

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



Twenty-sixth meeting of the Animals Committee  
Geneva (Switzerland), 15-20 March 2012 and Dublin (Ireland), 22-24 March 2012

SUMMARY RECORD

**Animals Committee matters**

1. Opening of the meeting

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed all participants, before giving the floor to the Secretary-General, who also welcomed everyone and introduced new members of the Secretariat's scientific team (Mr De Meulenaer and Ms Kwitsinskaia) and enforcement team (Ms Garcia Ferreira, Ms Jonsson and Mr van Rensburg). He wished the Committee well in its deliberations.

The Chair thanked the Secretary-General and invited suggestions as to how the Conference of the Parties could establish stronger measures to support the Committee as well as export countries, which deserved particular assistance.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.<sup>1</sup>

2. Rules of Procedure

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 2 and proposed amending Rule 22 as follows: "On request, the Secretariat shall distribute printed and translated documents...". The Secretariat explained that most members regularly indicated that they did not need printed copies and that this proposal was made to reduce costs. Although not opposed to the change in principle, a Party regretted that the suggestion had not been presented in the document, which would have given Parties time to consider it, and was concerned that this unannounced proposal might create a precedent.

Another Party asked a question on the procedure to accept observers, but the Chair invited it to raise this topic under agenda item 4 on *Admission of observers*.

The Committee had no objection to the proposed amendment from the Secretariat but considered that it should have been made in the document and not just in session. To avoid setting a precedent, it invited the Secretariat to make this proposal at its 27th meeting, but this time by the deadline for submitting documents. The Committee otherwise confirmed the validity of the Rules of Procedure in the Annex to document AC26 Doc. 2.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Europe (Mr Fleming) and Oceania (Mr Robertson), and by China and Mexico.

---

<sup>1</sup> As the Chair of the Animals Committee and the Secretariat intervened on all items not discussed in joint session with the Plants Committee, their names are not included in the lists of speakers at the end of those items.

### 3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme

#### 3.1 Agenda

The participants had no comment on document AC26 Doc. 3.1 and the Chair referred Indonesia to agenda item 3.2 for a question on the working programme.

The Committee adopted the agenda in document AC26 Doc. 3.1.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

#### 3.2 Working programme

The Chair introduced document AC26 Doc. 3.2 and suggested discussing agenda item 26.2 together with item 16, as both dealt with sharks. Mexico stated it wished to report under item 29 on a workshop on a programme to monitor Morelet's crocodiles (*Crocodylus moreletii*), and Indonesia requested to change the timing of item 25 to avoid clashing with prayer time.

The Committee adopted the working programme in document AC26 Doc. 3.2 with three amendments:

- a) considering item 26.2 (*Draft proposal to include Lamna nasus in Appendix II*) together with item 16 [*Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP15) on Conservation and management of sharks (Class Chondrichthyes)*];
- b) moving item 25 (*Review of objections to the registration of operations that breed Appendix-I animal species in captivity for commercial purposes*) from last to first in the second part of the morning session on Friday 16 March; and
- c) including an oral report by Mexico on a workshop on the Morelet's crocodile monitoring programme (also reported on in information document AC26 Inf. 11) under item 29 (*Any other business*).

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

### 4. Admission of observers

The Chair introduced document AC26 Doc. 4. A Party asked that the list of observers considered for admission be made available earlier, so that Parties may have more time to review it. The Chair explained that the customary late release of this document stemmed from the process and time frame to consider requests from organizations to be represented by observers at meetings of the Committee. He noted that a list released earlier would be incomplete and that these lists had never given rise to problems, as they were primarily distributed for information. Nevertheless, he invited suggestions from Parties to expedite publication of the document.

In response to a query, the Chair and Secretariat confirmed that the responsibility for inviting observers lay with the Chair only, which differed from the Rules of Procedure of the Conference of the Parties. The Secretariat added that the time frame for the admission of observers had been adopted by the Committee, and that the earlier release of a list of observers would require changing this time frame. An observer also pointed out that the Rules of Procedure for meetings of the Animals Committee already went beyond the provisions of Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP15) by giving the Committee the possibility to withdraw the right to participate as an observer.

The Committee noted the list of observers provided in document AC26 Doc. 4<sup>2</sup>.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by China, IWMC – World Conservation Trust and Species Management Specialists.

---

<sup>2</sup> Note from the Secretariat: document AC26 Doc. 4 was later replaced by document AC26 Doc. 4 (Rev. 1) to correct an organization name that had been misspelt.

## Items discussed with the Plants Committee

The Chair of the Plants Committee (PC), the Chair of the Animals Committee (AC), the Secretary-General and the Irish Minister for Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltach, Mr Jimmy Deenihan, welcomed the participants to the joint sessions of the 26th meeting of the Animals Committee and the 20th meeting of the Plants Committee.

### 5. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) (Decision 15.12)

The Secretariat introduced document AC26/PC20 Doc. 5, drawing attention to the meeting of the Chairs of the Scientific Advisory Bodies of Biodiversity-related Conventions (CSAB) that would be held later in the week. This meeting would give an opportunity to prepare a joint statement for the second session of the plenary meeting of IPBES, and the possible work programme of the Platform presented in the Annex to document AC26/PC20 Doc. 5. The Secretariat also thanked the representative of Mexico (Mr Benitez) for its participation in the first plenary meeting of IPBES in Nairobi (2011).

Mexico, supported by the AC representative of Europe (Mr Fleming), emphasized the importance of CITES representation both in the establishment of IPBES and in its evolution in the future, and reiterated its support for a mutual collaboration between CITES and IPBES. Additionally, it mentioned the importance of guaranteeing a two-way relationship, as user-beneficiary and also as supplier of elements useful to the platform, in order to achieve common objectives and avoid duplications.

The PC representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Ms Rivera) proceeded with reading out the following statement on behalf of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, which had requested that it be included in the record of the meeting:

*When the delegation of the Plurinational State of Bolivia participated in the 19th meeting of the Plants Committee, 25th meeting of the Animals Committee and 61st meeting of the Standing Committee, it expressed its concern at the excessively commercial emphasis that had surrounded the debates on this Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).*

*There is a clear intention to implement new market mechanisms and new types of rights of ownership of the services provided by nature, on the pretext of protecting biodiversity and conserving the functions of ecosystems. There is talk, for example, of payment mechanisms for ecosystem services, of assigning a monetary value to the functions of nature and to biodiversity in general, and of establishing new markets for nature, taking as a model the emerging markets for forests' capacity for carbon sequestration and storage.*

*Ecosystems have an intrinsic value, which cannot be calculated in monetary terms, and we stress that no instrument to conserve the biodiversity of our countries can be based on the commercialization of nature. For that reason, we oppose any plan to use the Platform as a mechanism to further the mandatory implementation of ecosystem markets, especially for those countries that do not share this approach.*

*In the view of Bolivia, dealing with the topic of the planet's biodiversity requires a high degree of care and profound thought, because we are making plans concerning an invaluable treasure which must remain in being to conserve and protect Mother Earth and all the beings that live on her. We are confident that, with contributions from all Member States the Platform on environmental and ecosystem services can become a useful instrument, contributing to tackling the underlying and structural causes which so far have brought about irreparable deterioration and losses of biodiversity.*

*In addition, we consider that, instead of this Platform concentrating on the commercialization of our Mother Earth by way of a monetary valuation, it should consider:*

- *Providing on an exclusive basis a scientific assessment which is authorized, independent, reliable and inclusive, similar to that of the IPCC, thus making a very positive contribution to the establishment of a more meaningful interface between science and politics, one which should contribute to the taking of more effective and equitable decisions, with equality of opportunities and the concerted action of decision-makers and populations to halt environmental degradation and the unrestrained exploitation of resources.*

- *The need to include best practices of indigenous peoples and local communities, which possess knowledge and practices that are very important for the conservation of biological diversity, based on their wisdom handed down over thousands of years, and on respect for our Mother Earth. This wisdom is expressed in their usages, customs, local knowledge, experiences and principles, passed down from generation to generation.*
- *An integral/holistic analysis of ecosystems that does not disaggregate or fragment the components of nature, given the interdependence among them.*
- *The approach must be wide-ranging, and there is a need for methodologies for real implementation of actions. Evaluations should therefore be directed towards estimating the costs of conserving and/or preserving environmental integrity, as well as the costs of the losses and impacts and also the costs of rehabilitation and compensation for lost development opportunities.*
- *The debate on recognition of the rights of Mother Earth is urgent and indispensable, as is an in-depth study of ecosystems' capacity for regeneration.*
- *Taking a role of coordination and exchange of information between the various conventions, with the full participation of the States Party. In this context, it is important to stress the need to analyse the relationship which would exist between the Committees and the Parties on the one hand and the IPBES on the other, and the benefit that would be obtained from it, although not from a commercial view of biodiversity but rather from a strictly scientific point of view directed towards caring for it, promoting the defence of it and planning actions to balance the current conditions of deterioration.*

*The Plurinational State of Bolivia is committed to working in this area, given that we have the best of reasons to make efforts in a constructive and positive manner with the objective of achieving a fair and balanced legal framework for all the beings that live on the planet, for the benefit of all, in particular the developing countries. For that reason, we stress that the work must take place under the rules of consensus and with equal participation by all countries.*

The Committees established a drafting group (AC26/PC20 DG1) with the following mandate:

On the basis of discussion in the plenary and contributions from the Chairs, as well as the Secretariat, finalize the wording of a draft statement that CITES could make at the 5th meeting of the Chairs of Scientific Advisory Bodies of Biodiversity-related Conventions and the second session of the IPBES plenary, whether individually or in coordination with the secretariats and scientific bodies of other biodiversity-related conventions.

The membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: Plants Committee (PC) representative of North America (Mr Benítez) and Animals Committee (AC) representative of Europe (Mr Fleming); and

Members: PC representative of Asia (Ms Zhou), Chair of the Standing Committee and the Secretariat.

Later in the meeting, Mr Benítez introduced document AC26/PC20 DG1 Doc. 1.

The Committees adopted document AC26/PC20 DG1 Doc. 1 with the following amendments to the membership of the drafting group:

- Co-Chairs: PC representative of North America (Mr Benítez) and AC representative of Europe (Mr Fleming); and
- Members: China, Republic of Korea, Chair of the Standing Committee, the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) and the Secretariat.<sup>3</sup>

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) and Europe (Mr Fleming), the PC representatives of Africa (Mr Hafashimana), Asia (Ms Zhou), Central and

---

<sup>3</sup> The report of AC26/PC20 DG1 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 1 to the present summary record.

South America and the Caribbean (Ms Rivera) and North America (Mr Benítez), and by China, Mexico Norway, the Chair of the Standing Committee, the AC and PC Chairs, IUCN, Humane Society International and the Secretariat.

6. Climate change (Decision 15.15) – Report of the joint working group

The AC representative of North America (Ms Caceres), as Co-Chair of the joint intersessional Working Group on Climate Change, presented document AC26/PC20 Doc. 6. She explained that the majority of members were of the opinion that the existing CITES provisions were sufficient to take into consideration the impacts of climate change, and that further specific guidance in that regard was not required. Nevertheless, five NGO members of the joint working group believed that such guidance would be needed, particularly for including species in CITES Appendices and making non-detriment findings.

The PC representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Ms Rivera) proceeded with reading out the following statement on behalf of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, which had requested that it be included in the record of the meeting:

*There is currently a strong consensus within the scientific community that climate change is happening much faster than in the most pessimistic scenarios, with severe and irreversible effects on wild species and the most vulnerable ecosystems in many regions, such as ecosystems in high mountain regions and in the Amazon basin. Climate change is already identified as a major threat factor for hundreds of CITES species, and at the same time some of its impacts may affect the way in which CITES carries out its function.*

*The most recent evaluations reported by the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) estimate that 20-30 % of the plants and animal species evaluated will probably be at greater risk of extinction if the rise in global average temperatures exceeds 1.5 – 2.5° C.*

*It is therefore imperative to take into account the impact of climate change, with particular attention to financing and capacity building to contribute to the sustainability of the use of wildlife. In the light of these risks, the CITES Parties must increasingly take the impacts of climate change into consideration in their decision-making processes, and particularly in the making of non-detriment findings.*

*Similarly, inadequate action in the control of trade in CITES species would have a serious effect on ecosystems' capacity for resilience and/or response under the impacts of climate change on biodiversity.*

*There is a need for a greater degree of research and fieldwork at regional level to study and implement actions of adaptation to or mitigation of the impacts of climate change in the context of transferring species between Appendices or in the making of non-detriment findings. The Convention should redouble its efforts in the raising of funding in order to measure the threat represented by climate change to those species that are listed in the CITES Appendices.*

*We recognize that the assessments provided by the Scientific Authority of the exporting countries, in relation to export permits, are based on a scientific review of the information available on population status, distribution, population trend, harvesting and other biological and ecological factors, as appropriate. However, climate change is clearly an ecological factor which should also be considered in this context, owing to the fact that CITES also requires that exports be regulated to maintain trade in species at a level consistent with their role in the ecosystems where they are found.*

Most participants supported the approach and recommendations of the Working Group, concurring that no further action was required.

The Committees agreed that the current provisions of the Convention and of Resolutions of the Conference of the Parties were sufficiently comprehensive and flexible to take into account the implications of climate change for science-based decision-making.

The Committees welcomed an initiative by the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) and partners, which are conducting an extensive literature review regarding the impacts of climate change on the population abundance of terrestrial vertebrates and plants, which may be relevant to the making of non-detriment findings as requested under Article IV of the Convention, and the adaptive management of many CITES-listed species.

The Committees requested that, on the basis of paragraphs 3 to 7 of document AC26/PC20 Doc. 6, the Co-Chairs of the joint working group on climate change, the AC representative of North America (Ms Caceres) and the United States of America, together with the Secretariat, prepare a report for submission at the 62nd meeting of the Standing Committee (SC62). The Committees agreed that with this, they had completed the work directed to them in Decision 15.15.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representatives of Europe (Mr Fleming) and North America (Ms Caceres), the PC representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Ms Rivera) and North America (Mr Benítez), and by Australia, Canada, China, Mexico, Norway, the AC and PC Chairs, European Union, UNEP-WCMC, Animal Welfare Institute, Humane Society International, WWF and the Secretariat.

#### 7. Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade [Decision 13.67 (Rev. CoP14)]

The Secretariat introduced document AC26/PC20 Doc. 7. TRAFFIC then presented the findings of its evaluation (in collaboration with IUCN) of six case studies of the Review of Significant Trade, contained in Annexes 3, 4 and 5 to that document.

The following general conclusions were highlighted:

- a) In all cases, the Review had led to significant changes in trade patterns for the species concerned, often entailing shifts in supply from one country to another. There was relatively little evidence that the review had led to shifts in supply to other CITES-listed species.
- b) In all cases, there had been changes to the management of the species in at least some range States, some of which could clearly be attributed to the Review. Most frequent were export controls, usually in the form of quotas. There was little evidence of large-scale shifts in production systems taking place as a result of the Review.
- c) It had been very difficult to assess changes in the status of wild populations of the species concerned, or to determine whether these could be attributed to the Review. There was a major gap in the long-term assessment of the impact of the Review, because it was often difficult and expensive to monitor wild populations of harvested species, and resources to carry out such work were limited in the range States concerned.
- d) Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) provided that financial support for implementing recommendations made under the Review were explicitly reliant on voluntary contributions from Parties and others. The Review had attracted funding for some of the case studies, including for survey work, development of sustainable harvest methods, and international cooperation and development of national action or management plans. But the question of long-term financing and capacity for implementing the Convention in at least some range States remained unresolved, and any positive impacts of the Review in these cases might be only temporary.
- e) The effectiveness of communications had considerable bearing on the progress of range States through the Review. There were instances where lack of response from range States has led to suspensions of trade, while it had subsequently become clear that harvest for trade was not an important factor in that range State, or that satisfactory non-detriment findings had been made but had not been communicated in a timely fashion. Conversely, rapid communication and evidence of some form of management in place was in itself not found to be evidence that harvest of the species for export was compliant with Article IV.
- f) A country-based approach could be more effective in the long term and a more efficient way of using resources when range States were the subject of Review recommendations for a range of different species.
- g) Within individual species, putting a stop to illegal harvests may be even more important than managing legal trade sustainably. Although outside the current remit of the Review, solving this problem could be the most important measure in ensuring that the provisions of Article IV were met. Again, this indicated that a more holistic approach may be advantageous.

