

CONVENTION SUR LE COMMERCE INTERNATIONAL DES ESPECES
DE FAUNE ET DE FLORE SAUVAGES MENACEES D'EXTINCTION



Dix-neuvième session du Comité pour les animaux
Genève (Suisse), 18 – 21 août 2003

RAPPORT RESUME

ACTIONS	EXECUTANTS	PAGE
1. Ouverture de la session		5
2. Adoption du règlement intérieur Adopté tel qu'amendé.		5
3. Adoption de l'ordre du jour et du programme de travail Adopté tel qu'amendé.		5
4. Admission des observateurs Le Secrétariat rappellera aux observateurs des Parties et des organisations qu'ils doivent apporter leurs lettres de créance conformément à l'article 7.	Secrétariat	6
5. Rapports régionaux Le Secrétariat enverra un modèle de questionnaire pour réunir des informations des Parties en vue de la préparation des rapports régionaux. Le représentant de la région Amérique centrale et du Sud et Caraïbes fournira une copie sur papier de son rapport au Comité pour les animaux.	Secrétariat Représentant de l'Amérique centrale et du Sud et Caraïbes	6
6. Planification stratégique Les représentants régionaux contacteront les Parties de leur région pour établir une liste des spécialistes scientifiques travaillant dans les organes de gestion et des autorités scientifiques.	Représentants régionaux	7

ACTIONS	EXECUTANTS	PAGE
7. Rapport sur la 49^e session du Comité permanent 7.1 Groupe de travail sur les questions techniques d'application Création d'un groupe de contact à composition ouverte. L'observateur des Etats-Unis d'Amérique recevra les suggestions des participants et fera rapport à la 20^e session du Comité. 7.2 Groupe de travail sur les quotas d'exportation Le Comité pour les animaux commentera les rapports du Groupe de travail sur les quotas d'exportation, qui le tiendra informé des progrès accomplis.	Groupe de contact, observateur des Etats-Unis Comité pour les animaux, Groupe de travail sur les quotas d'exportation	8
8. Etude du commerce important de spécimens d'espèces inscrites à l'Annexe II 8.1 Introduction à la résolution Conf. 12.8 Le faucon sacré sera immédiatement intégré dans l'Etude du commerce important. Examen d'autres nouvelles espèces reporté à la 20^e session du Comité. Le PNUE-WCMC préparera une analyse des données du commerce CITES pour la 20^e session avec l'aide de l'UICN et de TRAFFIC. 8.2 Examen de la mise en œuvre des recommandations Poursuite de la discussion reportée à la 20^e session. 8.3 Progrès accomplis dans l'Etude du commerce important (Phases IV et V) Recommandations du groupe de travail 3 sur <i>Strombus gigas</i> adoptées telles qu'amendées. Recommandations du groupe de travail 8 sur l'état des taxons sélectionnés pour examen depuis la CdP11 adoptées telles qu'amendées. 8.4 Progrès accomplis dans la première étude du commerce important par pays Poursuite de la discussion reportée à la 20^e session. 8.5 Evaluation de l'étude du commerce important Recommandations du groupe de travail 8 adoptées telles qu'amendées.	Comité pour les animaux, Secrétariat PNUE-WCMC, UICN, TRAFFIC Comité pour les animaux, Comité permanent, Secrétariat Groupe de travail 8, Comité pour les animaux, Président du Comité pour les animaux, Comité permanent, Secrétariat Groupe de travail 8, délégué du Comité pour les plantes	9 33 53 10 11 55

ACTIONS	EXECUTANTS	PAGE
8.6 Conservation de <i>Saiga tatarica</i> Recommandations du groupe de travail 8 adoptées telles qu'amendées.	Président du Comité pour les animaux, Comité permanent, Etats de l'aire de répartition, Secrétariat	55
9. Révision des critères d'amendement des Annexes I et II Recommandations du groupe de travail 1 adoptées.	Groupe de travail 9, Comité pour les animaux, Comité pour les plantes, Parties citées dans le tableau de la page 3 du document AC19 WG1 Doc. 1, Secrétariat	12 23
10. Examen périodique des espèces inscrites aux annexes Le GSC/UICN recherchera des fonds et examinera le calendrier à la lumière des décisions de la CdP13. 10.1 Examen périodique des espèces inscrites aux annexes Les progrès accomplis par le groupe de contact seront examinés à la 20 ^e session.	Groupe UICN de spécialistes des crocodiles Groupe de contact sur l'examen des annexes	12
11. Enregistrement et suivi des établissements élevant en captivité à des fins commerciales des espèces animales inscrites à l'Annexe I 11.1 Procédure d'enregistrement des établissements Secrétariat enverra aux Parties la notification figurant dans le document AC19 WG5 Doc. 1, adoptée telle qu'amendée. 11.2 Relation entre la production <i>ex situ</i> et la conservation <i>in situ</i> Recommandations du groupe de travail 2 adoptées telles qu'amendées. Le Secrétariat enverra aux Parties la notification figurant dans l'Annexe 2 du document AC19 WG2 Doc. 1, telle qu'amendée. <i>International Wildlife Coalition</i> préparera des définitions de la production <i>in situ</i> et de la conservation <i>ex situ</i> .	Groupe de travail sur l'enregistrement des établissements, Secrétariat Groupe de travail 2, Secrétariat <i>International Wildlife Coalition</i>	13 45 27
12. Transport des animaux vivants Recommandations du groupe de travail 10 adoptées.	Groupe de travail sur le transport, Comité pour les animaux	14 69

ACTIONS	EXECUTANTS	PAGE
13. Commerce des coraux durs Recommandations du groupe de travail 11 adoptées.	Groupe de travail 11	15 71
14. Contrôle des systèmes de production de l'élevage en captivité et en ranch et des prélèvements dans la nature pour les espèces inscrites à l'Annexe II Recommandations du groupe de travail 4 adoptées.	Groupe de travail 4, Secrétariat	15 43
15. Conservation et commerce des tortues d'eau douce et des tortues terrestres Recommandations du groupe de travail 6 adoptées telles qu'amendées.	Groupe de travail 6, représentant de l'Asie, Secrétariat	16 47
16. Hippocampes et autres membres de la famille des syngnathidés Recommandations du groupe de travail 7 adoptées, étant entendu que le Comité étudiera d'autres manières d'entreprendre les recherches recommandées.	Groupe de travail 7, Comité pour les animaux, Secrétariat	17 51
17. Conservation et commerce des concombres de mer des familles Holothuridae et Stichopodidae Recommandations du groupe de travail 9 adoptées.	Secrétariat	18 67
18. Situation des requins aux plans biologique et commercial Recommandations du groupe de travail 12 adoptées. Le Secrétariat enverra aux Parties la notification figurant dans l'Annexe 1 du document AC19 WG12 Doc. 1.	Groupe de travail 12, Groupe UICN de spécialistes des requins, Secrétariat Secrétariat	18 73
19. Commerce des espèces exotiques Un document sera soumis à la 20 ^e session.	Représentant de l'Océanie	19
20. Taxonomie et nomenclature normalisées Aucune action n'est requise.		19
21. Autres questions Aucune action n'est requise.		20
22. Remarques de clôture Aucune action n'est requise		20

1. Ouverture de la session (pas de document)

Le Président souhaite la bienvenue aux participants et remercie le Secrétariat pour son assistance dans l'organisation de la session. Le Secrétaire général de la CITES souhaite lui aussi la bienvenue aux participants.

2. Adoption du règlement intérieur (AC19 Doc. 2)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour et recommande des amendements mineurs visant à harmoniser le règlement intérieur du Comité pour les animaux et celui du Comité pour les plantes. Après les interventions du représentant de l'Europe et des observateurs des Pays-Bas et du Mexique, le Comité décide d'apporter les amendements suivants au règlement intérieur.

- a) A L'article 18, « Les documents devant être examinés à une session sont normalement fournis au Secrétariat 90 jours au moins avant cette session. » devient « Les documents devant être examinés par le Comité sont normalement fournis au Secrétariat 60 jours au moins avant cette session. »;
- b) La deuxième phrase de l'article 19, « Le Secrétariat envoie les documents imprimés d'une session 45 jours au moins avant la date proposée pour ladite session. », devient « Le Secrétariat envoie les documents imprimés d'une session 40 jours au moins avant ladite session. »;
- c) La dernière phrase de l'article 23, « Les Parties et les suppléants présents à la session en tant qu'observateurs sont habilités à être présents aux séances à huis clos. », devient « Les Parties, les suppléants et les organisations intergouvernementales présents à la session en tant qu'observateurs sont habilités à être présents aux séances à huis clos. »; et
- d) La première phrase de l'article 25, « Le secrétariat de la session prépare le compte-rendu résumé de chaque session et l'envoie aux Parties représentées à la session dans les 120 jours. », devient « Le secrétariat de la session prépare le compte-rendu résumé de chaque session et l'envoie aux Parties représentées à la session dans les 60 jours. ».

