

CONVENCIÓN SOBRE EL COMERCIO INTERNACIONAL DE ESPECIES
AMENAZADAS DE FAUNA Y FLORA SILVESTRES



Decimonovena reunión del Comité de Fauna
Ginebra (Suiza), 18-21 de agosto de 2003

INFORME RESUMIDO

MEDIDAS	EXECUTORS	PAGE
1. Apertura de la reunión		5
2. Adopción del Reglamento Se adoptó en la forma modificada.		5
3. Adopción del orden del día y del programa de trabajo Se adoptó en la forma modificada.		5
4. Admisión de observadores La Secretaría recordará a los observadores de las Partes u organizaciones que presenten sus credenciales con arreglo al Artículo 7.	Secretaría	6
5. Informes regionales La Secretaría distribuirá un modelo de formato de un cuestionario a fin de obtener información de las Partes para preparar los informes regionales. El representante regional de América Central, del Sur y el Caribe proporcionará una copia impresa de su informe al Comité de Fauna.	Secretaría Representante regional de América Central, del Sur y el Caribe	6
6. Planificación estratégica Los representantes regionales se pondrán en contacto con las Partes de sus regiones para establecer una lista de especialistas científicos en las Autoridades Administrativas y Científicas.	Representantes regionales	7
7. Informe sobre la 49ª reunión del Comité Permanente 7.1 Grupo de trabajo sobre cuestiones técnicas de aplicación Creación de un grupo de contacto de composición abierta. El observador de Estados Unidos compilará las sugerencias de los participantes e informará a la AC20.	Grupo de contacto, observador de Estados Unidos	8

MEDIDAS	EXECUTORS	PAGE
7.2 Grupo de trabajo sobre cupos de exportación El Comité de Fauna formulará comentarios acerca de los informes del Grupo de trabajo sobre cupos de exportación y se mantendrá informado sobre los progresos realizados.	Comité de Fauna, Grupo de trabajo sobre cupos de exportación	8
8. Examen del comercio significativo de especímenes de especies del Apéndice II 8.1 Introducción a la Resolución Conf. 12.8 El halcón sacre se incluirá en el examen del comercio significativo con efecto inmediato. La consideración de otras especies se postergó hasta la AC20. El PNUMA-CMCM realizará un análisis de los datos sobre el comercio CITES para su consideración en la AC20, con la asistencia de la UICN y TRAFFIC. 8.2 Examen de la aplicación de las recomendaciones Las deliberaciones se postergaron hasta la AC20. 8.3 Progresos realizados en la aplicación del Examen del comercio significativo (Pases IV y V) Las recomendaciones del grupo de trabajo 3 sobre <i>Strombus gigas</i> se adoptaron en la forma modificada. Las recomendaciones del grupo de trabajo 8 sobre el estado de los taxa seleccionadas para el examen desde la CdP11 se adoptaron en la forma modificada. 8.4 Progresos realizados en el examen del comercio significativo por países Las deliberaciones se postergaron hasta la AC20. 8.5 Evaluación del examen del comercio significativo Las recomendaciones del grupo de trabajo 8 se adoptaron en la forma modificada. 8.6 Conservación de <i>Saiga tatarica</i> Las recomendaciones del grupo de trabajo 8 se adoptaron en la forma modificada.	Comité de Fauna, Secretaría PNUMA-CMCM, UICN, TRAFFIC Comité de Fauna, Comité Permanente, Secretaría Grupo de trabajo 8, Comité de Fauna, Presidente del Comité de Fauna, Comité Permanente, Secretaría Grupo de trabajo 8, delegado del Comité de Flora Presidente del Comité de Fauna, Comité Permanente, Estados del área de distribución, Secretaría	9 10 33 53 11 55 55
9. Examen de los criterios para enmendar los Apéndices I y II Las recomendaciones del grupo de trabajo 1 se adoptaron.	Grupo de trabajo 1, Comité de Fauna, Comité de Flora, Partes citadas en el cuadro de la página 3 de documento AC19 WG1 Doc. 1, Secretaría	12 23

MEDIDAS	EXECUTORS	PAGE
17. Situación biológica y comercial de los cohombros de mar de las familias Holothuridae y Stichopodidae Las recomendaciones del grupo de trabajo 9 se adoptaron.	Secretaría	18 67
18. Situación biológica y comercial de los tiburones Las recomendaciones del grupo de trabajo 12 se adoptaron. La Secretaría enviará la Notificación a las Partes que figura en el Anexo 1 del documento AC19 WG12 Doc. 1.	Grupo de trabajo 12, Grupo de Especialistas en Tiburones de la UICN, Secretaría Secretaría	18 73
19. Comercio de especies exóticas Un documento sobre esta cuestión se someterá a la consideración de la AC20.	Representante regional de Oceanía	19
20. Taxonomía y nomenclatura Ninguna medida.		19
21. Otras cuestiones Ninguna medida.		20
22. Discursos de clausura Ninguna medida		21

1. Apertura de la reunión (Sin documento)

El Presidente dio la bienvenida a la reunión a todos los participantes y agradeció a la Secretaría su ayuda para organizar la reunión. El Secretario General de la CITES también dio la bienvenida a la reunión a los participantes.

2. Adopción del Reglamento (AC19 Doc. 2)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día y recomendó ligeras modificaciones para armonizar el Reglamento del Comité de Fauna y del Comité de Flora. Tras las intervenciones del representante de Europa, y de los observadores de los Países Bajos y México, el Comité acordó introducir las siguientes enmiendas en el Reglamento.

- a) Sustituir en el Artículo 18 "Los documentos que se sometan a la consideración del Comité deben obrar normalmente en poder de la Secretaría al menos 90 días antes de la reunión en que vayan a examinarse." por "Los documentos que se sometan a la consideración del Comité deben obrar normalmente en poder de la Secretaría al menos 60 días antes de la reunión en que vayan a examinarse.";
- b) Sustituir la segunda frase del Artículo 19 "La Secretaría distribuirá los documentos impresos relativos a una reunión al menos 45 días antes de la fecha prevista de la reunión en que se examinarán." por "La Secretaría distribuirá los documentos impresos relativos a una reunión al menos 40 días antes de la fecha prevista de la reunión en que se examinarán.";
- c) Sustituir la última frase del Artículo 23 "Las Partes y los miembros suplentes que participan en la reunión en calidad de observadores tendrán derecho a estar presentes en las sesiones a puerta cerrada." por "Las Partes, los miembros suplentes y organizaciones intergubernamentales que participan en la reunión en calidad de observadores tendrán derecho a estar presentes en las sesiones a puerta cerrada."; y
- d) Sustituir la primera frase del Artículo 25 "La Secretaría preparará un acta resumida de cada reunión y la remitirá a las Partes representadas en la reunión en el plazo de 120 días." por "La Secretaría preparará un acta resumida de cada reunión y la remitirá a las Partes representadas en la reunión en el plazo de 60 días.".

La Secretaría recomendó que el Comité considerara la modificación de la redacción de la última frase del Artículo 19. Señaló que la redacción actual era ambigua y podía interpretarse de dos maneras diferentes. Tras las intervenciones de los representantes de África y Oceanía, y de los observadores de Alemania, México y Estados Unidos, el Comité decidió aplazar los debates sobre la posible revisión de la redacción de la última frase del Artículo 19 hasta su 20ª reunión, después de haber debatido las cuestiones de comunicaciones.

El observador de Eslovenia hizo una consulta sobre la presentación de las credenciales de las Partes observadoras. Tras alguna aclaración del Secretario General, el Presidente anunció que las credenciales de las Partes observadoras se examinarían de conformidad con el Artículo 7, como se había hecho para las organizaciones. La Secretaría convino en recordar a los observadores de Partes u organizaciones que presentaran las credenciales en cumplimiento del Artículo 7.

3. Adopción del orden del día y del programa de trabajo

3.1 Orden del día [AC19 Doc. 3.1 (Rev. 7)]

El zoólogo del Comité de Nomenclatura declaró que los puntos 20.1 y 20.2 se discutirían en la reunión del Comité de Nomenclatura y ofreció que éste informara al Comité de Fauna el último día. El Comité de Fauna se mostró de acuerdo.

La Presidenta del Comité de Flora felicitó al Presidente del Comité de Fauna por su elección, y muchos otros participantes hicieron lo propio durante los debates. La Presidenta del Comité de Flora agradeció la ocasión de asistir a la reunión para compartir materias comunes y declaró que en la reunión del Comité de Nomenclatura sobre las plantas se había acordado que el botánico del Comité de Nomenclatura redactaría propuestas de cambios en la Resolución Conf. 12.11, sobre la nomenclatura normalizada.

El Comité de Fauna también acordó agregar los siguientes puntos en "Otras cuestiones":

21.2 Comercio con Estados no Partes en la Convención (a petición del observador de México); y

21.3 Informe sobre los progresos realizados con los manuales de identificación (a petición de la Secretaría).

3.2 Programa de trabajo [AC19 Doc. 3.2 (Rev. 1)]

El Presidente señaló que el programa de trabajo era provisional y que podía cambiar según las cuestiones del día. También dijo que habría varios grupos de trabajo y que se reunirían paralelamente, por lo que los participantes no podrían asistir a todos ellos. El observador de los Países Bajos indicó que en el programa de trabajo faltaba el punto 4 del orden del día Admisión de observadores. El Comité adoptó el programa de trabajo con la adición del punto 4 Admisión de observadores el primer día. La Secretaría agregó que el último día de la 19ª reunión del Comité de Fauna se presentarían informes regionales, y que tal vez los representantes regionales desearan consultar con las Partes de su región para agrupar toda información relativa a este punto.

4. Admisión de observadores (Sin documento)

El Presidente anunció al Comité el procedimiento para aceptar solicitudes de organizaciones no gubernamentales para asistir como observadoras a la reunión. El Comité acordó admitir esos observadores en la reunión.

5. Informes regionales

5.1 África (AC19 Doc. 5.1)

El Comité tomó nota del informe presentado por el representante regional.

5.2 Asia (Sin documento)

El representante de Asia presentó un informe verbal sobre los siguientes puntos:

- a) había recibido un informe de Brunei-Darussalam y no se habían registrado elevados volúmenes de comercio de especies de la CITES;
- b) había recibido el informe de Japón sobre los tiburones;
- c) se había celebrado una reunión de expertos sobre tiburones de siete países de la región en el Centro de Desarrollo de la Pesca de Asia sudoriental;
- d) Israel había proporcionado información sobre su trabajo de sensibilización del público, su plan de legislación nacional y los decomisos realizados en su país; y
- e) Emiratos Árabes Unidos había proporcionado un informe sobre la situación de la conservación del halcón sacre.

El Comité tomó nota del informe verbal presentado por el representante regional. El Presidente pidió que se proporcionara al Comité un ejemplar impreso.

5.3 América Central, del Sur y el Caribe (Sin documento)

El representante de América Central, del Sur y el Caribe presentó un informe verbal sobre los siguientes puntos:

- a) había dificultades de comunicación en la región;
- b) *Strombus gigas* era motivo de preocupación para la región y en junio de 2003 se había celebrado una reunión en Jamaica al respecto, organizada conjuntamente por varias

organizaciones y con la intervención de las Autoridades de Pesca y Ordenación gubernamentales; y

- c) Chile era uno de los países más activos en la región, pero muchos otros países de la región no se encontraban en la misma situación financiera o de capacidad.

El Comité tomó nota del informe verbal del representante regional. El Presidente pidió que se proporcionara al Comité un ejemplar impreso. El observador de Chile expresó preocupaciones por la representación en la región y, tras la aclaración del Secretario General respecto a las dificultades de muchos representantes regionales, el Presidente pidió que el representante de América Central, del Sur y el Caribe y el observador de Chile hablaran de las preocupaciones bilateralmente. El observador de México señaló que también su país realizaba actividades de trabajo en relación con la CITES en Meso-América.

5.4 Europa (AC19 Doc. 5.4)

El Comité tomó nota del informe presentado por el representante regional.

5.5 América del Norte (AC19 Doc. 5.5)

El Comité tomó nota del informe presentado por el representante regional.

5.6 Oceanía (AC19 Doc. 5.6)

El Comité tomó nota del informe presentado por el representante regional.

Teniendo en cuenta la sugerencia del Comité de Flora y de la Secretaría, el Comité de Fauna acordó considerar la utilización de un cuestionario para reunir información de las Partes en la preparación de informes regionales y pidió que se pusiera a disposición antes de la 20ª reunión del Comité de Fauna un modelo de formato.

En los debates intervinieron también los observadores de los Países Bajos y de la Coalición Internacional para la Vida Silvestre.

6. Planificación estratégica (AC19 Docs. 6.1-6.3)

La Secretaría presentó los documentos AC19 Docs. 6.1 y 6.2. El Presidente presentó el documento AC19 Doc. 6.3, y señaló que contenía una lista de actividades prioritarias sobre la base de los documentos AC19 Docs. 6.1 y 6.2.

Durante los debates se expresó aprecio por los documentos producidos por la Secretaría y por el Presidente. El observador de los Países Bajos señaló que la base de datos de modelos de permisos de la CITES era asunto de la Secretaría y no del Comité de Fauna [véase el documento AC19 Doc. 6.1, párrafo 3. b)]. También señaló que, debido a las actuales limitaciones presupuestarias, los exámenes tal vez hubieran de centrarse sólo en especies incluidas actualmente en los Apéndices de la CITES (véase el documento AC19 Doc. 6.3, párrafo 4. l)]. Los representantes de Oceanía y Europa, apoyados por el observador de Estados Unidos, indicaron la importancia de examinar especies no incluidas y el valor de los exámenes anteriores para revelar especies amenazadas de comercio internacional. El representante de Asia declaró que debía concederse prioridad a las especies incluidas en los Apéndices. El observador de la República de Corea dijo, en relación con las especies no incluidas, que la merma no era necesariamente consecuencia del comercio internacional, sino que podría deberse a muchos otros factores.

El observador de España manifestó que la cuestión de las unidades de medida normalizadas era muy importante y tenía que examinarse más a fondo. El Presidente dijo que la lista proporcionada en relación con unidades normalizadas no era exhaustiva. Los observadores de Israel, Países Bajos y España indicaron que algunas cuestiones técnicas podían exceder del ámbito del Comité de Fauna. Sin embargo, el observador de España agregó que algunos elementos como el etiquetado, el marcado y las microfichas guardaban eran pertinentes para la labor del Comité de Fauna. El Presidente remitió a los participantes al punto 7.1 del orden del día, en el que se discutirían cuestiones técnicas.

Los observadores de Israel, México, España, Estados Unidos y WWF Internacional debatieron del registro de los establecimientos de cría en cautividad de especímenes de especies del Apéndice I, conservación *in situ* y producción *ex situ*. Se preguntaron si deberían tratarse conjunta o separadamente y si guardaban relación con el Convenio sobre la Diversidad Biológica. El Presidente del Comité de Fauna señaló que esas cuestiones se tratarían por separado en el punto 11 del orden del día.

Los observadores de Israel y de la República de Corea, apoyados por el observador del Instituto de Bienestar de los Animales, indicaron que debía haber una manera de que el Grupo de Trabajo sobre Transporte abordara cuestiones de captura y almacenamiento de especímenes. Dijeron que otra posibilidad era crear un grupo de trabajo distinto a este respecto. El observador de la Coalición Internacional para la Vida Silvestre dijo que la cuestión de la captura y el almacenamiento de especímenes podía vincularse a la de la mortalidad de animales y el proceso de formulación de dictámenes sobre extracciones no perjudiciales. La Secretaría señaló que el Comité de Fauna no tenía que tratar asuntos relacionados con la captura y el almacenamiento de animales y debía centrarse en la prevención de la pérdida innecesaria de animales vivos. Agregó que esta cuestión podía tratarse en el Grupo de trabajo sobre transporte.

El representante de Oceanía solicitó una aclaración sobre la redacción de la última frase del párrafo 4. f) del documento AC19 Doc. 6.3. El Presidente y la Secretaría confirmaron que la frase debía rezar "En la 49ª reunión del Comité Permanente se decidió que las propuestas resultantes del proceso debían presentarse a la Conferencia de las Partes."

También hubo debate sobre la elaboración de guías de expertos regionales. La Presidenta del Comité de Flora advirtió que el Comité de Flora había terminado sus guías para todas las regiones en un formato normalizado, y que se disponía de ellas en el sitio web de la CITES.

Tras una breve discusión informal con los representantes regionales, y después de consultar con la Presidenta del Comité de Flora, el Presidente del Comité de Fauna encargó a los representantes regionales que se pusieran en contacto con las Partes de sus regiones para confeccionar una lista de expertos científicos en las Autoridades Administrativas y Científicas que actuarían como coordinadores.

Una vez finalizado el debate, el Comité adoptó la lista de prioridades descrita en el documento AC19 Doc. 6.3.

En esos debates intervinieron los representantes regionales de Asia y de Europa, y los observadores de Países Bajos, República de Corea y España.

7. Informe sobre la 49a. reunión del Comité Permanente

La Secretaría explicó que los puntos 9 y 10 del orden del día de la reunión se habían discutido también en la 49ª reunión del Comité Permanente.

7.1 Grupo de trabajo sobre cuestiones técnicas de aplicación (AC19 Doc. 7.1)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día y alentó a los miembros del Comité a considerar la mejor manera de colaborar con el Grupo de trabajo sobre cuestiones técnicas de aplicación. El observador de Estados Unidos indicó que había un grupo de trabajo sobre esta cuestión, presidido por un colega de la Autoridad Administrativa de Estados Unidos que no asistía a la 19ª reunión del Comité. La Presidenta del Comité de Flora señaló que durante los debates sobre esta cuestión en la 13ª reunión del Comité de Flora varios observadores se habían declarado dispuestos a transmitir ideas al grupo de trabajo, y también pidieron que éste mantuviera informado al Comité de Flora sobre cuestiones específicas.

El Comité estableció un grupo de contacto de composición abierta. El observador de Estados Unidos se declaró voluntario para recibir las sugerencias de los participantes e informar al Comité en su 20ª reunión.

En este debate intervinieron los representantes regionales de Asia, América del Norte y Oceanía, y los observadores de Chile, México, Países Bajos y Federación Internacional para la Vida Silvestre.

7.2 Grupo de trabajo sobre cupos de exportación (AC19 Doc. 7.2)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día. La Presidenta del Comité de Flora señaló que en los debates sobre esta cuestión en la 13ª reunión del Comité de Flora éste había ofrecido hacer observaciones al Grupo de trabajo sobre cupos de exportación, y pidió que se le mantuviera informado sobre los progresos. El Presidente del Comité de Fauna sugirió que este Comité haría lo mismo.

El Comité se ofreció a formular comentarios sobre los informes del Grupo de trabajo sobre cupos de exportación y pidió que se le mantuviera informado sobre sus progresos.

En este debate intervinieron el representante regional del Asia y los observadores de China, México, Federación de Rusia y Estados Unidos.

8. Examen del comercio significativo de especímenes de especies del Apéndice II

8.1 Introducción a la Resolución Conf. 12.8 (AC19 Doc. 8.1)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día con una presentación en PowerPoint que se puso a disposición de los participantes en forma impresa. Para poder terminar la labor sobre los taxa que se estaban examinando, el Comité decidió aplazar el examen de nuevas especies para incluirlas en el examen del comercio significativo hasta la 20ª reunión. El observador del PNUMA-CMCM señaló que el PNUMA-CMCM podía preparar un análisis completo muy manejable de datos sobre el comercio de la CITES antes de la próxima reunión del Comité de Fauna, y que podría hacerse con aportaciones de TRAFFIC y de la UICN.

Sin embargo, el observador de los Emiratos Árabes Unidos comunicó al Comité que existía un informe sobre el comercio de halcón sacre (*Falco cherrug*), y pidió que el Comité examinara esta especie, en cumplimiento de la Resolución Conf. 12.8, párrafo c). Dijo que el 92% de los halcones sacre en el comercio se capturaba en la naturaleza y procedía de 13 países. Además, indicó que se habían exportado 6.500 especímenes a la región del Golfo sin la debida documentación, y que ese nivel de captura tenía que ser insostenible. Los representantes de Asia, Europa y Oceanía, y el observador de la República Checa apoyaron el examen de la especie. El observador de China manifestó que esta era una cuestión de aplicación, y debía remitirse al Comité Permanente. El Presidente pidió a los Emiratos Árabes Unidos que pusiera su informe a disposición del Comité de Fauna y del grupo de trabajo sobre el comercio significativo (grupo de trabajo 8) para examinarlo.

En este debate intervinieron los observadores de los Países Bajos y Coalición Internacional para la Vida Silvestre.

8.2 Examen de la aplicación de las recomendaciones (AC19 Doc. 8.2)

La Secretaría presentó este punto de orden del día. TRAFFIC informó sobre la compilación de información para las bases de datos a que se hacía referencia en el documento AC19 Doc. 8.2, párrafo 4. b), y anunció que se dispondría de la base de datos en la 20ª reunión del Comité. A raíz de una pregunta del observador de Israel sobre la disponibilidad de la base de datos en Internet, el observador del PNUMA-CMCM dijo que podía establecerse fácilmente un vínculo con la base de datos sobre las especies mantenida por el PNUMA-CMCM y que podía obtenerse en el sitio web de la CITES.

La observadora de la *Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society* propuso que el narval se considerase una especie prioritaria en el examen. También señaló que desde 1979 no se habían realizado estudios sobre el estado de la población de la especie y que su comercio había aumentado. El observador de Canadá manifestó que, si bien no se había realizado ningún estudio sobre el estado de la población en el Ártico, Canadá tenía un acuerdo bilateral con Groenlandia, y que Groenlandia había procedido a una evaluación de las poblaciones en 1999. El Presidente remitió la cuestión del narval a la 20ª reunión, en que considerarían la inclusión de nuevas especies en el examen del comercio significativo.

El Comité tomó nota del informe de TRAFFIC y decidió aplazar el debate hasta la 20ª reunión.

En el debate intervinieron los observadores de Estados Unidos y la Red de Supervivencia de las Especies.