- h) It seemed evident that one of the great strengths of the Review had been its ability to combine support (through financial and technical input) with the possibility of sanction (ultimately through recommended suspensions of trade).
- i) The Review had become more formalized with time, which delivered benefits in terms of transparency, accountability and engagement of stakeholders, but had been accompanied by the loss of some speed, flexibility and adaptability. There was a perception amongst some stakeholders that the process was unduly lengthy and rigid.

The Committees established a working group (AC26/PC20 WG2) to look at item 7 with the following mandate:

On the basis discussions in plenary and document AC26/PC20 Doc. 7, the working group shall:

1. examine the case studies presented in Annex 3 to document AC26/PC20 Doc. 7 and provide comments orally for the plenary;
2. determine the agenda and any instructions for the meeting of the advisory working group for the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade to be held in June 2012;
3. prepare a roadmap for the preparation of the final report on the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade for presentation to the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and
4. confirm the final membership of the advisory working group.

The membership of working group AC26/PC20 WG2 was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: PC nomenclature specialist (Mr McGough) and AC representative of North America (Ms Caceres);

Members: AC representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), PC representative of Africa (Mr Hafashimana), alternate AC representative of Europe (Mr Lörtscher);

Parties: Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Netherlands, South Africa, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States and United Republic of Tanzania; and

IGOs and NGOs: European Union, IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, TRAFFIC, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, Humane Society International, WWF, Natural Resources Defence Council and Species Survival Network.

Later in the meeting, Ms Caceres introduced document AC26/PC20 WG2 Doc. 1.

The Committees agreed a number of amendments and additions to document AC26/PC20 WG2 Doc. 1, namely regarding the membership (names of the AC and PC representatives), Recommendation 2 (Draft agenda and Roadmap), and Recommendation 3 (include a chapeau statement). The Committees requested the Secretariat to produce a revised version of document AC26/PC20 WG2 Doc. 1 for later consideration.

Later in the meeting, the Chair of the Animals Committee introduced document AC26/PC20 WG2 Doc. 2, noting that all comments and proposed amendments had been included.

The Committees adopted document AC26/PC20 WG2 Doc. 2.<sup>4</sup>

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) and Europe (Mr Fleming), the PC representatives of Asia (Ms Zhou) and North America (Mr Benítez), and by the PC nomenclature specialist (Mr McGough), China, the AC and PC Chairs, TRAFFIC and the Secretariat.

---

<sup>4</sup> The report of AC26/PC20 WG2 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 2 to the present summary record.

## 8. Non-detriment findings

### 8.1 Implementation of Decision 15.23 on *Non-detriment findings*: background and links with Decisions 15.24, 15.26 and 15.27

The PC Chair, as Co-Chair of the joint Working Group on Non-Detriment Findings, introduced document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.1 and provided an overview of the implementation of Decisions 15.23 to 15.27.

The Committees noted document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.1.

No intervention was made during discussion of this item.

### 8.2 Summary report based on the responses to Notifications to the Parties [No. 2009/023, paragraph 1. f) of No. 2010/027 and No. 2011/004]

The PC Chair, as Co-Chair of the joint Working Group on Non-Detriment Findings, introduced document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.2. She drew particular attention to the summary and conclusions in paragraphs 7 to 16.

Participants stressed the importance for all Parties to make robust Non-detriment findings. They acknowledged the considerable amount of information that Parties had provided on the making of non-detriment findings, and suggested that it should be made available to the Parties as guidance material.

The Committees agreed to refer document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.2 to a working group.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the PC representatives of Asia (Ms Zhou) and Central and South America and the Caribbean (Ms Mites), and by the PC Chair.

### 8.3 Progress reports from Parties (Decision 15.23)

The Secretariat introduced document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.3, including the responses from Parties to Notification No. 2011/049 of 10 November 2011 contained in its Annex. In ensuing discussions, reference was made to information document AC26/PC20 Inf. 1 concerning a workshop on the making of non-detriment findings organized by China.

The Committees noted document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.3.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by China and the PC Chair.

### 8.4 Draft guidance on the making of non-detriment findings

The AC Chair, as Co-Chair of the joint Working Group on Non-Detriment Findings, introduced document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.4. He drew attention to its Annex, which listed a large variety of guidance and taxa-specific case studies for making non-detriment findings, and to the considerations in paragraph 8.

While recognizing the need to remain practical and pragmatic about the making of non-detriment findings, participants discussed possibilities to peer-review or formally publish information and research used in the process. They also recognized the need to improve access to relevant bibliographic databases, and develop or encourage user-friendly, accessible websites with information relevant to the making of non-detriment findings, including the Parties' reports on non-detriment findings.

The Committees agreed to refer document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.4 to a working group.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), the PC representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Ms Rivera) and North America (Mr Benítez), and by China, Mexico, the AC and PC Chairs and Humane Society International.

## 8.5 Discussion paper on non-detriment findings

The AC Chair, as Co-Chair of the joint Working Group on Non-Detriment Findings, introduced document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.5. He drew attention to the draft resolution in the Annex to this document, which could be submitted at CoP16, in compliance with Decision 15.24.

The participants generally agreed to the proposal from the Working Group to draft a resolution with non-prescriptive and non-binding guidance and principles for the making of non-detriment findings for submission at CoP16. Various suggestions for amending the draft in the Annex were made, including those proposed in information document AC26/PC20 Inf. 3, and it was agreed that all these proposals needed to be considered by a working group.

The Committees agreed to refer document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.5 to a working group. They also agreed that the discussion paper that they would prepare for consideration at CoP16 in compliance with Decision 15.23 would include a draft resolution on the establishment of non-legally binding guidelines for the making of non-detriment findings.

During discussion of this item, an intervention was made by the AC representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) and North America (Ms Caceres), the PC representatives of Asia (Ms Zhou), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Ms Rivera) and North America (Mr Benítez), and by Australia, Canada, China, Japan, the United States, and the AC and PC Chairs.

The Committees established a working group (AC26/PC20 WG3) to look at item 8 with the following mandate:

The working group shall:

1. review and provide comments on the actions proposed in paragraphs 15 and 16 of document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.2;
2. on the basis of document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.4 and taking account of the results of the International Expert Workshop on Non-Detriment Findings (Cancún, November 2008) and the responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2009/023, paragraph 1 f) of Notification to the Parties No. 2010/027, Notification to the Parties No. 2011/004 and paragraph f) of Notification to the Parties No. 2011/049, prepare draft guidance on the making of non-detriment findings, which can be conveyed to Parties for comment, in line with paragraph d) iii) of Decision 15.24; and
3. on the basis of document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.5, prepare a discussion paper for consideration at CoP16 with options on how to use the workshop outputs, including a draft resolution on the establishment of non-legally binding guidelines for the making of non-detriment findings.

The membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: AC Chair (Mr Ibero) and PC Chair (Ms Clemente);

Members: AC Representatives: Africa, Asia, Central and South America and the Caribbean, Europe, North America and Oceania; PC Representatives: Africa, Asia, Central and South America and the Caribbean, North America and Oceania;

Parties: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Kuwait, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, Poland, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, South Africa, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States;

IGOs and NGOs: European Commission, IUCN, Association of Midwest Fish & Wildlife Agencies, Association of Northeast Fish & Wildlife Agencies, Association of Western Fish & Wildlife Agencies, Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies, Conservation Force, Eurogroup for Animals, Humane Society International, Humane Society of the United States, Natural Resources Defense Council, Safari Club International Foundation, SSN, TRAFFIC International; and

CITES Secretariat.

Later in the meeting, the PC Chair reported on progress. AC26/PC20 Working Group 3 on non-detriment findings had not been able to fulfil its mandate within the allocated time frame and discussions on its recommendations, as presented in document AC26/PC20 WG3 Doc. 1, continued in plenary.

The Committees adopted document AC26/PC20 WG3 Doc. 1 with the following amendments:

Recommendations:

1. The Working Group concludes that point 1 is included in 3.
2. The Working Group concludes that the Annex to document Doc. AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.4 has to be submitted at CoP16 as ~~framework~~ reference and flexible examples for the Parties to make NDF.
3. Regarding point 3: the Working Group recommends the following draft resolution be adopted by the Animals and Plants Committees:

## Non-detriment findings

RECOGNIZING that according to Articles II, III, and IV of the Convention, Parties shall only allow trade in specimens of species included in Appendices I and II in accordance with their provisions, it is required that an export permit shall only be granted when a Scientific Authority of the State of export has advised that such export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species being traded (i.e. non-detriment finding or NDF), which shall be considered an essential requirement for CITES implementation;

RECALLING also that Article IV, paragraph 3, requires a Scientific Authority of each Party to monitor exports of Appendix-II species and to advise the Management Authority of suitable measures to be taken to limit such exports in order to maintain such species throughout their range at a level consistent with their role in the ecosystem [and well above the level at which they would qualify for Appendix I];

NOTING that Resolution Conf. 14.7 (Rev. CoP15) recommends that, when Parties are establishing national voluntary export quotas, they should do so based on a non-detriment finding by the Scientific Authority of the State of export;

RECALLING furthermore that, in Resolution Conf. 10.3 (*Designation and role of the Scientific Authorities*), the Conference of the Parties recommends, amongst other things, that:

- c) Management Authorities not issue any export or import permit, or certificate of introduction from the sea, for species listed in the Appendices without first obtaining the appropriate Scientific Authority findings or advice;

and

- h) the findings and advice of the Scientific Authority of the country of export be based on the scientific review of available information on the population status, distribution, population trend, harvest and other biological and ecological factors, as appropriate, and trade information relating to the species concerned;

RECALLING that the effective implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6 (a) will prevent the need to take appropriate actions according to Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) on the *Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species*;

NOTING that the great variety of taxa, life forms and biological characteristics of species included in Appendices I and II supports the idea that there are various ways a Scientific Authority can make non-detriment findings;

AWARE of the challenges Parties face when making scientifically-based non-detriment findings, and that guiding principles and experience sharing for making non-detriment findings would improve implementation of Articles III and IV of the Convention;

RECOGNIZING the outputs of the national and international/regional workshops on CITES non-detriment findings (China, Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Kuwait, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, etc.), the guidance for CITES Scientific Authorities produced by the IUCN and, other capacity-building workshops;

*Note: It was agreed to mention in the preamble the CITES Strategic Vision in its updated version as appropriate [REAFFIRMING Objective 1.5 of the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013 (Resolution Conf. 14.2) adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its 14th meeting (The Hague, 2007), that the best available scientific information is the basis for non-detriment findings].*

### THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

RECOMMENDS that:

- a) Scientific Authorities consider the following, non-binding, guiding principles in advising that trade will, or will not, be detrimental to the survival of a species:

- i) The non-detriment findings for Appendix-I and -II species is a science-based assessment that verifies that the proposed export is not detrimental to the survival of that species.
- ii) The non-detriment finding considers whether the species is maintained throughout its range at a level consistent with its role in the ecosystems in which it occurs.
- iii) The data requirements for a non-detriment finding depend on the level of risk and shall be influenced by, and be proportionate, to the vulnerability of the target species.
- iv) The making of an effective non-detriment finding relies upon specimen verification and certainty of identification for all specimens.
- v) The origin of the specimen will affect the type of non-detriment finding assessment that is appropriate, and may simplify assessment of risk.
- vi) When making a non-detriment finding, the methodology used should employ flexibility that enables the specific and individual characteristics of different taxa to be considered.
- iv) vii) The implementation of adaptive management, including monitoring, is an important consideration in the non-detriment finding making process.
- v) viii) The non-detriment finding is based on resource assessment methodologies which may include consideration of, but not limited to:
  - a) A. species biology and life history characteristics;
  - b) B. species range – historic and current;
  - c) C. population structure, status and trends (nationally or in the harvested area); ~~threats;~~
  - D. ~~threats;~~
  - d) E. species-specific levels and patterns of harvest/mortality (e.g. age, sex) ~~from the export operation;~~ - historic and current;
  - e) F. estimates of species-specific levels of harvest/mortality from all sources combined;
  - f) G. management measures currently in place and proposed, including adaptive management strategies and consideration of ~~rates~~ levels of compliance; and
  - g) H. results of population monitoring.

~~When making an NDF the methodology used, should employ flexibility that enables the specific and individual characteristics of different taxa to be considered.~~

- vi) ix) The sources of information that may be considered by the Scientific Authorities, but not limited to, in making non-detriment finding includes:
  - a) A. relevant scientific literature concerning species biology, life history, distribution and population trends;
  - b) B. details of any ecological risk assessments conducted;
  - c) C. scientific surveys conducted at harvest locations and ~~related sites that the species could recruit from (i.e. demonstrated important habitat that has been~~ at sites protected from harvest and other impacts); and
  - d) D. relevant knowledge and expertise of local and indigenous communities.
- ~~vii) The NDF employs appropriate broad-scale assessment, including assessments of total off-take whether destined for international trade or not.~~

- b) Parties consider as framework reference for making non-detriment findings the information included in the Annex of AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.4 and any subsequent updates available on the CITES Website (<http://www.cites.org/eng/prog/ndf/index.php>).

ENCOURAGE Parties:

- a) to explore more methods of making non-detriment findings;
- b) to share experiences and examples of making non-detriment findings, including through appropriate regional or subregional workshops, and communicate them to the Secretariat ~~in time~~;
- c) to maintain written records of the science-based rationale included in the Scientific Authorities non-detriment finding assessments; and
- d) to offer, on request, cooperative assistance to developing countries, for improvement of capacity regarding non-detriment finding based on nationally identified needs. Such cooperative assistance could take multiple forms, including financial and technical support.

DIRECTS the Secretariat:

- a) to maintain and update regularly with information from the Animals ~~&~~ and Plants Committees and Parties, a prominent section, with appropriate categorization of the information, on the CITES web site devoted to the making of non-detriment findings;
- b) to implement a user-friendly mechanism on the CITES website that would allow Parties to easily submit relevant information to be considered for inclusion in the website;
- c) to request that this information is accessible in the *Introduction to CITES and non-detriment findings* course in the CITES Virtual College; and
- ⇒ d) to assist identifying possible funding sources to help Parties implementing capacity building activities to make non-detriment findings.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> The report of AC26/PC20 WG3 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 3 to the present summary record.

The Committees asked the Secretariat, in collaboration with the Chairs of the Committees, to finalize the editing and formatting of the agreed text of the draft resolution on *Non-Detriment Findings* based on recommendation 3 of document AC26/PC20 WG3 Doc. 1.

The Committees requested the Secretariat to issue a Notification to the Parties, inviting the Parties to comment on the finalized draft resolution on *Non-Detriment Findings*.

