits), shark products (customs codes), corals (taxa that need to be reported species-specifically), ...
Objective 2.3			
To improve the scientific basis on which Scientific Authorities make non-detriment findings.			
2.3.1 Develop practical guidance for making non-detriment findings, including a manual and checklist, and samples of non-detriment findings and case studies.		Secretariat with Animals and Plants Committees Indicator: Manual, checklist, samples, and case studies available.	
2.3.2 Facilitate national and regional training for Scientific Authorities in the issuance of scientifically based non-detriment findings; include the use of the aforementioned guidance on non-detriment findings.		Secretariat with Animals and Plants Committees Indicator: Improved scientific basis in non-detriment findings.	

² Replaced by Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13).

2.3.5 Provide opportunities for Scientific Authorities to exchange information and data (e.g. sharing of non-detriment findings; sharing of data, management plans and case studies; postings to a website; and communication through a listserver).		Parties, Secretariat, Animals and Plants Committees Indicator: Increased access to information.	
<p>Objective 2.4</p> <p>To develop innovative technologies and encourage relevant research, including research into CITES implementation and enforcement, and to pursue these objectives, where appropriate, at the regional level.</p>			
2.4.1 In collaboration with enforcement agencies, identify the needs for and potential benefits of innovative technologies.		Secretariat, Animals and Plants Committees, Parties	
2.4.2 In collaboration with Parties, international agencies, and relevant research entities, identify the available technologies (e.g. digital technology, microchips, barcodes, holograms, DNA testing) relevant to assisting the better implementation of the Convention.		Secretariat, Animals and Plants Committees	
2.4.4 Develop with relevant institutions collaborative research projects for testing the appropriateness of new and forthcoming technologies.		Secretariat, Animals and Plants Committees	
2.4.5 Assess progress on a regional basis.		Standing, Animals and Plants Committees	
<p>GOAL 4: PROMOTE GREATER UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONVENTION</p>			
<p>Objective 4.3</p> <p>To promote greater awareness among and cooperation with the scientific community.</p>			
4.3.2 Participate actively at scientific meetings and conferences, and encourage participation in CITES issues by the scientific community.		Secretariat, Scientific Authorities, Animals, and Plants Committees Indicator: Increased awareness and involvement in CITES issues by the scientific community.	

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

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

REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE IN SPECIMENS OF APPENDIX II SPECIES

The Working Group on the Review of Significant Trade had two main tasks: to report on progress in the implementation of the Review of Significant Trade, particularly species already in the process (as per AC21 Doc. 10.1.1 (Rev.1)); and to select species for trade reviews after CoP13 (as per AC21 Doc. 10.2).

In terms of the first task, the WG considered three matters:

- a) finalisation of recommendations on *Cuora amboinensis* in Indonesia and Malaysia (Doc. 10.1.1 (Rev.1), Paragraph 9);
- b) renewal of the preliminary categorisation of *Falco cherrug* proposed by the Secretariat, eliminate range States where the species is of least concern, and formulate, in consultation with the Secretariat, recommendations for the remaining ones (Doc. 10.1.1 (Rev.1), Para. 13); and
- c) review the available responses from States and other documents to determine whether the AC is satisfied that Article IV is correctly implemented [Doc.10.1.1 (Rev.1), Paragraph15]

Membership:

Chairman: Mr Thomas Althaus (AC Chairman).

Members: representative of Europe (Ms Katalin Rodics) and alternate representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Sr. Alvaro José Velasco Barbieri);

Parties: Belgium; Canada; China; Czech Republic; Denmark (Greenland); France; Germany; Honduras; Indonesia; Italy; Madagascar; Netherlands; Slovakia; South Africa; Spain; Tanzania; Tunisia; United Arab Emirates; United Kingdom; United States; Zambia;

IGOs and NGOS: IFAW; International Animal Trade Organization; Deutsche Gesellschaft Für Herpetologie und Terrarienkunde E.V.; Species Survival Network; Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society; Conservation Force; David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation; Pet Care Trust; IUCN; WWF-US; International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation; Safari Club International Foundation; UNEP-WCMC; Pro Wildlife; International Caviar Importers Association France.

CITES Secretariat (also as rapporteur).

CUORA AMBOINENSIS:

Malaysia:

The Working Group recommended that the AC make the following recommendations to Malaysia for *Cuora amboinensis*:

- a) The Malaysian Management Authority should provide information to the Secretariat of its implementation of Article IV for trade in *Cuora amboinensis* in Peninsular Malaysia, Sarawak and Sabah; and

- b) The MA should commit to undertake a status assessment and field study of the species in Peninsular Malaysia, Sabah and Sarawak to be completed within 24 months, and to develop and implement an adaptive management programme for the species on the basis of the results of this study.

The reports should also address the nature of ranching procedures in Malaysia and the discrepancy between export and import trade data.

Indonesia:

The Working Group recommended that the AC make the following recommendations to Indonesia for *Cuora amboinensis*:

- a) The Indonesian Management Authority should review the annual export quota for *Cuora amboinensis*; and
- b) The MA should commit to undertake a status assessment and field study of the species to be completed within 24 months, and to develop and implement an adaptive management programme for the species on the basis of the results of this study.

FALCO CHERRUG

The WG suggested that the AC maintain the three categories as indicated in AC21 Doc. 10.1.1 (Rev.1) Annex 1 (Provisional categorisation of *Falco cherrug* by the Secretariat in accordance with Paragraphs (g) to (i) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. COP13)).

The only change suggested to the listed countries was the addition of Slovakia to category (iii), "Range states where *Falco cherrug* is categorised as of 'least concern' and where the available information appears to indicate that the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2(a), 3 or 6(a) are being implemented."

The WG suggested that when issuing recommendations, the following elements should be considered:

- i) Range states where *Falco cherrug* is categorised as of 'urgent concern':
- immediately establishing a zero quota for wild and captive bred specimens; informing the AC about the status of the species and how the status was determined; informing the AC on which basis the non-detriment findings would be found; providing AC with full details on any captive breeding facilities.
- ii) Range states where *Falco cherrug* is categorised as 'possible concern':
- a) Countries for which UNEP-WCMC have recorded exports and who have not replied to Secretariat requests for information:
- informing the AC about the status of the species and how the status was determined; informing the AC on which basis the non-detriment findings were made; providing full details to the AC on any captive breeding facilities; informing the country that lack of response to requests for information could result in re-categorisation into category i).
- b) Countries for which UNEP-WCMC have not recorded exports and who have not replied to Secretariat requests for information:
- informing the AC about the status of the species and how the status was determined; informing the AC on which basis the non-detriment findings were made if trade were to be permitted; informing the country that lack of response to requests for information could result in re-categorisation into category i).
- iii) Range states where *Falco cherrug* is categorised as of 'least concern':
- these countries will be excluded from the process

ARTICLE IV IMPLEMENTATION

See Annex to this document.