8.3 Progresos realizados en la aplicación del examen del comercio significativo (Fases IV y V) (AC19 Doc. 8.3)

La Secretaría presentó la sección del documento relativa a *Strombus gigas*. TRAFFIC presentó el Anexo al documento AC19 Doc. 8.3. El observador de Coalición Internacional para la Vida Silvestre felicitó a TRAFFIC por el informe, pero señaló que la mejor manera de proceder hubiera sido un planteamiento regional, sin excluir a los Estados del área de distribución de menor interés.

El Comité estableció un grupo de trabajo (grupo de trabajo 3) que examinaría la información proporcionada en el informe por TRAFFIC, analizaría la categorización provisional de la especie y formularía recomendaciones, integrado por:

- a) representantes regionales: Sr. Mohammad Pourkazemi (Asia, Presidente) y Sr. Sixto Incháustegui (América Central, del Sur y el Caribe);
- b) observaciones de Partes: Francia, México, Reino Unido y Estados Unidos;
- c) observadores de organizaciones intergubernamentales y no gubernamentales: Banco Mundial, Corporación Financiera Internacional y TRAFFIC; y
- d) la Secretaría.

Posteriormente, el Presidente del grupo de trabajo 3 presentó el documento AC19 WG3 Doc. 1. El representante de América Central, del Sur y el Caribe felicitó al grupo de trabajo por su labor. También señaló que, al pertenecer a la República Dominicana, que es uno de los países incluidos en la Categoría 1, exhortaba al apoyo de la Secretaría para ayudar a los países de esa categoría, en particular a elaborar y adoptar medidas para la ordenación satisfactoria de esta especie. El Comité adoptó las recomendaciones del grupo conforme se describen en el documento AC19 WG3 Doc. 1, con la adición, recomendada por el observador de los Países Bajos, del subpárrafo g) al párrafo 1 del Anexo 1, que diga "Pruebe que se ha iniciado lo descrito en los párrafos 2. a) y b).".

La Secretaría presentó seguidamente la sección del documento relativa al estado de los taxa seleccionados para el examen desde la CdP11. Tras la intervención del representante de Asia, el Comité decidió establecer un grupo de trabajo sobre el comercio significativo (grupo de trabajo 8) y le remitió esta cuestión.

8.4 Progresos realizados en el examen del comercio significativo por países (AC19 Doc. 8.4)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día. La observadora de Madagascar informó sobre la labor realizada. También señaló que era necesario hacer una corrección en la última frase del párrafo 11 del documento AC19 Doc. 8.4, de manera que diga:

Mientras tanto, la Autoridad Administrativa de Madagascar no expedirá permisos de exportación para especies sujetas a cupos anuales que se comuniquen a la Secretaría hasta que la Autoridad Científica haya compilado información sobre las instalaciones de los exportadores. Una vez se haya evaluado esta información, se asignarán cupos a esos exportadores, según proceda, y se concederán permisos.

El observador de Estados Unidos solicitó una copia del informe sobre las actas del cursillo. La Secretaría declaró que pondría gustosamente a disposición el informe, para que el proceso sea más transparente. Los observadores de *Pro Wildlife* e *IWMC* declararon que les preocupaba el nivel de comercio de algunas especies exportadas de Madagascar, e *IWMC* pidió a la Secretaría que enviara una nueva Notificación a las Partes con una enumeración de las especies que podían y no podían comerciarse con Madagascar. La Secretaría respondió que esto imponía ya una ardua labor a la Autoridad Administrativa malgache, y que primero trataría de terminar el Plan de Acción.

El Comité decidió aplazar el debate hasta la 20ª reunión.

En el debate intervinieron los observadores de República Checa, España, República Unida de Tanzanía, Estados Unidos y la Red de Supervivencia de las Especies.

8.5 Evaluación del examen del comercio significativo (AC19 Doc. 8.5)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día y señaló que un grupo de trabajo había discutido en la 13ª reunión del Comité de Flora esta cuestión y que su informe figuraba en el documento PC13 WG4 Doc. 1. El observador de *Defenders of Wildlife* dijo que no podían participar en el grupo de trabajo y esperaba que pudiera incluirse en la evaluación un proceso de consulta pública.

El Comité remitió esta cuestión al grupo de trabajo sobre el comercio significativo.

8.6 Conservación de *Saiga tatarica* (AC19 Doc. 8.6)

El observador de Estados Unidos presentó este punto del orden del día. Invitó al Comité a considerar los Anexos del documento AC19 Doc. 8.6. El observador de la Federación de Rusia señaló que no estaba de acuerdo con algunas de las hipótesis que se hacían en los documentos presentados por Estados Unidos y declaró que, aunque lentamente aún, las poblaciones eran estables. Indicó asimismo que la caza furtiva podía no ser la única razón de la disminución de la población y que podía haber algún ciclo natural, pues la población de la especie había sido también reducida a comienzos del siglo XX. La Secretaría señaló que, en junio de 2001, el Comité Permanente había recomendado a las Partes que rechazasen las importaciones de especímenes de saiga (*Saiga tatarica*) de la Federación de Rusia y de Kazajistán hasta que los dos Estados del área de distribución hubieran tomado determinadas medidas, incluida la elaboración y aplicación de una estrategia de conservación regional. La observadora de WWF Internacional manifestó que su organización había proporcionado fondos para un cursillo en 2002 sobre esta cuestión y para tratar de la drástica disminución de la población. También dijo que había caza furtiva para la obtención de astas, que se utilizaban en el comercio de medicina tradicional. Propuso que se remitiera el asunto al Comité Permanente. El observador de Fondo Internacional para la Protección de los Animales señaló que las poblaciones habían aumentado en los años anteriores al desmoronamiento de la Unión Soviética, como resultado de una estricta protección, pero que después habían florecido las actividades de caza furtiva.

El Comité remitió esta cuestión al grupo de trabajo sobre el comercio significativo.

Por lo tanto, el Comité acordó que el grupo de trabajo sobre el comercio significativo discutiera los puntos del orden del día 8.3, con excepción de *Strombus gigas*, 8.5 y 8.6. Este grupo estaba integrado por:

- a) representante regional: Sra. Katalin Rodics (Europa);
- b) observadores de Partes: Canadá, China, Irán, Federación de Rusia, España, Estados Unidos y Emiratos Árabes Unidos;
- c) observadores de organizaciones intergubernamentales y no gubernamentales: Comisión Europea, Fondo Internacional para la Protección de los Animales (IFAW), Coalición Internacional para la Vida Silvestre, *Nabu Naturschutzbund Deutschland E.V.*, Red de Supervivencia de las Especies y TRAFFIC;
- d) el Presidente del Comité de Fauna (Presidente); y
- e) la Secretaría.

Posteriormente, el Presidente del grupo de trabajo 8 sobre especímenes de especies incluidas en el Apéndice II presentó el documento AC19 WG8 Doc. 1, que comprendía la recomendación de incorporar al halcón sacre en el examen del comercio significativo inmediatamente, y con carácter excepcional. En cuanto a los esturiones, el observador de la Federación de Rusia señaló que

Acipenser persicus (véase la página 10 del documento AC19 WG8 Doc. 1) se encontraba en todo el mar Caspio en pequeñas cantidades, pero únicamente lo capturaba Irán.

El Comité adoptó las recomendaciones del grupo descritas en el documento AC19 WG8 Doc. 1 con una enmienda. En la sección sobre el saiga debía agregarse una nueva frase al último inciso de la página 12, después de "El Grupo de trabajo acordó" que rezara: "Se debe elaborar e iniciar lo antes posible un programa científico para apoyar la conservación y gestión de saiga".

9. Examen de los criterios para enmendar los Apéndices I y II (AC19 Doc. 9)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día. La Presidenta del Comité de Flora expuso el método adoptado por su Comité, conforme se describe en el documento PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev. 1). Ese método fue apoyado por los representantes de América del Norte y Oceanía, los observadores de China, México, Reino Unido y Estados Unidos. Los observadores de Canadá y Reino Unido señalaron que para experimentar los criterios propuestos no debían seleccionarse especies litigiosas, y el observador de *Defenders of Wildlife* pidió que en la selección figuraran algunas especies con respecto a las cuales se sabía que faltaban datos.

El Comité de Fauna acordó seguir el mismo método que el Comité de Flora. Estableció un grupo de trabajo (grupo de trabajo 1) para seleccionar los taxa que se utilizarían en el examen de los criterios de inclusión en el texto de la Presidencia (documento AC19 Doc. 9, Anexo), tomando en consideración el calendario adoptado por el Comité de Flora.

El Presidente anunció que el grupo de trabajo 1 estaba integrado por:

- a) representante regional: Sr. Rod Hay (Oceanía);
- b) observadores de Partes: Canadá, Chile, China, Alemania, Japón, México, Países Bajos, Noruega, República de Corea, Suiza, Estados Unidos (Presidente) y Zimbabwe; y
- c) observadores de organizaciones intergubernamentales y no gubernamentales: Comisión Europea, UICN, PNUMA-CMCM, Coalición Internacional para la Vida Silvestre, *Safari Club International*, TRAFFIC, *Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies* y WWF Internacional.

Posteriormente, el Presidente del grupo de trabajo 1 presentó el documento AC19 WG1 Doc. 1. Varios observadores que no habían asistido a la reunión del grupo de trabajo se ofrecieron a facilitar exámenes de especies. El Presidente del Comité de Fauna pidió que cualquier comentario sobre los nombres científicos utilizados en el documento se transmitiera directamente al Presidente del grupo de trabajo, pues la labor continuaría entre sus reuniones. Agregó que los participantes que desearan designar una especie para incluirla en la lista también deberían ponerse en contacto con el Presidente del grupo de trabajo 1. El Comité adoptó las recomendaciones del grupo descritas en el documento AC19 WG1 Doc. 1.

10. Examen periódico de los taxa animales incluidos en los Apéndices (AC19 Doc. 10)

La Secretaría presentó el documento AC19 Doc. 10, señalando que había dos cuestiones principales: una relativa a la necesidad de que el Comité de Fauna realizara un examen periódico general de las especies de animales que figuran en los Apéndices, y la otra relativa al examen específico de establecimientos de cría en granja de cocodrilos.

El observador del Grupo de Especialistas en Cocodrilos de la UICN presentó el examen específico de los establecimientos de cría en granja de cocodrilos, según se describía en el Anexo al documento AC19 Inf. 3. El Comité felicitó a ese grupo de especialistas por su propuesta, y recomendó que trate de hallar fondos para realizar la labor y examinar el momento oportuno en vista de las decisiones de la CdP13.

En el debate intervinieron los representantes de Asia, América del Norte y Oceanía, y los observadores de Estados Unidos, *Defenders of Wildlife*, Coalición Internacional para la Vida Silvestre y WWF Internacional.

10.1 Examen periódico de taxa animales y plantas incluidos en los Apéndices (AC19 Doc. 10.1)

El Presidente del grupo de contacto sobre el examen de los Apéndices presentó este punto del orden del día. La Presidenta del Comité de Flora señaló que el grupo de contacto sobre esta cuestión se había dirigido al Comité de Flora para reunir información con miras a incluirla en este documento, y que en la 13ª reunión del Comité de Flora se habían seleccionado miembros adicionales para formar parte del grupo de contacto. Según se declaró en esa reunión, el grupo estaba integrado ahora por los representantes en el Comité de Flora de África (Sr. John Donaldson y Sr. Quentin Luke) y Oceanía (Sr. Greg Leach), los observadores de Estados Unidos (Sr. Javier Álvarez, Presidente) y del PNUMA-CMCM (Sr. Gerardo Frago), el observador de España en el Comité de Fauna (Sr. Carlos Ibero) y las Presidencias de los Comités de Fauna y de Flora.

El Comité adoptó el método expuesto en el documento AC19 Doc. 10.1 y acordó examinar los progresos realizados por el grupo de contacto en su 20ª reunión. El observador de México dijo que se estaban realizando varios exámenes y que no estaban dispuestos a detener el proceso porque ya habían invertido una considerable cantidad de dinero. El Comité tomó nota de que estaban en curso algunos exámenes, pero acordó no iniciar otros hasta la CdP13.

11. Registro y control de los establecimientos que crían en cautividad con fines comerciales, especies animales incluidas en el Apéndice I

11.1 Procedimiento de registro de los establecimientos (AC19 Doc. 11.1)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día y señaló que había alguna duplicación con el punto 11.2. El observador de Estados Unidos dijo que el proceso permitía la denegación y que el pequeño número de establecimientos registrados no constituía un fracaso, sino un éxito. El observador de los Países Bajos pidió a la Secretaría que explicara por qué pensaba que los 99 establecimientos registrados eran un número reducido. La Secretaría respondió que había recibido pocas solicitudes de registro, que correspondían a las mismas especies y a los mismos países, y que se habían aceptado prácticamente todas ellas. Sin embargo, la Secretaría era consciente del número mucho mayor de establecimientos de cría con fines comerciales y de criadores aficionados en Europa y en Estados Unidos que crían especímenes de especies del Apéndice I. Por lo tanto, la Secretaría estimaba que este reducido número de establecimientos registrados planteaba un problema y deseaba que las Autoridades Administrativas hicieran mayor uso del proceso de registro.

El Comité estableció un grupo de trabajo entre reuniones (grupo de trabajo 5) para abordar los diferentes aspectos de la Decisión 12.78 y proporcionar observaciones sobre el proyecto de Notificación a las Partes contenido en el documento AC19 Doc. 11.1, Anexo 1. Este grupo estaba integrado por:

- a) representante regional: Sr. Choo-Hoo Giam (Asia);
- b) observadores de Partes: Canadá, Chile (Presidente), China, República Checa, Israel, Japón, México, Países Bajos, Federación de Rusia, Sudáfrica y España; y
- c) observadores de organizaciones intergubernamentales y no gubernamentales: UICN, la Asociación Americana de Zoológicos y Acuarios, *Animal Exhibitors Alliance*, *Animals Asia Foundation*, *Birds International Avicultural Park Breeding and Research Centre*, *IWMC* y Red de Supervivencia de las Especies.

A continuación, el Presidente advirtió de que siempre existía la posibilidad de que intervinieran en los grupos de trabajo entre reuniones otras Partes y organizaciones.

Posteriormente, el Presidente del grupo de trabajo 5 presentó el documento AC19 WG5 Doc. 1. El Comité adoptó el texto de la Notificación a las Partes contenida en el documento AC19 Doc. 11.1, Anexo 1, con las enmiendas expuestas en el documento AC19 WG5 Doc. 1, y pidió a la Secretaría que lo transmitiera.

11.2 Relaciones entre la producción *ex situ* y la conservación *in situ* (AC19 Doc. 11.2)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día y remitió a los participantes al documento AC19 Inf. 5, preparado por la UICN. Los observadores de Israel, Reino Unido, Estados Unidos y WWF de Estados Unidos convinieron en que se trataba de una cuestión importante y solicitaron la creación de otro grupo de trabajo del que deberían formar parte los Estados del área de distribución y el sector comercial. El representante de América del Norte señaló que pocos países de origen o países de la región neotropical estaban representados en la 19ª reunión del Comité de Fauna, y recomendó que el grupo trabajara entre reuniones. El Comité estableció un grupo de trabajo entre reuniones (grupo de trabajo 2) para tratar los diferentes aspectos de la Decisión 11.102 (Rev. CoP12), integrado por:

- a) representante regional: Sr. Rodrigo Medellín (América del Norte, Presidente);
- b) observadores de Partes: Canadá, Chile, México, Federación de Rusia, Reino Unido, Emiratos Árabes Unidos y Zimbabwe; y
- c) observadores de organizaciones intergubernamentales y no gubernamentales: UICN, Instituto de Protección de los Animales, *Defenders of Wildlife*, *International Elephant Foundation*, IFAW-Fondo Internacional para la Protección de los Animales, *Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd.*, *Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council*, Asociación Mundial de Zoológicos y Acuarios y WWF de Estados Unidos.

Posteriormente, el Presidente del grupo de trabajo 2 presentó el documento AC19 WG2 Doc. 1 e invitó al observador de Coalición Internacional para la Vida Silvestre a que preparara definiciones para la producción *in situ* y la conservación *ex situ*. El observador de México se ofreció a presentar especies adicionales y a realizar un estudio de casos. El Comité adoptó las recomendaciones del grupo descritas en el documento AC19 WG2 Doc. 1 con las siguientes enmiendas, según lo propuesto por el Presidente del grupo de trabajo, en el Anexo 2, párrafo 6. X:

- a) la primera línea debe decir "Efectos de la producción *ex situ* sobre la conservación *in situ* de la especie";
- b) el apartado g. debe decir: "Otros efectos de la producción *ex situ* sobre la conservación *in situ* de la especie"; y
- c) adición de un apartado h. que diga: "¿Está probado que la cría en cautividad estimula o reduce el comercio lícito o ilícito de especímenes silvestres?"

12. Transporte de animales vivos (AC19 Doc. 12)

La Presidenta del Grupo de trabajo sobre transporte presentó este punto del orden del día. Señaló que el estudio de investigación a que se hacía referencia en el documento AC19 Doc. 12, párrafo 10, sobre la mortalidad en el transporte podía obtenerse de la Autoridad Administrativa de CITES de Alemania y se resumía en el documento AC19 Inf. 4. La Presidenta del grupo de trabajo informó también al Comité de que cesaba en su cargo, y expresó su agradecimiento al Comité de Fauna, a los miembros del grupo de trabajo, a la Secretaría y a otros por su asistencia y sus contribuciones. El Presidente la felicitó, lo mismo que a su grupo, por la ardua labor realizada.

El Comité decidió que el Grupo de trabajo sobre transporte (grupo de trabajo 10) prepararía un programa de trabajo. Tras la solicitud de la *Humane Society* de Estados Unidos, la Real Sociedad Protectora de Animales (RSPCA) y la Sociedad Mundial para la Protección de los Animales (WSPA) de participar en el grupo de trabajo, el Presidente solicitó que se reunieran y decidieran designar uno o dos representantes solamente. Sin embargo, el Comité señaló que era posible que el Grupo de trabajo sobre transporte hubiera de reestructurarse, y que la decisión definitiva sobre la composición incumbía a su Presidente.

Ese grupo estaba integrado por:

- a) representante regional: Sra. Katalin Rodics (Europa, Presidenta);

- b) observadores de Partes: Austria, República Checa, Israel, Federación de Rusia y República Unida de Tanzania; y
- c) observadores de organizaciones intergubernamentales y no gubernamentales: UICN, Asociación Americana de Zoológicos y Acuarios, *Animal Exhibitors Alliance*, *Fund for Animals*, *Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council*, *Pro Wildlife*, *Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society*, la Real Sociedad Protectora de Animales, la Asociación Mundial de Zoológicos y Acuarios y la Sociedad Mundial para la Protección de los Animales.

El Presidente interino del Grupo de trabajo sobre transporte presentó el documento AC19 WG10 Doc. 1 y anunció que el nuevo Presidente del Grupo de trabajo sobre transporte designado era el representante de Austria (Sr. Peter Linhart). El observador de Sudáfrica pidió que el grupo de trabajo examinara la cuestión de reducir la mortalidad. El Comité adoptó las recomendaciones del grupo descritas en el documento AC19 WG10 Doc. 1.

13. Comercio de corales duros (AC19 Doc. 13)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día. El Comité estableció un grupo de trabajo entre reuniones (grupo de trabajo 11) para considerar y recomendar un medio práctico de distinguir los corales fosilizados de los no fosilizados en el comercio internacional. Este grupo estaba integrado por:

- a) representante regional: Sr. Rod Hay (Oceanía);
- b) observadores de Partes: Suiza, Reino Unido (Presidente) y Estados Unidos; y
- c) observadores de organizaciones no gubernamentales: *European Pet Organization*, *Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd.* y *Ornamental Fish International*.

A los principales países productores y a las principales organizaciones comerciales que intervienen en la exportación de coral que no estaban representados en la 19ª reunión del Comité se les permitiría también participar en el grupo de trabajo entre reuniones.

El Presidente del grupo de trabajo 11 presentó el documento AC19 WG11 Doc. 1, y señaló que el grupo de trabajo 11 consideraría la reconstitución del grupo de trabajo original sobre corales duros. El Comité adoptó las recomendaciones del grupo descritas en ese documento.

14. Control de los sistemas de cría en cautividad, cría en granjas y recolección en el medio silvestre de especies del Apéndice II (AC19 Doc. 14)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día. El observador de la UICN presentó el documento AC19 Inf. 6 y señaló que desearía la contribución del Comité de Fauna para incluirla en el informe final. La Presidenta del Comité de Flora dijo que el Comité de Flora había recomendado que se esperara a terminar el informe para tomar una decisión. El observador de los Países Bajos apoyó esta recomendación.

El representante de América del Norte dijo que este documento representaba un progreso considerable, pero que un cuadro en el que se describieran brevemente los diferentes sistemas de producción y las especies hubiera sido una adición útil. Los observadores de Sudáfrica y de la República Unida de Tanzania señalaron que disponían de sistemas de producción en sus países, que estaban mejorando aún la producción de animales silvestres y que las actuales definiciones de producción creaban confusión a las Autoridades Administrativas.

El observador del Reino Unido dijo que, en la 18ª reunión del Comité de Fauna, el grupo de trabajo sobre corales había solicitado códigos de origen adicionales que cubrieran la maricultura y el cultivo de corales y que esta era una importante cuestión que habría de abordarse. También señaló la necesidad de avanzar en cuestiones comunes al Comité de Fauna y al Comité de Flora.

Los observadores de Israel y de Estados Unidos señalaron que el informe abarcaba muchas cuestiones diferentes además de las relativas a los sistemas de producción, y que las aportaciones debían hacerse en la 19ª reunión del Comité de Fauna. El observador de Coalición Internacional para la Vida Silvestre abogó por la sencillez y la claridad al tratar de las definiciones de sistemas de producción, y el observador de *Pro Wildlife* pidió que se aplicaran mejor los sistemas existentes. El

observador de *Defenders of Wildlife* expresó la necesidad de considerar el impacto de nuevos códigos para las autoridades que se encuentran a la vanguardia de la observancia. El observador del Proyecto Caballito de Mar dijo que era necesario tener en cuenta los efectos sobre las poblaciones silvestres de los especímenes criados en cautividad.