The Committees agreed that the comments of the Parties, as received by the Secretariat, would be forwarded to the Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committees. Should the contributions or proposed amendments prove to be minor and non-controversial, the Committees would endeavour to consolidate these in a revised version of a draft resolution on non-detriment findings for consideration at CoP16. Otherwise, the Committees would submit at CoP16 the existing draft resolution with a summary of the different responses that had been received.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), Europe (Mr Fleming) and Oceania (Mr Robertson), the PC representative of Africa (Mr Hafashimana), and by Australia, Canada, China, Japan, South Africa, the United States, the AC and PC Chairs, European Union, Humane Society International, Humane Society of the United States, TRAFFIC, WWF and the Secretariat.

9. Capacity-building programme for science-based establishment and implementation of voluntary national export quotas for Appendix-II species (Decision 12.91) – Report of the joint working group

The AC representative of North America (Ms Caceres), as Co-Chair of the joint Working Group on Capacity-Building Programme for Science-Based Establishment and Implementation of Voluntary National Export Quotas for Appendix-II Species, introduced document AC26/PC20 Doc. 9. In connection with the recommendations in paragraphs 13 and 14, participants pointed out that various courses and workshops on the making of non-detriment findings already existed, including a course on the CITES website. The Secretariat thanked the Working Group for its comprehensive advice on improving this course.

The Committees adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 13 and 14, subparagraphs a) and b), of document AC26/PC20 Doc. 9, as follows:

- a) Request each Committee member to seek further examples/case studies from their region to provide to the Secretariat, in particular focusing attention on those countries with existing quotas that may have experiences or case studies to share.
- b) Request the Secretariat to consider the suggestions for improvement as outlined in Annex to this document [AC26/PC20 Doc. 9]
- c) Request the Secretariat to make available the contents of the CITES Virtual College in CD form for those without easy access to the CITES Virtual College via the Internet.

In relation to subparagraph c) of paragraph 14, the Committees noted that the CITES Virtual College contained a stand-alone course on the making on non-detriment findings, but recommended that it be updated and expanded.

They requested that the Co-Chairs of the joint Working Group (Ms Caceres and the United Kingdom):

- a) revise the recommendations in paragraph 14, subparagraph d), in light of the comments and discussion in plenary; and
- b) draft amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP15) on *Establishment of committees* and relevant Decisions in order to require the Animals and Plants Committees to provide on a permanent basis scientific advice on training materials used in capacity-building.

The Committees agreed that the report from the Co-Chairs would be considered later in the meeting in English only.

Later in the meeting, the United Kingdom introduced document AC26/PC20 Com. 1.

The Committees adopted document AC26/PC20 Com. 1 with the following amendment to paragraph 2, paragraph a): in the draft decision directed to the Secretariat, replace “request” by “invite”.<sup>6</sup>

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representative of North America (Ms Caceres), and by the United Kingdom, the AC and PC Chairs, and the Secretariat.

10. Revision of Resolution Conf. 14.8 on *Periodic Review of the Appendices*

The Secretariat introduced document AC26/PC20 Doc. 10.

Participants agreed that the current process for the Periodic Review of the Appendices was complex and slow, and that some parts of Resolution Conf. 14.8 were ambiguous, but there were reservations about suggestions to ‘automate’ the species selection to expedite or simplify the existing procedures.

The Committees adopted the suggestions in paragraph 2 of document AC26/PC20 Doc. 10 to improve the performance of the Periodic Review of the Appendices, and agreed that they should be considered in revising Resolution Conf. 14.8 on *Periodic Review of the Appendices*.

The Committees asked the participants to submit comments on, or propose amendments to Resolution Conf. 14.8 in writing to the Secretariat at the present joint sessions. They requested the Secretariat to prepare a document (in English only) on the basis of these contributions and the discussion in plenary, for consideration by the Committees later in the meeting.

Later in the meeting, and further to discussions and comments received at the present joint sessions, the Secretariat introduced a ‘non-paper’ outlining two options to revise Resolution Conf. 14.8 on *Periodic Review of the Appendices*: option 1 with amendments to the existing text of Resolution Conf. 14.8; and option 2 replacing the detailed instructions in the Resolution with a general mandate for the Animals and Plants Committees to develop and use any procedure they deemed appropriate.

The Committees decided that only option 1 should be discussed, as a proposal similar to option 2 had been rejected by the Conference of the Parties at its 15th meeting.

After hearing various suggestions to amend the text of Resolution Conf. 14.8 (specifically concerning paragraphs f), g) and h) under AGREES), the Committees concurred that it would not be feasible to revise in detail Resolution Conf. 14.8 during the present joint session. They requested the Secretariat to prepare a document during the lunch recess that listed the recommendations and issues concerning the Periodic Review of the Appendices that had emanated from recent meetings of the Committees, including the present joint session. They also agreed to establish a process for the revision of Resolution Conf. 14.8 that would involve the Standing Committee and to make proposals at CoP16.

Later in the meeting, the Secretariat introduced document AC26/PC20 Com. 2, outlining ways to improve the performance of the Periodic Review of the Appendices, as identified at the 25th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC25), AC26 and AC26/PC20, that could be considered when amending Resolution Conf. 14.8.

The Committees agreed that the Plants Committee would prepare a document for submission at SC62 concerning proposed amendments to improve the Periodic Review of the Appendices, incorporating the elements of document AC26/PC20 Com. 2 and a draft decision for submission at CoP16, instructing the Animals and Plants Committees to revise Resolution Conf. 14.8 in collaboration with the Secretariat. It was further decided by the Committees that the Plants Committee document would be circulated to the Animals and Plants Committees prior to the deadline for the submission of documents for SC62 (24 May 2012) to seek their concurrence.

Many participants regretted that no working group had been established to discuss this item more in-depth.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representatives of Europe (Mr Fleming), North America (Ms Caceres) and Oceania (Mr Robertson), the PC representatives of Africa (Ms Khayota), Asia (Ms Zhou), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Ms Rivera) and North America (Mr Benítez), and by Australia, Chile, Mexico, Norway, South Africa, the United States, the AC and PC

---

<sup>6</sup> Document AC26/PC20 Com. 1 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 4 to the present summary record.

Chairs, European Union, Humane Society International, Humane Society of the United States and the Secretariat.

11. Transport of live specimens (Decision 15.59) – Report of the joint working group

Austria, as Chair of the joint Working Group on Transport of Live Specimens, introduced document AC26/PC20 Doc. 11, drawing attention to the recommendations in paragraph 11. He also indicated that the working group had drafted an addendum to the IATA Live Animal Regulations (IATA/LAR) with taxa that required particular modifications of the existing IATA container requirements or transport procedures in order to ensure adequate transport by non-air modes.

The Committees established a working group (AC26/PC20 WG1), chaired by Austria, to look at item 11 with the following mandate:

The working group shall:

1. review and finalize the draft set of guidelines on non-air transport of live specimens provided by the co-chairs, which would replace the CITES Guidelines for transport and preparation for shipment of wild animals and plants (1981);
2. consider whether the final draft guidelines should be incorporated into an existing Resolution of the Conference of the Parties or the IATA/LAR and IATA/PCR or provided to Parties in some other way, and make related recommendations including the repeal of the existing Guidelines;
3. review and, if needed, propose revisions to Resolution Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP14) and Resolution Conf. 12.3 (CoP15); and
4. determine whether one or more draft Decisions are needed to provide for and guide future work on the transport of live specimens and, if so, prepare such draft Decisions.

The Committees agreed that this and other working groups established at the joint sessions of the 26th meeting of the Animals Committee and 20th meeting of the Plants Committee needed to include in their reports a list of the participants that took part in the working groups' discussions.

Later in the meeting, Austria introduced document AC26/PC20 WG1 Doc. 1.

The Committees adopted document AC26/PC20 WG1 Doc. 1 with the following amendments:

- a) In Recommendations: delete paragraph 5 and incorporate its text in Annex 2 of document AC26/PC20 WG1 Doc. 1, as shown in paragraph b) below; and
- b) In Annex 2, under RECOMMENDS, replace paragraph e) with "the Standing Committee and the Secretariat, in consultation with the Animals and Plants Committees and IATA, regularly review, revise and approve amendments to the CITES Guidelines for the Non-Air Transport of Live Wild Animals and Plants."<sup>7</sup>

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by Austria, Mexico, the AC and PC Chairs, and the Secretariat.

### **Animals Committee matters**

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

12.1 Overview of the species-based Review of Significant Trade

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 12.1, drawing links with the two following subitems. It referred to the online management system of the Review of Significant Trade now available for use, as well as to the latest Notification to the Parties issued on recommendations to suspend trade related

---

<sup>7</sup> The report of AC26/PC20 WG1 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 5 to the present summary record.

to the review (Notification No. 2011/035 of 5 September 2011). The online management system drew praise.

The Committee noted document AC26 Doc. 12.1.

During discussion of this item, an intervention was made by the regional representative of Europe (Mr Fleming).

#### 12.2 Species selected following CoP13 and CoP14

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 12.2. At its previous meeting, the Committee had requested clarifications from Madagascar regarding the export quotas of eight species and the Secretariat confirmed that Madagascar had notified it that they had established a zero export quota for *Calumma brevicorne*, *C. crypticum*, *C. gastrotaenia*, *C. nasutum*, *C. parsoni*, *Furcifer antimena* and *F. minor*, and an export quota of 250 specimens for *Furcifer campani*.

UNEP-WCMC introduced the Annex to document AC26 Doc. 12.2 and provided an oral update on three taxa. Aerial surveys had been conducted for *Tursiops aduncus* but the results had not been released yet. The Commission on Aquatic Bioresources of the Caspian Sea had held a meeting on *Huso huso* in December 2011 and its report was in preparation. Finally, updated information on seahorses caught in trawling was now available. Participants started providing further information on some of the species under review and asking questions, and the Chair invited them to share those with the working group to be established on this item. The Secretariat would also pass on to the working group any document submitted too late for inclusion in document AC26 Doc. 12.2. The Chair commended the great headway made by Madagascar over the past decade. Nevertheless, following a question from the floor, he asked the Malagasy delegation to explain to the working group the reason for doubling their quota of *Mantella baroni* from 5,000 to 10,000 specimens, when the species had been excluded from the Review of Significant Trade in 2008 on the understanding that its quota would not be increased, but this question was not answered. Iraq then made an intervention to state that they were preparing their accession to the Convention and the Chair congratulated them.

During discussion of this item, interventions were also made by the regional representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), and by Iraq, Madagascar, the Russian Federation, Thailand, the United Republic of Tanzania, Defenders of Wildlife and Prowildlife.

#### 12.3 Species selected following CoP15

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 12.3.

No intervention was made during discussion of this item.

The Committee established a working group (AC26 WG7) to look at items 12.2 and 12.3 with the following mandate:

The working group shall:

##### Concerning agenda item 12.2

For the 10 taxa selected following the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP14) and retained in the review after AC25, the working group shall:

1. In accordance with paragraphs k) and l) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13):
  - a) Review the reports in the Annex to document AC26 Doc. 12.2 and the responses received from range States (made available by the Secretariat to the working group), and, if appropriate, revise the preliminary categorizations proposed by UNEP-WCMC for the species concerned; and
  - b) Identify and refer to the Secretariat problems that are not related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a); and
2. In accordance with paragraphs m) to o) of the same Resolution, formulate recommendations for species of urgent concern and of possible concern with deadlines for their implementation.

- a) For species of urgent concern, these recommendations should propose specific actions to address problems related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a). Such recommendations should differentiate between short- and long-term actions, and may include, for example:
  - i) The establishment of administrative procedures, cautious export quotas or temporary restrictions on exports of the species concerned;
  - ii) The application of adaptive management procedures to ensure that further decisions about the harvesting and management of the species concerned will be based on the monitoring of the impact of previous harvesting and other factors; or
  - iii) The conducting of taxon- and country-specific status assessments, field studies or evaluation of threats to populations or other relevant factors to provide the basis for a Scientific Authority's non-detriment finding, as required under the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a) or 6 (a); and
- b) For species of possible concern, these recommendations should specify the information required to enable the Committee to determine whether the species should be categorized as either of urgent concern or of least concern. They should also specify interim measures, where appropriate, for the regulation of trade. Such recommendations should differentiate between short- and long-term actions, and may include, for example:
  - i) The conducting of taxon- and country-specific status assessments, field studies or evaluation of threats to populations or other relevant factors; or
  - ii) The establishment of cautious export quotas for the species concerned as an interim measure.

Deadlines for implementation of these recommendations must be appropriate to the nature of the action to be undertaken, and should normally be not less than 90 days but not more than two years after the date of transmission to the State concerned.

3. Review information provided by Madagascar on *Calumma* and *Furcifer* species and on *Mantella baroni*.

#### Concerning agenda item 12.3

For the 24 taxa selected following CoP15, the working group shall:

1. In accordance with paragraph f) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), review the available information presented in document AC26 Doc. 12.3 and the responses from affected range States (which will be made available by the Secretariat to the Working Group); and
2. If satisfied that Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a), is correctly implemented, recommend to the Animals Committee to eliminate the species from the review with respect to the range States concerned.

The membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: representatives of Europe (Mr Fleming) and North America (Ms Caceres);

AC member: representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi);

Parties: Australia, Canada, China, Czech Republic, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, Poland, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania and United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: European Union, IUCN – International Union for Conservation of Nature, UNEP-WCMC, Animal Welfare Institute, Association of Western Fish and Wildlife Agencies, British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, Conservation International, Defenders of Wildlife, Fundación Cethus, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Humane Society

Later on, on the last day of the meeting in Geneva, the Committee agreed to consider the report of the Working Group, document AC26 WG7 Doc. 1, even though it was available in English only. This would ensure the widest contribution possible as not all participants would be travelling on to Dublin for the final sessions of the meeting. It would be read out *in extenso* and interpreted for the benefit of non-English speakers.

Mr Fleming introduced document AC26 WG7 Doc. 1, also on behalf of the other Co-Chair, and started reading it out. A correction to a country name was requested as well as the change of status of the Iranian population of *Huso huso* from "possible concern" to "least concern", given that commercial catch was prohibited and that the Islamic Republic of Iran, unlike the other range States named in the report, had sent the requested information. The AC Chair confirmed receipt of that information, but only after the Working Group had met, and Mr Fleming explained that it did not specify whether commercial fishing was still prohibited in 2012. It was therefore recommended to keep the categorization for the Iranian population of *Huso huso* unchanged.

Regarding *Hippocampus kelloggi*, China thanked IUCN for its offer to provide data on the possible exports of seized specimens, but asked whether this note could be deleted from the AC26 WG7 report, arguing first that China would follow up on this quickly, and second that this issue was outside the Working Group's mandate. Mr Fleming clarified that the report was a record of what had been said during the WG meeting and that this fell under paragraph 1. b) of the AC26 WG7 mandate. The AC Chair supported that view. A spelling mistake in a species name was corrected and Australia offered its help with resolving the issue described in paragraph 5 on page 4. A suggestion to reduce the recommended quota for *Tursiops aduncus* from Solomon Islands was turned down. Regarding South Sudan and its population of *Balearica pavonina*, the Secretariat explained that it was trying to obtain the details of the competent authorities.

The other Co-Chair of WG7 (Ms Caceres) took up reading out the second part of the report. The basis for establishing a quota for *Mantella aurantiaca* from Madagascar was questioned, as that country had previously presented two different calculation methods and no explanation was provided for the way in which data from one locality only had been extrapolated to the rest of the country. These comments were deemed valid and the Chair suggested accepting the 2012 and 2013 quotas but requesting the scientific basis for any possible future change to them as well as for quotas for subsequent years, even if unchanged. New wording was then accepted to replace "taking from the wild" under *Huso huso*. It was also pointed out that, under *Hippocampus kelloggi*, the instruction in the footnote should not have been directed to the Secretariat and should have been included in the formal recommendations. In response to a question on fishing gear that could avoid by-catch of *Hippocampus* specimens, it was confirmed that this did not exist and that the obligation in certain areas to use selective fishing material effectively closed off these areas to fishing. A request was made to replace "spp." with "species" throughout the report.