SELECTION OF NEW SPECIES (AC21 Doc. 10.2)

The WG decided to address previously selected and suggested species, and not to add too many new species to the list.

The WG suggested one genus and one species for inclusion under the Significant Trade Review process:

Mantella (all species)

Testudo graeca (Lebanon)

The Chairman advised that when species were to be selected in accordance with paragraph (c) of the resolution, supporting documentation should be provided in advance.

The issue of the selection of *Monodon monoceros* was referred to a small working group.

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

Psittacus erithacus

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
Angola	No reply	Included	
Benin	No reply	Included	
Burundi	No reply	Included	
Cameroon	Reply received	Included	
Côte d'Ivoire	Reply received	Included	
Central African Republic	No reply	Included	
Congo	No reply	Included	
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Reply received	Included	
Equatorial Guinea	No reply	Included	
Gabon	Reply received	Included	
Ghana	Reply received	Excluded from review	Ban in place
Guinea	No reply	Included	
Guinea-Bissau	Reply received	Included	
Kenya	Reply received	Included	
Liberia	No reply	Included	
Mali	No reply	Included	
Nigeria	No reply	Included	
Rwanda	No reply	Included	
Sierra Leone	No reply	Included	
Togo	Reply received	Included	
Uganda	No reply	Included	
United Republic of Tanzania	No reply	Excluded from review	Ban in place (reported at AC21)

Poicephalus senegalus

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
Benin	No reply	Included	
Burkina Faso	No reply	Included	
Cameroon	No reply	Included	
Chad	No reply	Included	
Côte d'Ivoire	Reply received	Included	
Gambia	No reply	Included	

Ghana	No reply	Included	
Guinea	No reply	Included	
Guinea-Bissau	Reply received	Included	
Liberia	No reply	Included	
Mali	No reply	Included	
Mauritania	No reply	Included	
Niger	No reply	Included	
Nigeria	No reply	Included	
Senegal	No reply	Included	
Sierra Leone	No reply	Included	
Togo	Reply received	Included	

Gracula religiosa

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received	Excluded from review	Species not native; small introduced population exists
Bangladesh	No reply	Included	
Bhutan	No reply	Included	
Brunei Darussalam	No reply	Included	
Cambodia	No reply	Included	
China	Reply received	Excluded from review	No legal trade reported since 2000
India	No reply	Included	
Indonesia	Reply received	Excluded from review	Zero quota set up since 2000
Malaysia	Reply received	Included	
Myanmar	No reply	Included	
Nepal	No reply	Included	
Philippines	Reply received	Excluded from review	No reported trade
Singapore	Reply received	Excluded from review	Minimal figures for re-exports only
Sri Lanka	No reply	Included	
Thailand	No reply	Included	
Viet Nam	Reply received	Excluded from review	No permits for legal export given since 2000

Callagur borneoensis

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
Brunei Darussalam	No reply	Included	
Indonesia	Reply received	Excluded from review	Zero quota reported
Malaysia	Reply received	Included	
Thailand	No reply	Included	

Phelsuma dubia

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
French Polynesia, Mayotte, Wallis and Futuna Islands (France)	No reply	Included	
Kenya	Reply received	Included	
Madagascar	No reply	Included	
Mozambique	No reply	Included	
United Republic of Tanzania	No reply	Included	

Phelsuma v-nigra

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
Comoros	No reply	Included	
French Polynesia, Mayotte, Wallis and Futuna Islands (France)	No reply	Included	

Phelsuma comorensis

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
Comoros	No reply	Included	

Uromastyx acanthinura

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
Algeria	No reply	Included	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	No reply	Included	
Morocco	Reply received	Excluded from review	Exports only for scientific purposes and for zoos
Tunisia	No reply	Excluded from review	No trade - reported at AC21

Uromastyx benti

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
Oman	No reply	Included	
Saudi Arabia	No reply	Included	
Yemen	No reply	Included	

Uromastyx dispar

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
Algeria	No reply	Included	
Chad	No reply	Included	
Mali	No reply	Included	
Mauritania	No reply	Included	
Sudan	No reply	Included	

Uromastyx geyri

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
Algeria	No reply	Included	
Mali	No reply	Included	
Niger	No reply	Included	

Uromastyx ocellata

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
Djibouti	No reply	Included	
Egypt	No reply	Included	
Eritrea	No reply	Included	
Ethiopia	Reply received	Included	
Somalia	No reply	Included	
Sudan	No reply	Included	

Furcifer cephalolepis

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
Comoros	No reply	Included	

Hippopus hippopus

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received	Excluded from review	Minimal re-exports only

Australia	No reply	Included	
China	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial trade since 1999
Comoros	No reply	Included	
Fiji	No reply	Included	
India	No reply	Included	
Indonesia	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Japan	No reply	Included	
Kenya	No reply	Included	
Kiribati	No reply	Included	
Malaysia	No reply	Included	
Marshall Islands	No reply	Included	
Mauritius	No reply	Included	
Micronesia	No reply	Included	
Myanmar	No reply	Included	
New Caledonia (France)	Reply received	Included	
Palau	No reply	Included	
Papua New Guinea	No reply	Included	
Philippines	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Solomon Islands	Reply received	Excluded from review	Only hatchery operations
Somalia	No reply	Included	
Thailand	Reply received	Excluded from review	Export prohibition in place
Tonga	No reply	Included	
Vanuatu	No reply	Included	
Viet Nam	No reply	Included	

Tridacna crocea

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received	Excluded from review	Minimal regulated exports; minimal re-exports
Australia	No reply	Included	
China	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports since 1999
Fiji	No reply	Included	
India	No reply	Included	
Indonesia	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Japan	No reply	Included	