El Comité estableció un grupo de trabajo (grupo de trabajo 4) para examinar las propuestas del documento AC19 Inf. 6, integrado por:

- a) representantes regionales: Sr. Edson Chidziya (África, Presidente) y Sra. Katalin Rodics (Europa);
- b) observadores de Partes: Alemania, Israel, Madagascar, Países Bajos, República Unida de Tanzania, Sudáfrica y Estados Unidos; y
- c) observadores de organizaciones intergubernamentales y no gubernamentales: UICN, *European Pet Organization*, *Pro Wildlife*, Alianza para la Conservación Mundial y *World Parrot Trust*.

El Presidente del grupo de trabajo 4 presentó el documento AC19 WG4 Doc. 1, señalando que el debate no había terminado y que aceptarían nuevas aportaciones. Acto seguido, intervinieron el representante de Asia y los observadores de Sudáfrica, el Reino Unido y Estados Unidos. El representante de América del Norte indicó que se había preparado una matriz de datos para una reunión anterior del Comité de Fauna en la que se destacaban los diferentes códigos utilizados y sus características, que el grupo de trabajo podría ampliar y utilizar. El Comité adoptó las recomendaciones del grupo descritas en el documento AC19 WG4 Doc. 1.

15. Conservación y comercio de tortugas terrestres y galápagos

15.1 Abordar las recomendaciones formuladas en el cursillo de Kunming (AC19 Doc. 15.1)

El observador de Estados Unidos presentó este punto del orden del día y dijo que el Anexo al documento AC19 Doc. 15.1 podría ayudar al Comité a determinar la prioridad de las recomendaciones del cursillo de Kunming. Tras las intervenciones de los observadores de WAZA e *IWMC*, el Comité decidió establecer un grupo de trabajo sobre tortugas terrestres y galápagos (grupo de trabajo 6), al que remitió esta cuestión.

15.2 Desarrollo de medidas de conservación a medio y largo plazo para las tortugas terrestres y galápagos [AC19 Doc. 15.2 (Rev. 1)]

El observador de Alemania presentó este punto del orden del día y dijo que se habían acogido con satisfacción los comentarios y contribuciones del Comité sobre los Anexos 1 y 2 del documento AC19 Doc. 15.2 (Rev. 1). El Presidente señaló que se trataba de un documento interesante, con información sobre algunas cuestiones litigiosas. Tras las intervenciones de los observadores de Coalición Internacional para la Vida Silvestre y *Pro Wildlife*, el Comité remitió esta cuestión al grupo de trabajo 6.

15.3 Aplicación de la Resolución Conf. 11.9 (Rev. CoP12) y de las Decisiones 12.41, 12.42 y 12.43 (AC19 Doc. 15.3)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día y señaló que el grupo de trabajo sobre tortugas terrestres y galápagos podría actualizar, aclarar y categorizar por orden de prioridad las recomendaciones procedentes del cursillo de Kunming; y preparó el mandato para un estudio sobre tortugas de cuña (*Malacochersus tornieri*). Los observadores de los Países Bajos y la República Unida de Tanzania señalaron que había habido una misión del Comité de Fauna a la República Unida de Tanzania para conocer la producción de tortugas terrestres y la exportación, por lo que ya se había realizado parte del trabajo. La Secretaría indicó que pondría a disposición el informe de la misión, pero que este punto del orden del día se refería al examen de situación, al control del comercio y la producción de tortugas de cuña en todos los Estados del área de distribución de la especie. El Comité remitió esta cuestión al grupo de trabajo 6.

Los representantes de la *European Pet Organisation* y el *Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council* solicitaron participar en el grupo de trabajo, y el Presidente les pidió que se reunieran y decidieran designar un representante.

El grupo de trabajo sobre tortugas terrestres y galápagos estaba integrado por:

- a) representante regional: Sr. Michael Griffin (África, Presidente);
- b) observadores de Partes: China, Alemania, Malasia, Países Bajos, República Unida de Tanzania, Eslovenia, Suiza y Estados Unidos; y
- c) observadores de organizaciones intergubernamentales y no gubernamentales: UICN, *Chelonian Research Foundation*, *European Pet Organisation*, Fondo Internacional para la Protección de los Animales, *Pro Wildlife*, TRAFFIC, Asociación Mundial de Zoológicos y Acuarios y WWF de Estados Unidos.

Posteriormente, el Presidente del grupo de trabajo 6 presentó el documento AC19 WG6 Doc. 1. El observador de Japón señaló que si el párrafo 2. a) i) de ese documento se refería a la inclusión de especies no amenazadas, no podía estar de acuerdo con las recomendaciones del grupo de trabajo. La Secretaría expresó la preocupación de que las recomendaciones del grupo de trabajo 6 no abordaran todas las cuestiones suscitadas en la Decisión 12.43. El Comité tomó nota de esas observaciones y adoptó las recomendaciones del grupo descritas en el documento AC19 WG6 Doc. 1, con las siguientes enmiendas al párrafo 1, según lo recomendado por los observadores de los Países Bajos y la República Unida de Tanzania:

- a) apartado a): "Recomienda que se estudie la cuestión de la identificación genética de poblaciones silvestres aisladas y ejemplares criados en cautividad de *Malacochersus tornieri*, a fin de abordar las preocupaciones de Kenya acerca del inadecuado control del plantel reproductor tanzano.";
- b) apartado b): "Recomienda que se invite a las instituciones adecuadas a presentar propuestas para realizar ese estudio, y que la institución elegida se ponga en contacto con las Autoridades Administrativas y Científicas residentes para hallar fuentes fiables de material genético"; y
- c) apartado d): "Recomienda que los países que han indicado que también son Estados del área de distribución de esta especie (es decir, Uganda, Mozambique y Zambia) aporten pruebas detalladas de que es así."

El representante de Asia preguntó cuántas especies de tortugas terrestres y galápagos siguen sin incluir, y el observador de la *Chelonian Research Foundation* respondió que sólo queda un pequeño porcentaje, pero que esas tortugas pueden estar amenazadas por ser especies "semejantes".

16. Caballitos de mar y otros miembros de la familia Syngnathidae

16.1 Aplicación de la inclusión de *Hippocampus* spp. en el Apéndice II (AC19 Doc. 16.1)

El observador de Estados Unidos presentó este punto del orden del día. El observador de México ofreció acoger en su país el cursillo técnico. El observador del Proyecto Caballito de Mar señaló que podían hacer una contribución técnica al cursillo. El Comité remitió esta cuestión al grupo de trabajo sobre signátidos (grupo de trabajo 7).

16.2 Tamaño mínimo universal para los caballitos de mar (AC19 Doc. 16.2)

La Presidenta del grupo de trabajo sobre signátidos presentó este punto del orden del día. La Secretaría anunció que en la Decisión 12.56 se invitaba a la Organización Mundial de Aduanas (OMA) a preparar códigos armonizados sobre caballitos de mar vivos, caballitos de mar secos, peces aguja vivos (y mulas de mar) y peces aguja muertos (y mulas de mar). La Secretaría informó de que se había puesto en contacto con la OMA y que ésta había pedido información adicional. La Secretaría solicitó asistencia del grupo de trabajo para responder a las preguntas de la OMA, y declaró que pondría a disposición la correspondencia pertinente. El Presidente del Comité de Fauna indicó además que pondría a disposición del grupo de trabajo los documentos de los operadores que crían caballitos de mar en cautividad.

El Comité remitió esta cuestión al grupo de trabajo sobre signátidos, y recomendó que tomara también en cuenta las cuestiones planteadas en el punto 16.1 del orden del día. Se modificó la composición del grupo de trabajo, que está integrado ahora por:

- a) representantes regionales: Sr. Rod Hay (Oceanía) y Sr. Choo-Hoo Giam (Asia);
- b) observadores de Partes: China, Grecia, México, República de Corea, Sudáfrica y Estados Unidos; y
- c) observadores de organizaciones intergubernamentales y no gubernamentales: UICN, Fondo Internacional para la Protección de los Animales, *Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd.*, *Ornamental Fish International*, Proyecto Caballito de Mar (Presidenta) y *Swan International*.

Posteriormente, la Presidenta del grupo de trabajo 7 presentó el documento AC19 WG7 Doc. 1. El observador de Japón señaló que debían establecerse límites de tamaño mínimo para cada especie y que, en general, las cuestiones básicas de gestión y aplicación deberían resolverse antes de incluir una especie en los Apéndices de la CITES. El Comité adoptó las recomendaciones del grupo descritas en el documento AC19 WG7 Doc. 1, en la inteligencia de que el Comité podía considerar otras formas de realizar la investigación recomendada.

17. Situación biológica y comercial de los cohombros de mar de las familias

Holothuridae y Stichopodidae (AC19 Doc. 17)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día y señaló que la Decisión 12.60 destinada al Comité de Fauna no podría llevarse a cabo hasta que se terminara la Decisión 12.61, dirigida a la Secretaría. El observador de Japón señaló que la FAO estaba organizando una reunión en China en octubre de 2003 sobre cohombros de mar y propuso que la Secretaría colaborara con la FAO.

El Comité estableció un grupo de trabajo (grupo de trabajo 9) para examinar los objetivos y el programa del cursillo propuesto y la participación, integrado por:

- a) representantes regionales: Sr. Rod Hay (Oceanía, Presidente) y Sr. Choo-Hoo Giam (Asia);
- b) observadores de Partes: China, Japón, México, República de Corea, República Unida de Tanzania y Estados Unidos; y
- c) observadores de organizaciones intergubernamentales y no gubernamentales: UICN, *Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd.*, *Ornamental Fish International*, Proyecto Caballito de Mar, *Swan International* y TRAFFIC.

Posteriormente, el Presidente del grupo de trabajo 9 presentó el documento AC19 WG9 Doc. 1. Señaló también que debía establecerse contacto con el PNUMA-CMCM, pues disponían de considerable información sobre este grupo de especies. El observador de México deseaba señalar que a finales de 2003 o comienzos de 2004 se celebraría un cursillo técnico sobre conservación y gestión de caballitos de mar. El Comité adoptó las recomendaciones del grupo descritas en el documento AC19 WG9 Doc. 1.

18. Situación biológica y comercial de los tiburones

18.1 Progresos realizados por Estados Unidos en el desarrollo y la aplicación del

IPOA-sharks (AC19 Doc. 18.1)

Los observadores de Estados Unidos presentaron este punto del orden del día. El representante de Asia señaló que nueve países asiáticos habían participado en una reunión técnica regional sobre cuestiones de pesca, y que se dispondría de los resultados de esa reunión antes de la CdP13. El representante de Sudáfrica también indicó que habían preparado un proyecto de plan que se esperaba terminar para presentarlo a la FAO. El Comité estableció un grupo de trabajo sobre tiburones (grupo de trabajo 12) y le remitió esta cuestión.

18.2 Aplicación de la Resolución Conf. 12.6 y la Decisión 12.47 (AC19 Doc. 18.2)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día. El Presidente notificó que, en cumplimiento de la Decisión 12.47, se había puesto en contacto con la FAO, y que había acordado informarle de los progresos realizados sobre esta cuestión. La Secretaría pidió que el Comité examinara toda la información disponible y formulara recomendaciones sobre cada especie. El Comité remitió esta cuestión al grupo de trabajo 12.

18.3 Progresos realizados por Japón en el desarrollo y la aplicación del IPOA-sharks (AC19 Doc. 18.3)

El observador de Japón presentó este punto del orden del día. La observadora de Estados Unidos acogió con satisfacción el informe de Japón y señaló que la inclusión de especies en los Apéndices de la CITES no prohíbe el comercio sino que lo regula. También indicó que Estados Unidos no prohíbe los desembarcos de tiburones completos (tiburones con aletas intactas), por lo que fomenta la utilización efectiva de todo el animal. La Secretaría remitió también al Comité al documento AC19 Inf. 7 con respecto al punto 18 del orden del día. El observador de la UICN indicó que la UICN y TRAFFIC publicarían pronto un informe sobre el estado del comercio internacional de tiburones. El Comité remitió esta cuestión al grupo de trabajo 12, integrado por:

- a) representante regional: Sr. Choo-Hoo Giam (Asia);
- b) observadores de Partes: China, Grecia, Japón, República de Corea, Reino Unido y Estados Unidos; y
- c) observadores de organizaciones intergubernamentales y no gubernamentales: Comisión Europea, UICN, *Defenders of Wildlife*, Fondo Internacional para la Protección de los Animales, NABU *Naturschutzbund Deutschland E. V.*, TRAFFIC, *WildAid* y WWF del Reino Unido.

El Presidente dijo que el grupo designaría a su presidente.

Posteriormente, el observador de la Comisión Europea, a quien el grupo de trabajo 12 había designado Presidente, presentó el documento AC19 WG12 Doc. 1. El observador de Japón dijo que apreciaba los constantes esfuerzos realizados y la labor del grupo de trabajo, pero que el grupo de trabajo 12 debía considerar seriamente el apoyo a la gestión de especies de tiburón, y no limitarse a recomendar la inclusión de todas las especies de tiburón en los Apéndices de la CITES. El Comité adoptó las recomendaciones del grupo descritas en el documento AC19 WG12 Doc. 1, incluido el proyecto de Notificación a las Partes contenido en el Anexo 1.

19. Comercio de especies exóticas (Sin documento)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día y declaró que en la Decisión 10.76 se encargaba al Comité de Fauna que cooperara con el Grupo de Especialistas en Especies Invasoras de la CSE/UICN en la aplicación de su documento *Directrices de la UICN para la prevención de la pérdida de diversidad biológica debido a la invasión biológica*. El representante de Oceanía, como intermediario entre el Comité de Fauna y dicho grupo de la CSE/UICN, señaló que se había avanzado poco en la preparación de una lista de especies invasoras de la CITES, pero que ya se habían terminado las directrices de la UICN y se disponía de ellas en inglés, francés y español en <http://www.issg.org>. El observador de México indicó que sería más adecuado que la cuestión de las medidas *in situ* recomendadas para la importación de especies invasoras se abordase en el marco del Convenio sobre la Diversidad Biológica. El Comité recomendó que el representante de Oceanía presentara un documento sobre esta cuestión en la 20ª reunión. Los observadores de Chile, Israel y Estados Unidos, y la Secretaría, ofrecieron su colaboración para preparar el documento.

20. Taxonomía y nomenclatura normalizada

20.1 Función de la taxonomía y la nomenclatura normalizadas y enmiendas a los Apéndices como consecuencia de los cambios en la nomenclatura..... (AC19 Doc. 20.1)

El Presidente presentó este punto del orden del día y explicó que el documento se había discutido en la reunión del Comité de Nomenclatura (Fauna), celebrada el 19 de agosto. El

representante regional de América del Norte expresó preocupación por la transparencia del proceso de adopción de decisiones del Comité de Nomenclatura y recomendó un examen sobre su funcionamiento. El zoólogo del Comité de Nomenclatura dijo que todos los documentos para la Conferencia de las Partes se habían preparado con arreglo a los plazos establecidos por esa Conferencia. También señaló que no era posible especular qué especies se propondría incluir en los Apéndices de la CITES, y que se tuviera esto en cuenta al hacer recomendaciones sobre la nomenclatura. También indicó que el mandato del Comité de Nomenclatura estaba incluido en la Resolución Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP12) y que no procedía que un comité examinara el mandato de otro comité. El representante de América del Norte se mostró de acuerdo con el zoólogo del Comité de Nomenclatura, pero indicó que en él no había representación regional. El representante de África recomendó cautela sobre la cuestión de la representación regional. El observador de Coalición Internacional para la Vida Silvestre dijo que el problema resaltado podría ser de percepción, pues el Comité de Nomenclatura no había atraído mucha atención en el pasado. Agregó que, de ser necesario un examen, debería realizarse mediante la revisión de la Resolución Conf.12.11.

El Comité tomó nota del documento.

20.2 Nomenclatura normalizada para las aves (AC19 Doc. 20.2)

El observador de México presentó este punto del orden del día y explicó que el documento se había discutido en la reunión del Comité de Nomenclatura (Fauna). El zoólogo del Comité de Nomenclatura dijo que el problema planteado con respecto a la inclusión dividida de *Amazona ochrocephala-oratrix-auropalliata* no era un problema de nomenclatura, sino de identificación. También señaló que el cambio de referencia normalizada para las aves de Sibley y Munroe en el Manual *The Birds of the World* se debía a que este manual era una publicación más reciente y ofrecía útil información adicional. El Comité tomó nota del documento, y el Presidente sugirió que tal vez el Comité de Fauna o un grupo pudieran presentar un documento con respecto a la manera de abordar esta cuestión.

21. Otras cuestiones

21.1 Proyectos de investigación (AC19 Doc. 20.1)

El Presidente presentó este punto del orden del día. La Secretaría alentó a las Partes a presentar propuestas de proyectos. El representante de América del Norte acogió con satisfacción esta noticia y estimuló a las Partes a que publicaran cualquier estudio de investigación en revistas revisadas por homólogos. El Comité tomó nota del documento, recomendó a las Partes el procedimiento estipulado en la Resolución Conf. 12.2 para la aprobación de proyectos de financiación externa y les exhortó a que presentaran propuestas de proyectos.

21.2 Comercio con Estados no Partes en la Convención (Sin documento)

El observador de México presentó este punto del orden del día, y recomendó un examen de los procedimientos seguidos para el comercio con Estados no Partes en la Convención, de acuerdo con sus experiencias con las Islas Salomón sobre importaciones de delfines. Esto fue apoyado por el observador de *Defenders of Wildlife*. La Secretaría señaló que el establecimiento de prescripciones comerciales diferentes para las Partes y los Estados no Partes podría dar lugar a problemas con la Organización Mundial del Comercio. La Secretaría también señaló que la Resolución Conf. 9.5 contenía disposiciones adecuadas para el comercio con Estados no Partes. El representante de Oceanía dijo que esto podía ser más bien una cuestión de creación de capacidad de Partes y no Partes para que puedan formular dictámenes sobre extracciones no perjudiciales. El Comité tomó nota de las cuestiones suscitadas.

21.3 Informe sobre los progresos realizados con los manuales de identificación (Sin documento)

La Secretaría presentó este punto del orden del día y señaló que el documento PC13 Doc. 17 contenía una descripción de los progresos realizados sobre manuales de identificación. El observador de Israel preguntó si las hojas de manuales de identificación podían ponerse a disposición en la web. La Secretaría dijo que, en efecto, había planes para hacerlo y que

aunque se había iniciado la labor todavía no se había completado. El Comité tomó nota del informe.

El Presidente declaró que aún no se habían confirmado el lugar ni la fecha de la siguiente reunión del Comité de Fauna. El observador de Estados Unidos pidió que se celebrara a comienzos de 2004, a fin de disponer de tiempo suficiente para preparar los documentos destinados a la CdP13.

El observador de los Países Bajos retiró el documento AC19 Inf. 8. A petición suya, la Secretaría acordó proporcionar información presupuestaria en la 20ª reunión del Comité, sobre los costos de las reuniones del Comité de Fauna celebradas en diferentes lugares.

El representante de Asia dijo que no había suficiente representación de observadores de la región de Asia sudoriental. El representante de África indicó asimismo que muchas Partes de su región no disponían de fondos suficientes para asistir.

22. Discursos de clausura (Sin documento)

El Presidente expresó su agradecimiento a los miembros y suplentes del Comité de Fauna y a los observadores por su espíritu constructivo y su cooperación para llegar a las decisiones que se habían adoptado. También expresó su agradecimiento a la Secretaría por la organización de la reunión y a los intérpretes por su ayuda durante toda ella.

El representante de Oceanía, en nombre del Comité de Fauna, dio las gracias al Presidente por la eficiencia y gentileza con que había presidido la reunión.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

REVIEW OF THE CRITERIA FOR AMENDMENT OF APPENDICES I AND II (DECISION 12.97)

Members of the working group

The regional representative of Oceania and the observers from Canada, Chile, China, Japan, Mexico, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Spain, Switzerland, the United States of America (Chair), Zimbabwe, the European Commission (rapporteur), IUCN, International Wildlife Coalition, Safari Club International, TRAFFIC, and WWF International.

Terms of reference

- Select a very limited number of taxa "non-sensitive" species for review to ensure the applicability of the criteria and guidelines, taking into consideration also the previous work done by the Plants Committee at its 13th meeting on this issue [Decision 12.97 and SC49 Summary Report (Rev. 1), Agenda item 19].
- Recommend a process to check taxa against the proposed criteria, taking into consideration the proposed time frame (Decision 12.97).

Summary of the discussions and recommendations

1. The Chairman reminded the group of the process that had been agreed by the Plants Committee and the Animals Committee in plenary. He emphasized that it was not the purpose of the exercise to prove whether or not a given species qualified for Appendix I or II.
2. The rationale for including non-listed species was discussed. It was agreed that some non-listed species would merit inclusion if, because of their biological and trade characteristics, they provided and opportunity to test aspects of the listing criteria that would not otherwise be tested by examination of CITES-listed species.
3. The following additions/clarifications were made to the *modus operandi* agreed by the Plants Committee:
 - a) The need to use and test the definitions in Annex 5 of the Chair's text when applying Tables 1A and 2A of document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev. 1) was emphasized (i.e. the exercise should not just focus on changes to Annexes 1 and 2a);
 - b) The compilation process scheduled to take place in November should result in recommended changes to the Chair's text to be discussed at the 14th meeting of the Plants Committee (PC14) and 20th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC20);

- c) The Chair's text identified issues which merited further work at PC14 and AC20 and the review should help to bring these forward;
 - d) The CoP12 working group on criteria did not have time to consider Annex 6 to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) and this would have to be addressed at some stage; and
 - e) It was agreed that Parties who wished to carry out review of other species than those agreed by the working group could propose these to the Animals Committee's Chairman before 5 September 2003 for his approval.
4. The following proposed timeframe would allow for completion of the tasks in Decision 12.97. Changes to the timeline adopted by the Plants Committee [PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev. 1)] have been included.

August 18-21, 2003: The Animals Committee discusses the workplan and the list of species for review at their meetings in Geneva, and achieves consensus on objectives and timelines.

22 August – 5 September, 2003: A small contact group comprised by the United States (Robert Gabel and Javier Alvarez), United Kingdom (Noel McGough and Vincent Fleming), and Spain (Margarita Clemente and Carlos Ibero) finalizes edits to document CoP12 Com. I. 3 and drafts guidelines for conducting the review.