Le Secrétariat recommande au Comité de modifier la dernière phrase de l'article 19. Il constate que le libellé actuel est ambigu et pourrait se prêter à deux interprétations très différentes. Après les interventions des représentants de l'Afrique et de l'Océanie et celles des observateurs de l'Allemagne, des Etats-Unis d'Amérique et du Mexique, le Comité décide de reporter à sa 20^e session le débat sur un éventuel nouveau libellé pour la dernière phrase de l'article 19, jusqu'à ce que la discussion sur les questions de communication ait eu lieu.

L'observateur de la Slovénie demande des précisions sur la présentation des lettres de créance par les observateurs représentant une Partie. Le Secrétaire général apporte des éclaircissements puis le Président annonce que les lettres de créance des Parties observatrices seront examinées conformément à l'article 7, comme ce fut le cas précédemment pour les organisations. Le Secrétariat accepte de rappeler aux observateurs représentant une Partie ou une organisation de soumettre leurs lettres de créance conformément à l'article 7.

3. Adoption de l'ordre du jour et du programme de travail

3.1 Ordre du jour [AC19 Doc. 3.1 (Rev. 7)]

Le zoologue du Comité de la nomenclature déclare que les points 20.1 et 20.2 de l'ordre du jour seront également examinés à la réunion du Comité de la nomenclature et propose que ce Comité fasse rapport au Comité pour les animaux le dernier jour. Le Comité pour les animaux accepte cette proposition.

La Présidente du Comité pour les plantes, de même que d'autres participants tout au long de la session, félicite le Président du Comité pour les animaux pour son élection. Elle se félicite de l'occasion qui lui est offerte de participer à cette session et d'échanger des points de vue sur des sujets d'intérêt commun aux deux Comités; elle rappelle qu'à la réunion du Comité de la nomenclature consacrée aux plantes, il a été convenu que le botaniste de ce Comité

préparerait des projets de propositions d'amendements à la résolution Conf. 12.11 concernant la nomenclature normalisée.

Le Comité pour les animaux convient d'ajouter les points suivants sous « Autres questions »:

21.2 Commerce avec les Etats non-Parties à la Convention (à la demande de l'observateur du Mexique); et

21.3 Rapport d'activité sur les manuels d'identification (à la demande du Secrétariat).

3.2 Programme de travail [AC19 Doc. 3.2 (Rev. 1)]

Le Président note que le programme de travail est provisoire et pourrait changer en fonction des questions du jour. Il note aussi qu'il y aura plusieurs groupes de travail mais que comme ceux-ci se déroulent en parallèle, les participants ne pourront pas participer à tous les groupes. L'observateur des Pays-Bas relève que le point 4 de l'ordre du jour sur l'admission des observateurs ne figure pas dans le programme de travail. Le Comité adopte le programme de travail en y ajoutant un point 4, "Admission d'observateurs le premier jour". Le Secrétariat ajoute que les rapports régionaux seront présentés le dernier jour de la session et que les représentants régionaux pourraient consulter les Parties de leur région afin de réunir des informations sur ce point de l'ordre du jour.

4. Admission des observateurs (pas de document)

Le Président indique au Comité la procédure à suivre pour accepter la demande des organisations non gouvernementales souhaitant être admises à la session en tant qu'observateurs. Le Comité accepte l'admission de ces observateurs.

5. Rapports régionaux

5.1 Afrique (AC19 Doc. 5.1)

Le Comité prend note du rapport soumis par le représentant régional.

5.2 Asie (pas de document)

Le représentant de l'Asie fait un rapport oral sur les points suivants:

- a) Il a reçu un rapport du Brunéi Darussalam ; ce rapport ne mentionne pas de volumes élevés de commerce d'espèces CITES;
- b) Il a reçu le rapport du Japon sur les requins;
- c) Il y a eu une réunion de spécialistes des requins de sept pays de la région au *Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Centre*;
- d) Israël a fourni des informations sur ses activités de sensibilisation, son plan de législation nationale et ses saisies; et
- e) les Emirats arabes unis ont fourni un rapport sur la conservation et le commerce du faucon sacré.

Le Comité prend note du rapport oral du représentant régional et lui demande de lui en fournir une version écrite.

5.3 Amérique centrale et du Sud et Caraïbes (pas de document)

Le représentant de l'Amérique centrale et du Sud et Caraïbes fait un rapport oral sur les points suivants:

- a) il y a des problèmes de communication dans la région;

- b) *Strombus gigas* est un sujet de préoccupation pour la région; une réunion organisée conjointement par plusieurs organisations a eu lieu en juin 2003 à la Jamaïque à ce sujet; plusieurs services de la pêche et des organes de gestion y ont participé; et
- c) le Chili est l'un des pays les plus actifs de la région mais bon nombre d'autres pays de la région ne sont pas dans la même situation financière et ne disposent pas des mêmes capacités.

Le Comité prend note du rapport oral du représentant régional. Le Président lui demande d'en fournir au Comité une version imprimée. L'observateur du Chili se déclare préoccupé par la représentation dans la région; le Secrétaire général apporte des éclaircissements sur les difficultés rencontrées par plusieurs représentants régionaux puis le Président demande au représentant de l'Amérique centrale et du Sud et Caraïbes et à l'observateur du Chili de discuter au niveau bilatéral de leurs préoccupations. L'observateur du Mexique fait remarquer que son pays a lui aussi mené des activités liées à la CITES en Amérique centrale.

5.4 Europe (AC19 Doc. 5.4)

Le Comité prend note du rapport du représentant régional.

5.5 Amérique du Nord (AC19 Doc. 5.5)

Le Comité prend note du rapport du représentant régional.

5.6 Océanie (AC19 Doc. 5.6)

Le Comité prend note du rapport du représentant régional.

Retenant la suggestion du Comité pour les plantes et du Secrétariat, le Comité pour les animaux accepte d'envisager d'utiliser un questionnaire pour réunir des informations des Parties en vue de la préparation des rapports régionaux et demande qu'un modèle lui soit fourni avant sa 20^e session.

Les observateurs des Pays-Bas et d'*International Wildlife Coalition* sont également intervenus au cours du débat.

6. Planification stratégique (AC19 Docs. 6.1-6.3)

Le Secrétariat présente les documents AC19 Doc. 6.1 et 6.2. Le Président présente le document AC19 Doc. 6.3, notant qu'il inclut une liste d'activités prioritaires établie sur la base des documents AC19 Doc. 6.1 et 6.2.

Plusieurs participants expriment leur satisfaction quant aux documents préparés par le Secrétariat et le Président. L'observateur des Pays-Bas note que la base de données sur les spécimens de permis CITES concerne le Secrétariat et non le Comité pour les animaux [voir document AC19 Doc. 6.1, paragraphe 3. b)]. Il note aussi qu'en raison de contraintes budgétaires, les études risquent d'être axées uniquement sur les espèces déjà inscrites aux annexes CITES [voir document AC19 Doc. 6.3, paragraphe 4. l)]. Les représentants de l'Europe et de l'Océanie, appuyés par l'observateur des Etats-Unis, soulignent l'importance d'étudier les espèces non inscrites et la valeur des études déjà réalisées pour mettre en lumière les espèces menacées par le commerce international. Le représentant de l'Asie estime qu'il conviendrait d'accorder la priorité aux espèces déjà inscrites aux annexes. L'observateur de la République de Corée note que, pour ce qui est des espèces non inscrites, le déclin ne résulte pas forcément du commerce international mais pourrait être la conséquence de nombreux autres facteurs.

L'observateur de l'Espagne relève que la question des unités de mesure normalisées est très importante et doit être approfondie. Le Président note que la liste des unités normalisées qui est fournie n'est pas exhaustive. Les observateurs de l'Espagne, d'Israël et des Pays-Bas notent que les questions technologiques pourraient ne pas être du ressort du Comité. L'observateur de l'Espagne ajoute cependant que certains éléments comme l'étiquetage, le marquage et les microcircuits, sont effectivement au nombre des aspects du travail du Comité touchant à la gestion des spécimens. Le Président renvoie les participants au point 7.1 de l'ordre du jour sur les questions technologiques.