Clarification was sought regarding the quota for *Mantella bernhardi*. The Chair answered on behalf of the Malagasy delegation, which had had to leave, and confirmed that it was 150 specimens and not 650, as mentioned in information document AC26 Inf. 13. Yet, even the lower figure was considered optimistic by some, given the lack of explanation on how it had been arrived at, and a call was made to retain the species in the Review of Significant Trade with the same recommendations as for *M. aurantiaca*. One of the Co-Chairs explained that the information document provided an explanation for a quota of 650 specimens, and that its reduction to 150 only had been the reason for recommending deleting the species from the Review. The Chair made a suggestion to change the reference to *Tridacna* spp. to *Tridacna derasa* in the table, but finally agreed that it was sensible to have a management plan for the whole taxon.

The Committee adopted document AC26 WG7 Doc. 1 with the following amendments:

- a) Under Recommendations, Agenda item 12.2 (page 3 in the English):
  - paragraph 1. e): add "the Islamic Republic of Iran"; and
  - paragraph 2: correct species name from *Calumna* to *Calumma*;

- b) Under *Balearica pavonina*:
- for Guinea (page 5 in the English), correct paragraph numbering; and
  - for Sudan and South Sudan, last line (page 6 in the English), add "... the species and were in compliance ...";
- c) Under *Balearica regulorum*, for Uganda (page 7 in the English), correct paragraph numbering;
- d) Under *Mantella aurantiaca*, for Madagascar (page 7 in the English), amend paragraph d) to read "... it has established that ~~any revised~~ the export quota ...";
- e) Under *Huso huso*, for Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation (page 7 in the English), amend the text as follows:
- paragraph a): "... written confirmation that the ~~taking from the wild~~ commercial catch of *Huso huso* ..."; and
  - paragraph a): "If planning to resume the commercial catch and export ...";
- f) Under *Hippocampus kelloggi*, *H. kuda* and *H. spinosissimus*, for Thailand (page 8 in the English):
- replace "spp." with "species" everywhere; and
  - Delete the footnote and include a new paragraph g) under "Within one year" with the following text: "Develop and implement adequate control measures and inspection to enhance the enforcement of the reported ban on trawling within 3-5 km of the coast, as the main means of reducing incidental capture of these *Hippocampus* species;"; and renumber following paragraphs; and
- g) Under *Pandinus imperator*, for Ghana (page 10 in the English), standardize the wording so that it reads "Within 2 years, the Management Authority ~~shall~~ should: ...".

Further minor formatting or editorial corrections were also passed on directly to the Secretariat.<sup>8</sup>

The Committee also took note of the confirmation by Madagascar that the annual export quota for *Mantella bernhardi* in 2010, 2011 and 2012 was 150 specimens, and not 650 as erroneously indicated in document AC26 Inf. 13.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi and Mr Soemorumekso), Europe (Mr Fleming) and North America (Ms Caceres), the nomenclature specialist, and by China, Madagascar, Poland, the United States, IUCN, Animal Welfare Institute, IWMC – World Conservation Trust and SSN.

### 13. Periodic review of animal species included in the CITES Appendices

#### 13.1 Overview of species under review

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 13.1, explaining that, as previously requested, it had added columns for the "IUCN category" and "Range States", but had not had time to include the corresponding information. However, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) would be providing information on the IUCN categories through an information document later in the meeting<sup>9</sup>. A representative believed that, where the indication "In progress" was given in the "Notes" column, there would be value in distinguishing species actively reviewed from those for which nothing had been done. Secondly, under *Panthera leo*, it should be indicated that the representative of Africa (Mr Kasiki), speaking as Kenya, had offered to coordinate the Periodic Review and that South Africa had offered to work with Kenya on the review at AC25. This review was therefore more active than stated. The Chair echoed the request to specify the "In progress" status, recalling that this had already

<sup>8</sup> The report of AC26 WG7 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 6 to the present summary record.

<sup>9</sup> See document AC26 Inf. 14 at <http://www.cites.org/common/com/AC/26/E26-14i.pdf>.

been asked at AC25. A Party expressed its regret that the Secretariat had not requested this information from Parties when issuing Notification to the Parties No. 2011/038 of 21 September 2011 on *Periodic review of species included in the CITES Appendices*, and reiterated that this information, considered relevant by the Animals Committee, should be included and that the Secretariat should work with IUCN to complete the table. The Secretariat apologized for the incomplete Notification, explaining that it had been short-staffed at the time of its preparation and issuance, and that it would add the missing information in future documents.

The Chair also welcomed the news from the regional representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Álvarez) that the review was in progress for *Chondrohierax uncinatus wilsonii* and *Grus canadensis nesiotis*.

In response to a query, the United Kingdom explained that it had submitted information about a forthcoming workshop amongst African lion range States in information document AC26 Inf. 7 because the result of this workshop could be useful to the review. The Chair further clarified that he had asked the United Kingdom to submit this document and that LionAid, which was organizing the workshop, invited African delegations to participate in the event. He added that this workshop could be a great opportunity to further knowledge of this species and progress the review. Namibia welcomed these clarifications and indicated that it would consider participating.

The Committee noted document AC26 Doc. 13.1 and requested that, in future documents, the Secretariat complete the information under “IUCN category” and “Range States” in the summary tables, as agreed at the Committee’s 25th meeting. It also requested that, under “Notes”, the status currently reported as “In progress” distinguish actively-ongoing reviews from those for which no action had been taken since the selection of the species, and indicate the countries responsible for the reviews.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Álvarez) and Europe (Mr Fleming), and by Mexico and Namibia.

### 13.2 Species selected for review from CoP13 (2004) to CoP15 (2010)

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 13.2. The regional representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean stated that there had been no offer to date to conduct the review of *Puma concolor*.

China introduced its review of *Andrias davidianus*, which was contained in the Annex to document AC26 Doc. 13.2, and welcomed comments. China’s recommendation to maintain this species in Appendix I was supported. Several speakers stressed the importance of specifying which criteria of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) were met or not met in any recommendation stemming from the Periodic Review. A speaker stated that *Andrias davidianus* might be more threatened by potential harvesting for local consumption than international trade and asked China whether they had any information on this salamander being invasive in Japan. China did not have more information and the Chair suggested that this be discussed directly with China and Japan, as it was outside the scope of the Periodic Review. The Chair also mentioned that Australia had offered to review two species of *Rheobatrachus*.

The Committee accepted with gratitude the offer from Australia to conduct reviews of *Rheobatrachus silus* and *Rheobatrachus vitellinus*. It also thanked China for its review of *Andrias davidianus* and endorsed its conclusions. It agreed that, in future, reviews should always specify which criteria in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) were considered to justify the recommendation made.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Álvarez) and Europe (Mr Fleming), and by China, the United States and the Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research.

#### 13.2.1 Galliformes – Report of the working group

The alternate regional representative of North America (Ms Gnam), as Co-Chair of the Intersessional Working Group on Periodic Review, introduced document AC26 Doc. 13.2.1. Several speakers congratulated the United States for the funding they had provided and the

process they had followed (i.e. compiling readily-available scientific and trade information). This could be a good model to start off the review of other species, particularly those that were pending. It was also a good example of collaboration with IUCN specialist groups and could be envisaged for other processes, such as the Review of Significant Trade or the making of non-detriment findings. The Co-Chair of the Working Group explained that this method to gather data had been particularly effective and had not required significant funding or effort.

The Committee thanked the United States for the funding provided and congratulated it for its report on Galliformes contained in the Annex to document AC26 Doc. 13.2.1.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representative of Oceania (Mr Robertson) and the alternate regional representative of North America (Ms Gnam), and by Mexico.

### 13.3 Species selected for review from CoP15 (2010) to CoP17 (2016)

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 13.3 and Mexico introduced its Annex: a review of *Caracara lutosa*, which they had conducted. The review had concluded that the species was extinct and Mexico sought the support of the Committee to propose its deletion from Appendix II at CoP16. The risk of confusion with other *Caracara* species was queried but considered negligible, as the very few known specimens of *Caracara lutosa* were all museum specimens. In response to another question, Mexico explained that there was no record of successful captive breeding. Mexico was congratulated for the quality of its review and its proposal met with broad support.

Even though it did not apply to *Caracara lutosa*, a speaker questioned the need to have to transfer a species from Appendix I to II before it could be deleted from the Appendices. This requirement, which took two CoP meetings and therefore three years, seemed particularly unnecessary in the case of species considered extinct. The Chair suggested recommending a change to the procedure.

Finally, Mexico stated that it could present an amendment proposal at CoP16 and that the exclusion from the Appendices could be recorded as an annotation to Falconidae. It also raised concern about the difficult conditions under which the *Caracara lutosa* review was presented, as the Secretariat had suggested it may be difficult for the Animals Committee to discuss it by interpreting that paragraphs e), f) and h) of Resolution Conf. 14.8 required the Committee to determine which taxa were to be reviewed and to inform the Standing Committee of their selection, before conducting or organizing the reviews themselves. Mexico stated that the scientific committees had the prerogative to decide whether they were in a position to consider a periodic review submitted by a Party.

The Committee thanked Mexico for its review of *Caracara lutosa*, contained in the Annex to document AC26 Doc. 13.3, and endorsed its conclusions.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Europe (Mr Fleming), North America (Ms Caceres) and Oceania (Mr Robertson), by the Depositary Government (Switzerland), and by China, Mexico and IWMC – World Conservation Trust.

The Committee then established a working group (AC26 WG1) to look at item 13 with the following mandate:

The working group shall:

1. Review the table in the Annex of document AC26 Doc. 13.1 and provide comments as appropriate for consideration by the Committee;
2. For species selected for review from CoP13 to CoP15:
  - a) Taking into account the information presented in document AC26 Doc. 13.2 and the discussions in plenary regarding responses to Notification No. 2011/038, consider options to deal with or terminate the reviews of the remaining species; and

- b) Review the information and report presented in document 13.2.1 and its Annex, and make recommendations to the Committee regarding the listing in the Appendices of the 16 species of Galliformes under review; and
3. For species selected for review from CoP15 to CoP17:

Based on the information presented in documents AC26 Doc. 13.3 (and possibly additional information that the Secretariat would make available to the Working Group), make recommendation to the Committee regarding the final selection of taxa to be reviewed. For the selected taxa, provide guidance on how the reviews should be organized, and how information, participation and support from the range States could be obtained in compliance with paragraph h) of Resolution Conf. 14.8.

After clarifying that Committee members could participate in all working groups, the membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: AC Chair (Mr Ibero) and alternate representative of North America (Ms Gnam);

Parties: Australia, China, Ireland, Malaysia, Mexico, Spain, Switzerland and the United Kingdom; and

IGOs and NGOs: European Union, IUCN, Born Free USA, Humane Society International, Humane Society of the United States and ProWildlife.

Later in the meeting, the AC Chair asked for AC26 WG1 members whose names were not included in document AC26 WG1 Doc. 1 to step forward. The Co-Chair of Working Group 1 (Ms Gnam) then introduced document AC26 WG1 Doc. 1. Queried on the reason for making different recommendations for various species of least concern, she explained that this was due to look-alike problems. One speaker noted the need to include a column explaining the criteria that were met in order to justify the recommendations, as had already been requested in the past, but a member of the Working Group explained that the in-depth information needed to specify the criteria had not been available.

Regarding *Panthera leo*, Kenya mentioned that Guinea and Mali had sent their responses, which were now in translation. This information had not been available to the Working Group but could be included in the summary record of the meeting.<sup>10</sup>

It was recommended that, for species for which a decision had been made by the Committee, references to "proposals" be added to the mention of reviews that were still needed, by specifying "reviews and proposals". In addition to some corrections needed to the Spanish version, it was also suggested to group the various taxa in three tables: first the completed reviews, second the reviews in progress, and third the taxa awaiting review. However, it was explained that this option had been discarded by the Working Group. In response to a question, the Secretariat clarified that hybrid species, such as *Lophura imperialis*, also required a formal proposal to be deleted from the Appendices.

Discussions ensued on the fact that document AC26 WG1 Doc. 1 did not include all the species selected for review, as did document AC26 Doc. 13.1, and the difficulties this created in tracking their status. For example, Canada noted that it had volunteered at AC25 to undertake the review of the North American subspecies of *Puma concolor* in coordination with the United States. The alternate representative of North America (Ms Gnam) clarified that species selected for review from CoP13 to CoP15 were not included in the WG report and that the Secretariat would have to combine the lists. The Secretariat stated that a document would be produced at AC27 comprising all species and *inter alia* an indication of the range States and of the IUCN categories.

Regarding the proposals, which the Committee had to prepare or arrange the preparation of, it was felt more expedient to seek volunteers directly in session. Australia reiterated its offer to cover *Rheobatrachus silus* and *R. vitellinus*, specifying that they should be annotated as "extinct", and France agreed to work on *Lophura imperialis*. The alternate representative of North America stated that the United States could provide information on birds and suggested that Asian range States prepare the corresponding proposals, even though Australia offered to do it if there were no volunteers.

---

<sup>10</sup> At the time of writing this summary record (September 2012), these responses had still not been submitted to the Secretariat and are therefore not included in this document.

The Committee requested a number of amendments to document AC26 WG1 Doc. 1, namely to the membership (actual participants in the working group), the table (headings, addition of reviewers' names, standardization of information, corrections to taxonomic names), recommendation 1 (addition of countries and of a request to the Secretariat), recommendations 1-4 (addition of a reference to "proposals" after "reviews") and recommendation 3 (correction to the wording in Spanish). It requested the Secretariat to produce a revised version of the report and postponed adoption until its submission.

Later in the meeting, the Chair introduced document AC26 WG1 Doc. 2, correcting two mistakes.

The Committee adopted document AC26 WG1 Doc. 2 with the following amendments:

- a) Under "Membership / Parties", add "South Africa"; and
- b) Under "Other recommendations of the Working Group", add the word "not" in "... contact range States that did not respond to the request ...".<sup>11</sup>

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Africa (Mr Kasiki), Europe (Mr Fleming), North America (Ms Caceres) and Oceania (Mr Robertson), by the alternate representative of North America (Ms Gnam) and the nomenclature specialist (Ms Grimm), and by Australia, Canada, France, Mexico and the United States.

14. Criteria for the inclusion of species in Appendices I and II (Decision 15.29) – Report of the working group

The Chair of the Working Group on Criteria for the Inclusion of Species in Appendices (Ms Caceres, regional representative of North America) introduced document AC26 Doc. 14, thanking the Working Group members for their work. Several of those members took the floor to express their appreciation of the open forum that the Group offered to collaborate and discuss differing viewpoints. A member stated that there were more agreements than differences in the interpretation of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) with regard to commercially exploited aquatic species, but this was disputed by another who thought that it would be very difficult to reach agreement and recommended a *status quo*. The latter also requested that discussions, drafting and document submission proceed cautiously and in a timely manner to avoid putting non-native English speakers at a disadvantage.

The AC Chair proposed setting up an in-session working group and discussions ensued on its membership. The Chair of the Working Group recommended that the group be kept identical to the intersessional group, because of the discussions that had already taken place and complexity of the subject. However, several Parties thought that the need for transparency and the importance of the issue warranted an open membership, and the Chair of the Working Group agreed to accept new members, asking them nevertheless to be mindful of previous discussions.