6 September – 31 October, 2003: An intersessional working group named by the Animals Committee, along with the Committee Chairman, work toward completing the taxonomic reviews and simultaneously recommending specific changes to Doc. CoP12 Com. I. 3 criteria, if necessary, using the tables in Annex 2. If budget dictates it, this working group could conduct their business by email/post/telephone.

1 November – 30 November, 2003: The Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees compile in a table the results of the taxonomic reviews.

5 December 2003: The Secretariat posts the results of the taxonomic reviews on the CITES web site.

5 December 2003 – February 2004: Parties submit comments on the results of taxonomic reviews to the Animals and Plants Committees through their regional representatives.

February 2004: The Animals and Plants Committees hold a joint meeting to analyze the results of the taxonomic reviews, discuss revisions to CoP12 Com. I. 3, and prepare a draft resolution for consideration at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP13) in October 2004.

Note: At the end of PC13, it was announced that PC14 would be held in Namibia in February 2004. However, Namibia informed the Plants Committee that it would be unable to host a joint meeting of the Animals and Plants Committees. Consequently, during AC19, the Secretariat and Chairman of Animals Committee began conversations, still on-going, with South Africa to see if that country could host AC20 in February 2004 just prior to or immediately after PC14. A second option considered was holding AC20 in April 2004 and inviting PC members to attend a joint AC-PC session on the review of the listing criteria during AC20. Since most PC14 participants will have to stop in South Africa on their way to Namibia, several AC19 participants noted that the first option would be more cost-effective to those wishing to attend a joint AC-PC session on the review of the listing criteria, thus allowing a larger number of individuals to participate in the discussions on listing criteria. In addition to increasing the travel costs associated with attending disjunct PC and AC meetings and limiting the number of PC members able to attend AC20, the second option would provide the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees with only a few weeks to finalize a draft resolution on criteria to amend Appendices I and II.

March 2004 (SC50): The Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees submit draft resolution to the Standing Committee.

May 2004: A final draft resolution is posted on the CITES website (by the Secretariat) by the 150-day deadline prior to CoP13.

PROPOSED LIST OF TAXA TO EVALUATE THE DRAFT REVISED CRITERIA
CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT COP12 COM. I. 3

CITES-listed Animals

Mammals

Marine:

1. Gray whale (*Eschrichtius robustus*) - Japan (Kengo Tanaka), Mexico (Hesiquio Benítez), and United States of America (Robert Gabel)

Carnivore:

2. Leopard (*Panthera pardus*) - Zimbabwe (Tapera Chimuti)

Herbivore:

3. Argali (*Ovis ammon*) - China (Zhigang Jiang)
4. Vicuña (*Vicugna vicugna*) - Chile (Agustín Iriarte)

Primate:

5. Crab-eating macaque (*Macaca fascicularis*) - China (Zhigang Jiang); Viet Nam ?

Birds

Raptor:

6. Gyrfalcon (*Falco rusticolus*) - Canada (Veronique Brondex) and the United States of America (Robert Gabel)

Herbivore:

7. Yellow-headed amazon (*Amazona oratrix*) - Mexico (Hesiquio Benítez)
8. Lilac-crowned amazon (*Amazona finschi*) - Mexico (Hesiquio Benítez)

Reptiles

Crocodilian:

9. Yacare caiman (*Caiman yacare*) - Argentina (Victoria Lichtschein)

Snake:

10. Angolan python (*Python anchietae*) - Namibia (Michael Griffin)

Fish

Anadromous:

11. White sturgeon (*Acipenser transmontanus*) - United States of America (Robert Gabel) and Canada (Veronique Brondex)

Freshwater:

12. Isok barb (*Probarbus jullieni*) - United Kingdom (Vincent Fleming)
13. Asian arowana (*Scleropages formosus*) - United States of America (Robert Gabel)

Arthropods

Arachnid:

14. Emperor scorpion (*Pandinus imperator*) - Spain (Carlos Ibero) and France (Jacques Rigoulet)

Insect:

15. Apollo butterfly (*Parnassius apollo*) - Spain (Carlos Ibero)

Molluscs

16. Bear paw clam (*Hippopus hippopus*) - France (Jacques Rigoulet)

Non-CITES-listed Animals

Birds

Colonial:

17. Adelie penguin (*Pygoscelis adeliae*) - New Zealand (Rod Hay)

Amphibians

18. Western toad (*Bufo boreas*) - United States of America (Robert Gabel)

Reptiles

Lizard, Endemic:

19. Horned gecko (*Rhacodactylus* sp; species to be determined by reviewer) - France (Jacques Rigoulet)

Turtle:

20. Alligator snapping turtle (*Macrolemys temminckii*) - United States of America (Robert Gabel)

Fish

Marine, short-lived, high productivity:

21. Pacific sardine (*Sardinops melanostictus*) - Japan (Kengo Tanaka)
22. California sardine (*Sardinops sagax*) - United States of America (Robert Gabel)
23. Norwegian spring-spawning herring (*Clupea harengus*) - Norway (Arne Bjorge)

Marine, moderate productivity:

24. George's bank haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*) - United States of America (Robert Gabel)

Corals

25. Red coral (*Corallium rubrum*) - United Kingdom (Vincent Fleming) and Spain (Carlos Ibero)

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN *EX SITU* PRODUCTION AND *IN SITU* CONSERVATION

Participants

The working group was chaired by Rodrigo Medellín, Mexico.
Vincent Fleming, United Kingdom, served as rapporteur.
Tapera Chimuti, Parks and Wildlife Management Authority of Zimbabwe;
Masha Vorontsova, IFAW-Russia;
Karen Steuer, WWF-US;
Adam Roberts, Animal Welfare Institute;
Carroll Muffett, Defenders of Wildlife;
Marshall Meyers, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council;
Laura van der Meer, International Elephant Foundation;
Yolanda Matamoros, IUCN;
Peter Dollinger, World Association of Zoos and Aquaria.

1. This working group is coordinated with the WG on Registration for Commercial Captive Breeding of Appendix I species to avoid overlap and achieve synergy with that group.
2. The group took note of Decision 11.102 and reviewed the terms of reference as stated in document AC19 Doc. 11.2. The calendar for the group will be set when we have a final date for the next AC meeting but in the meantime we're assuming that the AC will meet in February of 2004.
3. The working group felt that a final report before the next CoP is not feasible at this point but we will work intersessionally to have a progress report that will include:
 - a) Results of the notification as modified below
 - b) Preliminary results of case studies of species that are bred *ex-situ* and the relationship with conservation *in-situ*
4. The WG decided that the case studies should not include only registered facilities, as most captive breeding operations are not registered. The terms of reference, coming from document AC19 Doc. 11.2, paragraph 11 was amended as reflected in Annex 1.

5. The initial list of case studies offered to be prepared by the WG members include:

<i>Crocodylus simensis</i>	Siam crocodile
<i>Ailuropoda melanoleuca</i>	Panda
<i>Falco peregrinus</i> (US and UK)	Peregrine falcon
<i>Crocodylus niloticus</i>	Nile crocodile
<i>Ursus tibethanus</i>	Asian black bear
<i>Bison bonasus</i>	European bison
<i>Diceros bicornis</i>	Black rhino
<i>Acinonyx jubatus</i>	Cheetah
<i>Scleropages formosus</i>	Asian bony tongue
Sturgeons from the Caspian sea	
<i>Vultur gryphus</i>	Andean condor
<i>Cyclura cornuta</i>	Caribbean iguana
<i>Leontopithecus rosalia</i>	Golden lion tamarin
<i>Panthera leo</i>	African lion

WAZA will expand this list in consultation with the regional associations.

6. The notification requesting information on additional case studies and relationship between ex-situ breeding operations and in-situ conservation programs was modified as it appears in Annex 2 of this document.

EXTRACT FROM DOCUMENT AC19 DOC. 11.2

11. The following elements could be included in the terms of reference of the working group suggested in the previous paragraph:

- a) Using the expertise of its members, responses to the Notification to the Parties and input from specialized organizations and the PC, evaluate the relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation by:
 - iii) assessing the ~~contribution-effect~~ of commercial and non-commercial captive breeding of CITES-listed animal species to the *in situ* conservation of those species;
 - iv) ~~consulting with the~~Take into account the work of the Convention on Biodiversity on issues of access and benefit sharing in relation to *ex situ* production;
 - iii) asking Parties and organizations to identify and provide information on potential case studies; and
 - iv) requesting organizations to provide information on the conservation costs and benefits of different captive-production systems.
- b) ~~In liaison with the PC In collaboration with WAZA, AZA, EAZA and others, and in liaison with the PC,~~ identify possible strategies and other mechanisms by which (nationally or internationally) registered ~~or non-registered~~ *ex situ* breeding operations may contribute to enhancing the recovery or conservation of CITES-listed species ~~within the countries of origin by~~ *in situ* by:
 - i) identifying examples of *in situ* recovery or conservation programmes for species produced in breeding operations, and examining in what form and under what conditions operations could usefully contribute to these programmes;
 - ii) ~~examining means to facilitate the transfer of offspring or breeding stock so as to maintain the genetic diversity of the captive populations;~~
 - iii) ~~proposing means to~~assessing the effect of reintroduction of captive-bred specimens for the conservation of the species~~whether re-introduction of captive-bred specimens could be beneficial to species conservation and, if so, how to develop programmes where this would be the case;~~
 - iv) examining mechanisms ~~for generating sustainable funding for in-situ conservation from ex-situ breeding operations to establish conservation funds that are linked to registered captive-breeding activities,~~ for instance through applying a 'conservation' levy on the sales of captive-bred specimens entering international trade;
 - v) evaluating the capacity and need of range States to develop or manage *in situ* recovery and conservation programmes for species produced in ~~registered~~ *ex situ* breeding operations ~~that can attract support from these operations;~~ and
 - vi) ~~encouraging the support to and establishment of conservation projects by consortia of ex situ production operations; and~~
- c) consider the development of a draft resolution for discussion at the 13th meeting of the Conference of Parties on tools for Scientific and Management Authorities to assist in monitoring and assessing the impacts of captive production systems, and to develop recommendations concerning *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation of CITES-listed species.

DRAFT

NOTIFICATION TO THE PARTIES

CONCERNING:

Relationship between ex situ production and in situ conservation

1. Decision 11.102 (Rev. CoP12), directs the Animals Committee to

continue to examine the complex issues related to the origin of founder breeding stock and the relationship between ex situ breeding operations and in situ conservation of the species and, in collaboration with the Plants Committee, the American Zoo and Aquarium Association, the European Association of Zoos and Aquaria and the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums, identify possible strategies and other mechanisms by which registered ex situ breeding operations may contribute to enhancing the recovery and/or conservation of the species within the countries of origin, and report its findings at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
2. The Secretariat circulated Notification to the Parties No. 2001/91 of 19 December 2001, inviting all Parties and organizations to provide information on the relationship between *ex situ* production systems and *in situ* conservation programmes for CITES-listed species. The response to this Notification was limited, and this new request for information has been developed in collaboration with the Animals Committee.
3. As communicated in Notification to the Parties No. 2001/091, a range of different perspectives and critical views appear to exist on the relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation of the species concerned.
4. A working group has been established within the Animals Committee to look at the relationship of *ex-situ* captive breeding and *in-situ* conservation.
5. Parties and organizations are invited to provide case studies to the In-Situ Ex-Situ Working Group that may assist the Animals Committee in examining the relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation of CITES-listed species.
6. The case studies should be submitted to the Chair of the WG by December 15th, 2003, in the following format:

TEMPLATE FOR CASE STUDY PREPARATION

- I. Author
- II. Taxon
- III. Range states where this taxon is found
- IV. Current estimated wild population size (if known)
- V. Species' status under CITES and the IUCN
- VI. Population trend for the species in the wild (Increasing, Decreasing, Stable, if known)
- VII. For each *ex situ* breeding operation that is the subject of this study:
 - a. Name,
 - b. Location,
 - c. Year of establishment,
 - d. CITES registration number (if applicable)
 - e. Type of operation (registered commercial, non-registered commercial, non-commercial)
 - f. Origin of the founder stock for the operations if known
- VIII. Number of individuals of this species successfully bred annually
- IX. Is there an *in situ* conservation program for this species? In which countries?

- X. How does the *ex situ* operation contribute to the *in situ* conservation of the species? For example:
- a. Have individuals been released into the wild? How many? Where did the release occur? From what operation? are relevant IUCN Reintroduction Guidelines being followed?
 - b. Have causes for the decline in the wild been identified? Mitigated? Stopped?
 - c. Is there an ongoing monitoring program in place covering the animals released into the wild?
 - d. Have the data from the monitoring program been analyzed and peer reviewed published and has success of releases been quantified?
 - e. What financial and other (specify) resources have been made available and used to support *in situ* conservation programs for the species from the *ex situ* breeding operation?
 - f. Explain how the *ex situ* breeding operation has demonstrably affected conservation education in the country of origin of the species and the country in which the *ex situ* breeding operation exists.
 - g. Other ways in which the *ex situ* operation contributes to the *in situ* conservation of the species.
7. The information received in response to this Notification will be presented to the Animals Committee to assist in its implementation of Decision 11.102 (Rev. CoP12) and its report for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

Working group reports

REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE IN SPECIMENS OF APPENDIX II SPECIES -
STROMBUS GIGAS (PHASE V)

Chair: M. Pourkazemi (Regional representative for Asia)

Participants: Sixto Inchaustegui (Regional Representative for Central South America and the Caribbean), Jacques Rigoulet (France), Jorge Alvarez-Romeo (Mexico), Alison Littlewood (United Kingdom) Miguel A. Rolon, Nancy Daves, John Field (United States of America), Stephanie Theile (TRAFFIC), Sabrina Birner (World Bank), Jim Armstrong (CITES Secretariat).

1. The working group recognized that *Strombus gigas* presents a unique situation in that it is the only species to have entered the significant trade process twice; which indicates that the process was not effective the first time round. In addition it was also acknowledged that since entering into the process in 2001 the Resolution dealing with Significant Trade had changed.
2. It was also recognized by the working group that although some range States would not have been informed of the proposed categorizations prior to AC19, that ample opportunity had been given to all range States to comment on the consultants report and on their implementation of Article IV in relation to *S. gigas*. In addition the major issues of concern identified in the report had all been highlighted during the International Queen Conch Initiative (IACI) workshop which met in Montego Bay, Jamaica (11-12 June 2003).
3. Members of the working group agreed that the report was a comprehensive summary of the current situation in the region and agreed with all the proposed categorizations as recommended by the CITES Secretariat and the consultant, except in the case of Mexico where, upon clarification, it was decided that it had sufficient regulatory mechanisms in place to ensure that harvest was being conducted in a sustainable manner and exports only concerned shells derived from this harvest. For this reason Mexico was moved from the category of 'possible concern' to 'of least concern',
4. In accordance with Resolution Conf. 12.8 all Parties categorized as of least concern would be removed from the review. However, in recognition of the fact that effective management of the population requires regional cooperation, these Parties should be invited to participate in the regional activities arising from this process.
5. The working group, in consultation with the CITES Secretariat, formulated a series of recommendations for those Parties' populations of 'urgent concern' and proposed specific actions to address problems related to the implementation of Article IV. The recommendations differentiate between short-term and long-term actions and are included in Annex 1 of this report. Countries in

this category should be encouraged to seek assistance from FAO and other appropriate organizations. These countries should also explore opportunities to strengthen bi-lateral communication with importing Parties and urge major importing countries to contribute technical and financial assistance. The working group also formulated recommendations for countries identified as having populations of 'possible concern' (see Annex 1).

6. In compliance with paragraph k) of Resolution Conf. 12.8, the working group identified that there were other issues of concern in many of the range States other than those specifically related to the implementation of Article IV, and identified a series of issues which the CITES Secretariat is asked to address in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Convention and relevant Resolutions (see Annex 1).
7. The working group asks the members of the Animals Committee to adopt this proposed approach and to consider actively engaging the consultant when finalizing the recommendations directed to the Parties identified as of 'possible concern', to ensure that the recommendations address the specific issues of concern raised in the report commissioned by the CITES Secretariat and identified in relation to individual countries.
8. The CITES Secretariat is requested to remind those countries subject to a trade suspension under Phase III of the Review of Significant Trade to provide information, as required by the Standing Committee, in order for the suspension which is currently in place to be withdrawn (namely Antigua & Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica and Trinidad & Tobago).

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Animals Committee proposes that the Standing Committee recommends a suspension of imports of specimens of the species from those Parties in Category (i) and Category (ii) if the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairman of the Animals Committee, has not been able to verify that they have implemented the following:

Category (i) - 'species of urgent concern' for which the available information indicates that the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2(a), 3 or 6, are not being implemented

Dominican Republic; Haiti; Honduras

1. Short-term actions to be taken within 6 months:

- a) Establish a voluntary moratorium on the commercial harvest (excluding legal harvest in territorial waters of the Parties concerned) and the international trade of *Strombus gigas* within four weeks of this recommendation being made (upon communication by the AC to the Parties);
- b) Identify areas to be designated for commercial fisheries;
- c) Undertake density studies in these designated areas;
- d) Identify and analyse trends in available landing data;
- e) Establish a standardized minimum meat weight that corresponds to adult specimens of unprocessed and processed meat;
- f) Based on the results of the density studies, the analysis of landing trends and standardized meat weight establish cautious catch and export quotas in consultation with the Secretariat;
- g) Demonstrate that items 2a) and 2b) below, have been initiated.

2. Long-term actions for implementation to be taken within 18 months:

- a) design and implement a fishery data collection programme. This programme is designed to collect catch and effort data and shall include 1.) a system of permits and licenses for commercial harvesters and exporters, and 2.) regular reporting of landing and export data;
- b) Design and implement a long-term population monitoring programme for the designated commercial fishing areas. This programme should provide reliable estimates of adult and juveniles densities within commercial fishing areas, at a minimum.
- c) Give serious consideration to the recommendations of the June 2003 IQCI meeting and commit specifically to those recommendations on:
 - i) development of a regional management regime, including cooperative quota setting,
 - ii) law enforcement capacity and effectiveness
 - iii) population assessments and other research relating to the management of Queen Conch

Category (ii) – ‘species of possible concern’ for which it is not clear whether or not the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2(a),3 or 6(a) are being implemented

Antigua and Barbuda*; Barbados*;Bahamas; Belize; Colombia; Cuba; Dominica*; Grenada; Nicaragua; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Trinidad and Tobago* (* refers to those countries currently subject to a trade suspension under Phase III of the Significant Trade Process)

3. Short-term actions to be taken within 12 months:

Bahamas, Belize, Colombia, Cuba, Nicaragua, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines shall:

- a) Establish within 12 months cautious catch and export quotas, communicate these to the Secretariat and provide information for the basis of these quotas.
- b) Establish a standardized minimum meat weight that corresponds to adult specimens of unprocessed and processed meat
- c) Design and implement a fishery data collection programme. This programme is designed to collect catch and effort data and shall include 1.) a system of permits and licenses for commercial harvesters and exporters, and 2.) regular reporting of landing and export data.
- d) Design and implement a long-term population monitoring programme for the designated commercial fishing areas. This programme should provide reliable estimates of adult and juveniles densities within commercial fishing areas, at a minimum.

4. Long-term actions to be taken within 24 months:

All Parties included in Category (ii) shall:

- a) apply adaptive management procedures to ensure that further decisions about harvesting and management of the species concerned will be based on the monitoring of the impact of previous harvesting and other factors.
- b) give serious consideration to the recommendations of the June 2003 IQCI meeting and commit specifically to those recommendations on
 - i) development of a regional management regime, including cooperative quota setting,
 - ii) law enforcement capacity and effectiveness
 - iii) population assessments and other research relating to the management of Queen Conch

The Secretariat should remind those countries subject to a trade suspension as a result of the Review of Significant Trade under Phase III to provide the required information to the Standing Committee in order for the suspension to be withdrawn.

Category (iii) – ‘species of least concern’ for which the available information appears to indicate that the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2(a), 3 or 6(a) are being met

Anguilla, Aruba, Bermuda, Brazil, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Costa Rica, France (including Guadeloupe and Martinique), Guatemala, Jamaica, Mexico, Montserrat, the Netherlands Antilles, Panama, Turks and Caicos Islands, United States of America (including Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands) and Venezuela.

On the basis of Resolution Conf. 12.8 all Parties categorized as of ‘least concern’ would be removed from the review.

These Parties are invited to participate in the regional activities arising from this process and should give serious consideration to the recommendations of the June 2003 IQCI meeting and commit specifically to those recommendations on:

- development of a regional management regime, including cooperative quota setting,
- law enforcement capacity and effectiveness
- population assessments and other research relating to the management of Queen Conch.

Problems identified in the course of the review that are not related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a)

In compliance with paragraph k) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 the working group recognized that there were other issues of concern in range States other than those specifically related to the implementation of Article IV, and directed the Secretariat to address these in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Convention and relevant Resolutions.

Problems identified included:

1. Several countries and dependent territories reportedly import specimens of *Strombus gigas* that have been obtained illegally, for example through unauthorized fishing in waters under the jurisdiction of other states and the subsequent transfer of the product across international borders. Often, the product is sold at sea or reported as being landed in national waters. Although this happens in many range States this is of particular concern for **Aruba (NL), the Dominican Republic, Guadeloupe (FR), Honduras, Martinique (FR) and the Netherlands Antilles (NL)**.
2. In several countries illegal fishing and subsequent transfer of the product across international borders occurs undermining national management measures. This is of particular concern for Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and Venezuela. These countries should also explore opportunities to strengthen bi-lateral communication, cooperation and exchange of data on law enforcement issues. This cooperation should especially be sought between importing and exporting States.
3. Insufficient monitoring and reporting of trade occurs in a number of range States and needs to be addressed. Monitoring and reporting of trade volumes seems especially problematic for the dependent territories of **France, the Netherlands** and the **United Kingdom**, with trade often not monitored and going unrecorded.
4. The majority of Parties have reported trade in *Strombus gigas* meat in numbers instead of kilograms. This prevents proper monitoring and analysis. All meat in international trade should be reported in kilograms (kg) and live specimens and shells in kilograms (kg) or number of specimens.
5. To properly control and monitor levels of exportation, information on percentages of tissue loss (and thus weight) during the processing is needed.
6. All countries are requested to collaborate in the development and establishment of a standardized conversion factor for queen conch meat found in international trade.
7. These queen conch range States should also seek assistance from FAO and urge major importing countries to contribute technical and financial assistance specifically in those countries categorized as of urgent concern.