Malaysia	No reply	Included	
New Caledonia (France)	Reply received	Included	
Palau	No reply	Included	
Papua New Guinea	No reply	Included	
Philippines	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Singapore	Reply received	Excluded from review	Minimal re-exports only
Solomon Islands	Reply received	Excluded from review	Only hatchery operations
Thailand	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Vanuatu	No reply	Included	
Viet Nam	No reply	Included	

Tridacna derasa

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received	Excluded from review	Minimal regulated exports; minimal re-exports
Australia	No reply	Included	
Comoros	No reply	Included	
Cook Islands	Reply received	Excluded from review	Only hatchery operations
Fiji	No reply	Included	
Indonesia	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Marshall Islands	No reply	Included	
Micronesia	No reply	Included	
New Caledonia (France)	Reply received	Included	
Palau	No reply	Included	
Papua New Guinea	No reply	Included	
Philippines	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Solomon Islands	Reply received	Excluded from review	Only hatchery operations
Tonga	No reply	Included	
Vanuatu	No reply	Included	
Viet Nam	No reply	Included	

Tridacna gigas

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received	Excluded from review	Minimal regulated exports; minimal re-exports
Australia	No reply	Included	
China	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Comoros	No reply	Included	
Fiji	No reply	Included	
Indonesia	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Japan	No reply	Included	
Kiribati	No reply	Included	
Malaysia	No reply	Included	
Marshall Islands	No reply	Included	
Micronesia	No reply	Included	
Myanmar	No reply	Included	
Palau	No reply	Included	
Papua New Guinea	No reply	Included	
Philippines	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Seychelles	Reply received	Excluded from review	Aquaculture production only
Solomon Islands	Reply received	Excluded from review	Only hatchery operations
Thailand	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Tonga	No reply	Included	
Vanuatu	No reply	Included	
Viet Nam	No reply	Included	

Tridacna maxima

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received	Excluded from review	NDF issued in accordance with Art IV
Australia	No reply	Included	
China	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Comoros	No reply	Included	
Cook Islands	Reply received	Excluded from review	Only hatchery operations
Egypt	No reply	Included	
Fiji	No reply	Included	

French Polynesia, Mayotte, Wallis and Futuna Islands (France)	No reply	Included	
India	No reply	Included	
Indonesia	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Japan	No reply	Included	
Kenya	No reply	Included	
Kiribati	No reply	Included	
Madagascar	No reply	Included	
Malaysia	No reply	Included	
Marshall Islands	No reply	Included	
Mauritius	No reply	Included	
Micronesia	No reply	Included	
Mozambique	No reply	Included	
Myanmar	No reply	Included	
New Caledonia (France)	Reply received	Included	
Niue	No reply	Included	
Palau	No reply	Included	
Papua New Guinea	No reply	Included	
Philippines	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Pitcairn Islands (United Kingdom)	No reply	Included	
Réunion (France)	No reply	Included	
Saudi Arabia	No reply	Included	
Seychelles	Reply received	Excluded from review	Aquaculture production
Singapore	Reply received	Excluded from review	Minimal re-exports only
Solomon Islands	Reply received	Excluded from review	Only hatchery operations
Somalia	No reply	Included	
South Africa	No reply	Excluded from review	Information provided at AC21
Sri Lanka	No reply	Included	
Thailand	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Tonga	No reply	Included	
United Republic of Tanzania	No reply	Included	
Vanuatu	No reply	Included	
Viet Nam	No reply	Included	

Tridacna squamosa

Range State	Response	Recommendations	Comments
American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico (United States of America)	Reply received	Excluded from review	NDF issued in accordance with Art IV
Australia	No reply	Included	
China	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Comoros	No reply	Included	
Cook Islands	Reply received	Excluded from review	Only hatchery operations
Egypt	No reply	Included	
Fiji	No reply	Included	
India	No reply	Included	
Indonesia	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Japan	No reply	Included	
Kenya	No reply	Included	
Kiribati	No reply	Included	
Madagascar	No reply	Included	
Malaysia	No reply	Included	
Marshall Islands	No reply	Included	
Mauritius	No reply	Included	
Micronesia	No reply	Included	
Mozambique	No reply	Included	
Myanmar	No reply	Included	
New Caledonia (France)	Reply received	Included	
Niue	No reply	Included	
Palau	No reply	Included	
Papua New Guinea	No reply	Included	
Philippines	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Pitcairn Islands (United Kingdom)	No reply	Included	
Saudi Arabia	No reply	Included	
Seychelles	Reply received	Excluded from review	Aquaculture production
Singapore	Reply received	Excluded from review	Minimal re-exports only
Solomon Islands	Reply received	Excluded from review	Only hatchery operations
Somalia	No reply	Included	
South Africa	No reply	Excluded from review	Information provided at AC21
Sri Lanka	No reply	Included	

Thailand	Reply received	Excluded from review	No commercial exports
Tonga	No reply	Included	
United Republic of Tanzania	No reply	Included	
Vanuatu	No reply	Included	
Viet Nam	No reply	Included	

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

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

PERIODIC REVIEW OF ANIMAL SPECIES INCLUDED IN THE CITES APPENDICES

Chair: Colmán Ó Críodáin, European Commission

Animals Committee: Asia (Nobuo Ishii (alternate), Japan), North America (Rodrigo Medellín, Mexico)

Parties: Canada (Veronique Brondex, Carolina Caceres), Japan (Yoshio Kaneko), Mexico (Hesiquio Benitez, Paola Mosig Reidl), Namibia (Christie Nghidinwa), Netherlands (Tine Griede), Slovakia (Zuna Vranková), Spain (Carlos Ibero), United Kingdom (Vin Fleming), United States of America (Roddy Gabel)

Observers: Association of Northeast Fish and Wildlife Agencies (Calvin DuBrock), Conservation Force (John J. Jackson III), Humane Society International (Ronald Orenstein, Rapporteur), International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (Don MacLauchlan), IWMC-World Conservation Trust (Jaques Berney), Safari Club International Foundation (Bob Byrne), Southeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (Osborne Baker), UNEP-WCMC (Gerardo Fragoso), Wildlife Conservation Society (Joshua Ginsberg)

CITES Secretariat (Milena S. Schmidt)

The Working Group met during morning and afternoon sessions on May 24, 2005. The Group addressed three tasks: the process for selection of future species for review [AC21 Doc. 11.1 (Rev. 1)], the status of reviews of already selected species (AC21 Doc. 11.2), and the proposed review of the Felidae (AC21 Doc. 11.3).