Les observateurs de l'Espagne, des Etats-Unis, d'Israël, du Mexique et du WWF International abordent l'enregistrement des établissements d'élevage en captivité de spécimens d'espèces inscrites à l'Annexe I, ainsi que la conservation *in situ* et de la production *ex situ*. Ils demandent si ces questions doivent être abordées ensemble ou séparément et si elles concernent la Convention sur la diversité biologique. Le Président du Comité fait remarquer qu'elles seront abordées séparément au point 11 de l'ordre du jour.

Les observateurs d'Israël et de la République de Corée, appuyés par l'observateur d'*Animal Welfare Institute*, notent que le Groupe de travail sur le transport devrait pouvoir aborder les questions de capture et de garde des spécimens. Ils proposent une autre solution : la création d'un groupe de travail sur ces questions. L'observateur d'*International Wildlife Coalition* note que la question de la capture et de la garde des spécimens pourrait être reliée à celle de la mortalité des animaux et au processus d'avis de commerce non préjudiciable. Le Secrétariat note que le Comité n'a pas à traiter les questions de capture et de garde des animaux et qu'il devrait se concentrer sur la prévention des pertes inutiles d'animaux vivants. Il ajoute que la question pourrait concerner le Groupe de travail sur le transport.

Le représentant de l'Océanie est prié de fournir des précisions sur le libellé de la dernière phrase du paragraphe 4. f) du document AC19 Doc. 6.3. Le Président et le Secrétariat indiquent que cette phrase devrait se lire comme suit: « A la 49^e session du Comité permanent, il a été décidé que les propositions résultant du processus devraient être soumises à la Conférence des Parties ».

Les participants discutent de l'établissement de répertoires régionaux de spécialistes. La Présidente du Comité pour les plantes annonce que son Comité a établi des répertoires normalisés pour toutes les régions qui ont été placés sur le site Internet de la CITES. Les représentants de l'Asie et de l'Europe, ainsi que les observateurs de l'Espagne, des Pays-Bas et de la République de Corée, sont intervenus dans le débat.

Après une brève discussion informelle avec les représentants régionaux et après consultation de la Présidente du Comité pour les plantes, le Président du Comité pour les animaux charge les représentants régionaux de contacter les Parties de leur région afin d'établir une liste de scientifiques travaillant dans les organes de gestion et les autorités scientifiques, lesquels auront un rôle d'interlocuteurs.

A l'issue de la discussion, le Comité adopte la liste des priorités figurant dans le document AC19 Doc. 6.3.

7. Rapport sur la 49^e session du Comité permanent

Le Secrétariat explique que les points 9 et 10 de l'ordre du jour de la présente session ont également été abordés à la 49^e session du Comité permanent.

7.1 Groupe de travail sur les questions techniques d'application (AC19 Doc. 7.1)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour et encourage les membres à envisager comment collaborer au mieux avec le Groupe de travail sur les questions techniques d'application. L'observateur des Etats-Unis rappelle qu'il existe un groupe de travail sur cette question, présidé par un des ses collègues de l'organe de gestion des Etats-Unis qui n'est pas venu à la session. La Présidente du Comité pour les plantes note que durant la discussion sur ce point à la 13^e session de son Comité, plusieurs observateurs ont proposé de soumettre des idées au groupe de travail et lui ont demandé de tenir le Comité pour les plantes informé de questions spécifiques.

Le Comité établit un groupe de contact dont la composition est ouverte. L'observateur des Etats-Unis propose de recevoir les suggestions des participants et de faire rapport au Comité à sa 20^e session.

Les représentants de l'Amérique du Nord, de l'Asie et de l'Océanie, ainsi que les observateurs du Chili, du Mexique, des Pays-Bas et d'*International Wildlife Federation* sont intervenus au cours du débat.

7.2 Groupe de travail sur les quotas d'exportation (AC19 Doc. 7.2)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. La Présidente du Comité pour les plantes indique qu'à la 13^e session de son Comité, durant la discussion sur ce point, le Comité pour les plantes a proposé de faire part de ses observations au Groupe de travail sur les quotas d'exportation et a demandé à être tenu informé des progrès accomplis. Le Président du Comité pour les animaux suggère que le Comité pour les animaux fasse de même.

Le Comité propose de commenter les rapports du Groupe de travail sur les quotas d'exportation et demande à être tenu informé des activités du Groupe.

Le représentant de l'Asie et les observateurs de la Chine, des Etats-Unis de la Fédération de Russie et du Mexique sont intervenus au cours du débat.

8. Etude du commerce important de spécimens d'espèces inscrites à l'Annexe II

8.1 Introduction à la résolution Conf. 12.8 (AC19 Doc. 8.1)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour en faisant une présentation PowerPoint dont un exemplaire a été remis aux participants. Pour permettre l'achèvement du travail sur les taxons dont l'examen a commencé, le Comité décide de rapporter à sa 20^e session l'examen de nouvelles espèces à inclure dans l'Etude sur le commerce important. L'observateur du PNUE-WCMC note que le PNUE-WCMC pourrait produire, en collaboration avec TRAFFIC et l'UICN, une analyse complète et facile à utiliser de la base de données CITES sur le commerce avant la prochaine session du Comité pour les animaux.

L'observateur des Emirats arabes signale que son pays a préparé un rapport sur le commerce du faucon sacré (*Falco cherrug*); il demande au Comité d'envisager d'inclure cette espèce dans l'étude, conformément à la résolution Conf. 12.8, paragraphe c). Il note que 92% des faucons sacrés faisant l'objet d'un commerce sont capturés dans la nature dans 13 pays. Il ajoute que 6500 spécimens ont été exportés vers la région du Golfe sans les documents appropriés et que ce niveau de prélèvement est certainement non durable. Les représentants de l'Asie, de l'Europe et de l'Océanie, ainsi que l'observateur de la République tchèque, se déclarent favorables à l'étude du commerce de cette espèce. L'observateur de la Chine note qu'il s'agit d'une question d'application qui devrait être transmise au Comité permanent. Le Président demande aux Emirats arabes unis de soumettre ce rapport au Comité et au groupe de travail sur le commerce important (le groupe de travail 8).

Les observateurs des Pays-Bas et d'*International Wildlife Coalition* sont intervenus au cours du débat.

8.2 Examen de la mise en œuvre des recommandations (AC19 Doc. 8.2)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. TRAFFIC indique où en est la compilation des informations pour la base de données mentionnée dans le document AC19 Doc. 8.2, point 4. b), et précise que cette base de données sera disponible pour la 20^e session. A une question de l'observateur d'Israël concernant la disponibilité de la base de données sur Internet, l'observateur du PNUE-WCMC répond qu'un lien pourrait facilement être créé avec la base de données sur les espèces tenue par le PNUE-WCMC et disponible à partir du site de la CITES.

L'observatrice de la *Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society* suggère que le narval soit considéré comme espèce prioritaire. Elle note qu'il n'y a plus eu d'étude sur l'état des populations de cette espèce depuis 1979 et que le volume du commerce dont elle fait l'objet augmente. L'observateur du Canada signale que bien qu'aucune étude sur l'état de l'espèce n'ait été faite dans l'Arctique, son pays a passé un accord bilatéral avec le Groenland, qui en a évalué les effectifs en 1999. Le Président renvoie la question du narval à la 20^e session, au cours de laquelle le Comité envisagera les nouvelles espèces à inclure dans l'Etude du commerce important.

Le Comité prend note du rapport de TRAFFIC et décide de reporter la discussion à sa 20^e session.

Les observateurs des Etats-Unis et de *Species Survival Network* sont intervenus au cours du débat.

8.3 Progrès accomplis dans l'étude du commerce important (Phases IV et V) (AC19 Doc. 8.3)

Le Secrétariat présente la partie du document AC19 Doc. 8.3 relative à *Strombus gigas*. TRAFFIC présente l'annexe à ce document. L'observateur d'*International Wildlife Coalition* félicite TRAFFIC pour son rapport mais note qu'il aurait mieux valu adopter une approche régionale et ne pas exclure les Etats de l'aire de répartition les moins préoccupants.

