

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



Twenty-seventh meeting of the Animals Committee
Veracruz (Mexico), 28 April – 3 May 2014

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Species trade and conservation

PERIODIC REVIEW OF SPECIES INCLUDED IN APPENDICES I AND II
[RESOLUTION CONF.14.8 (REV.COP16)]
(Agenda items 24.1, 24.2 and 24.3, 24.3.1, 24.3.2, 24.3.3, 24.3.24.3.5, 24.3.6 and 24.3.7)

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

Co-Chairs: the AC Chair (Ms Caceres) and representative of Africa (Mr Kasiki);

Parties: Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, China, Chile, Czech Republic, Indonesia, Mexico, Namibia, Netherlands, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America; and

IGOs and NGOs: International Trade Centre, IUCN – International Union for Conservation of Nature, UNEP-WCMC, Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Born Free USA, Conservation Force, Conservation International, Humane Society International, IFAW, Safari Club International, Sustainable Users Network, TRAFFIC, World Conservation Society and WWF.

Mandate

Taking account of the presentations and discussions in plenary, the working group shall:

1. Identify lessons learnt in the Periodic review to date and advise on implementation of Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP16);
2. Based on information provided in document AC27 Doc. 24.1, draft advice with regard to the species selected for review between CoP15 and CoP17 for which reviews are ongoing but for which a reviewer is required and the review of Felidae under Decision 13.93 (Rev. CoP16). Evaluate if these reviews should be stopped, or otherwise provide guidance on how information, participation and support from range States could be obtained in compliance with paragraph f) of Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP16).
3. Make recommendations concerning the implementation of Decisions 16.124, 16.125 and 16.126 for the Committee to consider.
4. Review the information and reviews presented in documents 24.3.3 to 24.3.7, and make recommendations to the Committee regarding the listing in the Appendices of the species concerned, clearly specifying the reference to the criteria in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16).

Recommendations:

The Working Group makes the following recommendations for consideration by the Animals Committee:

1. Regarding the implementation of Resolution Conf. 14.8 (rev. CoP16), the Animals Committee noted the goal of the Periodic Review has been stated as to ensure that the appendices correctly reflect the conservation needs of species. To this end it was agreed that there is value in having a review of the appendices. However, the current process could use some re-evaluation. For example:
 - Practical considerations, such as enforcement concerns, may also influence consideration of amendment of the appendices. For instance when reviewing species within higher-taxon listings, different considerations may be required, such as enforcement implications and complexity of the appendices and look alike issues.
 - Examination of extinct species may not be the best use of time and resources, noting that there will be a joint discussion of this in during the joint sessions of the 28th meeting of the Animals Committee and 21st meeting of the Plants Committee (Agenda item 10).
 - A process of prioritising species should be considered based on lessons learned.
 - Parties are expected to undertake Periodic Reviews.
2. The Animals Committee recommended that the Chair of the Animals Committee report to the Chair of the Plants Committee the discussions of the Animals Committee. The Animals Committee recommended an intersessional working group be formed to consider the periodic review process and possible revisions to Resolution Conf. 4.8 (rev. CoP16) and that the Animals Committee invite the Plants Committee to participate in such a working group.
3. With regards to lessons learned, the following were identified:
 - There was a value in elements of the current process, particularly in terms of facilitating consultation and dialogue among range States, which results in a better report. It also allows for an open discussion on whether the appendix listing is necessary and may facilitate discussions at a CoP.
 - Best results from the process came from reviews undertaken by the range States of the species in question, therefore involvement is essential and those range States' involvement should be sought early in the process.
 - Preparation of Periodic Reviews may seem over whelming to some leading to low rates of volunteers to prepare periodic reviews. Capacity building may overcome this.
4. Regarding the species selected for review between CoP15 and CoP17 for which reviews are ongoing but for which a reviewer is required, the Animals Committee noted with thanks the offer from the United States to review *Epioblasma sampsonii*, and the offers from Brazil to review *Cacajao melanocephalus*, *Saguinus martinsi* and *Pionopsitta pileata*. For the remaining 11 species for which there is no reviewer (*Aonyx capensis microdon*, *Prionodon pardicolor*, *Semnopithecus dussumieri*, *Semnopithecus entellus*, *Semnopithecus schistaceus*, *Phaner pallescens*, *Dryocopus javensis richardsi*, *Caiman crocodilus apaporiensis*, *Sphenodon punctatus*, *Varanus bengalensis*, *Varanus flavescens*), the Animals Committee recommends the relevant Regional Representatives and the Secretariat should write a letter to the relevant range States with the following points:
 - explain that the experience of the Animals Committee has shown that having range States lead or be engaged from the onset with a periodic review provides the best results;
 - ask the range State to identify any barriers to them conducting a review, which could include things such as capacity or lack of experts;