Selection of Species

The Working Group decided that, given the concerns raised in AC21 Doc. 11.1 (Rev. 1) about the usefulness of the existing guidelines, it would not be appropriate to select further individual species for review at this stage, though future *ad hoc* reviews could still be performed by the Animals Committee or by individual Parties should the data be available. The Working Group agreed that the approach of the review should be balanced, accepting equally the possibilities of deletion, transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II or transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I as potential outcomes. The Working Group agreed that only species currently listed in Appendices I and II should be considered for review.

UNEP-WCMC proposed that it could perform an analysis on a small subset of the Appendices, with the results to be made available for consideration at AC22. A number of "filters" were agreed that could be applied to the Appendices to produce a manageable data subset. These included:

- identifying species for which no legal trade has been recorded in the past ten years (it was noted that this criterion would require modification for species on Appendix I)
- excluding species recently reviewed (there was some disagreement about whether species subject to the Review of Significant Trade should also be excluded)
- species subject to other reviews such as those targeted by valid Decisions and Resolutions of the Parties (including African and Asian rhinoceros, elephants, leopards, markhor, cetaceans, vicuna, musk deer, Tibetan antelope, tortoises and freshwater turtles, Appendix-I Asian big cat species,

sharks, sturgeons and paddlefish, great apes, saiga antelope, marine turtles, medicinal plants included in Appendix II, bigleaf mahogany and agarwood producing taxa)

It was also agreed that, having filtered the data, UNEP-WCMC should identify as far as possible species whose classification under CITES is not congruent with listings by IUCN, domestic laws (where information available) and other listings of threatened species

Mexico noted it will present a review of *Crocodylus moreletii* at AC22.

The Working Group agreed that UNEP-WCMC should prepare a report on listed species of Amphibia, and on species of another taxon with similar-sized representation in the CITES Appendices (Galliformes and Lepidoptera were suggested as possibilities), for consideration at AC22 both with respect to selection of species and for possible modification of the review guidelines.

As part of its analysis UNEP-WCMC could identify on a preliminary basis species for which no review appeared to be warranted, species for which no recent trade had been reported, etc. (taking into account the possibility of misidentifications and taxonomic confusion).

Taking into account the results of this exercise, UNEP-WCMC would present to AC22 a preliminary review of the way to proceed with the remaining higher taxonomic groupings in the Appendices.

The Working Group noted changes to the flow chart suggested by the Plants Committee, but decided not to suggest specific revisions to the guidelines pending the report to be prepared by UNEP-WCMC.

Previously Selected Species

The Working Group considered what to do about species selected by the Animals Committee in 1999 and 2000 for which reviews have not been completed. Of the outstanding species, the Group decided to eliminate *Panthera pardus*, *Boa constrictor*, *Bufo superciliaris* and *Dyscophus antongilli* (these amphibian taxa will form part of the proposed UNEP-WCMC review), and *Goniopora* spp. Spain offered to review *Ornithoptera alexandrae*, the United States of America offered to review *Agapornis fischerii* and *Caloenas nicobarica*, and both these Parties offered to review *Hirudo medicinalis*.

For the remaining species, *Callithrix jacchus*, *Cephalophus sylvicultor*, *Mirounga leonina*, *Pteropus macrotis*, *Rhea americana*, *Crocodylus lacertinus* and *Tupinambis teguixin*, the Group recommended that the Secretariat issue a Notification to the Parties asking those countries which had volunteered to conduct reviews if they were still able to do so, and asking other Parties if they would be willing to review outstanding species if the original reviewers were not available.

Annex 1 provides suggested text for the proposed Notification.

The Working Group considered the reviews prepared by Mexico for *Dermatemys mawii* and *Ambystoma mexicanum*, both currently listed on Appendix II.

For *Dermatemys mawii*, the Group agreed that the available data indicate that the species could meet the biological criteria for Appendix I. However, only data for the Mexican population were available for review, and the Working Group encourages the other range states of the species (Belize, Guatemala and Honduras) to provide information on their populations to Mexico for consideration at AC22. The Working Group also encourages others who are in a position to gather information on the status of the species in the remaining range states to provide it to Mexico.

For *Ambystoma mexicanum*, the Group agreed that the data indicates that the species meets the biological criteria for Appendix I. The Working Group suggests deferring a final recommendation by the Animals Committee on this species until AC22, so that full consideration can be given to the practical implications of the various options for reclassifying this species under CITES.

Review of Felidae

The United States outlined the procedure for the review of the Felidae in AC21 Doc. 11.3. It was agreed that the entire review does not have to be completed by CoP14, but that Phase I (on *Lynx*) should be

completed by AC22 in order that Phase II, which should commence after AC22, can take into account methodological lessons learned from Phase I.

The Working Group recommended excluding all populations of *Panthera pardus* from the review of the Felidae complex, and not only the populations of Asia as recommended in document AC21 Doc. 11.3.

The Working Group made some suggestions with respect to the proposed procedure, including suggestions that the look-alike aspects of the study might be initiated at an early stage. It was further suggested that the review might be useful for the development of future analyses of the problems raised by look-alike species.

Annex 2 contains the text of proposed revisions to the procedure agreed to by the Working Group.

The Working Group agreed that the review should be conducted by an intersessional e-mail contact group of Range States and other relevant bodies, to be coordinated by the United States. Interested Parties and other organisations are encouraged to participate. Canada, Mexico and Spain already expressed interest in participating. The group noted that funding would be required to perform field studies and other aspects of the review.

PROPOSED TEXT FOR NOTIFICATION TO THE PARTIES

Following AC21, the state of play with regard to species selected for periodic review of the Appendices at AC15 and AC16 is indicated in the attached Table. Given the lapse of time, Parties that had volunteered to conduct a review, but that have not yet been in a position to carry it out, are asked to confirm that their offer to conduct the review still stands. Other Parties that are available to share the work or contribute funds with respect to those species are also invited to come forward.

For species for which there are no volunteers at present, volunteer Parties and offers of funding or assistance are also sought.

STRATEGY FOR REVIEW OF FELIDAE (REVISED)

A. Approach in two phases:

Phase I, AC21-AC22 – *Lynx* complex and potential look-alikes

Phase II, AC22-AC23 – Remaining Felidae

Phase II would take account of methodological lessons learned in Phase I and would continue after CoP14.