The Committee established a working group (AC26 WG2) to look at item 14 with the following mandate:

The working group shall:

1. Review the responses from the members of the working group to the questions outlined in paragraph 10 of document AC26 Doc. 14;
2. Develop guidance on the application of criterion B and the introductory text of Annex 2 a to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) to commercially exploited aquatic species proposed for inclusion in Appendix II;
3. Recommend the best way to incorporate this guidance for use when applying the Resolution without affecting its application to other taxa; and
4. Draft a document for review and adoption by the Animals Committee, and subsequent submission at SC62.

---

<sup>11</sup> The report of AC26 WG1 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 7 to the present summary record.

The membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: representatives of Africa (Mr Kasiki) and North America (Ms Caceres);

Parties: Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Germany, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Spain, Thailand and United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: European Union, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), IUCN, UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Fundación Cethus, Humane Society International, International Environmental Law Project, IWMC – World Conservation Trust, Pew Environment Group, SEAFDEC – Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, Species Management Specialists, SWAN International, TRAFFIC International and WWF.

Later in the meeting, Ms Caceres introduced document AC26 WG2 Doc. 1, stating that the membership was not correctly recorded. The Chair thanked the Working Group for its report, which was in a format that would facilitate the Committee's reporting at SC62. Some problems with the Spanish translation were pointed out, a suggestion was made to add "... inclusion and deletion ..." in paragraph 5, and it was felt that paragraph 7 did not make it clear that FAO had not agreed to a definition of "commercially-exploited aquatic species". Participants debated on whether the latter two suggestions were necessary. Even though the Chair reminded participants that this was just a reference and that the Committee was not asked to endorse a definition, there was a request to delete the whole paragraph 7. Ms Caceres confirmed that the Working Group was not proposing to adopt any definition and had only cited the FAO's paper for reference. A proposal was made to move forward by using FAO's exact language. Discussions then went back to paragraph 5. The amendment request had been withdrawn by its proponent but discussions continued and an amendment was finally agreed (see below). Returning to paragraph 7, new wording was proposed and accepted by all speakers.

The Committee adopted document AC26 WG2 Doc. 1 with the following amendments:

- a) The membership of the working group should include the representative of Oceania (Mr Robertson), and the list of IGOs and NGOs should read "European Union, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), IUCN, UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Fundación Cethus, Humane Society International, International Environmental Law Project, IWMC – World Conservation Trust, Pew Environment Group, SEAFDEC – Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, Species Management Specialists, SWAN International, TRAFFIC International and WWF";
- b) In Recommendation 4, in Spanish, correct the translation to read:
  - in subparagraph a): "... adoptar un enfoque ~~basado en una especie específica que es sensible a la vulnerabilidad de la especie~~ de análisis por especies sensible a su vulnerabilidad y ..."; and
  - in subparagraph b): "... tomar en consideración los ~~de~~ factores relacionados ...";
- c) In Recommendation 5, amend the end of the paragraph to read "... and how the taxon qualifies for ~~inclusion in Appendix II~~ the proposed amendment"; and
- d) In Recommendation 7, amend the text to read "... notes that FAO documentation ~~includes a definition that states~~ indicates that commercially-exploited aquatic species ~~are refer~~ to fish and invertebrates species ...".<sup>12</sup>

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), Europe (Mr Fleming), North America (Ms Caceres) and Oceania (Mr Robertson), by the nomenclature specialist (Ms Grimm), and by Argentina, Australia, China, Japan, Mexico, the United States, FAO, Pew Environment Group, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC), Species Management Specialists and WWF.

---

<sup>12</sup> The report of AC26 WG2 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 8 to the present summary record.

## 15. Sturgeons and paddlefish

### 15.1 Secretariat's report

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 15.1. An update of activities in the Caspian Sea States was provided. The Secretariat's assessment that the increasing number of captive-breeding operations was reducing the incentives for conservation of wild stocks was supported. However, two speakers spoke against the Secretariat's proposal to recommend deletion of its reporting requirement found in Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) on *Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish*. The information obtained through these reports, ongoing concerns regarding the conservation of wild populations of sturgeons in the Caspian Sea, and lack of progress since the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Gigiri, 2000) were all matters of concern that would justify continuing reporting. In contrast with the Caspian Sea, Canada reported that it was not experiencing problems with the sustainable use of stocks shared with the United States and that it would provide information to the Secretariat as soon as a regional strategy was completed. The Chair made the suggestion that the Secretariat's reporting requirement be discussed by the working group to be established on item 15. This was accepted, the Secretariat adding that, if reporting was still requested, it needed to know the nature of the report that Parties wanted.

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

### 15.2 Evaluation of sturgeon stock assessment and Total Allowable Catch (TAC) determination methodology reports from Caspian Sea range States

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 15.2, asking whether the three-year cycle evaluation foreseen in Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) was realistic and whether the Resolution should be amended. The regional representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) referred to document SC61 Doc. 48.2 (*Sturgeons – Monitoring of progress*), which contained a workplan for the Stock Assessment Committee. He described it as a roadmap that may need a timeline of three years for implementation. The Russian Federation then described steps it had taken to protect sturgeons, including actions against illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, limitation of fishing to research and reproduction purposes, and a 2011 FAO workshop that had resulted in a series of recommendations. All information was available on the Russian Federation website. The Chair commended these contributions which could help improve the status of sturgeons in the Caspian Sea and suggested that the working group to be established look at the three-year cycle evaluation.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

### 15.3 Review of Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) on *Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish* regarding caviar labelling, product sources and species identification – Report of the working group

The Chair of the Working Group (Mr Pourkazemi, regional representative of Asia) introduced this agenda item orally, as there was no document. He explained that the mandate of the working group was to review Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) and propose amendments, but that only one comment had been received. He therefore asked that this task be entrusted to the in-session working group.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

The Committee established a working group (AC26 WG3) to look at item 15 with the following mandate:

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

1. Review Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) regarding caviar labelling, product sources and species identification, etc., and, if necessary, propose draft amendments for consideration by the Committee.
2. Consider the actions proposed in documents AC26 Doc. 15.1 and 15.2 and provide recommendations to the Committee on amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) concerning:

- i) Written reporting by the Secretariat at each meeting of the Animals Committee on its activities relating to the conservation of and trade in sturgeon and paddlefish; and
- ii) The instructions given to the Animals Committee to: monitor progress with relevant provisions of the Resolution; undertake three-year cycle evaluations of stock monitoring methodologies; and report to the Standing Committee.

The membership was decided as follows:

Chairs: representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) as Chair and representative of Africa (Mr Zahzah) as Co-Chair;

Parties: Canada, China, Germany, Saudi Arabia and United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: IUCN, Association of Northeast Fish and Wildlife Agencies, ICIA – International Caviar Importers Association, IWMC – World Conservation Trust and TRAFFIC International.

Later in the meeting, the AC Chair asked AC26 WG3 members to check the membership recorded in document AC26 WG3 Doc. 1 and Mr Pourkazemi introduced the report. He pointed to some minor corrections needed, read out a comment received after the report had been finalized and suggested a change to the last paragraph.

The Committee adopted document AC26 WG3 Doc. 1 with the following amendments:

- addition of the Russian Federation in the working group membership;
- Point 1, regarding the amendment to paragraph g): deletion and addition, respectively, of a final "s" to the word "year", as follows: "... the end of the quota years (1 March – last day of February) ... processed in the preceding quota years";
- Point 1, regarding the amendment to paragraph b): deletion of the final "s" at the end of "label", as follows: "In Annex 1, in paragraph b: the definition of non-reusable labels should ..."; and
- Point 2, last line: replace the final part of the sentence as follows: "... consider ways to ~~ensure that these recommendations are implemented~~ facilitate the implementation of these recommendations".<sup>13</sup>

No intervention was made during discussion of this item.

16. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP15) on Conservation and management of sharks (Class Chondrichthyes)

This agenda item was discussed in conjunction with item 26.2 on *Draft proposal to include Lamna nasus in Appendix II.*

16.1 Report of the working group

The Chair of the Working Group (Mr Robertson, regional representative of Oceania) introduced document AC26 Doc. 16.1. He could not report progress because of the clashing timing between the present meeting and FAO's global review of the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks. Additionally, many of the top 20 shark fishing nations had not responded to the FAO questionnaire. The AC Chair also regretted the limited information on sharks submitted in response to Notification to the Parties No. 2011/49. The Republic of Korea took the floor to indicate that they would submit the requested information during the present meeting. While acknowledging the efforts of CITES to assist with the management and conservation of sharks, some speakers stated that FAO and regional fishery management organizations were the appropriate bodies to deal with these species, but it was retorted that regulating international trade was the role of CITES and that the different organizations' purviews were complementary.

---

<sup>13</sup> The report of AC26 WG3 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 9 to the present summary record.

FAO explained that the *International Plan of Action for Conservation and Management of Sharks* had been adopted 10 years earlier and that its review was not yet concluded. The questionnaire sent out to FAO member States had taken into account the work of the Animals Committee and its working group and focused on the major shark fishing nations, i.e. those responsible for more than 1 % of fishing. A report would be ready in July 2012 and sent to the CITES Secretariat as soon as possible. Finally, the proceedings of the FAO/CITES workshop referred to in paragraph 14 of document AC26 Doc. 16.1 was now available online and in print<sup>14</sup>, and catalogues and identification guides were in preparation. The AC Chair and the Secretariat complimented FAO for its activities and leadership, and the Secretariat added that it was also working on shark species with CMS, whose Conference of the Parties had recently identified international trade as a major threat to giant manta rays. Further discussion was directed to the working group established under agenda item 26.2 (AC26 WG4).

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representative of North America (Ms Caceres) and by Australia, China, the Republic of Korea, FAO and Pew.

## 16.2 Reports from Parties

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 16.2, informing the Committee that, in paragraph 4, Colombia, Montenegro and the Republic of Korea should be added to the list of Parties that had submitted reports, making a total of 42 countries. These reports and a summary would be made available to the working group. Argentina was preparing its response to Notification to the Parties No. 2011/49 and gave an oral report on the actions it had taken to protect sharks. China also gave an oral progress report and recommended a review of the three shark species already included in the CITES Appendices before any other related species was listed. The United Kingdom's report on *Assessing the intrinsic vulnerability of harvested sharks*, available as information document AC26 Inf. 9, and document CoP15 Doc. 53, which contained a list of shark species of concern, were referred to as useful for the working group.

Arguments in favour and against the involvement of CITES in shark management and conservation were put forward. A participant pointed out that the many prohibitions and measures in place seemed ineffective and that CITES could therefore help. On the contrary, concerns were expressed about the effectiveness of CITES in protecting marine species, but this was counter-argued by the example of what CITES had achieved with the queen conch. It was also underlined that FAO had a mandate to manage fisheries but not to regulate international trade, which was the role of CITES. China's suggestion to review the three CITES-listed shark species was supported by some but met with scepticism by others, who argued that there was no case for establishing a new process to review these particular species, as Resolutions Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP15) [*Conservation and management of sharks (Class Chondrichthyes)*] and Conf. 14.8 (*Periodic Review of the Appendices*) already provided such mechanisms. Further discussions on this item were referred to the working group established under agenda item 26.2 (AC26 WG4).

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom, the United States, Pew, Species Management Specialists (SMS), Species Survival Network (SSN) and WWF.

## 17. Snake trade and conservation management (Decision 15.76) – Report of the working group

The Chair of the Working Group on Snake Trade and Conservation (Mr Lörtscher, alternate representative of Europe) introduced this agenda item orally, as there was no document. He gave an update on recommendations 2 and 7 of document AC25 WG5 Doc. 1, relating to the result of the IUCN assessment of Asian snakes for inclusion in the Red List and to identification materials for live snakes, parts and derivatives, respectively. He also mentioned the forthcoming study on trade in python snakes in Asia by the International Trade Centre and the UNCTAD BioTrade Initiative's work on the use of snake leather in the luxury industry. In response to a query from the Chair, the United States clarified that they would provide a document on classification to the working group only, as they had just decided to circulate it.

---

<sup>14</sup> See information document AC26 Inf. 6 at <http://www.cites.org/common/com/AC/26/E26-06i.pdf>.

The Committee established a working group (AC26 WG5) to look at item 17 with the following mandate:

In support of the activities of the Standing Committee Working Group on Snakes (WGS), the working group shall:

1. Review the collation and evaluation of existing identification materials for live snakes, parts and derivatives, and make recommendations regarding additional materials and ways to bring these to the attention of the Parties;
2. Review the outputs of the IUCN Red Listing process for Asian snakes and make recommendations for consideration by the Parties with regard to amending the CITES Appendices; and
3. Consider other actions that could support the work of the WGS.

The membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: representative of Asia (Mr Soemorumekso) and alternate representative of Europe (Mr Lörtscher);

Parties: China, Indonesia, Ireland, Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia and United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: IUCN, Animal Welfare Institute, Conservation International, Eurogroup for Animals, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Humane Society of the United States, ProWildlife, Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Species Management Specialists, Species Survival Network and TRAFFIC International.

Later in the meeting, Mr Lörtscher introduced document AC26 WG5 Doc. 1, spelling out some corrections and suggesting a few changes. A few additional changes were also requested from the floor.

The Committee adopted document AC26 WG5 Doc. 1 with the following amendments:

- Deletion of "The membership was decided as follows:" before "Recommendations";
- Recommendation 1. a): change the wording as follows: "Compile a list of existing identification materials for Asian live snakes, skins and products made of snake leather ~~from the Asian Regions~~, including ...";
- Draft decision directed to the Animals Committee: delete the word "incorporate" as follows: "The Animals Committee shall at its 27th meeting consider the final IUCN red list assessments for Asian snake species and, if available, ~~incorporate~~ new information ..."; and
- Recommendation 4: change the wording as follows: "The Animals Committee recommends that the Standing Committee's Working Group on Asian snakes, ~~shall~~ in its deliberations and recommendations, consider ...".<sup>15</sup>

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the alternate representative of Europe (Mr Lörtscher), and by the United States, IUCN and SMS.

#### 18. Tortoises and freshwater turtles (Decision 15.79)

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 18. In response to a query, the Chair explained that the Committee could not engage a consultant directly and that the recommendations in paragraph 6 should be discussed, and reworded as necessary, in the working group to be established on this item. The United States and Singapore were thanked for organizing workshops on turtles in 2010 and 2011, respectively.

The Committee established a working group (AC26 WG6) to look at item 18 with the following mandate:

In support of the activities of the Standing Committee intersessional Working Group on Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles, the working group shall:

---

<sup>15</sup> The report of AC26 WG5 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 10 to the present summary record.

1. Assess progress, if any, with the study to identify and discuss factors that are of particular relevance to make non-detriment findings for tortoises and freshwater turtles, including (but not limited to) turtle population status and dynamics, trade dynamics, and the trade in parts, products and derivatives. As this study should provide guidance for Parties to make non-detriment findings for tortoises and freshwater turtles, advise on its integration into recommendations and actions emanating from agenda item 8; and
2. Review the results of the North American Turtle Trade Workshop, held in Saint Louis in September 2010, and the Asian Turtle Conservation Workshop, held in Singapore in February 2011, and additional pertinent information, and make recommendations for consideration by the Committee, which could make recommendations at SC62 or CoP16, as appropriate.

The membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Calvar and Mr Álvarez);

Parties: Canada, Chile, China, Indonesia, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Switzerland, United Republic of Tanzania and United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: IUCN, Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Animal Welfare Institute, Conservation International, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Humane Society International, Pet Care Trust, ProWildlife, Species Management Specialists, Species Survival Network, SWAN International, TRAFFIC International and Wildlife Conservation Society.