Le Comité établit un groupe de travail (le groupe de travail 3) chargé d'examiner les informations communiquées dans le rapport de TRAFFIC ainsi que les catégories provisoires d'espèces, et de formuler des recommandations. Ce groupe comprend:

- a) des représentants régionaux: M. Mohammad Pourkazemi (Asie, président) et M. Sixto Incháustegui (Amérique centrale et du Sud et Caraïbes);
- b) des observateurs de Parties: Etats-Unis, France, Mexique et Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord;
- c) des observateurs d'organisations intergouvernementales et non gouvernementales: *World Bank International Finance Corporation* et TRAFFIC;
- d) le Secrétariat.

Le Président du groupe de travail 3 présente le document AC19 WG3 Doc. 1. Le représentant de l'Amérique centrale et du Sud et Caraïbes félicite le groupe de travail pour son travail. En tant que citoyen de la République dominicaine, l'un des pays classé dans la Catégorie 1, il prie le Secrétariat d'aider les pays de la Catégorie 1 à élaborer et adopter des mesures pour garantir le succès de la gestion de cette espèce. Le Comité adopte les recommandations du groupe énoncées dans le document AC19 WG3 Doc. 1, en y ajoutant au paragraphe 1 de l'annexe 1, sur recommandation de l'observateur des Pays-Bas, l'alinéa g) suivant: « Montrer que les paragraphes 2. a) et 2. b) ci-dessous ont été mis en œuvre ».

Le Secrétariat présente ensuite la partie du document relative à la situation des taxons sélectionnés pour l'étude depuis la CdP11. Après une intervention du représentant de l'Asie, le Comité décide d'établir un groupe de travail sur le commerce important (le groupe de travail 8) auquel il renvoie cette question.

8.4 Progrès accomplis dans la première étude du commerce important par pays (AC19 Doc. 8.4)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. L'observatrice de Madagascar fait état des progrès accomplis. Elle apporte une correction à la dernière phrase du point 11 du document AC19 Doc. 8.4, qui devient:

Entre-temps, l'organe de gestion de Madagascar ne délivre pas de permis d'exportation pour les espèces faisant l'objet de quotas annuels communiqués au Secrétariat tant que l'autorité scientifique n'a pas réuni des informations sur les installations des exportateurs. Lorsque ces informations ont été évaluées et analysées, les quotas sont alloués entre ces exportateurs comme approprié et les permis sont délivrés.

L'observateur des Etats-Unis demande une copie du rapport sur le compte-rendu de l'atelier. Le Secrétariat se déclare prêt à fournir une copie de ce rapport afin d'assurer la transparence du processus. Les observateurs de *Pro Wildlife* et d'IWMC se déclarent préoccupés par le volume du commerce de certaines espèces exportées de Madagascar ; IWMC prie le Secrétariat d'envoyer une nouvelle notification aux Parties avec la liste des espèces qui ne peuvent pas faire l'objet d'un commerce avec Madagascar. Le Secrétariat répond qu'il impose déjà un volume de travail considérable à l'organe de gestion de Madagascar et qu'il faut d'abord le laisser finir le plan d'action.

Le Comité décide de reporter la discussion à sa 20^e session.

Les observateurs de la République tchèque, de l'Espagne, de la République-Unie de Tanzanie, des Etats-Unis et du *Species Survival Network* sont intervenus au cours du débat.

8.5 Evaluation de l'étude du commerce important..... (AC19 Doc. 8.5)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour, notant qu'un groupe de travail de la 13^e session du Comité pour les plantes a lui aussi examiné cette question et que son rapport figure dans le document PC13 WG4 Doc. 1. L'observateur de *Defenders of Wildlife* indique qu'il n'a pas pu participer au groupe de travail et espère qu'un processus de consultation publique pourra être inclus dans l'évaluation.

Le Comité renvoie cette question au groupe de travail sur le commerce important.

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

L'observateur des Etats-Unis présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. Il invite le Comité à examiner les annexes du document AC19 Doc. 8.6. L'observateur de la Fédération de Russie signale son désaccord avec certaines hypothèses figurant dans les documents soumis par les Etats-Unis et ajoute que même si leurs effectifs sont bas, les populations sont stables. Il note que le braconnage n'est peut-être pas la seule cause du déclin des effectifs et qu'il existe peut-être un cycle naturel des populations, puisque les effectifs étaient déjà faibles au début des années 1900. Le Secrétariat rappelle qu'en juin 2001, le Comité permanent a recommandé aux Parties de ne plus autoriser d'importations de spécimens de saïgas (*Saiga tatarica*) de la Fédération de Russie et du Kazakhstan tant que ces deux Etats de l'aire de répartition n'auraient pas pris de dispositions, y compris l'élaboration et la mise en oeuvre d'une stratégie régionale de conservation. L'observatrice du WWF International indique qu'en 2002, le WWF a financé un atelier sur cette question et pour traiter le grave déclin des populations. Elle signale l'existence d'un braconnage pour les cornes, qui sont utilisées en médecine traditionnelle. Elle propose de renvoyer la question au Comité permanent. L'observateur d'IFAW-*International Fund for Animal Welfare* note qu'avant la désintégration de l'Union soviétique, des mesures de protection très strictes avaient entraîné une augmentation des effectifs mais que depuis, le braconnage a recommencé.

Le Comité renvoie cette question au groupe de travail sur le commerce important.

En conséquence, le Comité charge le groupe de travail sur le commerce important d'aborder les points 8.3 (sauf *Strombus gigas*), 8.5 et 8.6 de l'ordre du jour. Ce groupe comprend:

- a) une représentante régionale: Mme Katalin Rodics (Europe);
- b) des observateurs de Parties: Canada, Chine, Emirats arabes unis, Espagne, Etats-Unis, Fédération de Russie et Iran;
- c) des observateurs d'organisations intergouvernementales et non gouvernementales: Commission européenne, IFAW-*International Fund for Animal Welfare*, *International Wildlife Coalition*, *Nabu Naturschutzbund Deutschland E.V.*, *Species Survival Network* et TRAFFIC;
- d) le Président du Comité pour les animaux (président);
- e) le Secrétariat.

Le Président du groupe de travail 8 sur les spécimens d'espèces de l'Annexe II présente le document AC19 WG8 Doc. 1, y compris la recommandation demandant l'intégration du faucon sacré dans l'Etude sur le commerce important, immédiatement et en tant que cas exceptionnel. Concernant les esturgeons, l'observateur de la Fédération de Russie note qu'*Acipenser persicus* (voir page 10 du document AC19 WG8 Doc. 1) se trouve en petit nombre dans toute la mer Caspienne, mais que seul l'Iran le pêche.

Le Comité adopte les recommandations du groupe énoncées dans le document AC19 WG8 Doc. 1, en apportant une modification dans la partie sur la saïga (*Saiga tatarica*) : une nouvelle phrase est

ajoutée à la dernière puce de la page 12, sous « Le Groupe de travail convient »: « Un programme scientifique à l'appui de la conservation et de la gestion du saïga devrait être élaboré et lancé dès que possible ».

9. Révision des critères d'amendement des Annexes I et II (AC19 Doc. 9)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. La Présidente du Comité pour les plantes expose la démarche adoptée par son Comité, indiquée dans le document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev. 1). Les représentants de l'Amérique du Nord et de l'Océanie, et les observateurs de la Chine, des Etats-Unis, du Mexique et du Royaume-Uni appuient cette démarche. Les observateurs du Canada et du Royaume-Uni estiment quant à eux que les espèces controversées ne devraient pas être sélectionnées pour tester les critères d'inscription proposés, et l'observateur de *Defenders of Wildlife* demande que la sélection inclue des espèces sur lesquelles les données sont insuffisantes.

Le Comité pour les animaux convient de suivre la même démarche que celle du Comité pour les plantes. Il établit un groupe de travail (le groupe de travail 1) chargé de sélectionner les taxons qui seront utilisés pour tester les critères d'inscription figurant dans le texte du président (document AC19 Doc. 9, annexe), en tenant compte du calendrier adopté par le Comité pour les plantes.

Le Président annonce la composition du groupe de travail 1:

- a) un représentant régional: M. Rod Hay (Océanie);
- b) des observateurs de Parties: Allemagne, Canada, Chili, Chine, Etats-Unis (Président), Japon, Mexique, Norvège, Pays-Bas, République de Corée, Suisse et Zimbabwe;
- c) des observateurs d'organisations intergouvernementales et non gouvernementales: Commission européenne, *International Wildlife Coalition*, PNUE-WCMC, Safari Club International, TRAFFIC, UICN, *Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies*, et WWF International.