B. Trade review of *Lynx* spp. and look-alikes

1. Species and volumes in trade – analysis of UNEP-WCMC data

- a) Sources: wild, captive-bred, other
- b) Specimens in trade: whole skins, parts, products, live animals

2. Survey of illegal trade – report on confiscations, interdictions, etc. by TRAFFIC, subject to availability of funds

- a) Possibly to include an industry survey
- b) Consider analysis of market influences, which may indicate whether substitutions of different species are likely to occur in practice, and under what conditions

C. Status review

1. Survey all range countries of *Lynx* spp. to determine:

- a) Status (increasing, decreasing, or stable population and range)
- b) Potential threats, with emphasis on impacts of trade
 - i) Is harvest allowed?
 - ii) If so, is it regulated?
 - iii) If so, for what purposes?
 - iv) What is harvest level and how is it determined?
 - v) What exports are allowed?
 - vi) Is illegal trade documented or perceived to be a significant problem?
 - vii) Are there other identified threats to the species?

2. Determine overall status of the species from range-country surveys and other sources (taking into account the outcome of the forthcoming revision of the status of Felidae by the IUCN specialist group, as well as other information sources).

3. For each species: is it being adversely impacted by trade, or is it likely to become so without continued listing in the Appendices? For Appendix-I species (i.e. those remaining in the review): are they still 'threatened with extinction'?

D. Similarity of appearance, listings under Article II. 2. (b)

1. Is there evidence of this species being traded as other species, or vice versa (i.e. are there known problems with similarity of appearance)
2. Determine which species are true look-alikes (e.g. does *Caracal caracal* really resemble *Lynx* spp., as stated in CITES identification materials?).
3. Survey current literature and consult experts to determine, in addition to colour, whether other differences exist for comparison and identification (e.g. hair microscopy or other characteristics of integument).
4. If possible, determine how much of trade is in whole pelts versus parts, which will help focus the review on where identification is problematic and whether it is necessary to control trade beyond the country of harvest. To summarise, in the form that "species A" and "species B" are traded, what are the difficulties in distinguishing specimens and what are the possible solutions?

SPECIES SELECTED BY THE ANIMALS COMMITTEE IN 1999 AND 2000 IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PERIODIC REVIEWS OF SPECIES INCLUDED IN THE CITES APPENDICES (PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH V) UNDER RESOLVES IN ANNEX 2 OF RESOLUTION CONF. 9.1 (REV.) ON ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEES SUBSEQUENTLY REPLACED BY RESOLUTION CONF. 11.1

Species (Appendix in 1999 and 2000)	Party volunteering to conduct the periodic review	Completion of the reviews	Final AC recommendation
Mammals			
<i>Callithrix jacchus</i> (I)	Brazil		
<i>Cephalophus sylvicultor</i> (II)	<i>no volunteers</i>		
<i>Macaca fascicularis</i> (II)	Indonesia	AC16 (2000)	Retain
<i>Mirounga leonine</i> (II)	Australia		
<i>Panthera pardus</i> (I)	Kenya	Exclude because the status of this species was considered implicitly at CoP12&13 in the context of quota proposals	
<i>Pteropus macrotis</i> (II)	Australia		
<i>Saiga tatarica</i> (II)	United States of America	AC16 (2000)	Retain
Birds			
<i>Anas aucklandica</i> (I)	Australia; New Zealand	AC18 (2002)	Retain
<i>Agapornis fischerii</i> (II)	Switzerland; United Republic of Tanzania		
<i>Ara macao</i> (I)	Guatemala; Mexico	AC17 (2001)	Retain
<i>Caloenas nicobarica</i> (I)	USA		
<i>Falco peregrinus</i> (I)	United States of America	AC17 (2001)	Retain
<i>Macrocephalon maleo</i> (I)	Indonesia	AC16 (2000)	Retain
<i>Rhea americana</i> (II)	Argentina		
Reptiles			
<i>Boa constrictor</i> (II)	<i>no volunteers</i>	Exclude because of at this stage lookalike considerations	
<i>Cnemidophorus hyperythrus</i> (II)	United States of America	AC18 (2002)	Delete from Appendix II
<i>Crocodylus lacertinus</i> (II)	Netherlands		
<i>Dermatemys mawii</i> (II)	Guatemala; Mexico	AC21 (2005)	Final recommendation deferred until AC22
<i>Dermodochelys coriacea</i> (I)	United States of America	AC16 (2000)	Retain
<i>Python anchietae</i> (II)	Namibia	AC16 (2000)	Retain
<i>Tupinambis teguixin</i> (II)	Argentina		
Amphibians			
<i>Ambystoma mexicanum</i> (II)	Mexico; United States of America	AC21 (2005)	Final recommendation deferred until AC22
<i>Bufo superciliaris</i> (I)	Netherlands	Postponed	

		pending UNEP-WCMC analysis of Amphibia	
<i>Dyscophus antongilli</i> (I)	Netherlands	Postponed pending UNEP-WCMC analysis of Amphibia	
<i>Hoplobatrachus tigerinus</i> (II)	Netherlands	Removed from list at AC17	
Fishes			
<i>Cynoscion macdonaldi</i> (I)	Mexico	AC17 (2001)	Retain
<i>Probarbus jullieni</i> (I)	United Kingdom	AC16 (2000)	Retain
<i>Scleropages formosus</i> (I)	Indonesia	AC16 (2000)	Retain
Invertebrates			
Antipatharia (II)	United States of America	AC16 (2000)	Retain
<i>Goniopora</i> spp. (II)	<i>no volunteers</i>		Removed from the list at AC21
<i>Hirudo medicinalis</i> (II)	Spain and the United States of America		
<i>Ornithoptera alexandrae</i> (I)	<i>Spain</i>		
<i>Parnassius apollo</i> (II)	Spain	AC18 (2002)	Retain

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

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

TRANSPORT OF LIVE ANIMALS

Chairman: K. Rodics (AC- Europe)

Party Observers: Austria, China, Czech Republic, Germany, Alternative representative for Africa, AC representative for Asia, Slovakia, South Africa, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America.

IGO and NGO Observers: IATA, WAZA, OATA, Humane Society of the United States.

CITES Secretariat.