Draft recommendations of IQCI-CITES Workshop
Montego Bay, Jamaica 11-12 June, 2003

Recognizing that *Strombus gigas* is one of the most important fisheries for the region and that this species is experiencing continued and significant declines,

Recognizing also that due to its biological characteristics, this species is vulnerable to over-exploitation and that once depleted, recovery can take many years to occur,

Recognizing further the 1996 San Juan Declaration establishing the International Queen Conch Initiative,

Considering that an active program to cooperate on the conservation and management of this species will directly respond to guidance from leaders given at the World Summit on Sustainable Development with respect to the need to take action at all levels to restore depleted fish stocks on an urgent basis,

Reaffirming our commitment to proper implementation of Article IV of CITES,

Recognizing that a lack of financial and human resources limits the ability of national governments and regional organizations to implement the recommendations in this document,

Noting that stock declines have occurred despite 10 years of listing on Appendix II of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES),

Deeply concerned that a lack of focused attention to this species will result in the loss of this species as a commercially viable resource in many parts of the region,

Acknowledging the management and regulatory measures including closures, gear and size restrictions already underway at the national level in support of the sustainable use of this species,

Fully aware of the need to consider management of this species in the context of scarce resources for fisheries enforcement and as one component of a sustainable fisheries management program at the national, sub-regional and regional level,

Noting that reliability, compatibility and quality of data on the status and trends of queen conch stocks and on trade constitutes a serious impediment to effective management of conch stocks,

Understanding the need for greater networking among countries and regional partners to manage this shared resource,

Committed to building partnerships among all interested organizations, institutions and stakeholders in the region to maximize effective use of scarce human and financial resources, and

Welcoming the recent establishment of the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism in this regard,

The International Queen Conch Initiative-CITES Workshop submits the Following Recommendations, pending approval by governments, for consideration by national governments and appropriate inter-governmental bodies, in particular CARICOM, CRFM, CITES and FAO.

Relating to Significant Trade Review Process/ Improvement of CITES implementation capabilities

1. States should provide specific comments on the report in its totality and national implementation of Article IV to CITES Secretariat by June 30 deadline.
2. After consideration in Capitals, meeting organizers should provide to CITES, by June 30 deadline, these recommendations along with a summary report as a regional response to the TRAFFIC Report.
3. States should urge appropriate authorities to review relevant national legislation implementing CITES with a view to meeting minimum standards in the CITES National Legislation Project.

4. States that have not already done so should consider establishing catch and export quotas to improve the management of *Strombus gigas* and should report those quotas to CITES authorities for notification to Parties.
5. States, where appropriate, are urged to find the most effective channel of communication between authorities responsible for queen conch management and national CITES authorities and stakeholders, and between the CITES Secretariat and the Parties.
6. CITES and FAO are urged to work together to finalize the Memorandum of Understanding between them as soon as possible.
7. One goal of the CITES-FAO MOU is to facilitate improved communication and exchange of information between CITES and fisheries authorities at the national level bearing in mind the existing FAO communication network.
8. States should consider designating authorities responsible for management of conch stocks as CITES authorities for this species.

Relating to Improvement of Scientific Research on Queen Conch Biology

9. Establish regional database and/or standardized data storage formats for conch biological research.
10. Promote partnership with existing organizations working on similar activities.
11. Stock assessment, early life history, growth and recruitment studies need to be priorities in national and regional research programs.
12. Promote the undertaking of more abundance surveys for *Strombus gigas*.
13. Need to develop standardized methodologies and implementation strategies for more robust abundance surveys taking into account the biological characteristics of *Strombus gigas*.
14. Explore stock enhancement opportunities for this species as well as opportunities for transplantation of spawning stocks to locations that will maximize spawning success.
15. Biological research should also focus on identification of essential spawning and recruitment habitat as well as research addressing dispersal of larvae for *Strombus gigas* with a view to assisting planners in establishing effective marine reserves to promote rebuilding of stocks.
16. Cooperative arrangements should be sought to conduct stock assessments, based on the best science available and transparency of data, for queen conch, as necessary.

Relating to Improvement of Status and Trends Reporting for Queen Conch Stocks

17. Promote exchange of standardized data to facilitate a more accurate regional picture of status and trends of *Strombus gigas* stocks. In this regard, a harmonized conversion factor for conch product types is critical.
18. Favourably consider CRFM Project proposal for Strengthening Assessment and Management of the Conch Resources in the Region.
19. As a matter of priority, States should consult within governments to reduce discrepancies in reporting on status and trends of stocks as well as trade data (e.g. differences in CITES data and fisheries export data).
20. The region should actively participate in the implementation of FAO's Strategy for Improvement of Status and Trends of Fisheries – requesting that Queen Conch be considered as a priority by FAO in implementing the Strategy.

Relating to Improved Cooperation on Management of QC Stocks

21. States should favourably consider CRFM proposal to establish a Caribbean regional lobster and conch fisheries management organization. CRFM should consult with other regional bodies in order to avoid duplication of efforts.
22. Non-CARICOM countries are encouraged to become Associate Members of CRFM at the earliest opportunity. Non-CARICOM countries should work closely with CRFM to establish criteria for associate member status in CRFM.
23. During discussions/negotiations to establish a Caribbean regional lobster and conch fisheries management organization, consideration should be given to the use of the CRFM Lobster and Conch Working Group as a mechanism to organize efforts in this regard.
24. Pursue discussions and cooperative opportunities on the utility and feasibility of establishing marine reserves for queen conch stocks, in particular pursue cooperation between CRFM initiative, Caribbean Environment Program, FAO, and other governmental and non-governmental organizations on these issues.
25. Cooperation on management measures at the sub-regional level will be critical to leveraging scarce resources.

Relating to Improved Law Enforcement Capacity and Effectiveness

26. States should pursue, as a matter of priority, regional cooperation to deter and eliminate IUU fishing activities in the Caribbean region.
27. Recognize the need for and initiate capacity building programs to implement these recommendations, in particular with respect to law enforcement issues.
28. Cooperative programs should include but not be limited to information sharing, law enforcement initiatives, training opportunities, technical assistance, and other relevant means.
29. States, where appropriate, should strengthen their legal and regulatory structures for law enforcement relating to fisheries management.
30. Promote opportunities for regional cooperation on implementation of the FAO International Plan of Action to deter, prevent and eliminate IUU fishing, in particular Caribbean regional participation in upcoming FAO consultations on IPOA implementation.
31. Consider participation in the voluntary Fisheries Monitoring Control and Surveillance Network.
32. Explore opportunities to strengthen bilateral communication, cooperation and exchange of data on law enforcement issues. This cooperation should especially be sought between importing and exporting States.

Relating to Improved Education, Outreach and Involvement of Industry/Interested Stakeholders

33. Develop and implement education and outreach programs targeting fishers, consumers and young people designed to raise awareness of queen conch status and concerns.
34. Seek partnership opportunities with industry and NGO community to fund these efforts. (note: Dominican Republic, Archipelago of the Sciences Program (Guadeloupe), CONACYT (Mexico), CINVSTAV (Mexico), Parque Xelha (Mexico), Conch Heritage Network (USA) and CFMC programs for youth outreach).
35. Ensure transparency throughout the development of a regional fisheries management organization for conch and lobster fisheries by including industry and interested stakeholders in these discussions at local, national, sub-regional and regional levels.

Relating to Operationalizing Resolutions and International Conventions and Other Relevant Arrangements

36. Promote cooperation between intergovernmental organizations interested in this resource, in particular CITES and SPAW protocol, as a means to secure adequate resources for States to implement these recommendations and meet commitments under international conventions.
37. States should solicit donor parties and organizations that are interested in the conservation and sustainable use of the queen conch outside the range States region to provide the technical assistance and financial support in accordance with Conf. Res. 12.8 to ensure that adequate human resources, institutional capacity, legal and regulatory systems, research and management strategies are executed and maintained for the overall improvement of this marine resource.
38. States should promote the continued viability of *Strombus gigas* for the food security of the region by fully implementing appropriate quality assurance programs, recognizing the need for capacity building assistance in this regard and noting the value-added such work would bring to the sector.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

Report of the working group

CONTROL OF CAPTIVE BREEDING, RANCHING AND WILD
HARVEST PRODUCTION SYSTEMS FOR APPENDIX-II SPECIES

Chair: Edson Chidziya, Regional Representative for Africa

Present: Irina Sprotte, Germany
Maria Anastasiou, Greece
Simon Nemtzov, Israel
Thea Carroll, South Africa
Julius Kibebe, United Republic of Tanzania
Roddy Gabel, United States of America
Alison Rosser, IUCN-The World Conservation Union
Jaques Berney, IWMC-World Conservation Trust
Cristiana Senni, World Parrot Trust
Ger van Vliet and Anna van der Heijden, CITES Secretariat

Mandate:

- Examine the IUCN document AC19 Inf. 6, which summarizes the IUCN report on a review of the different wildlife production systems
- Review and refine the suggestions and proposals in the documents as appropriate.

Recommendations:

1. The production systems should be grouped on the basis of three main characteristics:
 - a) the level of wild collection and its impact on population survival;
 - b) the extent to which wild collection is offset by enhancing productivity through rearing; and
 - c) the extent to which specimens are bred in captivity according to Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.).
2. The existing source codes (C, F, D, R, W) should be maintained in order to remain simple, practical and clear.
3. The code C should be used for specimens bred in captivity according to Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.).

4. The code F should be used for specimens resulting from the exchange of gametes under captive conditions or propagated asexually in captivity (F1 or subsequent generations) that do not fulfil the definition of 'bred in captivity' in Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.).
5. The code D, as defined in Resolution Conf. 12.3, should be used only from specimens from operations captive-breeding Appendix-I species for commercial purposes that are registered with the CITES Secretariat. (There was no full agreement within the working group on this recommendation.)
6. With regard to the code R: 'specimens originating from a ranching operation': Resolution Conf. 11.16 should be revised or amended to include ranching operations other than those linked to a down-listing from Appendix I to Appendix II. This will therefore include a management plan that provides for sustainable use of the species The Group through IUCN and with the input from the Secretariat, will intersessionally, develop a draft resolution in this regard for consideration at AC20
7. By default, W will be used for wild specimens of animals and should refer to those from any source other than those mentioned above.
8. To improve implementation of source codes by both importing and exporting countries interpretative material with relevant examples of production systems under the source codes should be developed. These materials should include a description of elements that should be considered in making non-detriment findings within each production system.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

Report of the working group

REGISTRATION AND MONITORING OF OPERATIONS THAT BREED APPENDIX-I ANIMAL SPECIES
FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES. DOC. AC19 DOC. 11.1 ANNEX -
PROCESS FOR REGISTERING OPERATIONS

Members of the Working Group: N. Ishii, Japan; M. Calderon, Spain, V. Brondex, Canada; J. Stankova, Czech Republic, A. Iriarte, Chile; J. Galvin, Animal Exhibitors Alliance, A. Michels, SSN, P. Ross, IUCN; G. Cochrane, Animals Asia Foundation; K. Vehrs, AZA; M. Jardinel, Birds International.

1. Chairman of the Working group was unavoidably detained. The WG delegated P. Ross as interim Chair. After introduction, the WG reviewed AC19 Doc. 11.1, and identified these points 4. a), b) and c) as their scope:
 - a) describe and analyse the specific problems that limit the wider use of the registration procedure;*
 - b) provide recommendations to resolve these problems; and*
 - c) study and evaluate how commercial captive breeding operations contributes to conservation of Appendix-I species.*
2. The WG agreed to focus on a) and b). The Parties are divided on whether there is a problem. Recognizing that the WG would complete its work intersessionally, the first task is to collect information and analyze it. We reviewed the draft notification (AC19 Doc. 11.1 Annex 2) and accepted points 1, 2. and 3. as suitable background. Operational part 4. a) and b) should produce useful information. After discussion the WG decided 4. c) i), ii) and iii) properly address the concern of WG2 and are not necessary to evaluate the registration process *per se*. The Chair of this WG has coordinated with the Chair of WG2 and harmonized on this point.

The WG recommended that the Secretariat review the outputs of WG5 and WG2, and remove 4.c) i), ii) and iii) from the notification assuming this point is covered by a notification of WG 2.

3. Noting concerns raised in AC discussion the WG identified an additional need for information from Parties about unregistered captive breeding operations. There is a continuum from small scale, non-commercial hobby breeders to large scale, commercial breeders, some of whom are registered.

The WG recognized that CITES can only be concerned with operations that supplied specimens to international trade. Therefore, Parties need not register operations that do not supply specimens to international trade, but the transfer of specimens from unregistered to registered operations should be regulated.

4. After discussion of the information that was required by the WG to “a) *describe and analyse the specific problems that limit the wider use of the registration procedure;*”, the WG recommended additional requests for the draft notification as follows:
 4. c) i) **Provide information on the numbers and species concerned of any unregistered operations that are captive breeding Appendix-I specimens that enter international trade.**
 - ii) **Provide available information, best estimates or information from other sources (e.g. hobby, amateur and commercial breeding associations) on any operations involved in commercial captive breeding of Appendix-I species (it would assist the Secretariat and the Working Group to be advised if this information is not available).**
5. As a preliminary guide to topics and concerns regarding problems with the registration procedure (Conf. 12.10) the WG offers the following list of perceived issues and problems. We do not necessarily agree that these are all serious or substantive, but they have been raised in this and previous discussions:
 - a) The time required to process applications by both the Management Authorities and the Secretariat is too long.
 - b) Following from this delay, and the absence of any mechanism to update the registry, information in the registry regarding captive breeding operations is not current.
 - c) Management Authorities expressed difficulties in determining whether operations are commercial despite the clear CITES definitions of “commercial”.
 - d) Breeding operations and Management Authorities have difficulties documenting the legal acquisition of the original stocks, particularly when these were acquired a long time ago.
 - e) Many small operations routinely exchange specimens with other operations and therefore do not meet the criteria definition for “closed facility”.
 - f) Unregistered operations may transfer specimens to registered operations which then enter international trade.
 - g) The volume of work for Management Authorities to register and monitor breeding operations, when these are numerous, is overwhelming.
 - h) Detailed reporting of stock and operations is onerous to both the operations and the Management Authorities.
 - i) Documenting production of F2 or procedures previously successful in producing F2 are difficult.
 - j) The registration criteria are too strict.
 - k) There are possibilities of delay to listing by range States.
 - l) In spite of Conf. 10.17 (Rev.) Decide c), some Parties perceive a difficulty in registering operations that produce hybrids with an Appendix-I parent.
6. Finally, the WG recognized the very short time available for distribution and responses to this notification. Therefore, the WG anticipated collecting the same information directly and independently from diverse sources (including the Secretariat) during its intersessional work. We will also request details of trade in captive bred Appendix-I specimens from UNEP-WCMC. Information received from all sources could be combined in a data base. In relation to the last term of reference c) that was not addressed by the WG, this will be discussed intersessionally. The WG also addressed the need for efficient electronic communication to conduct its work (private list or e-group). Due to the schedule of COP13 and the next AC Meeting the WG request the Secretariat to distribute the notification immediately and encourage the Parties to respond within 45 days. The WG will report the analysis of information received and recommendations to resolve this problem to the AC20.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

CONSERVATION OF AND TRADE IN TORTOISES AND FRESHWATER TURTLES

Participants:

Regional representative of Africa (Chair), Germany, China, [Indonesia], Malaysia, the Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America (Rapporteur); IUCN (Deputy Chair); WWF – World Wide Fund for Nature (Rapporteur);

Chelonian Research Foundation, [Conservation International], European Pet Association, [International Fund for Animal Welfare], IWMC – World Conservation Trust, International Wildlife Coalition, ProWildlife, [TRAFFIC], [Wildlife Conservation Society], World Association of Zoos and Aquariums.

Not all working group participants attended the full meeting; additional participants are invited to participate intersessionally.

The working group was provided with terms of reference for their discussions by the Secretariat, which were to:

- Consider the Annexes 1 to AC19 Doc. 15.1 and 1 and 2 to AC19 Doc. 15.2 (Rev.1) and formulate recommendations for follow-up.
- Monitor the implementation of Resolution Conf. 11.9 (Rev. CoP12) and follow up on the recommendations and findings formulated at the Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles held in Kunming, China, 25-28 March 2002 (see Document CoP12 Doc 10.1, paragraph 99).
- Address the actions called for in Decision 12.43 regarding *Malacochersus tornieri* (pancake tortoise) [see AC19 Doc. 15.3 (Rev.1)-pp 1-2].

Conclusions of the working group:

The working group agreed that determining specific and detailed priorities, for both species and conservation recommendations, is a complex task requiring continuation during intersessional work, with the benefit of input from additional Parties and other stakeholders.

1. Pancake Tortoise

The working group:

- a) Recommends that the issue of genetic identification of separate wild populations and farmed individuals of *Malacochersus tornieri* be studied, in order to address Kenya's concerns that the control of the Tanzanian breeding stocks is not adequate.

- b) Recommends that proposals to undertake such a study be invited from suitable institutions, and that the institution chosen should liaise with the responsible Management and Scientific Authorities to find reliable sources of genetic material.
- c) Recommends that a desktop study on the natural history of the species be undertaken.
- d) Recommends that countries that have indicated that they are also range States for this species (i.e. Uganda, Mozambique, Zambia) provide detailed evidence that this is the case.

2. Continuing Development of Conservation Measures for Asian Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles

a) Future listings

The working group:

- i) Encourages range States to proceed with the development of proposals to list all remaining unlisted species of Asian freshwater turtles on Appendix II of CITES by CoP13 [referring to AC19 Doc.15.1 and the recommendations of the Kunming Workshop in AC19 Doc. 15.3 (Rev. 1)]. This would facilitate border controls and other enforcement efforts.
- ii) If it is not feasible for the range States to prepare all these proposals for CoP13 (October 2004), the WG recommends that the range States list the remaining species on Appendix III as an interim measure.
- iii) Requests that the Secretariat send out a notification to Parties about this recommendation.
- iv) Requests the Asian Representatives to inform Parties in their region about this recommendation.
- v) Recommends that the prioritization for proposals to list species on Appendix II follow the recommendations contained within document AC19 Doc. 15.1.
- vi) Encourages NGOs with expertise and resources on this issue to support and assist range State efforts to prepare proposals for listings of these species.

b) Enforcement

Enforcement issues include:

- i) The working group recognizes the need for further improvement of national and domestic legislation concerning tortoises and freshwater turtles.
- ii) The working group is concerned about indications that turtles are at times shipped declared as 'Fisheries Products', and recommends consideration of adopting Harmonized Customs Codes to prevent such misrepresentations.
- iii) Communications between Management Authorities within the region were identified as an ongoing problem, which needs to be addressed in the wider CITES context.

c) Transport

The working group recommends that:

- i) The CITES Secretariat strongly urges that all Parties enforce IATA regulations, and that National Authorities insist that airlines adhere to these regulations.
- ii) Close liaison be developed with the Transport working group.

d) Confiscation and Disposal

The working group:

- i) Encourages Management Authorities and law enforcement personnel to continue and enhance cooperation with rescue centres.
- ii) Encourages authorities and institutions to follow existing guidelines on the disposal of confiscated animals as closely as local circumstances permit.

e) In-situ Conservation and Management Issues

The working group:

- i) Recommended that further consideration be given to various marking and identification techniques for turtles, including consideration of the specific problems involving small and juvenile animals.
- ii) Recalled the management utility and conservation value of restricting trade to specific size classes, as instituted for Pancake Tortoises.
- iii) Discussed whether farming affects harvest pressure on wild populations. In certain cases, a higher value may be placed on wild specimens, and in some cases, the introduction of farming may stimulate an increase in the value of wild specimens. Alternatively, farming may help prevent extreme pressure on wild resources through overall price moderation due to market forces. The group concluded that the impacts of farming can vary.
- iv) Discussed the issue of invasive species and agreed that this issue is better considered in the context of other fora, specifically the Convention on Biological Diversity.
- v) Discussed management practices in existing Asian turtle farms, and considered avenues to harness the energy and resources of commercial farms for the benefit of conservation actions.

3. General Recommendations

The working group agreed that:

- a) All Asian range Parties should be encouraged to participate intersessionally in further development of specific working group priorities.
- b) A follow-up regional workshop after CoP13 should be considered to share successful achievements and assist with further development towards implementation of prioritised recommendations to address outstanding challenges.
- c) Training on enforcement is needed, and this is needed at the generic level as well as specific to turtles and tortoises. It was suggested that regional Asian Parties involved in the trade of these species should be given consideration for more immediate training and capacity building, over other countries on the Secretariat's training schedule. Training for these countries should include specific modules that focus on enforcement and identification problems specific to the trade in turtles and tortoises, as well as general enforcement training.
- d) The valuable information contained in the full Proceedings of the Kunming Workshop should be made available as a matter of priority.
- e) Although trade in turtles and tortoises is an increasingly global issue, involving many countries, the group agreed that the most immediate need for attention remains in Asia, and that Parties should continue to make this region a focal point to support the implementation of the recommendations from the Kunming Workshop.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

SEAHORSES & OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FAMILY SYGNATHIDAE

Participants

Asia, Oceania, China, Greece, Mexico, Republic of Korea, United States of America, IUCN, IFAW-International Fund for Animal Welfare, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association, Ornamental Fish International, Project Seahorse (Chair), SWAN International.

Working Group (WG) Member not present: South Africa.

Terms of Reference

- Identify a minimum size limit for specimens of all *Hippocampus* species in trade as one component of an adaptive management plan, and as a simple precautionary means of making initial non-detriment findings in accordance with Article IV of the Convention. Also, consider other means of making non-detriment findings.
- Identify other technical issues that might be of interest or that need to be discussed at the workshop in Mexico proposed in AC19 Doc 16.1
- Consider the issue of developing harmonised codes for Syngnathidae for the World Customs Organisation (Decision 12.56).