Le Président du groupe de travail 1 présente le document AC19 WG1 Doc. 1. Plusieurs observateurs qui n'ont pas participé au groupe de travail proposent de contribuer aux études sur les espèces. Le Président du Comité pour les animaux demande que tous les commentaires sur les noms scientifiques utilisés dans le document soient transmis directement au Président du groupe de travail, puisque les travaux se poursuivront entre les sessions. Il ajoute que les participants souhaitant désigner une espèce à inclure dans la liste devront contacter le Président du groupe de travail 1. Le Comité adopte les recommandations du groupe telles qu'elles figurent dans le document AC19 WG1 Doc. 1.

10. Examen périodique des espèces inscrites aux annexes (AC19 Doc. 10)

Le Secrétariat présente le document AC19 Doc. 10 et note qu'il y a deux questions principales, l'une sur l'obligation pour le Comité pour les animaux d'entreprendre un examen général périodique des espèces animales inscrites aux annexes, et l'autre sur l'examen spécifique des établissements élevant des crocodiliens en ranch.

Cette dernière question est évoquée par l'observateur du Groupe CSE/UICN de spécialistes des crocodiliens, sur la base de l'annexe du document AC19 Inf. 3. Le Comité félicite ce Groupe pour sa proposition et lui recommande de rechercher des fonds pour la réaliser, et d'adapter son calendrier aux décisions qui seront prises à la CdP13.

Les représentants de l'Amérique du Nord, de l'Asie et de l'Océanie, ainsi que les observateurs des Etats-Unis d'Amérique, de *Defenders of Wildlife*, d'*International Wildlife Coalition* et du WWF International sont intervenus au cours du débat.

10.1 Examen périodique des espèces inscrites aux annexes (AC19 Doc. 10.1)

Le Président du Groupe de contact sur l'examen des annexes présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. La Présidente du Comité pour les plantes note que le groupe de contact sur cette question a prié son Comité de lui fournir des informations à incorporer dans ce document, et que d'autres membres ont été désignés à la 13^e session du Comité pour les plantes pour faire partie du groupe de contact. Comme indiqué à la 13^e session du Comité pour les plantes, le

groupe se compose des représentants de l’Afrique (John Donaldson et Quentin Luke) et de l’Océanie (Greg Leach), et des observateurs des Etats-Unis (Javier Alvarez, président) et du PNUE-WCMC (Gerardo Fragoso), de l’observateur de l’Espagne au Comité pour les animaux (Carlos Ibero), ainsi que du Président du Comité pour les animaux et de la Présidente du Comité pour les plantes.

Le Comité adopte la démarche exposée dans le document AC19 Doc. 10.1 et convient d’examiner à sa 20^e session le travail accompli par le groupe de contact. L’observateur du Mexique note que plusieurs examens sont en cours dans son pays et que celui-ci ne souhaite pas interrompre le processus dans lequel il a déjà investi beaucoup d’argent. Le Comité note que quelques examens sont en cours mais convient de ne pas en entreprendre de nouveaux avant la CdP13.

11. Enregistrement et suivi des établissements élevant en captivité à des fins commerciales des espèces animales inscrites à l’Annexe I

11.1 Procédure d’enregistrement des établissements (AC19 Doc. 11.1)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l’ordre du jour, notant qu’il couvre en partie le point 11.2. L’observateur des Etats-Unis note que la procédure prévoit le rejet d’un établissement et que le petit nombre d’établissements enregistrés ne représente pas un échec mais un succès. L’observateur des Pays-Bas demande pourquoi le Secrétariat considère que le chiffre de 99 établissements enregistrés est faible. Le Secrétariat répond qu’il a reçu peu de demandes d’enregistrement, qu’elles concernaient les mêmes espèces et les mêmes pays, et qu’elles ont pratiquement toutes été acceptées. Le Secrétariat déclare qu’il y a un nombre beaucoup plus grand d’établissements d’élevage en captivité à des fins commerciales et d’éleveurs amateurs élevant, en Europe et aux Etats-Unis, des spécimens d’espèces inscrites à l’Annexe I. Il estime donc que le petit nombre d’établissements enregistrés constitue un problème et souhaite que les organes de gestion recourent plus largement à la procédure d’enregistrement.

Le Comité établit un groupe de travail intersessions (le groupe de travail 5) chargé d’aborder les différents aspects de la décision 12.78 et de commenter le projet de notification aux Parties figurant dans le document AC19 Doc. 11.1, annexe 1. Ce groupe comprend:

- a) un représentant régional: M. Choo-Hoo Giam (Asie);
- b) des observateurs de Parties: Afrique du Sud, Canada, Chili (Président), Chine, Espagne, Fédération de Russie, Israël, Japon, Mexique, Pays-Bas et République tchèque;
- c) des observateurs d’organisations intergouvernementales et non gouvernementales: *American Zoo and Aquarium Association, Animal Exhibitors Alliance, Animals Asia Foundation, Birds International Avicultural Park Breeding and Research Centre, IWMC, Species Survival Network* et UICN.

Le Président indique que d’autres Parties et organisations peuvent encore participer aux groupes de travail intersessions.

Le Président du groupe de travail 5 présente le document AC19 WG5 Doc. 1. Le Comité adopte le texte de la notification aux Parties figurant dans le document AC19 Doc. 11.1, annexe 1, en y apportant les modifications mentionnées dans le document AC19 WG5 Doc. 1, et prie le Secrétariat de l’envoyer aux Parties.

11.2 Relation entre la production *ex situ* et la conservation *in situ* (AC19 Doc. 11.2)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l’ordre du jour et renvoie les participants au document AC19 Inf. 5, préparé par l’UICN. Les observateurs des Etats-Unis, d’Israël et du Royaume-Uni, et celui du WWF US, conviennent que cette question est importante et nécessite un groupe de travail distinct, qui devrait inclure des Etats d’aires de répartition et le secteur commercial. Le représentant de l’Amérique du Nord, notant que très peu de pays d’origine ou de pays de la région néotropicale sont représentés à la 19^e session du Comité, recommande que le groupe de

travail agisse entre les sessions. Le Comité établit un groupe de travail intersessions (le groupe de travail 2) chargé d'aborder les différents aspects de la décision 11.102 (Rev. CoP12).

Ce groupe comprend:

- a) un représentant régional: M. Rodrigo Medellín (Amérique du Nord, Président);
- b) des observateurs de Parties: Canada, Chili, Emirats arabes unis, Fédération de Russie, Mexique, Royaume-Uni et Zimbabwe;
- c) des observateurs d'organisations intergouvernementales et non gouvernementales: *Animal Welfare Institute, Defenders of Wildlife, International Elephant Foundation, IFAW-International Fund for Animal Welfare, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd., Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, UICN, World Association of Zoos and Aquariums* et WWF US.

Le Président du groupe de travail 2 présente le document AC19 WG2 Doc. 1 et invite l'observateur d'*International Wildlife Coalition* à préparer une définition de la production *in situ* et de la conservation *ex situ*. L'observateur du Mexique propose de soumettre d'autres espèces et de mener une étude de cas. Le Comité adopte les recommandations du groupe énoncées dans le document AC19 WG2 Doc. 1, en apportant les modifications suivantes à l'annexe 2, paragraphe 6. X, proposées par le Président du groupe de travail:

- a) la première ligne devient: « Effets des établissements *ex situ* sur la conservation *in situ* de l'espèce »;
- b) l'alinéa g devient: « Autres effets des établissements *ex situ* sur la conservation *in situ* de l'espèce »;
- c) la questions suivante est ajoutée à l'alinéa h: « Y a-t-il des preuves indiquant que l'élevage en captivité favorise le commerce licite ou illicite des spécimens sauvages ou qu'il le réduise? ».

12. Transport des animaux vivants (AC19 Doc. 12)

La Présidente du Groupe de travail sur le transport (GTT) présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. Elle indique que l'étude sur la mortalité durant le transport citée au point 10 du document AC19 Doc. 12 peut être obtenue auprès de l'organe de gestion CITES de l'Allemagne; elle précise que l'étude est résumée dans le document AC19 Inf. 4. La Présidente du GTT informe le Comité qu'elle quittera prochainement son poste et elle remercie le Comité pour les animaux, les membres du GTT, le Secrétariat et tous ceux qui ont apporté leur assistance et une contribution au Groupe. La Présidente la félicite, elle et son groupe, pour le travail accompli.