The Chairman explained that she did not intend to chair the whole session, and that WG4 needed to decide upon another chairman, particularly if it were to continue working intersessionally. The Working Group agreed that Mr Peter Linhart (the observer from Austria) would be its Chairman, and he took over from K. Rodics after she had introduced the items on the agenda of WG4.

CITES Secretariat and AC Europe representative highlighted the tasks asked from the working group. Previous Chairs were thanked for their contributions. Documents 16.1 and 16.2 were introduced, after the election of Austria as acting AC-TWG – Chair. Secretariat noted that Resolution conf. 10.21 may be usefully revised to ensure that less follow-up is required between meetings of the Conference of the Parties.

1 Document 16.1

Item 4.

a) and b) CITES AC-TWG in liaison with CITES secretariat shall identify guides or model practices for other modes of transport that can be used to replace the CITES transport guidelines. The working group, with a view of avoiding potential problems with new, duplicate or overlapping regulations (National, regional, international), should in particular consider work done by the IATA and the OIE. In particular the group is to take note of the development of an OIE web portal that will refer to existing country regulations and other existing guidelines applicable to modes of transport other than by air. CITES Secretariat is to notify parties of the OIE portal once created.

c) AC-TWG chair to prepare a combined report on 13.88 and 13.89 for the Animals committee Chair for discussion at next Animal Committee meeting.

2 Document 16.2

AC-TWG to redraft resolution 10.21, via email exchange and request the AC chair to liaise with the PC chair for new wording to the resolution to reflect decision 13.89 points a) ii) and a) iii). It was recommended to remove the wording as stated in point 5 of document 16.2 as this task was considered as completed (refer to the report issued by the German authorities on transport losses). The US representative circulated a document for consideration by the AC-TWG, which contains new wording to resolution 10.21. IATA informs of an IATA initiative that seeks to eliminate paper.

Action Plan and timetable: AC-TWG chair in conjunction with secretariat, AC chair and PC chair to initiate the coordination required to achieve the points above and manage the production of the reports as required within the deadlines contained in the rules of procedures of the convention.

AC-TWG chair is to contact the OIE for circulation of decisions issued by the OIE at their annual general meeting for circulation to AC-TWG members.

End July circulate letter to AC chair for him to contact and liaise with PC chair concerning the review of conference resolution 10.21.

By the end of 2005 the AC-TWG chair to request organizations that participate in OIE's portal website initiative for the feedback that they received from visitors to the site [via a reply form that will be available on the site].

From Jan – Feb 2006; compilation of feedback; drafting of reply from AC-TWG to OIE system [in consultation with AC chair and Secretariat]; and preparation and circulation to AC-TWG members of first draft revision of Resolution Conf. 10.21. Consider circulation of draft to PC chair.

March 2006 response to draft resolution from AC-TWG members.

May 2006 AC-TWG chair circulate the finished draft revision of Resolution Conf. 10.21 to the AC and PC chairmen and to the Secretariat.

August 2006 (?) working group meeting to be scheduled at the joint PC-AC session.

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

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

SEA CUCUMBERS

Chairman M. Pourkazemi (AC- Asia)

CITES secretariat, Party Observers: Alternative member for Asia, Belgium, China, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, United States of America.

NGO Observers: TRAFFIC, Swan International, FAO, Species Management Specialists

The consultant shall:

- a) review the proceedings of the International technical workshop on the conservation of sea cucumbers in the families Holothuriidae and Stichopodidae (March 2004, Kuala Lumpur), as well as those of the forum on Advances in Sea Cucumber Aquaculture and Management (ASCAM) convened by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (October 2003; Dalian);
- b) prepare, for consideration at the 22nd meeting of the Animals Committee, a condensed discussion paper (max. 20 pages), according to the format in the Annex, on the biological and trade status of sea cucumbers in the above families and based on analysis, to provide scientific guidance on the actions needed to secure their conservation status; and
- c) subject to the availability of funding, submit a draft report to the Secretariat by 1 April 2006.

Note: In undertaking the foregoing tasks the consultant should take account of,

- any other referenced relevant information, and
- incorporate wherever possible the activities undertaken by the proposed FAO initiative on sea cucumbers

Format of discussion paper

Executive summary with recommendations

I Biological and trade status

- i) Background (history of sea cucumber in CITES; summary of two workshops, their purpose and structure)
- ii) Biology of sea cucumbers
 - summarized taxonomy, ecology, distribution and population status
- iii) Production methods and volumes
 - aquaculture
 - capture fishery (targeted, bycatch)
 - regulatory controls (including protective measures)
- iv) utilization of sea cucumbers
 - levels and types of utilisation
- v) trade (legal/illegal/unreported)
 - volume/value
 - regulatory measures
 - identification and implementation issues
- vi) social and economic aspects

II Management and conservation strategy

- i) identify the type of management to be applied to reduce impacts on the wild populations
- ii) relationship between aquaculture, capture fisheries and conservation of the wild populations
- iii) implementation and enforcement of national and international measures (respective roles and relationship of CITES and FAO)
- iv) identify gaps for managing the resource on a regional, or, if possible range State level

III Conclusions and recommendations

IV References

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

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

CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF SHARKS

Members of the working group

Chairman: Mr Hay, (AC-Oceania);

Regional Representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean; Alternate Representative for Asia.

Observers from Parties: China, Germany, Greece, Mexico, Spain, United States of America

Observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations: IUCN Shark Specialist Group, The Ocean Conservancy, Swan International, Species Management Specialists, WWF International, TRAFFIC International.

FAO attended the meeting as an observer only.

CITES Secretariat and Earth Negotiations Bulletin.

Australia and South Africa were unable to attend the meeting, but had offered their support and requested membership of the intersessional Working Group.

The Working Group accepted these offers.

Terms of Reference

The Working Group was asked to review the following recommendations from document AC 21.18, concerning the need for the Animals Committee to implement the Decisions in Resolution Conf. 12.6 (which continue beyond CoP13) and Decision 13.43 (see below). These recommendations were to:

- **Consider** the tasks assigned to it under Decision 13.43 and the support that might be required to implement Decision 13.42;
- **Develop and adopt** a work programme during the course of the present meeting and intersessionally to prepare a comprehensive report for CoP14;
- **Establish** a process for consultation with FAO regarding convening a workshop on the conservation and management of sharks;
- **Establish** a process to complete the work on WCO Customs codes for sharks;
- **Convene** a working group to work intersessionally in order to oversee and complete the work; and
- **Invite** the working group to report progress at AC22.