Later in the meeting, Mr Álvarez introduced document AC26 WG6 Doc. 1, indicating that the membership and the references to URLs in recommendations 2 and 3 on page 2 needed correcting. Two Parties requested an amendment to the second recommendation, third paragraph, which they saw as an instruction from the Committee infringing on countries' sovereignty. However, the Chair clarified that it was just an encouragement and not an obligation, and that it was perfectly in keeping with the CITES mandate. The Secretariat suggested some changes.

The Committee adopted document AC26 WG6 Doc. 1 with the following amendments:

- a) In the membership, delete the word "Asia" under "Co-Chairs";
- b) In Recommendation 1:
  - Draft decision a): amend the text to read "... including (but not limited to) tortoises and turtle population ...";
  - Merge draft decisions a) and b) and amend the latter to read "... make the results of the study available to the Animals Committee ~~and Standing Committee~~ for ~~their~~ its consideration."; and
  - Draft decision d): amend the wording to read "The Standing Committee should review the study undertaken in accordance with Decision 16.XX and the Animals Committee recommendations, and make its own recommendations, as appropriate, for communication to the Parties or for consideration at the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties."; and
- c) In Recommendations 2, first paragraph, and 3, replace "[insert WCS web page URL once document is available]" with "[insert CITES web page URL referring to document AC26 Inf. 17]".<sup>16</sup>

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Álvarez) and North America (Ms Caceres), the alternate representative of Europe (Mr Lörtscher), and by Canada, China and Indonesia.

---

<sup>16</sup> The report of WG6 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 11 to the present summary record.

19. Sea cucumbers [Decision 14.100 (Rev. CoP15)] – Report of the working group

The Co-Chair of the Working Group on Sea Cucumbers (Mr Robertson, regional representative of Oceania) introduced document AC26 Doc. 19. The AC Chair agreed with him that the issuance of a Notification to the Parties to inform them of the availability of the information would complete the work required under Decision 14.100 (Rev. CoP15). The Co-Chair also advised the Committee that the work done was being disseminated in workshops run by FAO. Noting that 10 years of discussing sea cucumbers in CITES had not led to the inclusion of any species in Appendix I or II, a Party resolved that these species should be managed by coastal States and regional organizations, and that discussions should be drawn to a conclusion at CoP16. In response to questions on the need for an in-session working group, the Chair explained that there were two matters at stake: one was to draw up a final document for submission at CoP16, and the other was to draft a Notification to the Parties to conclude the work under Decision 14.100 (Rev. CoP15). FAO explained that it had made great efforts in the past five years to provide information on sea cucumbers, organize workshops and improve the sustainability of sea cucumber fishing in the Pacific Ocean. It now planned to do the same in other regions. It also referred to reports and various publications, both published and forthcoming. The Chair commended the work of FAO and responded favourably to its request for assistance in publicizing the material they had produced.

The Committee established a drafting group (AC26 DG1) to draft a Notification to the Parties drawing attention to the report from the CITES workshop in 2003<sup>17</sup>, the FAO documents on these species and any other relevant publications, and encouraging range States to use this and other information to manage their fisheries. This Notification would effectively conclude the work directed to the Committee in Decision 14.100 (Rev. CoP15).

The membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: representative of Oceania and United States;

Parties: Australia, China and Japan; and

IGO: FAO.

Later in the meeting, the United States introduced document AC26 DG1 Doc. 1. The Chair commented again that, if it were adopted, the work of the Committee under Decision 14.100 (Rev. CoP15) would be completed.

The Committee adopted document AC26 DG1 Doc. 1 with corrections to the membership of the drafting group to replace "alternate representative of North America (Ms Gnam)" with "United States of America" as Co-Chair, and to add China in the list of Parties.<sup>18</sup>

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representative of Oceania (Mr Robertson), and by Australia, China, Japan, the United States and FAO.

20. Nomenclatural matters

The nomenclature specialist of the Animals Committee (Ms Grimm) introduced document AC26 Doc. 20, which drew repeated praise for its quality and scope. She referred to Mexico for *Agalychnis* species. Mexico presented the identification guide that they had produced to assist non-specialists in distinguishing the various species in this genus. They thanked Canada for translating the guide and printing copies in English and French. The guide was provided as document AC26 Inf. 10 and printed copies had been made available to the participants.

Referring to Decision 15.62, paragraph a)<sup>19</sup>, which had been overlooked in the document, the nomenclature specialist explained that funding had only become available at the end of 2011 and that a specialist had been found for reptiles and amphibians, but not for mammals. This specialist had proposed

---

<sup>17</sup> See document CoP14 Doc. 62 at <http://www.cites.org/eng/cop/14/doc/E14-62.pdf>.

<sup>18</sup> The report of AC26 DG1 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 12 to the present summary record.

<sup>19</sup> Decision 15.62, paragraph a), reads as follows: "Subject to funding, the Animals Committee shall undertake a review of recent proposed changes to the taxonomy and nomenclature of CITES-listed mammals, reptiles and amphibians of Madagascar, with a view to producing checklists to be considered by the Animals Committee in preparation for the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties."

17 changes, 13 of which had already been identified in the course of the regular compilation of changes carried out by UNEP-WCMC and the nomenclature specialist. Two referred to tentative changes, but the Conference of the Parties tended to adopt names commonly used only. This left two species, one of which was not yet recognized under CITES and should be added to Annex 1 to document AC26 Doc. 20.

Regarding *Epypedobates machalilla* being included in Appendix II or not, the representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Calvar) mentioned that work was well underway and should be completed soon. Regarding the instruction in Decision 15.63 to identify taxa listed in the Appendices that could be included under the name of a higher taxon without altering the scope of the listing, concern was expressed about possible problems that this could create, as it would require a good knowledge of the higher taxon. Caution was therefore warranted for regrouping taxa beyond the genus level. In response to a question on whether the list of corals and bibliography in Annex 6 were proposed for adoption, the nomenclature specialist explained that hers was just an interim list as there were many species of corals. Even then, the number of references seemed far too long to be acceptable to the Parties and the Chair suggested to reduce the bibliography and to establish a list of species that would be manageable. The nomenclature specialist clarified that the first part of Annex 6 could be used as a standardized reference and serve as a starting point. Nevertheless, it was pointed out that this list contained many synonyms, which could be a source of confusion, and that the lack of agreement among specialists made matters even more difficult. The Chair insisted on the importance of providing Parties with the most useful and practical tool possible. He then invited participants who had made specific comments to raise them with the working group to be established on this issue.

The Committee established a working group (AC26 WG9) to look at item 20 with the following mandate:

The working group shall:

1. On the basis of document AC26 Doc. 20 and its Annexes, develop recommendations for consideration by the Committee on all nomenclatural changes identified in paragraphs 2, 7, 8 and 9 of the document for which the Committee has not taken decisions;
2. Review progress with the implementation of: Decisions 15.62, paragraph a) (on the basis of material provided by the Secretariat); 15.63; and 15.64 paragraph a). Develop specific recommendations as necessary; and
3. Draft text about the implementation of the nomenclature Decisions directed to the Animal Committee for review by the Committee and subsequent submission at CoP16.

The membership was decided as follows:

Chair: AC nomenclature specialist (Ms Grimm);

Parties: Mexico, Switzerland and United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: UNEP-WCMC, Conservation International, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Humane Society of the United States, Ornamental Fish International, IWMC – World Conservation Trust, Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and Species Survival Network.

Later in the meeting, Ms Grimm introduced document AC26 WG9 Doc. 1, correcting a spelling mistake in Recommendation 2 and reading out an amendment to Recommendation 3. Some corrections to the Spanish version were also requested from the floor. Reconsidering the recommendation under *Decision 15.63* to change the individual listing of all species in a genus to a generic listing, a participant feared that this might result in the unintentional inclusion of new species in the Appendices. Ms Grimm explained that, as things stood, all species resulting from a split would be automatically covered, but newly-described species would not. In contrast, with a listing changed to the generic level, the newly-described species would indeed be covered and therefore not necessarily reflect the original intent. She also reassured another participant that the Working Group did not propose going further than regrouping species at the generic level. As such, it should not create the difficulties in the identification of the individual species that a higher taxonomic listing could. The Secretariat pointed out that recommendations to revise Resolutions should include specific wording and a summary of the implications of the proposed changes. The Secretariat offered its assistance in presenting the proposed changes in such a way that the Conference would be able to grasp their magnitude, *inter alia* through a draft revised version of Resolution

Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP15) and of the Appendices, with the proposed changes marked up. Going back to the risk of changing a listing unintentionally by including species under the name of a higher taxon, Ms Grimm stated that she shared that concern and she suggested reporting to the Conference that assessing the impact of this proposal would be carried out between CoP16 and CoP17. Alternatively, the Committee could ask the Conference to reconsider the value of the instruction given in Decision 15.63, outlining the problems encountered. Discussions were then adjourned to leave time to draft a new recommendation.

Later in the meeting, new text was successfully proposed in replacement of Recommendation 2, *Decision 15.63*, paragraphs a) and b), page 2; and Recommendation 3, *Decision 15.63*, paragraphs a) and b), page 3, of document AC26 WG9 Doc. 1.

The Committee adopted document AC26 WG9 Doc. 1 with the following amendments:

- a) In Recommendation 2, under "Decision 15.62, paragraph a)", correct the author's name "Kluge" in subparagraph c). In subparagraph d), change "Madagassian" to "Malagasy" in English and the Spanish should read "... en ~~Madagassian~~ Chamaeleonidae de Madagascar ...";
- b) In Recommendation 2, replace the text under "Decision 15.63" with "Recommends that the Conference of the Parties consider Decision 15.63 concluded";
- c) In Recommendation 3, replace the text under "Decision 15.63" with:

"The Animals Committee undertook the analysis to identify species listed in the Appendices that might be included under the name of a higher taxon (document AC26 Doc. 20, Annex 5). The Committee determined that it could not, with certainty, identify changes that would not alter the scope of the original listings.

It turned out that shifting to a higher taxon always bears the potential of widening the scope of the original proposal in cases where species newly described are true species and not split from listed ones.

The Animals Committee therefore recommends that the Conference of the Parties consider Decision 15.63 concluded."; and

- d) In Recommendation 3, under "Decision 15.64, paragraph a)", correct the Spanish translation to read "... referencias normalizadas ~~abaradoras~~ exhaustivas..." in subparagraph a). In subparagraph c), amend the text to read "... to revise the ~~list~~ aforementioned standard reference ...".<sup>20</sup>

The Committee also agreed that its nomenclature specialist would work with the Secretariat when drafting its report for CoP16 to present the proposed changes in a way that would help the Conference grasp their magnitude and practical impact.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Asia (Mr Soemorumekso), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Calvar), North America (Ms Caceres) and Oceania (Mr Robertson), by the nomenclature specialist, and by Mexico, the European Union, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Humane Society International and SMS.

## 21. Identification of CITES-listed corals in trade [Decision 15.64 b)] – Report of the working group

The regional representative of Europe (Mr Fleming), also on behalf of the regional representative of Asia (Mr Soemorumekso), introduced document AC26 Doc. 21. The Committee postponed a decision on this item until the intersessional working group (named Working Group 10 for the purpose of the present meeting) had had a chance to look at recent contributions and could report later in the meeting.

Later in the meeting, Mr Fleming introduced document AC26 WG10 Doc. 1, also on behalf of Mr Soemorumekso. This report was the result of intersessional work and of the last meeting of the group, which had been held in the margins of the present meeting. Mr Fleming stressed that specimens of coral taxa were particularly difficult to identify, even for specialists, and most identification had to be done by

---

<sup>20</sup> The report of AC26 WG9 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 13 to the present summary record.

non-specialists, such as Customs officers. He explained that spelling mistakes had been corrected but not highlighted, and clarified that this list would have to be revised if the standard nomenclatural references proposed under agenda item 20 were adopted at CoP16.

The Committee adopted document AC26 WG10 Doc. 1.<sup>21</sup>

No intervention was made during discussion of this item.

### Item discussed with the Plants Committee

#### 22. Progress report on the Identification Manual

The Secretariat introduced documents AC26 Doc. 22 and PC20 Doc. 21, emphasizing that it was seeking cooperation and partnership on technical issues mentioned in paragraphs 6 to 8 in the documents.

The Committees noted documents AC26 Doc. 22 and PC20 Doc. 21.

The Committees noted the intervention from Mexico, on behalf of the North American region, in support of the further development of the CITES Wiki Identification Manual. The Committees supported Mexico's call for the Committees, Parties and observers to become more engaged in this process, and to assist the Secretariat and UNEP-WCMC in their efforts to include links to relevant identification materials.

The Committees welcomed the offer from Belgium to collaborate with the Secretariat in updating the information in the Identification Manual concerning animal species held in captivity, and this with the assistance of the European Association of Zoos and Aquaria (EAZA). They encouraged Belgium to contact the Secretariat in this regard.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by Belgium, Mexico, the AC and PC Chairs, and the Secretariat.

### Animals Committee matters

#### 23. Relationship between wildlife trade and wildlife diseases

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 23 (Rev. 1).

The Committee recognized the importance of wildlife trade and wildlife diseases, and the linkages with CITES. However, it believed that wildlife diseases were best addressed by other organizations, such as the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), and was concerned about the Secretariat's limited resources to get involved in these issues. It therefore recommended that the Standing Committee decide on the level of priority that the Secretariat should give to this issue, proposing in particular to change the Secretariat's status in the Scientific Task Force on Wildlife and Ecosystem Health, co-convened by CMS and FAO, from "core affiliate" to "observer" or "partner", which would be less demanding but still allow it to share information. The Animals Committee also agreed that it would be useful for the Standing Committee to draw the Parties' attention to the work of OIE and to its relevance to CITES, and to the possible incidental impact of disease control measures on programmes designed to ensure the sustainable use of wildlife.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Calvar), Europe (Mr Fleming) and North America (Ms Caceres), and by FAO, IUCN, Eurogroup for Animals, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research and Humane Society International.

#### 24. Report of the Chair for the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

Referring to document AC26 Inf. 12 and an informal meeting of the members of the Animals Committee, the Chair outlined how he intended to compile information for his report for CoP16. He also explained how he would organize reporting of the Committee at CoP16 on items that would require substantial debate and decision-making by including them in separate documents submitted by the Committee.

---

<sup>21</sup> The report of AC26 WG10 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 14 to the present summary record.

The Committee noted the Chair's explanations.

No intervention was made during discussion of this item.

25. Review of objections to the registration of operations that breed Appendix-I animal species in captivity for commercial purposes

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 25.

In response to the objection raised by Indonesia, the Philippines stated that the parental breeding stock concerned had comprised pre-Convention specimens imported in compliance with the legislation in effect at the time. As for the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Indonesia, it was a voluntary measure to implement Resolution Conf. 13.9 on *Encouraging cooperation between Parties with ex situ breeding operations and those with in situ conservation programmes*. Approval of the MoU and of its action plan was not a prerequisite for the registration of the species.

Indonesia considered that the documents submitted by the applicant were not sufficient proof of the legal origin of the parental breeding stock. Regarding the MoU and the related action plan submitted to the Philippines in 2011, the Philippines has offered to hold a bilateral meeting, but at a time inconvenient to Indonesia. Nevertheless, Indonesia welcomed such a meeting and the Philippines hoped to organize it in April and to come to an agreement beneficial to both Parties. Indonesia reiterated that proving the legal origin of the parental breeding stock remained crucial. The Philippines then said that they would need to check with their Management Authority before responding to some technical questions on permits and possible DNA analyses, as they were represented at the present meeting by their Permanent Mission.