- request comment on whether the range State agrees such a review is required or if the range State would object to removing the species from the periodic review; and
 - ask whether the range State would have concerns if another Party or organization undertook the review, and whether they would be prepared to assist.
5. The letter should have appended to it a list of all the range State/ species combinations that still remain in the review as found in the periodic review database. Should no volunteers be found to undertake these remaining reviews, the Animals Committee will need to be prepared to make a determination on retaining these species and seeking non-range State reviewers to undertake the review or removing the species from the review at its 28th meeting.
 6. With regard to Decision 16.124, the Animals Committee noted that much of the information needed to undertake the periodic review of *Cuora galbinifrons* and *Mauremys annamensis* is found in the proposals recently submitted to CoP16. The Animals Committee recommends these species be included in the Periodic Review and the Secretariat request range States express their interest in undertaking this review, in particular seeking the interest of Viet Nam via a letter similar to that proposed in recommendation 4 above with the addition of an offer of support from the IUCN/SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group and removal of the request for comment on whether the review is required.
 7. With regard to Decision 16.125, the Animals Committee was pleased to accept Indonesia's offer to undertake this periodic review and noted their request for support.
 8. Regarding the review of Felidae under Decision 13.93 (Rev. CoP16), the Animals Committee noted that once the review of *Panthera leo* (ongoing) and *Puma concolor cougar* and *Puma concolor coryi* (ongoing) were concluded, the activities required under this Decision will be completed.
 9. Regarding with document 24.3.3, *Pantheria leo*, the Animals Committee took note of information from IUCN on the upcoming 2015 Red List Assessment of lion and requests Namibia and Kenya incorporate this information into their review and prepare a revised review for consideration at the 28th meeting of the Animals Committee. In doing so, the Animals Committee urges IUCN to provide the updated assessment to the authors of the review as soon as possible. Additionally, the Animals Committee representatives are encouraged to continue appealing to range States who have yet to respond to provide information on this species and the Animals Committee requests the Secretariat also request information from range States who have yet to respond via a letter from the Secretariat. The Animals Committee also noted recent information regarding changes in the nomenclature of lions and requests the nomenclature expert of the Animals Committee review this information.
 10. Regarding document 24.3.4, *Monachus tropicalis*, the Animals Committee agreed with the recommendation to delete this extinct species from Appendix I.
 11. Regarding document 24.3.5, *Pteropus tokudae*, the Animals Committee decided to defer decision on this review to the 28th Meeting of the Animals Committee, to benefit from the results of the discussion on extinct and possibly extinct species during the joint sessions of the 27th meeting of the Animals Committee and 21st meeting of the Plants Committee (AC27/PC21 Doc. 10). The Working Group agreed in principle with the recommendation to retain this extinct species on Appendix II (where it is currently listed as part of *Pteropus* spp.) due to similarity of appearance to other *Pteropus* spp being traded in the region and any resulting enforcement challenges, specifically the risk of this species' name being used to trade other species without permits. Further, its deletion from the higher taxon listing in App. II would complicate rather than streamline the Appendices.
 12. Regarding with document 24.3.6, *Grus canadensis pulla*, the Animals Committee agreed with the recommendation to retain this species in Appendix I.
 13. Regarding document 24.3.7, *Epicrates inornatus*, the Animals Committee agreed with the recommendation to transfer this species to CITES Appendix II.