Working Group discussions

The Chair reminded the WG that the primary mandate of the AC arises from Decision 13.43, directed to the Animals Committee:

The Animals Committee, taking account of the work of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) on the conservation and management of sharks and on CITES implementation issues relating to listed marine species, shall:

- a) review implementation issues related to sharks listed in the CITES Appendices with a view *inter alia* to sharing experiences that may have arisen and solutions that may have been found;*
- b) identify specific cases where trade is having an adverse impact on sharks, in particular those key shark species threatened in this way;*
- c) prepare a report on trade-related measures adopted and implemented by Parties that are aimed at improving the conservation status of sharks; and*
- d) report on the above at the 14th meeting of the Conference of Parties.*

Intersessional Shark Working Group

It was agreed that the work of the Animals Committee would have to be continued intersessionally and that the purpose of these discussions was to set the agenda for the intersessional Shark Working Group.

The work of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

The observer from FAO informed the Working Group that, as a result of requests from Members following CITES CoP13, FAO will be holding a Technical Consultation on the implementation of the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA–Sharks). This will probably take place in early December 2005, and probably in Rome (notification of this meeting will likely be announced no later than August/September 2005).

An FAO Technical Consultation is a wide-ranging meeting that is open to all Member governments, observer governments, UN bodies, IGOs and NGOs. It will probably focus mainly on implementation of the IPOA–Sharks, the progress being made by States and the difficulties that are being encountered. Its emphasis is likely to be on fisheries management, monitoring and the acquisition of data on shark landings. FAO would primarily consider shark fisheries mortality from all causes; it might not consider issues of international trade management directly unless specifically requested to do so by its Members, so this is something that CITES could contribute.

The report of the Technical Consultation would be drafted (in English) before the end of the meeting, and would be published in the FAO official languages a few months later, in good time for the next meeting of the Animals Committee in August 2006.

Possible input from CITES to the Technical Consultation was discussed. The Working Group requested the CITES Secretariat to make Document 13.35 on the Conservation and Management of Sharks available to the FAO Secretariat and to invite them to make use of any sections that FAO felt would inform the Consultation.

The Working Group recommended that Parties ensured that CITES Authorities consulted with their Fisheries Agencies before the Technical Consultation in order to ensure that the views of the members of the intersessional Shark Working Group were taken into account, while reinforcing the respective roles of each organisation.

a) Notification for review of shark listing implementation issues

The Working Group agreed that a Notification would be required to implement point a) of Decision 13.43 and that the Working Group should immediately develop this in order to obtain a swift response that could be reviewed by the intersessional Shark Working Group. Following a wide-ranging discussion, the

appended draft was agreed. The Secretariat was requested to circulate this to Parties as soon as possible.

TRAFFIC International noted that they had published a short review of implementation of the shark listings in China and Hong Kong in 2004. This had also looked at capacity building and the needs of some countries to undertake training and issue ID materials. They commended the efforts by China to align legislation in order to accommodate implementation of the listings and their consultation with fin traders (involving industry in the process of implementation).

The Chair noted that it would be useful to examine legislative responses to the listings in the notification.

CITES Secretariat suggested that UNEP-WCMC be asked to provide the Intersessional Shark Working Group with information on shark trade records.

The CITES Secretariat was requested to forward responses received from the Notification to the Working Group Chairman for analysis by a small sub-group of the Intersessional Shark Working Group. China, United States of America, TRAFFIC International, and IUCN volunteered for this work.

b) Identification of specific cases where trade is having an adverse impact on sharks, and those key shark species threatened in this way

This part of the Decision concerns both the trade-related threats to sharks, such as fin trade, curio trade, aquarium trade and meat trade, and the identification of the key species threatened by this trade.

The list prepared at AC 20 is a starting point, but needs further refinement. The USA has been evaluating possible ways to refine the original list of species and will provide suggestions to the Working Group. It was stressed and agreed that the species listed in document CoP13 Doc. 13.35 was never intended to be a candidate list for amendments of the Appendices, but a list of species of management concern.

The WG agreed to carry out the task of reviewing both lists intersessionally, coordinated by the IUCN Shark Specialist Group, ensuring that technical peer review is incorporated into the process and that Parties have the opportunity to contribute to this process. FAO could be approached to identify the names of peer reviewers. IUCN SSG will also circulate to its membership for peer review. The Chair requested members of the WG to circulate any documents developed by the Working Group to their national experts. The Observer from FAO suggested that, while undertaking these case studies, CITES try to quantify the impact of international trade compared with other sources of mortality. This might be done as a percentage of overall utilisation/mortality.

While some of this work could be undertaken by email, a meeting, subject to the availability of funding, would be useful for the resolution of some issues. The Working Group recommended that, since the FAO Technical Consultation would bring many shark experts into a single venue, this might be a useful opportunity for such discussion. It should not be attempted during the Technical Consultation, but during a separate meeting adjacent to it. The venue could be in Rome (if the Technical Consultation is held there) or in the UK. IUCN and WWF International will consider possible venues. Funding was not identified for this process. It was noted that not all members of the AC SWG will likely attend the Technical Consultation and the associated AC SWG, but members of this WG should aim to delegate attendance to other individuals in their States, if appropriate, and ensure that they also peer review the results.

The Intersessional Working Group noted that this review should be completed and a final draft prepared by June 2006, to enable its circulation prior to the 22nd meeting of the Animals Committee.

c) Reporting on trade-related measures adopted and implemented by Parties that are aimed at improving the conservation status of sharks

This can partly be covered by work done under a, above, but is intended to apply not only to CITES-listed species. The Working Group hoped that the FAO workshop on IPOA-implementation would provide additional information on such trade-related measures. FAO clarified that this would not necessarily form an explicit part of the FAO Technical Consultation. It was suggested that the CITES Secretariat and, particularly, FAO Members could specifically request that FAO includes this within the TOR of the

Technical Consultation. It would not necessarily otherwise form part of FAO's remit. US noted that trade-related measures could be broader than simple trade-tracking. They could, for example, include monitoring of landings that supply international trade, prohibitions on possession, or bans on exports in order to support domestic management measures.

The Working Group agreed that this matter would be the subject of an additional question in the Notification to be sent requesting information on the implementation of shark species listings.