Several speakers then criticized the Philippines for attempting once more to get these species registered when similar applications had already been rejected several times by the Conference of the Parties, the evidence of legal acquisition that had been submitted was not specific enough and no new evidence had been put forward. On the other hand, a Committee member wondered what standards of evidence should be deemed necessary for pre-Convention specimens or countries that had become Parties after the import of the parental breeding stock. He also suggested looking at trade patterns, as there was substantial trade in the species concerned at the time, from Indonesia as well as from non-range States, including the United Kingdom and the United States. The Chair concluded that all these questions should be taken into account by a working group, which would comprise Committee members only. Indeed, comments were sought from the Committee within the framework of Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP15) and the concurrence of this discussion with the Committee meeting was a coincidence. For the same reason, the Chair was reluctant to incorporate discussing Resolution Conf. 13.9 in the mandate of the working group and this proposal was withdrawn.

The Committee established a working group (AC26 WG8) to look at item 25 with the following mandate:

On the basis of document AC26 Doc. 25 and the documentation in its Annexes, the working group shall review the objection, and provide comments for the Secretariat to forward to the Parties concerned in compliance with the provisions in Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP15).

Membership would comprise the members and alternate members of the Committee, and the AC Chair (Mr Ibero) would chair the working group.

Later in the meeting, the AC Chair introduced document AC26 WG8 Doc. 1. Whilst recognizing that the supporting evidence in the applications from the Philippines was not as complete as one might wish, much trade in specimens of the species concerned was occurring at the time of import. The Committee had therefore concluded that it seemed likely that the import had been legal. Regarding the MoU and action plan, these were an initiative that was welcome but not required, and could therefore not be accepted as a valid objection. The Chair opened the door for comments, reminding participants that, had the consultation been carried out under the postal procedure foreseen under Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP15), it would have been limited to the members of the Committee.

Commenting on recommendation 3 in the WG report, Indonesia explained that a CITES permit would have been required to export specimens of *C. moluccensis* in 1981. Regarding recommendation 4, they stated that the Committee was not in a position to assess the legality of trade. They also asked how applications that had been previously rejected by the Conference could be found to be acceptable. Finally, regarding recommendation 9, they acknowledged the voluntary nature of the MoU and clarified that their primary

objection arose from the uncertainty surrounding the conditions of acquisition of the parental breeding stock. The Chair clarified that the Committee was not making recommendations one way or another and that the language in document AC26 WG8 Doc. 1 reflected the different perceptions of the members. Questions arose on the Committee's evaluation of trade and on the conclusion drawn in recommendation 6, and it was stated that the Standing Committee was a better forum to assess the issue of legality of acquisition. The Chair commented that the word "entirely" should have been deleted from that recommendation. Some members disagreed as to whether recommendation 6 should be retained or deleted, and the Chair asked for a short conciliabule among Committee members to come to a conclusion.

The Committee adopted document AC26 WG8 Doc. 1 with the deletion of Recommendation 6 and the renumbering of the following paragraphs.<sup>22</sup> It also recommended that the Standing Committee consider in detail the issue of the legality of the founding parental stock.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi and Mr Soemorumekso) and Europe (Mr Fleming), and by Indonesia, Mexico, the Philippines, the United States, Prowildlife and SSN.

## 26. Proposals to amend the Appendices

### 26.1 Draft proposal to transfer *Trichechus senegalensis* from Appendix II to Appendix I

The Secretariat introduced document AC26 Doc. 26.1, explaining that the draft amendment proposal contained in the Annex was being submitted for comments. None of the six proponents of the proposal was represented at the meeting, but the regional representative of Africa (Mr Zahzah) had received a written statement from Senegal to introduce the proposal and Senegal had requested the statement to be read into the record, which was as follows:

*Mr Chair, honourable delegates and participants in the 26th session of the Animals Committee,*

*Senegal would like to express its most sincere regrets for not being able to participate in this meeting on behalf of the co-proponents of the proposal. We thank Dr Khaled Zahzah, the representative of Africa within the Animals Committee, for agreeing to provide his assistance on the presentation of this proposal to transfer the West African manatee (*Trichechus senegalensis*) from Appendix II to Appendix I. We also would like to inform the Committee that, since the first submission of this proposal to the Secretariat, we continued consultations within the range States and with specialists of the species, and we have updated our proposal based on these consultations. The revised version of our proposal was provided to the Committee on 13 March 2012 in document AC26 Doc. 26.1, Annex (Rev. 1), which is now available in French and in English on the CITES website. We hope that members of the Committee will have had the chance to review the revised version of our proposal.*

*Mr Chair, the draft proposal provided to you today results from intense regional consultations within the range States of the species, consultations which will continue until the submission of the proposal in October 2012. Thus, when submitting this proposal and presenting it, Senegal is talking on behalf of Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania and Sierra Leone, seven of the 21 range States of the West African manatee.*

*The West African manatee is, as you know, a species classified as "Vulnerable" in the IUCN Red List of Threatened species since 1978. This species is facing threats the impact of which is more and more destructive throughout its range, including the reduction and deterioration of its habitat, poaching for illegal trade and the consumption of its products, and climate change to just mention a few.*

*Mr Chair, our most pressing source of concern today for the survival of the species, and the reason why this proposal is before you, is the observation that illegal international trade in the products of this species is growing in our range States. Products of the manatee (meat, oil, skin, bones, genitalia) are subject to a growing demand in our countries due to the belief in their medical properties and the concomitant growth of our populations. Market prices for these products have increased significantly and illegal international trade has become a very lucrative activity for those involved in this trade. We provided information on this subject in paragraph 6.1*

---

<sup>22</sup> The report of AC26 WG8 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 15 to the present summary record.

of the proposal. All of our range States fully protect this species in their national legislation and prohibit its hunt and trade. By requesting listing of the West African manatee in CITES Appendix I, we are calling on the international community to support us in the protection of this species. A listing of the West African manatee in CITES Appendix I will lead to the implementation of stricter sanctions for those involved in illegal trade and will strengthen our enforcement efforts. A listing in Appendix I will also allow us to raise more awareness in our countries and in our communities on the priority importance of its protection.

Mr Chair, the West African manatee is a species increasingly traded internationally in our region. We consider that it has become imperative to strengthen its CITES protection to list it in Appendix I based on criteria A and C of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) Annex 1. In an effort to continue the consultations which led to the preparation of this proposal, we seek the comments and questions of the Animals Committee and of CITES Parties on this proposal. Senegal will also remain available to exchange on this proposal with any interested person after the meeting.

To close, Mr Chair, please let me respectfully request that a copy of this statement be included in the report of the Committee which will be prepared after the close of the session. I thank you and I thank members of this Committee for their input.

The Committee considered that there were doubts as to whether the draft proposal met the criteria for inclusion in Appendix I. In particular, it seemed that there was little or no international trade. More specific information on the type and volume of international trade proving its impact on the species would strengthen the proposal. Additionally, not enough information was provided on population trends, and historical and current population sizes. On the basis of the document provided, measures taken at the national level seemed better suited to address the conservation concerns.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Africa (Mr Zahzah) and North America (Ms Caceres), by the alternate representative of Europe (Mr Lörtscher) and by the United States.

#### 26.2 Draft proposal to include *Lamna nasus* in Appendix II

This agenda item was discussed in conjunction with item 16 on *Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP15) on "Conservation and management of sharks (Class Chondrichthyes)"*.

Germany introduced the draft amendment proposal contained in the Annex to document AC26 Doc. 26.2, indicating that this was a first draft and that they welcomed comments and questions. Formal consultations would be carried out if the Member States of the European Union decided to go forward with this proposal. The Chair asked participants to focus on the way the information was presented and not on whether the species should be listed or not. Two delegations assessed the proposal favourably and said that they would send comments directly to Germany subsequently, whilst another thought that the species did not meet the criteria for inclusion in Appendix II. Argentina suggested deleting the reference to "Regional Fisheries Management Organisation" in *Additional remarks* and requested that the footnote in Annex 3 on page 17 also apply to "South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands". The Chair then moved to establish a working group.

The Committee established a working group (AC26 WG4) to look at items 16 and 26.2 with the following mandate:

In support of the implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP15) and reporting by the Animals Committee at CoP16, the working group shall:

1. Examine the information provided by range States on trade and other relevant data in response to Notifications to the Parties Nos. 2010/027 and 2011/049 and taking into account discussions in plenary, together with the final report of the joint FAO/CITES *Workshop to review the application and effectiveness of international regulatory measures for the conservation and sustainable use of elasmobranchs (Italy, 2010)* and other relevant information;
2. Draft an analysis of the information mentioned in paragraph 1 above, including recommendations, for consideration by the Committee and subsequent reporting at CoP16; and

3. Review the draft proposal to include *Lamna nasus* in Appendix II, presented in document AC26 Doc. 26.2, and provide comments for consideration by the Committee.

The membership was decided as follows:

Chairs: representative of Oceania (Mr Robertson) as Chair and alternate representative of Asia (Mr Ishii) as Vice-Chair;

Parties: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom and United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: European Union, FAO, IUCN, SEAFDEC – Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, Animal Welfare Institute, Defenders of Wildlife, Fundación Cethus, Humane Society of the United States, Pew Environment Group, Project AWARE Foundation, Species Management Specialists, Species Survival Network, SWAN International, TRAFFIC International, Wildlife Conservation Society and WWF.

Later in the meeting, Mr Robertson introduced document AC26 WG4 Doc. 1. Some errors in the Spanish version were pointed out. A Party requested specifying in paragraph 5 on page 2 that the list of species appended to the document was enclosed for information purposes, adding that it had not been discussed in the working group. Additionally, it supported keeping the words "where applicable," in the first draft decision. The AC Chair and Mr Robertson thought that the amendment that had been requested was unnecessary as the list was referred to in the WG mandate as background information. The Secretariat mentioned that the first and second draft decisions should indicate to whom they were directed. It also pointed out that the process of going through the Animals Committee, then the Standing Committee, then the Secretariat, would take until July 2014, and that a direct instruction to the Secretariat would shave one year off this timeline. Finally, it drew attention to the fact that, in the current Resolution, the instruction directed to the Committee to report its analyses to the Conference only extended until CoP16. In response to this last comment, deletion of the reference to CoP meetings was suggested, especially in view of the last paragraph of the Resolution which already directed the Committee to report progress at CoP meetings. However, this last instruction was deemed not specific enough, and a change in wording was favoured over a deletion.

The Committee adopted document AC26 WG4 Doc. 1 with the following amendments:

- a) In Membership, under IGOs and NGOs, add the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals and Shark Advocates International;
- b) In Recommendation 1:
  - paragraph 1: delete "when reviewing species of concern from the Class Chondrichthyes,"; and
  - paragraph 2: delete "/Entities";
- c) In Recommendations 1-6, in Spanish, conjugate the verbs in the subjunctive mood instead of using the form "debería/n" plus infinitive, i.e. "tomen nota" instead of "deberían tomar nota", "informe" instead of "debería informar", etc.;
- d) Under "Draft decisions", Section 1):
  - Add the heading "***Directed to the Secretariat***";
  - First paragraph: delete the square brackets in "[where applicable,]" and delete "[as appropriate,]"; and
  - Second paragraph: merge with the first paragraph and amend the wording to read "REQUESTS the Animals Committee to ask the Standing Committee to request the Conference of the Parties directs the Secretariat to";

- e) Under "Draft decisions", Section 2):
- Add the heading "***Directed to the Parties***"; and
  - delete "RECOGNIZING/"; and
- f) Under "Draft amendment to Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP15)", add a recommendation to amend the second operative paragraph as follows: "DIRECTS the Animals Committee to examine new information provided by range States on trade and other available relevant data and information, and report their analyses at ~~the 16th~~ meetings of the Conference of the Parties;"<sup>23</sup>.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representative of Europe (Mr Fleming), North America (Ms Caceres) and Oceania (Mr Robertson), and by Argentina, China, Germany, Japan, Mexico and the United States.

### 26.3 Draft proposal to delete *Campephilus imperialis* from the Appendices

The Secretariat gave a brief introduction of document AC26 Doc. 26.3 and Mexico introduced the draft amendment proposal contained in the Annex. According to the study that had been carried out, the species had become extinct between 1946 and 1965 as a result of loss of habitat and local hunting, but not international trade. The species met the criteria for deletion from the Appendices laid out in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15). The original intention had been to present it as part of the Periodic Review of the Appendices, but this had not been possible because the species had not been selected in the review at the previous meeting of the Committee. Mexico had therefore decided to present it as an amendment proposal. Finally, they requested that the Secretariat acknowledge receipt of information and inform Parties of deadlines in a more timely manner in future.

The need for species considered extinct to be transferred from Appendix I to II before they could be deleted from the Appendices was questioned, as it had already been under agenda item 13.3. The Chair reiterated that a revision of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) in this regard might be in order.

The Committee considered that the draft proposal by Mexico to remove *Campephilus imperialis* from Appendix I met the criteria for such a deletion and commended Mexico for the quality of the proposal.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the regional representatives of Europe (Mr Fleming), North America (Ms Caceres) and Oceania (Mr Robertson), and by Mexico.

## 27. Reports on the actions taken by regional representatives and additional information from Parties, relevant to regional cooperation and the work of the Animals Committee

The Committee noted the regional reports.

### 27.1 Africa

The regional representative of Africa (Mr Kasiki) introduced document AC26 Doc. 27.1 and the Committee noted the report.

No intervention was made during discussion of this item.

### 27.2 Asia

The regional representative of Asia (Mr Soemorumekso) introduced document AC26 Doc. 27.2 (Rev. 1) and the Committee noted the report.

No intervention was made during discussion of this item.

---

<sup>23</sup> The report of AC26 WG4 in its final adopted form is contained in Annex 16 to the present summary record.

### 27.3 Central and South America and the Caribbean

The regional representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Calvar) introduced document AC26 Doc. 27.3. The Chair pointed out that some of the information in the report was not CITES-related and that the Committee was struggling to complete discussion of the items on the agenda as it were. The regional representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean expressed his understanding and limited the rest of his presentation to CITES-related activities that were not mentioned in the report, such as non-detriment findings made by Peru on *Tayassu pecari*.

Referring to the discussions held and template for regional reports agreed at AC25, the Chair suggested improving reporting methods by focussing the regional reports on the work of the regional representatives and on some CITES highlights, and by including further information in annexes.

The Committee noted the report.

No intervention was made during discussion of this item.

### 27.4 Europe

The regional representative of Europe (Mr Fleming) introduced document AC26 Doc. 27.4. The Chair thanked him for his brevity and regretted the lack of response from many Parties in the region. He also agreed with the regional representative of Oceania (Mr Robertson) that the substantial contribution of EUR 2.5 million that the European Commission had made towards CITES projects and activities should be acknowledged.

The Committee noted the report and acknowledged with gratitude the substantial funding that the European Commission had directed to the implementation of the Decisions adopted at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties and to capacity-building projects, as reported in document AC26 Doc. 27.5, Addendum.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

### 27.5 North America

The regional representative of North America (Ms Caceres) introduced document AC26 Doc. 27.5. Since the report had been submitted, the region had also compiled a draft resolution on non-detriment findings which would be submitted to the scientific committees for comments.

The Committee noted the report.

No intervention was made during discussion of this item.

### 27.6 Oceania

The regional representative of North America (Mr Robertson) introduced document AC26 Doc. 27.6, explaining that the main issue in the region was marine species and that he tried to involve non-Parties by keeping them informed of CITES activities and developments. This was reflected in the report and the Chair congratulated him for this effort.

The Committee noted the report.

No intervention was made during discussion of this item.

## 28. Time and venue of the 27th meeting of the Animals Committee

The Secretariat announced that, in consultation with the Chair, the *Centre International de Conférences Genève* had been booked for 7-11 April 2014. The 27th meeting would therefore be held on those dates and in that venue unless a Party offered to host it. There was no financial penalty in cancelling the reservation until one year before the scheduled date of the meeting. Regretting that he could not commit to offer to host AC27 in Spain, the Chair encouraged Parties to make an offer.