Le Comité décide que le Groupe de travail sur le transport (le groupe de travail 10) établira un programme de travail.

La *Humane Society of the United States*, la *Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals* et la Société mondiale pour la protection des animaux ayant demandé à participer au groupe de travail, le Président les prie de se réunir et de désigner un ou deux représentants. Le Comité note toutefois que le Groupe de travail sur le transport devra peut-être être restructuré et que la décision finale sur la composition incombera au président.

Ce groupe de travail comprend:

- a) une représentante régionale: Mme Katalin Rodics (Europe, Présidente);
- b) des observateurs de Parties: Autriche, Fédération de Russie, Israël, République tchèque et République-Unie de Tanzanie;
- c) des observateurs d'organisations intergouvernementales et non gouvernementales: *American Zoo and Aquarium Association, Animal Exhibitors Alliance, Fund for Animals, Humane Society of the United States*, la *Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals*, Société

mondiale pour la protection des animaux *Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, Pro Wildlife, UICN, Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society*, et *World Association of Zoos and Aquariums*.

Le Président par intérim du Groupe de travail sur le transport présente le document AC19 WG10 Doc. 1 et annonce que le représentant de l'Autriche (Peter Linhart) vient d'être désigné président du groupe. L'observateur de l'Afrique du Sud prie le groupe de travail d'étudier la question de la baisse de la mortalité. Le Comité adopte les recommandations du groupe figurant dans le document AC19 WG10 Doc. 1.

13. Commerce des coraux durs (AC19 Doc. 13)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. Le Comité établit un groupe de travail intersessions (le groupe de travail 11) chargé d'envisager et de recommander un moyen pratique de distinguer les coraux fossilisés des coraux non fossilisés dans le commerce international. Ce groupe comprend:

- a) un représentant régional: M. Rod Hay (Océanie);
- b) des observateurs de Parties: Etats-Unis, Royaume-Uni (le Président) et Suisse;
- c) des observateurs d'organisations non gouvernementales: *European Pet Organization, Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd.* et *Ornamental Fish International*.

Les principaux pays producteurs et organisations commerciales engagés dans l'exportation de coraux qui ne sont pas représentés à la 19^e session du Comité seront aussi autorisés à participer au groupe de travail intersessions.

Le Président du groupe de travail 11 présente ensuite le document AC19 WG11 Doc. 1, notant que le groupe de travail 11 réfléchira à la possibilité de reconstituer le Groupe de travail sur les coraux durs tel qu'il existait à l'origine. Le Comité adopte les recommandations du groupe figurant dans ce document.

14. Contrôle des systèmes de production de l'élevage en captivité et en ranch et des prélèvements dans la nature pour les espèces inscrites à l'Annexe II (AC19 Doc. 14)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. L'observateur de l'UICN présente le document AC19 Inf. 6, notant que l'UICN souhaite que le Comité pour les animaux contribue au rapport final. La Présidente du Comité pour les plantes note que le Comité a recommandé d'attendre que le rapport soit terminé avant de prendre une décision. L'observateur des Pays-Bas indique qu'il souhaite aussi que le rapport soit terminé avant de prendre une décision.

Le représentant de l'Amérique du Nord note que ce document a considérablement progressé mais qu'un tableau décrivant brièvement les différents systèmes de production et les espèces concernées aurait été un complément utile. Les observateurs de l'Afrique du Sud et de la République-Unie de Tanzanie indiquent qu'il y a des systèmes de production dans leur pays, que la production d'animaux sauvages continue de s'améliorer et que les définitions actuelles de la production créent une confusion pour les organes de gestion.

L'observateur du Royaume-Uni note qu'à la 18^e session du Comité, le Groupe de travail sur les coraux avait demandé la création de codes de source supplémentaires couvrant la mariculture et l'élevage de coraux ; il estime que cette question est importante et doit être abordée, de même que les préoccupations communes du Comité pour les animaux et du Comité pour les plantes.

Les observateurs des Etats-Unis et d'Israël notent qu'outre les systèmes de production, le rapport couvre un grand nombre de questions très différentes, et qu'il faudrait les aborder à la présente session. L'observateur d'*International Wildlife Coalition* demande qu'on fasse preuve de simplicité et de clarté dans les définitions relatives aux systèmes de production, et l'observateur de *Pro Wildlife* demande une meilleure application des systèmes existants. L'observateur de *Defenders of Wildlife* souligne la nécessité de considérer l'impact des nouveaux codes pour les autorités chargées de la lutte contre la fraude qui se trouvent en première ligne. L'observateur de *Project Seahorse* rappelle la nécessité de garder à l'esprit les effets des spécimens élevés en captivité sur les populations sauvages.

Le Comité établit un groupe de travail (le groupe de travail 4) chargé d'examiner les propositions figurant dans le document AC19 Inf. 6. Ce groupe comprend:

- a) des représentants régionaux: M. Edson Chidziya (Afrique, Président) et Mme Katalin Rodics (Europe);
- b) des observateurs de Parties: Afrique du Sud, Allemagne, Etats-Unis, Israël, Madagascar, Pays-Bas et République-Unie de Tanzanie;
- c) des observateurs d'organisations intergouvernementales et non gouvernementales: *European Pet Organization*, *Pro Wildlife*, UICN, *World Conservation Trust* et *World Parrot Trust*.

Le Président du groupe de travail 4 présente le document AC19 WG4 Doc. 1. Il note que la discussion n'est pas close et invite les participants à prendre la parole. Le représentant de l'Asie et les observateurs de l'Afrique du Sud, des Etats-Unis et du Royaume-Uni interviennent. Le représentant de l'Amérique du Nord note qu'une matrice de données avait été préparée pour une session antérieure du Comité, indiquant les différents codes en usage et leurs caractéristiques; il ajoute que cette matrice pourrait être élargie et utilisée par le groupe de travail. Le Comité adopte les recommandations du groupe figurant dans le document AC19 WG4 Doc. 1.

15. Conservation et commerce des tortues d'eau douce et des tortues terrestres

15.1 Traiter les recommandations de l'atelier de Kunming (AC19 Doc. 15.1)

L'observateur des Etats-Unis présente ce point de l'ordre du jour en indiquant que l'annexe du document AC19 Doc. 15.1 aidera le Comité à établir les priorités parmi les recommandations de l'atelier de Kunming. Après les interventions des observateurs de WAZA et d'IWMC, le Comité décide d'établir un Groupe de travail sur les tortues d'eau douce et les tortues terrestres (le groupe de travail 6) auquel il renvoie cette question.

15.2 Préparation de mesures de conservation à moyen et à long termes pour les tortues terrestres et les tortues d'eau douce [AC19 Doc. 15.2 (Rev. 1)]

L'observateur de l'Allemagne présente ce point de l'ordre du jour et exprime sa satisfaction pour les commentaires et la contribution du Comité aux annexes 1 et 2 du document AC19 Doc. 15.2 (Rev. 1). Le Président note que c'est un document intéressant qui contient des informations sur des questions controversées. Après les interventions des observateurs d'*International Wildlife Coalition* et de *Pro Wildlife*, le Comité renvoie cette question au groupe de travail sur les tortues d'eau douce et les tortues terrestres (le groupe de travail 6).

15.3 Application de la résolution Conf. 11.9 (Rev. CoP12) et des décisions 12.41, 12.42 et 12.43) (AC19 Doc. 15.3)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour en notant que le groupe de travail sur les tortues d'eau douce et les tortues terrestres pourrait mettre à jour, clarifier et classer par ordre de priorité les recommandations de l'atelier de Kunming, et qu'il pourrait aussi préparer un mandat pour l'étude de la tortue de Tornier (*Malacochersus tornieri*). Les observateurs des Pays-Bas et de la République-Unie de Tanzanie notent que le Comité pour les animaux s'est rendu en mission en République-Unie de Tanzanie pour étudier la production et l'exportation de tortues et qu'une partie du travail a donc déjà été accomplie. Le Secrétariat indique qu'il mettra le rapport de mission à la disposition des participants mais que ce point de l'ordre du jour concerne les évaluations de l'état, le contrôle et la production de tortues de Tornier dans tous les Etats de l'aire de répartition de l'espèce. Le Comité renvoie cette question au groupe de travail 6.