World Customs Organization and Customs Codes

This is a very technical area. The former intersessional Shark Working Group had produced a list of product codes, but this has not yet been agreed between the WCO and CITES. The CITES Secretariat noted that they do liaise closely with the WCO and often attend enforcement meetings, and that the need to explore better ways to apply customs codes to all environmental goods has been discussed in several fora. Options possibly include the use of 8 digit codes instead of the current 6 digits. The Working Group agreed that this needed to be taken forward and the Chair agreed to liaise with the representative of the United States of America in order to determine the best way to advance work on this issue.

DRAFT Notification on the management of trade in sharks

Parties and the Animals Committee were directed by Resolution Conf. 12.6 to take a number of actions to improve the biological and trade status of sharks. The Animals Committee was directed to “*examine information provided by range States in shark assessment reports and other available relevant documents, with a view to identifying key species and examining these for consideration and possible listing under CITES; and to make species-specific recommendations at the 13th meeting and subsequent meetings of the Conference of the Parties if necessary on improving the conservation status of sharks and the regulation of international trade in these species.*”

Document CoP13 Doc. 13.35 describes the Animals Committee’s activities under this Resolution. The 13th meeting of the Conference of Parties to CITES continued work in fulfillment of Resolution Conf. 12.6 by adopting Decision 13.42 directed to Parties and Decision 13.43 directed to the Animals Committee. Decision 13.43 directed the Animals Committee, *inter alia*, to:

- a) *review implementation issues related to sharks listed in the CITES Appendices with a view inter alia to sharing experiences that may have arisen and solutions that may have been found and*
- c) *prepare a report on trade-related measures adopted and implemented by Parties that are aimed at improving the conservation status of sharks.*

This notification is circulated on behalf of the Animals Committee. It requests Parties to provide information to enable the Animals Committee to fulfil some of its obligations under Decision 13.43. The Animals Committee recognises that this Notification places an additional reporting burden upon CITES Authorities, but hopes that it is structured so as to minimise the time necessary to respond to the following seven questions and is consistent with information required for Annual Reports.

1. Names and contact details of individuals and organisations in Scientific and Management Authorities responsible for trade in listed shark species

Scientific Authority	Management Authority
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. Has your State imported any products from the following Appendix II listed species?

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>Cetorhinus maximus</i> Basking shark | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Rhincodon typus</i> Whale shark | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Carcharodon carcharias</i> White shark | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |

If yes, please give the following details:

- i) Type of product (e.g. fins, meat, skin, liver oil, jaws, teeth)
- ii) Quantities of each product
- iii) Exporting State of each product
- iv) State of origin of each product

3. Has your State exported any products from the following Appendix II listed species?

Cetorhinus maximus Basking shark Yes No

Rhincodon typus Whale shark Yes No

Carcharodon carcharias White shark Yes No

If yes, please give the following details:

- i) Type of product (e.g. fins, meat, skin, liver oil, jaws, teeth)
- ii) Quantities of each product
- iii) Derived from what sort of fishery (target, bycatch, other)
- iv) Re-exported products
- v) Please can you share your procedures and methodology for developing non-detriment findings for the exports derived from listed sharks caught in your waters?

4. Does your country have techniques (e.g. identification manuals, DNA techniques) for assisting in the monitoring of shark products in trade? If so, please give brief details or references.

5. Do you have other experiences with or comments on implementing the above shark listings that you can share with the Animals Committee Shark Working Group?

6. What materials/other assistance might be helpful in enabling your State to implement these listings?

7. Please describe any other trade-related measures (e.g. quotas, reporting requirements, observers, catch documentation) that your State has adopted and implemented in order to improve the conservation status of sharks (including species not listed on CITES Appendices) that may be of interest to other Parties.

Thank you very much.

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

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

CONSERVATION OF AND TRADE IN GREAT APES

Working Group participants: Regional Representative for Africa (KE), Chair; Republic of Korea; Democratic Republic of Congo; CITES Secretariat (Senior Enforcement Officer); Born Free USA; David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation; Humane Society of the United States; IUCN; World Association of Zoos and Aquaria.

The Working Group on Conservation of and Trade in Great Apes provides the 21st meeting of the CITES Animals Committee with the following recommendations for adoption:

The Animals Committee:

1. Recommends the Secretariat engage in joint CITES-GRASP technical missions to Southeast Asia and Central Africa to explore the challenges of great ape conservation in these regions, enforcement of national laws and CITES regulations governing trade in great apes, border security and the capacity of enforcement agencies to prevent illegal taking and intercept illegal shipments of great apes, and matters surrounding repatriation or rehoming of confiscated live animals.
2. Suggests the Standing Committee explore the establishment of a Great Ape Enforcement Task Force pursuant to Res. Conf. 11.3 (Rev. COP 13) with a view to enhancing cooperation to prevent illegal trade in great apes.
3. Asks the Secretariat to issue a notification calling on donor countries to match the contributions toward GRASP's work already provided by the Government of the United Kingdom, or in some other way contribute significantly to the general operations of GRASP, or provide specific funding to undertake the technical missions referred to in paragraph 1.
4. Specifically suggests that the CITES Secretariat apply for a grant from the Government of the United States under the Great Ape Conservation Act to undertake the work in paragraphs 1 and 2.
5. Urges CITES and GRASP Secretariats to undertake the technical missions as soon as practicable and provide a timetable for action to the Intergovernmental Meeting on Great Apes and GRASP in September 2005.
6. Suggests CITES Secretariat explore possibilities for working with IATA and individual airlines to prevent illegal shipments of great apes by air.
7. Should make contact with the Interim Scientific Committee of GRASP to establish the current availability of DNA information related to great apes; and, if such information is found to be insufficient, cooperate with GRASP to gather the information necessary to create such a DNA database.
8. Further urges all Parties to notify the CITES Secretariat of any sanctuary facilities within their countries suitably equipped to house and care for great apes confiscated from trade, to be included in the list of facilities originally circulated by the CITES Secretariat in Notification 2002/074 ("Confiscation of Live Animals").
9. Requests that a Representative of GRASP be invited to report to the 22nd meeting of the Animals Committee on progress made and the outcome of the work mentioned in paragraphs 1 and 2 above.
10. Encourages CITES Standing Committee to endorse these recommendations when it considers the Conservation of and Trade in Great Apes at its 53rd meeting In Geneva from 27 June – July 1.