I Non-detriment findings

1. Making non-detriment findings (NDFs) for *Hippocampus*
 - a) The WG agreed that it would be necessary for the Animals Committee to offer Parties advice in making NDFs, in light of the complex nature of this high volume trade in many species. Parties could adopt such recommendations as they saw fit.
 - b) Management tools that can assist Parties to improve the sustainability of fisheries as a basis for making NDFs include establishment of quotas, restriction of fishing effort, spatial or temporal fishing closures, gear adjustment, adopting initially low precautionary catch limits, tenurial rights, selective fishing (by sex etc), and size restrictions.
 - c) In light of limited understanding of *Hippocampus* population dynamics and fishing mortality, the WG concluded that minimum size limits offered the best tool to allow Parties to make interim NDFs (see paragraphs 3 & 5 below).

Recommendation: Animals Committee should encourage Parties to assess the value of other scientific and management tools that may assist in making NDFs for *Hippocampus*, with particular consideration to temporal and spatial closures and gear adjustment.

Recommendation: Animals Committee should encourage Parties to advance monitoring and assessment of *Hippocampus* populations in order to assess the effectiveness of universal minimum size limits and other management tools in securing sustainable fisheries at levels that allow NDFs.

2. Making non-detriment findings for cultured *Hippocampus*

- a) Parties that have satisfied themselves about the sustainable nature of aquaculture or captive breeding operations with respect to their impacts on wild populations may, of course, make NDFs at their discretion (according to the Convention), regardless of any other measures proposed in this report; the recommended universal minimum size limits (see paragraph 5) would not apply to approved aquaculture or captive-breeding operations.

Recommendation: Animals Committee should develop (by AC20) advice to Parties about factors they might consider in evaluating the sustainability of aquaculture ventures with respect to wild populations, as they seek to make NDFs.

Recommendation: Recognising potential difficulties in enforcement, Animals Committee should investigate (by AC20) costs and benefits of different types of tracking, labelling and monitoring systems (either for individuals or for batches) to distinguish between captive-bred and wild-caught *Hippocampus*.

3. Different forms of size limits

- a) The WG explored the viability of minimum, maximum and slot (minimum and maximum simultaneously) sizes as NDFs, and concluded that minimum sizes offered the best combination of precautionary management and enforceability.

4. Selective removal

- a) The WG acknowledged that the existing preference for large *Hippocampus* in traditional medicine means that establishing a minimum size limit is unlikely to shift further pressure onto the larger cohorts of *Hippocampus* within a population. Changes in size composition of catch and trade should, however, be assessed.

5. Universal minimum size limit

- a) After extensive discussion and careful consideration of a wide array of arguments and concerns, the WG decided that the AC should recommend a universal minimum size limit for all *Hippocampus* to Parties, in order to facilitate their NDFs. This would be set to allow most species (that reach a maximum adult size above the agreed minimum) to breed before recruiting to the fishery.
- b) The WG agreed that it would be helpful to have further research available before recommending a precise minimum size limit, in order to incorporate all available biological and trade knowledge. The 10 cm universal minimum size limit proposed in AC19 Doc 16.2 was felt to be a reasonable estimate, but the WG would prefer to review this proposed threshold at AC20, incorporating any further findings, in order to refine it if necessary.

Recommendation: Animals Committee should recommend (at AC20) a universal minimum size limit for export of all *Hippocampus* that do not originate from approved aquaculture operations.

Recommendation: As a matter of urgency, Animals Committee should encourage Parties, IGOs, NGOs and trade sectors to offer financial and technical support for necessary research on size at maturity, maximum adult size, and size distributions in trade for all *Hippocampus*. This work must be completed by AC20 in order to enable refinement of the recommendations in AC19 Doc 16.2 to

minimize economic loss while maximizing conservation benefit. The cost of research should amount to approximately US\$30-40K.

6. Live *Hippocampus* in trade

- a) Representatives of the ornamental fish industry expressed concern about the application of a universal minimum size to their relatively low volume trades, which often value smaller animals, as do the curiosity trades. After due deliberation, however, it was agreed that the minimum size to be recommended at AC20 would apply to all wild-caught *Hippocampus* in all trade, live and dried. This consensus reflected the recognition that live and dried trades are interconnected and that simple means of enforcing trade regulations are needed at this stage.

7. Species with maximum size lower than the proposed threshold size

- a) The smaller species (with adult size less than the agreed minimum) would not be subject to international trade if the proposed universal minimum size limit were used to make NDFs. This measure should not compromise trade, as very few of these small *Hippocampus* are currently exported from the wild.
- b) Smaller species could still be traded where they originated from approved aquaculture or captive-breeding operations, or where Parties demonstrated other suitable means of making NDFs.

Recommendation: Animals Committee should encourage Parties to develop complementary means of making NDFs that might allow smaller *Hippocampus* species to re-enter trade.

8. Trade of parts and derivatives

- a) The WG encouraged Parties to restrict *Hippocampus* exports from country of origin to whole animals only, in line with existing trade practice; all raw *Hippocampus* are currently exported whole, although they may be processed before re-export. This measure should preclude the possibility of *Hippocampus* below the minimum size limit being exported as parts and derivatives.

Recommendation: Animals Committee should consider (at AC20) how best to address the export of patent or pre-packaged traditional medicine where it is manufactured in the country of origin; few Parties would face this challenge at present.

9. Bycatch and discards

- a) The WG recognised that a universal minimum size limit, although still highly recommended, would be less effective in reducing detriment for *Hippocampus* populations subject to high bycatch pressure than for those subject to target fisheries.

Recommendation: Animals Committee should urge Parties, as a matter of great importance, to work with fishers and fisheries managers to document and analyse bycatch comprehensively in order to develop mitigation measures that would allow other, complementary, means of making NDFs; these might include temporal and/or spatial closures and gear adjustment.

10. Enforcement

- a) The WG noted that a universal minimum size limit has the advantage of being practical and relatively easy to enforce, particularly if enforcement officers employ careful sampling regimes.

Recommendation: As noted in AC19 Doc 16.2, the Animals Committee should develop conversion factors in order to set a universal minimum trade height that could be readily assessed by enforcement officers, as a surrogate for full *Hippocampus* height. This research could be integrated with that outlined in paragraph 5.

11. Independent certification

- a) The WG noted a potential role for independent certification bodies to assist Parties to make NDFs for aquaculture and captive breeding facilities, and to help develop complementary means of making NDFs for wild *Hippocampus*.

II Mexican workshop sponsored by USA

12. The WG congratulated the USA for its initiative in organising a technical workshop on making NDFs for *Hippocampus*, expected in late 2003 or early 2004 (as outlined in AC19 Doc 16.1). It requests the USA to include fishers and fisheries industry representatives among the participants. The workshop provides an opportunity to make progress on technical issues identified in this report. In particular, the WG encourages the USA to consider incorporating the following matters in the agenda:

- a) assessing value of scientific and management tools in making NDFs for *Hippocampus*
- b) monitoring and assessment of *Hippocampus* populations to allow NDFs.
- c) making NDFs for *Hippocampus* aquaculture and captive breeding operations;
- d) tracking, labelling, and monitoring so as to distinguish captive-bred from wild-caught animals;
- e) identifying analyses that may contribute to refining the recommended universal minimum size limit;
- f) making NDFs for the smaller species, with maximum adult size below the recommended universal minimum size;
- g) assessing *Hippocampus* bycatch, in order to recognise detriment and identify management options;
- h) making NDFs for *Hippocampus* populations caught in non-selective fishing gear;
- i) factors for height to trade height conversions;
- j) sampling procedures for enforcement officers handling large volumes of *Hippocampus*;
- k) anticipated changes in supply and demand of *Hippocampus* as Appendix II listing is implemented and thereafter.

III Decision 12.55

13. The WG considered a request from the World Customs Organization for further information on the nature of *Hippocampus* trade. In response to its questions, the WG noted that (a) most *Hippocampus* in trade are indeed used for human consumption, as medicines and tonic foods, and (b) the standard taxonomy approved by the Nomenclature Committee on 19 August 2003 represents the working list of species used by CITES.

Request: The Secretariat is requested to provide this information to the WCO, again asking that the WCO provide Customs codes that distinguish four categories of syngnathids in trade, as undertaken in Hong Kong SAR: live seahorses, dried seahorses, live pipefishes (and pipehorses), dried pipefishes (and pipehorses).

Final recommendation: The Animals Committee should continue the activities of this WG intersessionally to achieve necessary outputs by AC20 and CoP13, and should expand its membership to include representatives of key exporting countries.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

Report of the working group

REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE IN SPECIMENS OF APPENDIX-II SPECIES

The Significant Trade Working Group met on 20 August to work on the following Terms of Reference:

- a) Revise the documentation available in regard to the Review of Significant Trade for all taxa that have been selected since CoP11 (see list under paragraph 6 on p. 2 of AC19 Doc. 8.3 and in 8.6 (*Saiga tatarica*), as well as the saker falcon (*Falco cherrug*).
- b) Formulate recommendations as appropriate as outlined in Resolution Conf. 12.8.
- c) Examine the draft Terms of Reference (TOR) for an Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade, to be considered at CoP13, as proposed in AC19 Doc. 8.5. Review or amend the draft if appropriate, taking into consideration PC13 WG4 Doc.1.

The documents to be used were:

AC19 Doc. 8.1; AC19 Doc. 8.1 Annex: Resolution Conf. 12.8
AC19 Doc. 8.3 (other than *Strombus gigas*)
AC19 Doc. 8.5
AC19 Doc. 8.6
PC 13 WG4 Doc.1

The participants in the Working Group were:

Members of the Committee:

Chairman:	Thomas Althaus	AC Chairman, Regional Representative for Europe; Switzerland
	Katalin Rodics	Regional Representative for Europe; Hungary

Parties:

Robert Jones	Canada
Meng Sha	China
Jiang Zhigang	China
Zhou Zhihua	China
Mohammad Reza Hosseini	Iran
Ju Young Park	Republic of Korea
Alexey Nikiforov	Russian Federation
Tatyana Kretova	Russian Federation
Raissa Khodorevskaya	Russian Federation

Alexander Sorokin	Russian Federation
Andrey Subbotin	Russian Federation
Carlos Ibero	Spain
Frederic Launay	United Arab Emirates
Abdulnasser Alshamsi	United Arab Emirates
Javier Alvarez	United States of America

Intergovernmental Organizations:

Colmán Ó Críodáin	European Commission
Peter Paul van Dijk	IUCN

Non-governmental Organizations:

Anders Rhodin	Chelonian Conservation Society
Masha Vorontsova	International Fund for Animal Welfare
Ron Orenstein	International Wildlife Coalition
Heike Finke	NABU: German Society for Nature Conservation
Angela Barden	TRAFFIC
Sue Fisher	Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society
Susan Lieberman	WWF International (Rapporteur)

I. Draft Terms of Reference for an Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade, to be considered at CoP 13, as propose in AC 19 Doc. 8.5

The first issue discussed referred to Decision 12.75 adopted at COP12, which directs the Animals and Plants Committees to draft TOR for an evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade, to be considered at CoP13.

The USA provided a detailed summary of the Plants Committee (PC) discussions regarding the evaluation (see Doc PC13 W4 Doc1). He noted that the PC hasn't even completed one phase, and has not made recommendations that are specific to plant species. The PC believes that the country review process in Madagascar may have impacts on the evaluation and recommendations, particularly with this new country-based review process. PC recommends not commencing until after COP14. The USA agreed with the PC that there should be a joint document from both committees to be considered (as per the Plants Committee). He noted that the PC is concerned that undue attention is given to animals issues when dealing with significant trade.

This Working Group spent considerable time discussing the document from the PC (WG4 Doc1). It was agreed to discuss the PC Document first then look at the actual draft Terms of Reference (provided by the Secretariat). There was significant discussion as to whether the process can begin after COP13, or should wait until after COP14, as recommended by the PC. There was also discussion as to whether the review should wait for the results of the country-based pilot study (Madagascar).

The Working Group agreed on the following:

- **It is important that the TOR are focused on how the Parties and others can learn from the lessons of the past years (more than 13 years for animals).**
- **TRAFFIC is to be congratulated for its work on the database on significant trade information, and is encouraged to design the database so that questions can be asked to enable it to inform the process of the review. The database will be critical to the process of the review.**
- **The Review should also address the conservation impacts of the significant trade process, including case studies and, if available, information on changes to the status in the wild of species that have been reviewed. Some members did not agree with case studies.**
- **The Animals Committee has a long history with significant trade, with more than 250 animal species having been reviewed. It is important to proceed with this review, using the animals-related expertise and experience.**

- However, it is preferable that the TOR reflect a phased-in process, with some of the review taking place between COP13 and COP14.
- The Working Group greatly appreciated the concerns of the PC, but nevertheless believes the review should commence its first phase after COP13, with subsequent plants-related input after COP14 (when the first phase will be complete for plants).
- The Working Group agreed that the pilot country-based study in Madagascar is exceedingly important. The review should not wait for that study to be complete, as it will take a long time to be completed with recommendations implemented; however, the Working Group hopes that as results become available, any information from that study, particularly that is species-specific, should be part of the review and learning.
- The evaluation will be dependent on funds being made available. Parties and the Budget Committee at COP13 are encouraged to ensure that funds are available.
- Range states should be actively encouraged to participate in the evaluation process.
- Work should commence inter-sessionally on the draft TOR, but the Animals Committee should not finalize its recommendations until AC20 (in 2004). The Working Group recommends the following process:
 - Comments from the members of this Working Group on the TOR should be provided to a contact point. The person recommended is Colmán Ó Críodáin of the European Commission.
 - Comments should be sent to Colmán Ó Críodáin by email, no later than 1 October 2003.
 - Colmán Ó Críodáin will work with the Plants Committee-designated representative, Noel McGough (UK), on proposed final TOR. Colmán Ó Críodáin's input will take into consideration all comments received, and comments made during the Working Group meeting.
 - The AC will finalize timing issues and the draft TOR at AC20.
 - It is recommended to include in discussions at AC20 on the TOR, information received from the TRAFFIC-produced Significant Trade Database, which will be finalized by AC20.

The Working Group made the following observations on the draft TOR in AC19 Doc. 8.5 Annex:

Objectives

- Objective 1.a. Rather than "evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the Review of Significant Trade...", it is preferable to say "evaluate the importance of the review of Significant Trade and its contribution to implementation of Article IV paragraphs 2(a), 3, and 6(a)." This is the same text as recommended by the PC.
- The TOR should include in its objectives an assessment of the value of information gathered through the review (which may have value for the Parties beyond the country concerned).
- Objective 1.c: The objective should be to formulate recommendations *concerning the significant trade process*, in view of the results and findings of the evaluation and the impact assessments. [Note: it is important that the review not make any recommendations regarding the listings of species, but rather the process itself].

Process

- The US noted that the PC recommended including impacts on unlisted species in the review. The Chairman and China felt that it should only consider Appendix II species. The Working Group did not endorse the PC recommendation to look specifically at impacts on unlisted species.
- China and others suggested the review should look at not only impacts on species, but whether legislation and regulations have improved, impacts on enforcement, CITES implementation in general

and other impacts in exporting countries (which are more general and not only for the species subject to the review).

- Paragraph 2 should be changed to read: The evaluation will *commence* between the 13th and 14th meetings of the CoP. That is in recognition of the PC concerns, and also in recognition that funds may be a factor.
- The Working Group agreed that paragraphs 3, 4, and 6 should be edited to reflect a more active role of AC and PC members in overseeing the review.

Content of the Evaluation

- The USA raised several concerns about paragraph 7, which will be provided in writing to Colmán Ó Críodáin. Concerns regard lack of clarity in use of terms (types of species, constraints, etc.), mechanisms for choosing case studies, and what is meant by markets. The USA expressed significant concerns with inclusion of costs and benefits, as that is not part of the AC's work and is not relevant to the evaluation. No member disagreed.
- The Chairman and several NGO's also identified difficulties with the text, and all are asked to provide comments as per the above procedure.

II. Saker falcon (*Falco cherrug*)

The delegate of the United Arab Emirates (Fred Launay, UAE Scientific Authority) provided an extensive summary of the conservation status and international trade in Saker falcons (*Falco cherrug*). The UAE provided a document to members of the Committee and the Secretariat, which the Secretariat will be asked to copy. An oral presentation on the issue was provided to the Working Group. In brief, trade in the species has increased; and there are serious concerns about the species' status in the wild. The UAE summarized trade issues, and information gathered as the result of a data collection and registration scheme in the UAE. The UAE found that fewer than 10% of saker falcons have proper CITES permits (based on the registration scheme). Many countries have established quotas without any attention to the status of the species' populations in the wild. One country (Mongolia) has increased its quota from 40 to 300 per year, while its population has decreased significantly. In the UAE, 3,200 falcons were registered last year, and 1,200 are sakers, with 92% of the sakers that are wild caught, from 13 countries. It is notable that 80% of the birds in UAE are now registered.. Of particular concerns is the fact that 89% of the saker falcon imports into the UAE were from 1 country (Pakistan), with more than 1000 birds, but Pakistan is believed to have only 10 breeding pairs in the wild. UAE noted that they take this very seriously, and are bringing the issue to the attention of the Animals Committee, to request the assistance of the Secretariat, the range states, and the AC. Work is needed to monitor wild populations, and to bring trade to be brought to sustainable levels. If nothing is done, the numbers in the next 5-6 years in the wild will be so low that there will not be able to be ANY trade (illegal or legal). The UAE noted that it will be hosting a major international workshop on falconry trade, in cooperation with the CITES Secretariat, involving importing and exporting countries, transit countries, and relevant NGOs, early in 2004.

The Working Group thanked the UAE, and discussed the issue.

Europe (Hungary) noted that Eastern European countries (including Slovakia, Czech Republic, Slovenia, and Ukraine) not present here have been consulted, and although they considered an Appendix I proposal, the Secretariat recommended to them that the significant trade process should be explored as an alternative. Hungary recommends taking the illegal trade issues to the Standing Committee, but also moving on the significant trade process. The situation is serious, and urgent steps are needed. Hungary hosted the World Conference of Birds of Prey in 2003. The Saker falcon subgroup of that conference agreed that CITES action must be taken urgently. Hungary is the only country with an increasing saker falcon population (from 10 pairs in the 1970's to 140 pairs today), since every nest has been guarded by volunteers for 20 years.

There was further discussion of the Pakistan issue. Pakistan is a hub- with most birds being illegal exported from China moving through Pakistan. Imports from Pakistan are a combination of. re-exports, exports, and illegal trade. Many come in without any permits. There is concern that some countries have

increased their export quotas to meet the commercial demand, but are not linked with population status or non-detriment findings.. .

China appreciated the UAE paper and the fact that UAE brought the issue forward, and noted that they are working hard to crack down on smuggling of this and other species, with more than 1,000 of Pakistani nationals involved every year. Many wild-caught saker falcons are illegally exported to the Middle East each year, and it is not a significant trade review issue. China recommends asking the Standing Committee to help address the illegal trade issues. However, China noted Rule 19 of the Rules of Procedure, and that it was unfortunate that the document had not been provided in sufficient time before the meeting.

China, Russia, the Secretariat, WWF, and others welcomed the workshop to be hosted by the UAE for early in 2004, and all hoped that the workshop will assist in solving problems for this species and addressing the relevant issues.

Russia noted this is a major problem, and agrees strongly with UAE that this is an issue both of significant trade (and non-detriment) as well as illegal trade. The situation must be studied. The problem is one of pressure on wild populations, and for Russia it is entirely an issue of illegal trade (since no permits are issued for wild-caught sakers).

TRAFFIC and WWF recommended that the issue should go directly to the Standing Committee, as well as to the significant trade process.

The Working Group agreed by consensus:

- **This is a serious conservation issue, and should be addressed as a matter of urgency.**
- **As per Resolution Conf. 12.8 paragraph c, this species should go forward as an exceptional case and enter the Significant Trade Review process immediately.**
- **This is an issue both of illegal trade and of Article IV/non-detriment findings, and as such it both belongs in the Significant Trade Review, and should be dealt with as regards illegal trade.**
- **The issue should go forward, through the AC Chairman and the Secretariat, to the Standing Committee.**
- **As a matter of urgency, the Secretariat should send letters to both Pakistan and Mongolia on the issue, based on the information provided by the UAE.**

III. Progress on the implementation of the Review of Significant Trade (Phases IV and V)

The Working Group discussed Doc. 8.3, for each species identified in paragraph 6. It was agreed that Resolution Conf. 12.8 should be used, even for species where the process was begun previously, rather than create tremendous confusion by going back to Conf. 8.9 (Rev) for those species. It was agreed that the Secretariat would summarize the issue for each species, and Working Group members would comment as relevant, including range states when present. Based on the discussion, and information received by the Secretariat, the AC Chairman would determine whether the species and country concerned could be removed from the significant trade process, or brought forward to the Standing Committee as per relevant paragraphs of Conf. 12.8.

Species have been identified by the Animals Committee (at prior AC meetings) as either “of urgent concern” (former category 1), “possible concern” (former category 2), or “least concern” (former category 3). Details are in Conf. 12.8.

Moschus spp.

China: The Secretariat reported that the AC assigned the species in China as “urgent concern”. AC18 sent a range of recommendations to China, to be implemented within 1 year, and some within 3 months. They were sent to China the end of November. 2002 and received in December, and must be implemented within 12 months. The secretariat noted that the 90-day recommendations asked China to commit to or initiate certain actions, including: provide results of a national musk deer survey, clarify

harvest of wild musk deer in China, establish conservative harvest quotas if harvest is allowed, initiate a number of studies, establish a national conservation and management strategy for musk deer (taking into consideration captive breeding), implement enforcement efforts to combat poaching and domestic use, collaborate with neighbouring countries (particularly Russia), develop a system to inspect and register musk deer farms, develop non-lethal techniques to collect musk, register importers and exporters.

China replied that the primary recommendations related to commitments. China wrote to the Secretariat in February 2003 and provided the required information. China changed the protection level of all musk deer species. All are now Class I protected animals under Chinese law. Domestic management is under the State Forestry Administration of China, and China will respond as required by the end of 2003. China noted that in February 2003 the State Forestry Administration issued regulations for hunting and capture, initiated an investigation of stockpiles of raw musk, prohibited production from raw musk of anything other than medicines. A great deal of work is underway in China.