Les observateurs d'*European Pet Organisation* et de *Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council* ayant demandé à participer au groupe de travail, le Président les prie de se réunir et de désigner un représentant.

Le groupe de travail sur les tortues d'eau douce et les tortues terrestres comprend:

- a) un représentant régional: M. Michael Griffin (Afrique, Président);

- b) des observateurs de Parties: Allemagne, Chine, Etats-Unis, Malaisie, Pays-Bas, République-Unie de Tanzanie, Slovénie et Suisse;
- c) des observateurs d'organisations intergouvernementales et non gouvernementales: *Chelonian Research Foundation*, *European Pet Organisation*, *IFAW-International Fund for Animal Welfare*, *Pro Wildlife*, *TRAFFIC*, *UICN*, *World Association of Zoos and Aquarium* et *WWF US*.

Le Président du groupe de travail 6 présente le document AC19 WG6 Doc. 1. L'observateur du Japon indique qu'il n'approuve pas les recommandations du groupe de travail si l'alinéa 2. a) i) de ce document concerne l'inscription d'espèces non menacées. Le Secrétariat se déclare préoccupé de ce que les recommandations du groupe de travail 6 n'abordent pas tous les points soulevés dans la décision 12.43. Le Comité prend note de ces commentaires et adopte les recommandations du groupe énoncées dans le document AC19 WG6 Doc. 1 en apportant au paragraphe 1 les modifications suivantes, recommandées par les observateurs des Pays-Bas et de la République-Unie de Tanzanie:

- a) l'alinéa a) devient « Recommande que la question de l'identification génétique des populations sauvages séparées et des individus élevés en ferme de l'espèce *Malacochersus tornieri* soit étudiée afin de répondre à la préoccupation du Kenya concernant le contrôle inadéquat du cheptel reproducteur tanzanien »;
- b) l'alinéa b) devient « Recommande que les institutions appropriées soient incitées à proposer d'entreprendre une telle étude, et que l'institution retenue contacte l'organe de gestion et l'autorité scientifique locaux pour trouver des sources fiables de matériel génétique »; et
- c) l'alinéa d) devient « Recommande que les pays ayant indiqué qu'ils sont eux aussi des Etats de l'aire de répartition de cette espèce (Ouganda, Mozambique et Zambie) en fournissent la preuve détaillée ».

Le représentant de l'Asie demande combien d'espèces de tortues d'eau douce et de tortues terrestres ne sont toujours pas inscrites aux annexes; l'observateur de la *Chelonian Research Foundation* répond qu'il n'en reste qu'un petit pourcentage mais que les espèces concernées pourraient être menacées car elles sont des « espèces semblables ».

16. Hippocampes et autres membres de la famille des syngnathidés

16.1 Application de l'inscription d'*Hippocampus* spp. à l'Annexe II (AC19 Doc. 16.1)

L'observateur des Etats-Unis présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. L'observateur du Mexique propose que l'atelier technique ait lieu dans son pays. L'observateur de *Project Seahorse* note qu'il pourrait fournir une contribution technique à l'atelier. Le Comité renvoie cette question au Groupe de travail sur les syngnathidés (le groupe de travail 7).

16.2 Limite universelle de taille minimale pour les hippocampes (AC19 Doc. 16.2)

La présidente du Groupe de travail sur les syngnathidés présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. Le Secrétariat rappelle que la décision 12.56 invite l'Organisation mondiale des douanes (OMD) à mettre au point des codes harmonisés pour les hippocampes vivants, les hippocampes séchés, les syngnathes (et autres syngnathidés) vivants et les syngnathes (et autres syngnathidés) séchés. Le Secrétariat indique qu'il a contacté l'OMD, qui a demandé des informations supplémentaires. Le Secrétariat demande l'assistance du groupe de travail pour répondre aux questions de l'OMD et indique qu'il mettra la correspondance pertinente à disposition. Le Président du Comité pour les animaux indique qu'il mettra à la disposition du groupe de travail les documents qui lui seront fournis par les éleveurs d'hippocampes.

Le Comité renvoie cette question au Groupe de travail sur les syngnathidés en lui recommandant de prendre en considération les questions soulevées au point 16.1. de l'ordre du jour. Ce groupe de travail comprend à présent:

- a) des représentants régionaux: M. Choo-Hoo Giam (Asie) et M. Rod Hay (Océanie);

- b) des observateurs de Parties: Afrique du Sud, Chine, Etats-Unis, Grèce, Mexique et République de Corée;
- c) des observateurs d'organisations intergouvernementales et non gouvernementales: IFAW-*International Fund for Animal Welfare*, *Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd.*, *Ornamental Fish International*, *Project Seahorse* (présidente), *Swan International* et UICN.

La présidente du groupe de travail 7 présente le document AC19 WG7 Doc. 1. L'observateur du Japon note qu'il conviendrait d'établir des limites de taille minimale pour chaque espèce et que, de manière générale, il faudrait que les questions élémentaires de gestion et d'application aient été résolues avant d'inscrire une espèce aux annexes de la CITES. Le Comité adopte les recommandations du groupe énoncées dans le document AC19 WG7 Doc. 1, étant entendu que le Comité pourra rechercher d'autres moyens d'entreprendre la recherche recommandée.

17. Conservation et commerce des concombres de mer des familles Holothuridae et Stichopodidae (AC19 Doc. 17)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour, notant que la décision 12.60, à l'adresse du Comité pour les animaux, ne pourra pas être mise en œuvre tant que la décision 12.61, à l'adresse du Secrétariat, ne sera pas appliquée. L'observateur du Japon note que la FAO organise en Chine en octobre 2003 une réunion sur les concombres de mer et suggère que Secrétariat collabore avec la FAO sur cette question.

Le Comité établit un groupe de travail chargé d'examiner les objectifs et l'ordre du jour de l'atelier proposé et la participation à cet atelier (groupe de travail 9). Ce groupe de travail comprend:

- a) des représentants régionaux: M. Choo-Hoo Giam (Asie) et M. Rod Hay (Océanie, Président),
- b) des observateurs de Parties: Chine, Etats-Unis, Japon, Mexique, République de Corée et République-Unie de Tanzanie;
- c) des observateurs d'organisations intergouvernementales et non gouvernementales: *Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association Ltd.*, *Ornamental Fish International*, *Project Seahorse*, *Swan International*, TRAFFIC et UICN.

Le Président du groupe de travail 9 présente le document AC19 WG9 Doc. 1 et indique que le PNUE-WCMC devrait être contacté car il dispose de nombreuses informations sur ce groupe d'espèces. L'observateur du Mexique signale qu'un atelier technique sur la conservation et la gestion des hippocampes a été proposé pour fin 2003 ou début 2004. Le Comité adopte les recommandations du groupe énoncées dans le document AC19 WG9 Doc. 1.

18. Situation des requins aux plans biologique et commercial

18.1 Progrès accomplis par les Etats-Unis d'Amérique dans l'élaboration et la mise en œuvre du PAI-requins (AC19 Doc. 18.1)

Les observateurs des Etats-Unis présentent ce point de l'ordre du jour. Le représentant de l'Asie indique que neuf pays de sa région ont participé à une réunion technique régionale sur les pêches, dont les résultats seront publiés avant la CdP13. Le représentant de l'Afrique du Sud annonce que son pays a préparé un avant-projet qui doit encore être peaufiné avant d'être soumis à la FAO. Le Comité établit un groupe de travail sur les requins (le groupe de travail 12) auquel il renvoie cette question.

18.2 Application de la résolution Conf. 12.6 et de la décision 12.47 (AC19 Doc. 18.2)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. Le Président signale que conformément à la décision 12.47, il a pris contact avec la FAO, qui a accepté de le tenir informé des progrès accomplis. Le Secrétariat demande que le Comité passe en revue toutes les informations disponibles et fasse des recommandations au niveau de l'espèce. Le Comité renvoie la question au groupe de travail 12.

18.3 Progrès accomplis par le Japon dans l'élaboration et la mise en œuvre du PAI-requins..... (AC19 Doc. 18.3)

L'observateur du Japon présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. L'observatrice des Etats-Unis se déclare satisfaite du rapport du Japon et fait remarquer que l'inscription des espèces de requins aux annexes CITES n'interdit pas le commerce mais le réglemente. Elle constate que les Etats-Unis n'interdisent pas le débarquement des requins entiers (avec les nageoires intactes), encourageant ainsi l'utilisation de l'animal entier. Le Secrétariat renvoie le Comité au document AC19 Inf. 7 en ce qui concerne le point de l'ordre du jour 18. L'observateur de l'UICN indique que son organisation et TRAFFIC publieront prochainement un rapport sur l'état et le commerce international des requins. Le Comité renvoie la question au groupe de travail 12.