China's CITES Scientific Authority (ESSC) did a market survey of Traditional Chinese Medicine and musk deer in 2001, and provided the report to the Secretariat. The Management Authority of China is paying attention to musk deer conservation. It is now listed as one of 15 key animals for the 21st century for China (also includes the giant panda, golden monkey, etc.). The State Forestry Administration will provide funds for these species. A nation-wide survey was conducted in 2002, and will be published soon. ESSC and TRAFFIC East Asia held a symposium on the sustainable use of musk deer in 2002. No sale of musk deer is allowed in China other than for medicine; all other trade is strictly illegal. Medicines must be made from stockpiles only.

In response to an inquiry from WWF, China noted that the survey results, the result of 5 years of work, will be released shortly.

The Chairman noted that the AC will await the final results from China, and its response by November 2003, but no further action is needed by the Committee at this time. **The Working Group agreed.**

The Secretariat stated that by the end of 2003, the outcome will be evaluated, with a report to the Standing Committee in March 2004.

Russia: Russia's musk deer were included in "category 1" (urgent concern). The Secretariat reported that the AC made several recommendations that went to Russia in 2001. Examples of recommendations included: a commitment to monitor populations, establish mechanisms to prevent illegal harvesting for domestic or international trade, and mechanisms to regulate export of legally-obtained specimens. Russia was requested not to authorize exports of raw musk until these commitments made (in 3 months). Within 12 months: Russia was asked to initiate population monitoring, establish effective mechanisms to prevent illegal harvest, and put in place mechanisms to regulate export. After 90 days: the Secretariat received the commitments from Russia to take these actions.

Russia reported to the Secretariat on its long-standing population monitoring programme, which was the basis for setting quotas. Russia reported that mechanisms to prevent illegal harvest are in place, including anti-poaching teams, etc. After 12 months, the Secretariat asked Russia for further clarification, which was provided.

Russia noted the musk deer workshop held in Moscow in July 2003. Russia reported some of the results of a 3-year TRAFFIC Europe/Russia project, devoted to a survey of conservation of and trade in musk deer in Russia. Participants included government, scientists, NGOs. The workshop discussed measures needed to strengthen the conservation and management of Russian populations of musk deer. The main conclusions of the workshop were:

- The government census understates the size of the musk deer population.
- Current harvest and export quotas are low, based on the population size.
- Notwithstanding poaching and illicit trade in musk, the Russian population is sustainable, although it has dropped catastrophically in some regions. Ex: in Sakhalin, it is endangered (in Russia Red Data Book).

- The Russian population doesn't meet criteria for Appendix I.
- A strategy is needed for the conservation and management of musk deer in Russia.

Activities and measures for conservation and management agreed by the participants were:

- Establish Musk Deer Specialists Working Group
- Establish a monitoring system for musk deer populations.
- Work out principles for sustainable harvest (e.g., harvest without killing, selected harvest of males)
- Establish permanent monitoring of the market (legal and illegal)
- Work out principles of using a legal market as an alternative to the illegal, black market
- Develop legislation for sustainable use and conservation

The workshop in Russia decided to ask WWF-Russia and TRAFFIC Russia to draft the preliminary Strategy of Conservation and Management of Musk Deer.

TRAFFIC read a statement from the UK Management Authority, who commissioned a report from TRAFFIC Russia on population status, harvest, and trade. The report is now in draft, and will be available in the next few months. The research assessed musk deer populations in selected areas, analyzed hunting and illegal and legal trade in musk. The report indicates that populations cannot sustain present levels of harvest (legal and illegal). The UK MA would like to keep the species in the significant trade process until the report can be evaluated. TRAFFIC noted that although the population is fortunately higher than was thought, the level of illegal harvest and poaching are also higher. TRAFFIC also noted that increased efforts to deal with poaching are needed (with which Russia concurred). TRAFFIC said the report will be available shortly; and perhaps musk deer should stay within the process until results are available.

IFAW noted that there are seizure data from the Russian Far East; there is no information on seizures on the Russia/China border, which is a serious problem. IFAW welcomed the work China is doing on the market. They noted that strict border controls are needed.

The Chairman noted that even if the AC recommendations resulted in actions, the issue may not be fixed, and the issue should go forward to the Standing Committee (it is already on the agenda).

WWF recommended sending the issue to the Standing Committee, urging that TRAFFIC's report, the UK study, and other information be put on the Secretariat's website, and provided to Parties, the AC, and the SC.

China said it has taken measures to decrease demand. Musk is not used in perfume in China, and half of the medicine demand is satisfied by artificial production.. All medicine production is strictly controlled, and demand is decreasing. TRAFFIC noted that work in China is critical to what is happening in Russia, in terms of poaching, and controls on illegal trade. The issue should go forward for discussion at the Standing Committee meeting.

The Working Group agreed:

- **The secretariat will provide all relevant materials to the AC Chairman, and together they will provide information and a report on progress to the Standing Committee (including reports, studies, conclusions, etc.).**
- **Russia and China have complied with the 90-day recommendations. Russia has complied with the 12-month deadline, and it is expected China will reply by the November 2003 deadline.**

Naja naja spp.

The Secretariat noted that this was discussed at AC18. All countries identified with problems had to establish cautious export quotas and provide information on the scientific basis of those quotas.

China - least concern (category 3). China was asked to provide information if had a trade ban. The Secretariat never received official confirmation of the ban (the decree or legislation), and China agreed to send it forward.

Indonesia: category 2 (possible concern). Indonesia was asked to establish a cautious quota. It established a quota in 2003 of 500 individuals. The Secretariat considers it complied with the recommendations.

Laos: category 1: urgent concern. Letters were sent, and no response was received. Laos is a non-party.

Malaysia: category 1: urgent concern. Responses were sent in 2001, but Malaysia never clarified the issue of quotas, and Malaysia continues to export specimens. It has never provided information on the scientific basis of export quotas.

Thailand: category 1: urgent concern. No response has been received by the Secretariat.

Singapore: category 3: least concern. Singapore was asked about controls on transit, and a satisfactory response was received.

The Working Group recommends reporting to the Standing Committee as regards: Laos (lack of response), Thailand (lack of response), and Malaysia (inadequate response regarding implementation of Article IV).

Cuora amboiensis. Discussed at AC18. The Secretariat reported:

Indonesia: category 1: urgent concern. Indonesia was asked for the basis of their quotas. The 2002 quota was for 18,000 animals. Questions were asked as to how the species is distributed within the country, the role of the Management Authority, Scientific Authority, and Fisheries Department in establishing the quota. Indonesia responded with information on distribution, and limited information on population status, and felt that 18,000 is a conservative quota. Indonesia claimed the distribution and habitat are ample and widespread. There has never been a thorough study of the species, and no information is provided to the Secretariat on the basis of the quota or how it is set. There is no evidence of an actual non-detriment finding.

Malaysia: category 1: urgent concern. Malaysia was asked for the scientific basis of its non-detriment findings. The export quota was 50,000 per year for Peninsular Malaysia. Malaysia was asked for information on exports from all 3 parts of Malaysia (Peninsular, Sabah, Sarawak). There are concerns of illegal trade in animals from Indonesia. Malaysia was asked how they verify specimens exported are really from Malaysia. Response referred to Peninsular Malaysia only,, and not Sabah or Sarawak. Malaysia reported that the quota is based only on exports in previous years, and observed stocks in collection centers. Malaysia says this is a reduced quota. Malaysia has exported: 276,000 in 2000, 50,000 in 2001, 32,000 by Sept. 2002.

Viet Nam: category 1: urgent concern. A letter was sent from the Secretariat. No response was received. The request was comparable to that sent to Malaysia and Indonesia.

Singapore: category 3 (least concern) but action was requested. This is not an issue of non-detriment findings but rather Singapore believed to have problems controlling transit shipments. The letter asked Singapore to pay attention to transit, since these species are identified frequently as fish products. Singapore has replied that all consignments of freshwater turtles must be declared, and subject to government approval.

IUCN noted that the species is subject to intensive, organized harvest, and there is no good population status information available.

The Working Group agreed:

- **Malaysia and Indonesia should be brought forward to the Standing Committee, as it is clear Article IV is not being complied with at all for this species.**
- **Viet Nam should be brought to the Standing Committee, as it has not responded at all.**

WWF and others further discussed the issue of trade in live freshwater turtles that are identified as fish and not wildlife, suggesting that this be one of the issues sent to the Technical Working Group of the Standing Committee I (for work on Customs codes, enforcement, checking during shipment, etc.). China shared its experience in revising their Customs code for live turtles.

The Working Group agreed that:

- **The issue of misidentification as fish or fishery products should be brought to the attention of the Technical Implementation Working Group.**
- **The Turtle and Tortoise Working Group should be asked to address this issue as well.**

Cuora flavomarginata

The Secretariat reported that the species (endemic to China) was included in category 2 (possible concern). China was asked for up-to-date export data. China provided information within a week, with export data. Since June 2000, China has suspended all commercial export of all turtles except for 2 unlisted species. There were 3 shipments of *C. flavomarginata*, of only 14 animals, prior to that.

The Working Group agreed:

- **this is no longer a concern, and it belongs in category 3 (least concern).**
- **This issue should be referred to the Turtle and Tortoise Working Group, which is dealing with a resolution, decisions, etc., on freshwater turtles and tortoises.**

TRAFFIC asked if there were any illegal trade problems with the species?

IUCN responded that there is some smuggling to Hong Kong, for pet trade, and China was asked to monitor the situation.

Cuora galbinifrons

China: category 2: possible concern: The same questions as above were asked, and China responded on time: 13 animals were exported, and there is now an export ban. **The conclusions were the same.**

Laos: category 2 (possible concern) also. The same information was requested. There was no reply.

Viet Nam: category 2 (possible concern). The same information was requested. There was no reply.

The Working Group concluded that for this species: Viet Nam and Laos should be placed in “category 1”, and recommendations issued.

Lissemys punctata

The Secretariat reported that the only country with recommendations was Bangladesh, category 2 (possible concern). The letter sent asked for clarification of the scientific basis of the non-detriment findings, and clarification of why there were few exports reported but importing countries indicated large trade volumes from Bangladesh. No response was received. Exports are about 220/year (for pet trade).

The Working Group recommended that Bangladesh be placed in category 1: urgent concern, and recommendations issued.

Pyxis planicauda: The species has been transferred to Appendix I.

Acipenseriformes

The Secretariat reported that those Eurasian species included in significant trade from AC16 (10 species) are now covered in the Paris Agreement review. In that Agreement, a large number of actions were agreed to by range countries, including: stock assessments, joint quota setting (harvest and export), illegal domestic use (caviar and meat), enforcement collaboration, assessments of needs to combat poaching and illegal trade, and identification.. SC46 agreed to the Paris Agreement in 2001, which concludes 31 December 2003. SC in 2004 will evaluate if all of the commitments have been met. Various reports of the Secretariat on implementation have been submitted to the Standing Committee. In August 2003 the Secretariat will meet with FAO on elements of the Paris Agreement. The Secretariat believes there has been significant, positive progress on the Paris Agreement, with positive impacts on reducing illegal caviar trade, as well as on domestic use and poaching.

The AC Chairman will wait for end of Paris Agreement procedure, and comment to the Standing Committee.

Acipenser baerii: Paris Agreement

Acipenser fulvescens (Lake sturgeon):

The Secretariat reported this was in category 2 (possible concern), then moved to category 1 (urgent concern). The AC believed there were further questions based on information from Canada. Canada considers the information sufficient and has sought clarification on the decision to retain the Canadian population in category 1. There has been much back-and-forth between Canada and the Animals Committee. It is now up to the AC Chairman if the information is sufficient, or if it should go to the Standing Committee.

Canada reported that it was asked for information on basis of how quotas are set and how management measures are determined. For Canada, provinces have delegated management responsibility. Although the timeline was short, Canada responded, and is waiting for a response. The USA shared Canada's concerns, and believes Canada has fully complied.

The Working Group agreed that Canada, the Secretariat, and AC Chairman should meet separately and resolve this issue this week.

Acipenser gueldenstaedtii: Paris Agreement

Acipenser nudipectus: Paris Agreement

Acipenser oxyrinchus: Atlantic sturgeon. At AC18, it was in category 2 (possible concern). Canada was asked to clarify certain issues, and information was provided. The information received was acceptable.

The Working Group agreed to place the species in "category 3" (least concern).

Acipenser persicus. The species is found in Iran and Azerbaijan. At AC18, Iran was considered least concern (category 3: least concern).

Azerbaijan: AC18 put this in category 1 (urgent concern), with a recommendation that Azerbaijan provide clarification on whether export quotas include *A. persicus*, and how they distinguish *persicus* and *guildenstadii*. The Secretariat noted that Azerbaijan has no quotas for the species and does not harvest it.

Iran noted that *A. persicus* is found in the southern Caspian in Iran. The population has increased due to the long-standing restocking programme of Iran, with data since 1973. There is no quota for Azerbaijan, which should be eliminated from the process. A DNA marker differentiating these species is expected in 6-7 months.

The Working Group agreed to recommend moving this species to the least concern category.

Acipenser ruthenus: Paris Agreement

Acipenser schrenckii: Paris Agreement

Acipenser stellatus: Paris Agreement

Acipenser transmontanus: was moved to category 3 (least concern) and removed from process.

Huso dauricus: Paris Agreement

Huso huso: Paris Agreement

Polyodon spathula: was moved to category 3 (least concern), and removed from process.

Scaphirhynchus platyrhynchus: was moved to category 3 (least concern), and removed from process.

Saiga (*Saiga tatarica*) (refer to AC19 Doc. 8.6), which was discussed in Plenary.

The Secretariat reported that based on an earlier process, the Standing Committee decided for both Russia and Kazakhstan to recommend that trade cease, with no imports (horns, meat, trophies, etc.) until the countries had adopted and implemented a regional conservation strategy for the saiga. The Convention on Migratory Species and CITES worked together, and co-sponsored the May 2002 Elista, Kalmykia workshop (see Doc. 8.6). This resulted in a draft MOU between the range states, including an Action Plan for the species' conservation, restoration, and sustainable use. Many activities are listed in the plan; some are relevant to CMS, some to CITES, and some are domestic in nature. The plan is excellent- but has no strict timeframes, it is unclear who is responsible and by when, and will be costly to implement. It is key that the CITES community assist with key issues in the plan. The Secretariat noted that there is poaching for meat and domestic use as well as illegal trade in horn.

Several participants recommended looking at those recommendations in the Action Plan that concern CITES, and send them to the Standing Committee as a matter of urgency.

Russia noted that the proportion of adult males is dangerously low in the population. Russia noted that it has a great deal of scientific information, which it can share on request. Russia has information on population status, habitat, harvest information, etc. Russia noted that there were internal bureaucratic problems, involving intergovernmental relations. The species is under the authority of the Department of Hunting of the Ministry of Agriculture, although the Ministry of Natural Resources is the CITES Management Authority. The Russian Academy of Sciences has established a working group to develop a strategy for the conservation and sustainable use of saiga. A new inter-institutional group has been set up involving the Russian Academy Sciences, Ministry of Natural Resources, and Department of Hunting. The first meeting will be held the end of September 2003 to discuss a strategy. Russia shared that its Department of Hunting is spending about \$200,000 per year on the species. Hunting and harvest have been prohibited since 1998.

The Secretariat believes that the major problem is Kazakhstan, where although the population is larger it is less well protected, with less work on conservation. Kazakhstan prohibits hunting until 2005.

It is notable that there are debates about the population in Kazakhstan, which may be up to 25,000 (but was 250,000 only 5 years ago).

TRAFFIC expressed concern about the species, on behalf of TRAFFIC and IUCN, and recommended as well that the Standing Committee take up the issue.

IFAW said it is unfortunate if the saiga becomes a scapegoat for bureaucratic problems. There is a need to remain consistent with and implement the recommendations of the Elista Workshop. They recommend that the MOU in the document be signed between the countries, and that funds meant for saiga conservation will actually be spent on saiga. They recommend that an intergovernmental body implement saiga conservation, through the MOU.

There was discussion as to the level of poaching, with responses from Russia that it is for meat consumption right now more than for illegal export of horns. It was suggested by several participants that there is a need to look at trade demand in China and other consumer countries, to help address illegal trade issues.

The Working Group agreed:

- This is a matter of great conservation urgency.
- The issues around saiga should be sent as a matter of urgency to the Standing Committee, for action and follow-up.
- This is not an issue for the significant trade review, but pursuant to the mandate of the Animals Committee (under 12.8 and other resolutions), the issue should be sent to the Standing Committee.
- Consumer countries, and issues of demand, markets, and illegal trade, should be addressed by the Secretariat and the Standing Committee. Consumer countries should be asked to provide information on what steps they are taking to control illegal trade in this species.
- Range states should be encouraged to sign the MOU.
- The AC Chairman and Secretariat are asked to evaluate those recommendations in the Action Plan that concern CITES, and send them to the Standing Committee as a matter of priority for action as appropriate.

Any other business

The Working Group recommends that the Secretariat follow up with UNEP-WCMC regarding the reports it provides to the Secretariat and Animals Committee, in an effort to provide improved, more user-friendly reports.. Those improvements could include graphical analyses, summary information on conservation status, concerns, and other analyses and presentations beyond the provision of raw data.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

CONSERVATION OF & TRADE IN SEA CUCUMBERS

Participants

Oceania (Chair), Asia, Secretariat, China, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association, Ornamental Fish International, Project Seahorse, SWAN International.

Working Group (WG) Members not present: IUCN, TRAFFIC.

Terms of Reference

Provide comments and guidance to the Secretariat concerning the proposed objectives, agenda, participation and practical arrangements for the workshop (on biology, catch, and bycatch of, and trade in, sea cucumbers Holothuridae and Stichopodidae), which are presented in paragraphs 5 to 13 of AC19 Doc. 17.

Relationship with FAO-sponsored workshop on aquaculture of Holothurians in October 2003

1. The WG considered the suggestion of Japan to take advantage of this FAO-funded workshop in China and agreed that the Secretariat should be asked to explore all possibilities for hosting the workshops jointly or consecutively.

Objectives of the workshop

2. The WG agreed that the objectives of the workshop as outlined in AC19 Doc. 17 were appropriate and comprehensive.

Workshop execution

3. At the request of the Chair, Project Seahorse described the plans, execution and reporting for the CITES workshop on syngnathid conservation, held in May 2002 in the Philippines. The WG agreed that this was a reasonable model for the holothurian workshop. Consequently, background material will be required on (i) holothurian biology, (ii) fisheries and trade, (iii) possible management options and (iv) conservation status.

Agenda

4. The WG agreed that the draft agenda, as outlined in AC19 Doc. 17 Annex, should allow the workshop to meet the objectives set out in the same document. As outlined, the working programme should contain both thematic and country presentations, before breaking into thematic groups to address the need for specific recommendations for CITES action. It was noted that, contrary to the draft agenda, sea cucumbers are not traded for traditional medicine. The workshop should review all elements needed for the AC discussion document due for presentation to CoP13.

Workshop participants

5. The WG agreed that the workshop should be as inclusive as possible within a manageable size. It recommended that the following should be invited: Parties, technical experts, trade interests, conservation NGOs, national Ministries of Fisheries, academics, and resource managers (e.g. FAO, South Pacific Regional Environmental Program, the South Pacific Commission). The contributors to the SPC's Bêche-de-Mer bulletin may help to identify some of the expertise needed at the workshop, as may the FAO.
6. It was suggested that the Secretariat approach all Parties about their level of interest in attending the workshop. Should interest prove too high to accommodate at the small gathering, then regions should be asked to decide on their representation. The USA agreed to help the Secretariat to draft a request to Parties to nominate participants. The following Parties present in the WG expressed a willingness to participate in this workshop: China, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Republic of Tanzania, Singapore and USA.
7. Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association, Ornamental Fish International, Project Seahorse and SWAN International also expressed strong interest in participating in the workshop, directly if possible but indirectly if necessary, through submission of a briefing document. The Chair welcomed such contributions.
8. The WG agreed that the Secretariat would need to identify individuals or groups that could help to implement this workshop, and write the discussion document (e.g. TRAFFIC and FAO).

Timing

9. If the workshop is not held in conjunction with the FAO workshop in October 2003, the WG endorsed the Secretariat's suggestion that the workshop be held in December 2003 or January 2004.

Funding

10. The Secretariat reported that donors had been confirmed for the entire cost of the workshop, with support coming from the United States of America State Department and the United States of America National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Location

11. If this workshop is not to be held in conjunction with the FAO Holothurian workshop, then the Secretariat is encouraged to seek a venue in a nation engaged in major trade of Holothurians.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

TRANSPORT OF LIVE ANIMALS

Participants: European representative of the AC (Acting Interim Chair), Austria, China (absent), Czech Republic, Germany, Israel, Russian Federation, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America (absent), Zimbabwe, Animal Exhibitors' Alliance, AZA, Fund for Animals, HSUS, PIJAC, Pro Wildlife (absent), RSPCA, WAZA (absent), WDCS, WSPA

1. The Transport Working Group (TWG) met once at the 19th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC19).
 2. The Interim Chairman, in the name of the TWG and AC, thanked Irina Sprotte, for her efforts in serving as Chairman of the TWG since 1998.
 3. Setting priorities for the TWG until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP13).
 - a) The TWG will continue to use Resolution Conf. 10.21 as a basis for their work program, taking into account also Decision 12.85 directed to the Animals Committee.
 4. Towards implementation of Decision 12.85, paragraph a). To develop recommendations for rail, road or sea transport.
 - a) IATA is the standard for air-transport, but no single world-wide standard exists for non-air transport. Also IATA standards are sometimes not applicable for other modes of transport.
 - b) CITES has the opportunity to impose a single standard for CITES-listed species as CITES permits could include a requirement for use of such a standard.
 - c) A number of members of the TWG reported knowledge of a variety of studies and standards that are in place already in the United States of America, Europe and elsewhere. In addition some NGO's have access to species-specific standards or requirements for transport (e.g. for marine mammals).
- Agreed:** The TWG will work to collect these various standards and studies, and to distribute them among the members. The Chairman will serve as focal point to collate these with the intention of seeing their applicability (or lack thereof) to transport of CITES-listed species by road, rail and sea.
5. Towards implementation of Decision 12.85, paragraph c). To identify model practices for transport and preparation for shipment of live wild animals.
 - a) The TWG understands identifying a "model", as actually looking at identifying best practices.