Le groupe de travail 12 comprend:

- a) un représentant régional: M. Choo-Hoo Giam (Asie);
- b) des observateurs de Parties: Chine, Etats-Unis, Grèce, Japon, République de Corée et Royaume-Uni;
- c) des observateurs d'organisations intergouvernementales et non gouvernementales: Commission européenne, *Defenders of Wildlife*, IFAW-*International Fund for Animal Welfare*, NABU Naturschutzbund Deutschland E.V, TRAFFIC, UICN, *WildAid* et WWF R.-U.

Le Président note que le groupe devra nommer son président.

L'observateur de la Commission européenne, que le groupe de travail 12 a désigné comme son président, présente le document AC19 WG12 Doc. 1. L'observateur du Japon rend hommage au groupe de travail 12 pour son action constante et ses travaux, estimant toutefois que le groupe devrait envisager sérieusement d'appuyer la gestion des espèces de requins au lieu de se contenter de recommander l'inscription de toutes les espèces de requins aux annexes CITES. Le Comité adopte les recommandations du groupe énoncées dans le document AC19 WG12 Doc. 1, y compris le projet de notification aux Parties figurant à l'annexe 1.

19. Commerce des espèces exotiques (pas de document)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour en rappelant que la décision 10.76 demande au Comité pour les animaux de coopérer avec le Groupe CSE/UICN de spécialistes des espèces envahissantes (GSEE) à la mise en œuvre de son document *Draft IUCN Guidelines for the Prevention of Biodiversity Loss due to Biological Invasion*. Le représentant de l'Océanie, en tant qu'intermédiaire entre le Comité pour les animaux et le GSEE, note que les progrès accomplis dans la préparation d'une liste des espèces CITES envahissantes ont été lents mais que les lignes directrices de l'UICN sont à présent terminées et disponibles en anglais, en espagnol et en français sur le site <http://www.issg.org>. L'observateur du Mexique note que la question des mesures *in situ* recommandées pour l'importation d'espèces envahissantes serait mieux traitée par le biais de la Convention sur la diversité biologique. Le Comité recommande au représentant de l'Océanie de soumettre un document sur cette question à la 20^e session. Les observateurs du Chili, des Etats-Unis et d'Israël, ainsi que le Secrétariat, proposent de contribuer à la préparation de ce document.

20. Taxonomie et nomenclature normalisées

20.1 Rôle de la taxonomie et des références de nomenclature normalisées et amendement des annexes suite à des changements dans la nomenclature (AC19 Doc. 20.1)

Le Président présente ce point de l'ordre du jour expliquant que ce document a été discuté à la réunion du Comité de la nomenclature (faune) le 19 août. Le représentant de l'Amérique du Nord se déclare préoccupé par le manque de transparence du processus de décision du Comité de la nomenclature et recommande un examen du fonctionnement de ce Comité. Le zoologue du Comité de la nomenclature note que tous les documents préparés pour la Conférence des Parties l'ont été en respectant les délais établis par la CdP. Il note également qu'il n'a pas été possible de savoir à l'avance quelles espèces seraient proposées pour inscription aux annexes CITES et qu'il a fallu en tenir compte au moment de la formulation des recommandations

concernant la nomenclature. Il ajoute que le mandat du Comité de la nomenclature figure dans la résolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP12) et qu'il ne convient pas qu'un comité examine le mandat d'un autre comité. Le représentant de l'Amérique du Nord partage cette opinion, notant toutefois qu'il n'y a pas de représentation régionale au Comité de la nomenclature. Le représentant de l'Afrique recommande la prudence sur la question de la représentation régionale. L'observateur d'*International Wildlife Coalition* note qu'il pourrait s'agir d'un problème de perception, le Comité de la nomenclature n'ayant pas fait l'objet d'une grande attention par le passé. Il ajoute qu'une étude est nécessaire et qu'elle devrait passer par une révision de la résolution Conf.12.11.

Le Comité prend note du document.

20.2 Nomenclature normalisée pour les oiseaux (AC19 Doc. 20.2)

L'observateur du Mexique présente ce point de l'ordre du jour en expliquant que le document a été discuté à la réunion du Comité de la nomenclature (faune). Le zoologue de ce Comité fait observer que le problème concernant l'inscription scindée du complexe *Amazona ochrocephala-oratrix-auropalliata* n'est pas un problème de nomenclature mais d'identification. Il ajoute que le changement apporté à la référence normalisée pour les oiseaux intitulée *Handbook of the Birds of the World* au lieu de *Sibley and Munroe* est due au fait que *Handbook of the Birds of the World* est une publication plus récente et fournit des renseignements supplémentaires et utiles. Le Comité prend note du document et le Président propose que le Comité pour les animaux ou une Partie présente un document suggérant des moyens de traiter ce problème.

21. Autres questions

21.1 Projets de recherche (AC19 Doc. 20.1)

Le Président présente ce point de l'ordre du jour. Le Secrétariat encourage les Parties à soumettre des propositions de projets. Le représentant de l'Amérique du Nord s'en félicite et encourage les Parties à publier des monographies dans des revues approuvées par des collègues. Le Comité prend note du document en rappelant aux Parties la procédure énoncée dans la résolution Conf. 12.2 concernant l'approbation des projets à financement extrabudgétaire et en les priant instamment de soumettre des propositions de projets.

21.2 Commerce avec les Etats non-Parties à la Convention (pas de document)

L'observateur du Mexique présente ce point de l'ordre du jour en recommandant un examen de la procédure relative au commerce avec les Etats qui ne sont pas Parties à la CITES, à la lumière de l'expérience de son pays avec les îles Salomon pour les importations de dauphins. L'observateur de *Defenders of Wildlife* appuie cette recommandation. Le Secrétariat note qu'établir des exigences différentes en matière de commerce pour les Etats Parties à la CITES et les non-Parties pourrait entraîner des problèmes avec l'Organisation mondiale du commerce. Il note aussi que la résolution Conf. 9.5 offre des dispositions adéquates pour le commerce avec les Etats qui ne sont pas Parties à la CITES. Le représentant de l'Océanie estime que c'est peut-être plutôt une question de renforcement des capacités des Etats Parties et non-Parties à la Convention pour qu'elles soient capables d'émettre les avis de commerce non préjudiciable. Le Comité prend note des questions soulevées.

21.3 Rapport d'activité sur les manuels d'identification (pas de document)

Le Secrétariat présente ce point de l'ordre du jour, notant que document PC13 Doc. 17 contient une vue d'ensemble des progrès accomplis en ce qui concerne les manuels d'identification. L'observateur d'Israël demande si les fiches du manuel d'identification seront disponibles sur Internet. Le Secrétariat répond que cela est prévu, que ce travail a commencé. Le Comité prend note du rapport.

Le Président note que la date et le lieu de la prochaine session du Comité pour les animaux n'ont pas encore été confirmés. L'observateur des Etats-Unis demande que la session ait lieu au début de 2004 afin que les participants aient le temps de préparer les documents qui seront soumis à la CdP13.

L'observateur des Pays-Bas retire le document AC19 Inf. 8. A sa demande, le Secrétariat convient de fournir à la 20^e session du Comité, des informations concernant le coût des sessions du Comité tenues à divers endroits.

Le représentant de l'Asie note une sous-représentation des observateurs de la région de l'Asie du sud-est. Le représentant de l'Afrique indique que faute de fonds, plusieurs Parties de sa région n'ont pas pu venir à la présente session.

22. Remarques de clôture (pas de document)

Le Président remercie les membres du Comité pour les animaux et leurs suppléants, ainsi que les observateurs, pour la coopération et l'esprit constructif dont ils ont fait preuve pour parvenir aux décisions prises durant la présente session. Il remercie également le Secrétariat d'avoir organisé la session et les interprètes pour leur appui durant les travaux du Comité.

Au nom du Comité, le représentant de l'Océanie remercie le Président de l'efficacité et de la courtoisie dont il a fait preuve en assurant la présidence de la session.

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 with 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 approach 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.