- b) IATA is considered generally as the best standard, and the idea is to build a model of how an exporter should prepare its animals for transport.
- c) The TWG needs to work to offer improvements to the IATA standard.
- d) As a starting point it may be useful to consult reliable and experienced animal exporters.
- e) In the past, the TWG has tried to do get information on best practices, but it is hard to collect data (as most shippers won't report bad methods).
- f) Tanzania has offered to collect information from some African animal-exporting companies who have much experience in preparing wild animals for shipment.
- g) Other members will also try to gather information from other sources on best practices for preparation of wild animals for transport.

Agreed: The Chairman will collect this and other information on this issue. At the next meeting of the TWG, the members will discuss this information to try to develop a model in accordance with the Resolution.

- 6. Towards implementation of Decision 12.85, paragraph b). To investigate cost-effective options for packing materials that may be recommended to IATA.

- a) Like paragraph c), this part is also related to identifying best practices.

Agreed: The collection of information for the "model" in paragraph b), will also include looking at best practice for use of cost-effective packing materials, too.

- 7. The Interim Chair sees the TWG as including in its Terms of Reference also the issue of reduction of mortality during capture and storage before international transport, as included in Objective 1.1.6 in the CITES Strategic Vision.

- a) Some members felt that mortality before international transport is a domestic issue only, and the TWG should be involved only in those animals ultimately in international trade.
- b) Other members felt that this issue is related to the management of the species and it is thus to the survival of the species in the wild and non-detriment findings.
- c) Other members felt that it is an animal welfare issue more than a non-detriment issue.

Agreed: The TWG will approach the AC for advice about including the issue of reducing mortality before international transport into the TWG's Terms of Reference, or perhaps that it should be addressed in the issue of non-detriment findings.

- 8. Decision 12.86 is also related to animal transport, and is directed to the Secretariat in consultation with the Animals Committee. The TWG wishes to continue to be involved with the Secretariat in negotiating the MOU with IATA and WAZA.

- 9. Election of a new Chairman of the TWG.

- a) The Parties in the TWG unanimously propose Peter Linhart, the delegate from Austria, to serve as the new Chairman of the TWG.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

Report of the working group

TRADE IN HARD CORALS

Present: United Kingdom (Chairman), Regional Representative for Oceania, Switzerland, United States of America, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association, Ornamental Fish International

1. The Group addressed the terms of reference, namely to consider how to implement Decision 12.62, which directs the Animals Committee to consider and recommend a practical means of distinguishing fossilised corals from non-fossilised corals in international trade and report to CoP13.
2. The Group agreed the approached outlined below as a means of taking this work forward recognizing that many members of the previous working group (e.g. Australia, Belgium for European Community, Fiji, Indonesia, AKKII and TRAFFIC) were not present.
 - a) The Chairman would invite participants to suggest approaches to defining fossilized corals by the end of September 2003.
 - b) Participants in the working group would then be invited to consider the approaches, if necessary, through consultation with relevant expertise, and to provide comments by the end of October 2003.
 - c) Working group participants would then be asked to:
 - i) test the different approaches for the practicality of implementation (at relevant stages in the process from collection through export to import); and
 - ii) comment on the implications of adopting the different approaches (e.g. on conservation of coral reefs, implications for traders, etc.) and suggest risks and benefits of different approaches.
3. The group will provide progress report to AC20 when the group will consider and prepare a final report to be considered by the Animals Committee.
4. As some members of the group were new to the issue, the Chairman agreed to provide a brief history of the previous work of the group on this issue. Work will continue intersessionally by email.

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



Nineteenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 August 2003

BIOLOGICAL AND TRADE STATUS OF SHARKS

Members of the Working Group

The representative of Asia and the observers from China, Republic of Korea, Greece, the United Kingdom, the United States of America (Vice Chair and Rapporteur), the European Commission (Chair), IUCN, Defenders of Wildlife, IFAW, WildAid and WWF (UK).

Terms of Reference

Establish a process to:

- continue activities specified under Decision 11.94 (carried over to Decision 12.47) beyond the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and report on progress at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties;
- critically review progress towards IPOA-Sharks implementation (NPOA-Sharks) by major fishing and trading nations, by a date one year before the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES;
- 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;
- 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.

Summary of discussions and recommendations

1. The Working Group addressed the four Terms of Reference from the Animals Committee listed above. It also discussed formulation of a response to a letter from the World Customs Organisation.
2. *TOR 1. Establish a process to continue activities specified under Decision 11.94 (carried over to Decision 12.47) beyond the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and report on progress at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties;*

- a) The Working Group did not believe that this agenda item required much discussion at this time because the activities specified under Decision 11.94 / 12.47 are ongoing. However, members of the Working Group highlighted the lack of communication between CITES management authorities and national counterparts in fisheries, and the need to improve this situation. The Working Group also stressed the importance of CITES continuing to pursue negotiation of an MOU with FAO.
3. *TOR 2. Establish a process to critically review progress towards IPOA-Sharks implementation (NPOA-Sharks) by major fishing and trading nations, by a date one year before the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES;*
- a) The Working Group noted that the CITES Secretariat has only just (15 August) issued a Notification to the Parties on "Conservation and Management of Sharks" (2003/051), and that the deadline for comments is 30 September 2003.
- b) The Working Group requested that the IUCN Shark Specialist Group produce a report summarizing the results of Notification 2003/051 that are received by the Secretariat, and the IUCN Shark Specialist Group agreed. However, the Working Group felt that the information requested in the Notification to the Parties was too broad and that it would greatly assist the Parties if more specificity and structure could be provided. Accordingly, the Working Group recommended that a questionnaire prepared by the IUCN Shark Specialist Group and modified by the WG be sent to the Parties as part of a follow-up notification. Recognizing the workload faced by the Secretariat, the Working Group has drafted a proposed Notification (see draft appended at Annex I). Regional representatives on the Animals Committee are encouraged to bring the new Notification to the Parties to the attention of relevant national bodies.
- c) While it will not be possible to meet the exact completion date envisaged in Res. Conf. 12.16 (3 October), the IUCN Shark Specialist Group will attempt to complete an initial synthesis by the end of October. The format of the document will be similar to AC18 Doc. 19.2 and Notification to Parties No. 2002/042, with the addition of new materials, as available.
- d) The Working Group agreed that for many Parties, particularly developing nations, implementing the IPOA is a daunting prospect. The requirements are difficult to meet except in cases where extremely detailed information and adequate management capacity are available. Therefore, the Working Group recognized that, in some cases, the IPOA can only be implemented in stages, resulting in incremental progress. The proposed questionnaire aims to identify stages in progress towards full implementation. The Working Group emphasized that continuing failure to adequately implement the IPOA will be detrimental to sustainable trade in the long term.
- e) The Working Group recommended that an inter-sessional working group be established to review the IUCN Shark Specialist Group report and further address the second (and third) term(s) of reference. The proposed membership of the Working Group is: Oceania (Chair), United Kingdom, United States of America, China, Republic of Korea, Australia (by invitation), Ecuador (by invitation), European Commission, IUCN, TRAFFIC, WWF, IFAW, Defenders of Wildlife, WildAid and other Parties or observers that wish to participate can do so at the discretion of the Chair.
- f) The IUCN Shark Specialist Group further reported that some of its members, contracted to APEC (the Asia Pacific Economic Communities), have been developing a technical handbook for the management of shark fisheries; this is now very close to completion. The handbook should include guidelines for the incremental implementation of the IPOA-Sharks by shark fishing states, in order to assist managers who lack the capacity initially to fully implement the IPOA as outlined in FAO's Technical Guidelines.
4. *Establish a process 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;*
- a) The IUCN Shark Specialist Group agreed to compile an initial draft list of key species based on the survey detailed under the second term of reference, as well as other relevant reports and reviews; such information to be considered further by the intersessional group and at AC 20.

- b) The working group noted the deadline for posting of documents for AC 20 and the need to allow time for translation prior to that.

5 *Establish a process 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.*

- a) The Working Group agreed that it was not possible to offer firm recommendations on this issue at this time, prior to completion of the IUCN Shark Specialist Group's review. However, it was recommended that Parties that have other information not covered by the proposed questionnaire (Annex I) should make such information available for AC 20.
6. It was acknowledged that completion of the tasks assigned to the IUCN Shark Specialist Group was conditional on the availability of human resources within the short timeframe available.

Customs Codes

7. The Working Group examined a letter received by the CITES Secretariat from the World Customs Organization (WCO) requesting information on scientific names and product categories for sharks in trade. The Working Group was unable to completely address this issue at this time because it lacked information on systems already in place and the harmonized system (HS) used by WCO. In addition, the Working Group felt that this issue warranted more thorough research in order to do an adequate job, rather than rushing to get something in place to meet the deadline for the WCO's next meeting (September 2003).
8. In particular, the Working Group felt that it was essential to examine Hong Kong's classification system, which is believed to provide accurate and complete statistics. Hong Kong volunteered to provide details on their classification system to the Secretariat. The Working Group also identified the need to develop an approach that is consistent with that for seahorses and other relevant species-groups. It is also essential to coordinate and consult with FAO.
9. The observer from Defenders of Wildlife agreed to read relevant HS chapters and develop a list of likely product categories and codes for sharks in trade. This list would be completed in time for presentation at AC 20.
10. The IUCN Shark Specialist Group volunteered to develop a draft list of sharks for this purpose, at appropriate levels of taxonomic groupings, for further consideration (Annex II). The proposed list includes high-volume or high-value species, and species of special concern, grouped at the order, family, genus or species level, depending on the level of detail needed for data collection.
11. While it was agreed that trade data supplied by WCO would be useful, other sources of information would also be needed.

Draft Notification to Parties no. 2003/??, further to Notification 2003/051 dated 15 August 2003

Notification 2003/051 dated 15 August 2003 invited the Management Authorities of the Parties to seek information from their fisheries departments on the implementation of IPOA-Sharks, particularly with regard to the establishment of National Plans of Action, and to submit this information to the Secretariat by 30 September 2003.

A working group on sharks was established by the 19th Meeting of the Animals Committee in order to implement the elements of Resolution Conf. 12.6 directed to the Animals Committee. This Working Group considered, *inter alia*, how best to undertake the critical review of progress towards IPOA-Sharks implementation. Based on the report of the Working Group, the Animals Committee concluded that it would be helpful to Management Authorities if Notification 2003/051 was clarified. The Animals Committee recommended the attached structure for a response to that Notification.

Questionnaire on progress with implementation of the UN FAO IPOA-Sharks

Name of respondent State:

Key contact person and agency for further enquiries on Shark Assessment Reports and National Plans of Action

Name:

Agency:

Address:

Telephone/fax nos:

Email:

1) Information on Fisheries

Does your State land sharks? From target fisheries? Yes ☐ No ☐

 From bycatch fisheries? Yes ☐ No ☐

Does your State have any regulations specifically for shark fisheries? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please provide details.

2) Information on Trade

Does your state export shark products? Yes ☐ No ☐

Does your state import shark products? Yes ☐ No ☐

Does your state have customs codes for these products?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have customs codes, what are these?

3) Information on data collection

Data collected on catches

- | | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| · Including discards | Yes ☐ | No ☐ |
| · Excluding discards | Yes ☐ | No ☐ |

Data collected on landings

Yes ☐ No ☐

Fishery-independent research underway

Yes ☐ No ☐

(e.g. biology, ecology, distribution, abundance)

Fleet data collected (e.g. vessels, fishers, gear used, areas fished)

Yes ☐ No ☐

Catch and effort data collected

Yes ☐ No ☐

Habitat research or data collection underway

Yes ☐ No ☐

4) Shark fisheries assessment report (SAR)

Has your state produced a SAR (as required under the FAO IPOA-Sharks)?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have produced a SAR, please provide title, date of release, where available and provide copy to Secretariat for review by Animals Committee (as required under Resolution Conf. 12.6).

If no, please clarify:

Is your state planning to produce a SAR?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, what stage has this reached?

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| • No action yet taken | Yes ☐ | No ☐ |
| • Initial discussions, undertaken, draft not yet available | Yes ☐ | No ☐ |

Please indicate month/year when draft will become available and/or brief comments.

- | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| • Draft produced | Yes ☐ | No ☐ |
|------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|

Please provide information (e.g. title; date; review due month/year).

- Public/industry consultation on draft underway Yes ☐ No ☐
- Workshop planned to discuss preparation, Yes ☐ No ☐

Please provide dates (month, year) when workshop(s) or other activities will take place.

- Draft SAR finalised, but awaiting official Governmental adoption.

Please provide the date (month, year) when SAR is expected to be formally adopted

5) National Plan of Action for Sharks (NPOA)

Has your state produced an NPOA (as required under the FAO IPOA-Sharks)? Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have produced an NPOA, please provide title, date of release, where available and provide copy to Secretariat for review by Animals Committee (as required under Resolution Conf. 12.6).

Has the NPOA been implemented? Yes ☐ No ☐

If not implemented, on what date is implementation anticipated?

If no NPOA has been produced, please clarify:

Is your state planning to produce an NPOA? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, what stage has this reached?

- No action yet taken Yes ☐ No ☐
- Initial discussions, undertaken, draft not yet available Yes ☐ No ☐

Please indicate month/year when draft will become available and/or brief comments.

- Draft produced Yes ☐ No ☐

Please provide information (e.g. title; date; review due month/year).

- Public/industry consultation on draft underway Yes ☐ No ☐
- Workshop planned to discuss preparation, Yes ☐ No ☐

Please provide dates (month, year) when workshop(s) or other activities will take place.

- Draft NPOA finalised, but awaiting official Governmental adoption. Yes ☐ No ☐

Please provide the date (month, year) when NPOA is expected to be formally adopted

6) Other species-level conservation and management activity

Key commercial species identified/managed

Yes ☐

No ☐

If yes, please provide details.

Key species of conservation concern identified/managed

Yes ☐

No ☐

If yes, please provide details.

CITES-listed shark species managed or monitored

Yes ☐

No ☐

If yes, please provide details.

7) Other information/comments:

Preliminary draft list of scientific names of sharks (and their relatives) for submission to the World Customs Organisation

This list is certainly not exhaustive (there are over 1,000 species). Those orders, families, genera or species named are thought to be present in international trade in significant quantities, or are of importance for other reasons. Additional taxa may need to be added when this list is reviewed.

The scientific classification used follows that of L.J.V. Compagno, in Fowler *et al.* 2003 in press.

CLASS CHONDRICHTHYES.

SUBCLASS HOLOCEPHALII.

ORDER CHIMAERIFORMES. Chimaeras, rabbit fishes, spookfishes.

SUBCLASS ELASMOBRANCHII

ORDER SQUALIFORMES. Dogfish Sharks.

Squalus acanthias. Piked/Spiny dogfish, Spurdog.

Squalus sp.

Centrophorus sp. Gulper sharks

Deania sp. Gulper sharks

Centroscyllium sp. deepwater dogfish

Centroscymnus coelolepis. Portugese dogfish.

Centroscymnus sp. Deepwater dogfish.

Dalatias licha. Kitefin shark.

ORDER SQUATINIFORMES. Angel Sharks.

Squatina sp.

ORDER PRISTIOPHORIFORMES. Sawsharks.

Pristiophorus sp.

ORDER RAJIFORMES, Batoids.

SUBORDER PRISTOIDEI. SAWFISHES.

Anoxypristis cuspidata. Knifetooth, pointed, or narrow sawfish.

Pristis clavata. Dwarf or Queensland sawfish.

Pristis microdon. Greattooth or freshwater sawfish.

Pristis pectinata. Smalltooth or wide sawfish.

Pristis perotteti. Largetooth sawfish.

Pristis pristis. Common sawfish.

Pristis zijsron. Green sawfish.

SUBORDER RHYNCHOBATOIDEI. WEDGEFISHES.

Rhynchobatus sp.

SUBORDER RHINOBATOIDEI. GUITARFISHES.

Rhinobatos typus Giant shovelnose ray.

Rhinobatos sp.

SUBORDER TORPEDINOIDEI. ELECTRIC RAYS.

SUBORDER RAJOIDEI. SKATES.

Amblyraja radiata Thorny skate.

Amblyraja sp.

Dipturus sp. Long-nosed skates

Leucoraja sp.

Okamejei sp.

Raja sp

Rajella sp.

Rostroraja alba. White skate.

Anacanthobatis and *Cruriraja* sp. Legskates

SUBORDER MYLIOBATOIDEI. STINGRAYS.

This suborder enters trade in the form of stingray leather, possibly also as meat, and as live specimens for aquaria (particularly small species and young individuals).

FAMILY UROLOPHIDAE. STINGAREES.

FAMILY UROTRYGONIDAE. ROUND STINGRAYS.

FAMILY POTAMOTRYGONIDAE. RIVER AND FANTAIL STINGRAYS.

(Note: these are primarily ornamental live trade species. The number of listed species could be reduced through consultation with Brazil.)

Paratrygon aireba Discusray.

Plesiotrygon iwamae Longtailed river stingray.

Potamotrygon brachyura Shorttailed river stingray.

Potamotrygon castexi Vermiculate river stingray.

Potamotrygon constellata Thorny river stingray.

Potamotrygon dumerilii Anglespot river stingray.

Potamotrygon falkneri Largespot river stingray.

Potamotrygon henlei Bigtooth river stingray.

Potamotrygon hystrix Porcupine river stingray.

Potamotrygon humerosa Roughback river stingray.

Potamotrygon leopoldi Whiteblotched river stingray.

Potamotrygon magdalenae Magdalena river stingray.

Potamotrygon motoro Ocellate river stingray.

Potamotrygon ocellata Redblotched river stingray.

Potamotrygon orbignyi Smoothback river stingray.

Potamotrygon schroederi Rosette river stingray.

Potamotrygon schuemacheri Parana river stingray.

Potamotrygon scobina Raspy river stingray.

Potamotrygon signata Parnaiba river stingray.

Potamotrygon yepesi Maracaibo river stingray.

Taeniura lymma Ribbontailed stingray, Bluespotted ribbontail or fantail ray.

FAMILY DASYATIDAE. WHIPTAIL STINGRAYS.

Dasyatis sp.

Himantura sp.

FAMILY GYMNURIDAE. BUTTERFLY RAYS.

FAMILY MYLIOBATIDAE. EAGLE RAYS.

Aetobatus sp.

Aetomylaeus sp.

Myliobatis sp.

Pteromylaeus sp.

FAMILY RHINOPTERIDAE. COWNOSE RAYS.

FAMILY MOBULIDAE. DEVIL RAYS.

Manta birostris Manta.

Mobula sp. Devil rays

SUPERORDER GALEOMORPHII. GALEOMORPH SHARKS.

ORDER HETERODONTIFORMES. Bullhead Sharks.

Enter ornamental fish trade (small, hardy and colourful). Meat may also be traded.

ORDER ORECTOLOBIFORMES. Carpet Sharks.

Enter ornamental fish trade (many are small, hardy and colourful). Meat may also be traded.

FAMILY PARASCYLLIIDAE. COLLARED CARPETSHARKS.

FAMILY BRACHAELURIDAE. BLIND SHARKS.

FAMILY ORECTOLOBIDAE. WOBEGONGS.

FAMILY HEMISCYLLIIDAE. LONGTAILED CARPETHARKS.

FAMILY GINGLYMOSTOMATIDAE. NURSE SHARKS.

Ginglymostoma cirratum Nurse shark.

Nebrius ferrugineus. Tawny nurse shark.

Pseudoginglymostoma brevicaudatum . Shorttail nurse shark.

FAMILY STEGOSTOMATIDAE. ZEBRA SHARKS.

FAMILY RHINCODONTIDAE. WHALE SHARKS.

***Rhincodon typus*. Whale shark. Listed on Appendix II**

ORDER LAMNIFORMES. Mackerel Sharks.

FAMILY ODONTASPIDIDAE. SAND TIGER SHARKS.

Carcharias taurus Sand tiger, spotted raggedtooth, or gray nurse shark.

Odontaspis sp.

FAMILY MEGACHASMIDAE. MEGAMOUTH SHARKS.

Megachasma pelagios Megamouth shark.

FAMILY ALOPIIDAE. THRESHER SHARKS.

Alopias pelagicus Pelagic thresher.

Alopias superciliosus Bigeye thresher.

Alopias vulpinus Thresher shark.

FAMILY CETORHINIDAE. BASKING SHARKS.

***Cetorhinus maximus* Basking shark. Listed on Appendix II**

FAMILY LAMNIDAE. MACKEREL SHARKS.

***Carcharodon carcharias* Great white shark. Listed on Appendix III**

Isurus sp. mako sharks.

Lamna ditropis Salmon shark.

Lamna nasus Porbeagle shark.

ORDER CARCHARHINIFORMES. GROUND SHARKS.

FAMILY SCYLORHINIDAE. Catsharks.

Cephaloscyllium sp. Swellsharks.

Galeus sp.

Scyliorhinus sp.

FAMILY LEPTOCHARIIDAE. BARBELED HOUND SHARKS.

FAMILY TRIAKIDAE. HOUND SHARKS.

Galeorhinus galeus Tope, soupfin or school shark.

Mustelus antarcticus. Gummy shark or rig.

Mustelus sp. Smoothhound or gummy shark

Triakis sp.

FAMILY CARCHARHINIDAE. REQUIEM SHARKS.

Carcharhinus brachyurus Bronze whaler.

Carcharhinus brevipinna Spinner shark.

Carcharhinus falciformis Silky shark.

Carcharhinus galapagensis. Galapagos shark.

Carcharhinus leucas Bull shark.

Carcharhinus limbatus Blacktip shark.

Carcharhinus longimanus Oceanic whitetip shark.

Carcharhinus obscurus Dusky shark.

Carcharhinus plumbeus Sandbar shark.

Galeocerdo cuvier. Tiger shark.

Prionace glauca Blue shark.

FAMILY SPHYRNIDAE. HAMMERHEAD SHARKS.

Sphyrna sp.

Compagno, L.J.V. 2003 (in press). Checklist of Living Chondrichthyes. *In*: Fowler, S.L., Camhi, M., Burgess, G.H., Cailliet, G.M., Fordham, S.V, Cavanagh, R.D., Simpfendorfer, C.A. and Musick, J.A. (Eds) In press (2003). *Sharks, rays and chimaeras: the status of the chondrichthyan fishes*. IUCN SSC Shark Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.