Mexico made an intervention during discussion of this item.

29. Any other business

The Minister of the Environment and Forests of Madagascar briefly attended the afternoon session of Thursday 15 March and gave a speech. The Minister highlighted the successes of CITES in his country but also the great peril threatening its fauna and flora. Madagascar had taken two measures to protect its wildlife: first to ban exports of threatened endemic species, and second to redraft its legislation. The Minister welcomed any assistance that CITES could offer to his country to protect its environment. The importance of the unique biodiversity of Madagascar was echoed by the AC Chair. The CITES Secretary-General stated that the Secretariat would support Madagascar through its capacity-building project funded by the European Commission, and he thanked Madagascar for its commitment and the European Commission for its funding.

Mexico stated that they had started a monitoring programme of *Crocodylus moreletii* in collaboration with Belize and Guatemala, and further to recommendations made by the Committee at its 23rd meeting and the IUCN Crocodile Specialist Group. It referred participants to information document AC26 Inf. 11. They detailed the work carried out so far and the information that had been gathered and fed into a CONABIO database. During a workshop to analyse results of the first monitoring season of the programme in Mexico (2011), Guatemalan participants had express interest in initiating monitoring activities in 2012, and some elements of collaboration with Mexican experts and authorities had been proposed. Mexico planned to present results at the forthcoming 21st working meeting of the IUCN Crocodile Specialist Group and hoped to report on progress at CoP16. The Chair welcomed this information from Mexico and Guatemala's involvement.

As the Spanish delegation had had to leave, the Chair read out a statement on its behalf announcing the forthcoming 11th edition of the Master's course on *Management, Access and Conservation of Species in Trade: the International Framework* at the International University of Andalusia. Spain thanked the Parties that helped maintain this course. Registration had started, as explained in information document AC26/PC20 Inf. 2, and a Notification to the Parties would follow.

Ireland stated that it looked forward to welcoming the participants at the joint sessions in Dublin on Thursday 22 March. They explained that the holding of the two meetings back-to-back had not been possible owing to logistic rather than financial reasons, and they encouraged other Parties to host the Committees' meetings.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by Ireland, Madagascar and Mexico.

30. Closing remarks (of the joint sessions with the 20th meeting of the Plants Committee and of the 26th meeting of the Animals Committee)

At the end of the joint sessions with the Plants Committee, the Chair of the Plants Committee, the Chair of the Animals Committee and the CITES Secretary-General thanked Ireland for hosting the joint meeting and the United States for supporting it. They also thanked all the participants and in particular the interpreters. The Chairs of the Committees then closed the joint sessions of the 26th meeting of the Animals Committee and 20th meeting of the Plants Committee.

At the end of the last session of the Animals Committee meeting, the Chair thanked the members of the Committee, the participants and the Secretariat for their active participation, and the interpreters for their work. On behalf of the Committee, the representative of Oceania (Mr Robertson) congratulated and thanked the Chair for his leadership and guidance.

**Results of discussions of the Animals and Plants Committees on item 5  
on Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)  
(Decision 15.12), based on document AC26/PC20 DG1 Doc. 1**

**Document adopted by the Committees**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

- Co-Chairs: PC representative of North America (Mr Benitez-Diaz) and AC representative of Europe (Mr Fleming); and
- Members: China, Republic of Korea, Chair of the Standing Committee, CMS and CITES Secretariat.

Mandate

On the basis of discussion in the plenary and contributions from the Chairs, as well as the Secretariat, the working group shall finalize the wording of a draft statement that CITES could make at the fifth meeting of the Chairs of Scientific Advisory Bodies of Biodiversity-related Conventions and at the second session of the IPBES plenary, whether individually or in coordination with the secretariats and scientific bodies of other biodiversity-related conventions.

Recommendations

1. The Drafting Group has noted the historical developments related to IPBES, including the Busan Outcome, Decision 15.12 of the Conference of the Parties to CITES, guidance provided by SC61 and the first plenary meeting for IPBES. The joint statement of the biodiversity-related conventions to the first plenary meeting for IPBES noted the need for strong linkages between the Platform and the Conventions and stressed that the Conventions stood ready to contribute ideas and proposals for the work of IPBES.
2. The Drafting Group recommends that the following key points be endorsed by the Animals and Plants Committees:
  - a) The second meeting of the plenary for IPBES (Panama City, April 2012) should clarify the means by which [CITES] is to participate in IPBES. For example, [CITES] [biodiversity-related conventions] could have a special status in IPBES, perhaps as participating organizations similar to those recognized in the IPCC.
  - b) There should be a two-way relationship between [CITES] and IPBES in which the [Convention] is both a user or beneficiary of IPBES as well as a contributor to IPBES.
  - c) A mechanism should be developed for facilitating communication between [CITES] and IPBES (e.g. for the conveyance of government requests to IPBES from the Conference of the Parties).
  - d) Cooperation among the secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions in relation to IPBES could be facilitated through a cooperative Memorandum of Understanding between the Biodiversity Liaison Group and the IPBES Secretariat.
  - e) [CITES] already has a great deal of information, knowledge and experience – as well as existing databases – to contribute to IPBES (e.g. regarding the sustainable use of listed species in international trade and the ecosystem services that these species provide) and additional information, knowledge and experience will be generated and shared in the future. In this connection, [CITES] can contribute to each of the four key functions identified in the work programme for IPBES (assessment, knowledge generation, policy support tools and methodologies and capacity building).
  - f) The identification of capacity building needs and related financing by IPBES offers an opportunity to ensure that capacity building is linked wherever possible to the enhanced use of applied science for implementation of [CITES].

- g) Every effort should be made to enhance effective cooperation between [CITES] and IPBES and to avoid duplication.
  - h) Collaboration between [CITES] and IPBES should occur at the global, regional and national levels.
3. If, following the second meeting of the plenary for IPBES, there is any need for the Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committees and the Secretariat to participate in IPBES-related meetings before CoP16, this should be addressed in a discussion document prepared by the Secretariat for consideration by SC62. The same discussion document should also propose terms of reference for the Chairs and Secretariat to guide their engagement with IPBES prior to CoP16.

**Results of discussions of the Animals and Plants Committees on item 7 on *Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade [Decision 13.67 (Rev. CoP14)]*, based on document AC26/PC20 WG2 Doc. 2**

**Document adopted by the Committees**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

Chairs:	Carolina Caceres, North American Representative on the Animals Committee, Noel McGough, Nomenclature specialist on the Plants Committee;
Members and alternate members:	AC representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), PC representative of Africa (Mr Hafashimana), Alternate AC representative of Europe (Mr Lörtscher);
Parties:	Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Netherlands, South Africa, Tanzania, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States of America; and
IGOs and NGOs:	EU, IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, TRAFFIC, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, Humane Society International, WWF, Natural Resources Defence Council and Species Survival Network.

Mandate

On the basis discussions in plenary and document AC26/PC20 Doc. 7, the working group shall:

1. examine the case studies presented in Annex 3 to document AC26/PC20 Doc. 7 and provide comments orally for the plenary;
2. determine the agenda and any instructions for the meeting of the advisory working group for the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade to be held in June 2012;
3. prepare a roadmap for the preparation of the final report on the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade for presentation at the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and
4. confirm the final membership of the advisory working group.

Recommendations

1. The Animals and Plants Committee are invited to provide the advisory working group for the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade with the observations made by the Dublin working group (below) for their discussion at the meeting to be held in June 2012.
2. The Animals and Plants Committee are invited to adopt the following as a proposed agenda for the meeting of the advisory group and roadmap for the preparation of the final report:

Draft Agenda

- a) Introductions
- b) Overview of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), *Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species*, including its objections and process followed
- c) Presentation on the Results of the Case Studies
- d) Review progress against the Terms of Reference and *modus operandi* for the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade and make recommendations for the consideration of the Animals and Plants Committees, focussing in particular on:

- i) Selection
  - ii) Correspondence and Communications
  - iii) Categorization
  - iv) Recommendations
  - v) Implementation of Recommendations
  - vi) Non-article IV issues
  - vii) Other
- e) Impact of the Review of Significant Trade
  - f) Conclusions and Next Steps (including management plans and action plans)
  - g) Approval of a report for the Animals and Plants Committees

#### Roadmap

Today – June 2012	<i>Opportunity for Parties and interested organizations to provide their feedback to the advisory working group co-chairs</i>
June 2012	Meeting of the Advisory Working Group, Vilm, Germany
July 2012	Oral report on progress to the Standing Committee
June – October 2012	Develop report for CoP16, reporting on current progress, initial conclusions and next steps
April 2013 – July 2014	Advisory Working Group works intersessionally to follow-up on direction confirmed by the Animals and Plants Committees.
April 2014	Report of the Advisory Working Group to be considered by AC27/PC21.
July 2014	Submit draft recommendations to Animals Committee and Plants Committee (may include changes to resolution as identified)
2014 Standing Committee Meeting	Report on progress to Standing Committee
2014 – 2015	Intersessional work to further elaborate draft recommendations following direction provided by AC/PC/SC
2014 – 2015	<i>Opportunity for Parties and interested organizations to provide their feedback to the advisory working group co-chairs</i>
2015 Meetings of the Animals & Plants Committees	Final draft report and recommendations to be agreed by the Animals and Plants Committee
2015 Standing Committee Meeting	Final draft report and recommendations presented to the Standing Committee
2015 – 2016	Final report and recommendations completed based on AC/PC/SC direction and recommendations submitted to CoP 17
2016	CoP 17

3. The Animals and Plants Committees agreed that the Advisory Working Group should take account of the following observations:

It was noted that the final membership of the advisory working group may change in that the currently identified representatives may no longer be available. The Co-Chairs of the advisory working group will work with the Secretariat and the Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committee to confirm the final participants in the advisory working group as soon as possible.

COMMENTS ON AC26/PC20 DOC. 7 THAT MAY BE OF RELEVANCE  
FOR THE MEETING OF THE ADVISORY WORKING GROUP IN JUNE

It was noted that, whereas the case studies were presented on a species by species basis, most of the issues arising were cross-cutting in nature.

There was much discussion of the utility of conducting more country reviews, which might offer a means of addressing systemic capacity issues. Some discussion took place on the only country review to have been carried out to date; namely Madagascar. It was noted that no funds had been available to evaluate this review in parallel with the case studies considered by TRAFFIC. However, there was agreement that, if funds were made available in time, an evaluation of the Madagascar country review would be an invaluable aid to the discussions of the advisory working group meeting in June.

With regard to the remark in TRAFFIC's report that many of the most important issues that emerged in the case studies were not directly related to implementation of Article IV, the need for a more holistic approach was noted. At present, the only scope to deal with issues not relating to Article IV is for the Committees to bring these to the attention of the Secretariat. The Secretariat informed the group that, when it was made aware of such issues, the information was normally passed on to the relevant desk officer in the Secretariat. Depending on the seriousness of the issue raised, the Secretariat would decide subsequently whether or not to refer the matter to the Standing Committee. The working group felt that a more formalised process for dealing with such issues should be considered. It was also suggested that the advisory working group look at the case of bigleaf mahogany, where parallel processes are running in both the Plants and Standing Committees addressing Article IV issues and legal issues respectively.

The group also discussed the merits of the present system for informing the Standing Committee whether or not recommendations from the Plants or Animals Committees have been met. At present, this is decided upon by the Committee chairs, in consultation with the Secretariat. However the Chairs might not have been directly involved in formulating these recommendations at an earlier stage and so may not be in the best position to decide whether or not they had been complied with.

Cases where the same species was entered into review more than once were considered. This could be due to a range of factors, such as range States resuming high levels of trade once scrutiny had eased, shifts in trade to other range States, flaws in the recommendations provided by the Committees or simply poor communication and understanding. The question of range States establishing zero quotas in response to the review was discussed at some length. There was concern that sometimes this happened because the range States saw this as an easier route than trying to implement complex recommendations. There was also concern that such zero quotas could be lifted once the species/ country exited from the review. The Committees were responding to this problem by effectively requiring the relevant range States to seek Committee approval for resumption of trade. However, the wisdom of having an ever-accumulating list of such species/ countries was questioned.

Poor communication – and associated poor understanding on the part of range States in receipt of correspondence – emerged as major issues. It was noted that some countries that were subject to trade suspensions as a result of failure to respond to correspondence might not necessarily have more serious underlying problems relating to implementation of Article IV. It was recommended that the initial letter from the Secretariat be made more explanatory – e.g. by including a questionnaire. It was also recommended that range States be encouraged to see the process as an opportunity to draw attention to problems of capacity and to seek assistance in remedying these. It was also noted that better communication with range States in the initial stages might help to eliminate more countries, thus making the later stages more efficient.

The database which would allow structured review of past cases was universally welcomed. The Secretariat indicated that they intended to include correspondence from range States in the database, albeit with restricted access. In this regard, the working group noted the recommendation of the Animals Committee that in future range States be asked to specify if they did not want their correspondence to be made public, with a presumption that otherwise it would be.

The working group discussed means to make the process more efficient by resourcing it better in the initial stages. It was noted that the initial analysis provided to the Committees to aid in the selection process is carried out voluntarily by UNEP-WCMC; core funds are only sufficient to cover the cost of providing the raw trade data in phase 1 and the more detailed evaluations later. UNEP-WCMC indicated that, with more resources, they could make the initial selection process more efficient by developing automated ways of filtering out artefacts

that were the result of improved reporting, or cases where, despite a rising trend of overall trade volumes, some range States were exporting few or no specimens. It was also pointed out that, although the process appears very drawn out, the timespans for the later in-depth reviews are, in fact, very tight. This lends weight to the need to eliminate non-problem cases at the earliest opportunity.

More generally, the slowness of the process remains an issue. It was noted that this is determined by the frequency of physical meetings of the Committees and that it could be speeded up considerably without any need to amend Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) if the Committees were prepared to do more work intersessionally.

The need for improved guidance on the process was noted. There is a module devoted to it in the Virtual College. However, further means to provide expanded guidance could be considered.

**Results of discussions of the Animals and Plants Committees on item 8 on  
*Non-detriment findings* based on document AC26/PC20 WG3 Doc. 1**

**Document adopted by the Committees**

Membership

- Co-Chairs: Mr Carlos Ibero Solana and Ms Margarita África Clemente Muñoz;
- Members: AC Representatives: Africa, Asia, Central and South America and the Caribbean; Europe; North America and Oceania; PC Representatives: Africa, Asia, Central and South America and the Caribbean; North America and Oceania;
- Party observers: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Kuwait, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Poland, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, South Africa, Thailand, The Netherlands, United Kingdom; United States of America;
- CITES Secretariat: Mr John Scanlon, Ms Milena Sosa Schmidt, Ms Elena Kvitsinskaia; and
- IGOs and NGOs: European Commission, IUCN, Assoc of Midwest Fish & Wildlife Agencies, Assoc. of Northeast Fish & Wildlife Agencies, Assoc. of Western Fish & Wildlife Agencies, Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies, Conservation Force, CSA&C, Eurogroup for Animals, HSI, Humane Society US, NRDC, Safari Club International Foundation, SSN, TRAFFIC International.

Mandate

The working group shall:

1. review and provide comments on the actions proposed in paragraphs 15 and 16 of document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.2;
2. on the basis of document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.4 and taking account of the results of the International Expert Workshop on Non-Detriment Findings (Cancún, November 2008) and the responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2009/023, paragraph 1 f) of Notification to the Parties No. 2010/027, Notification to the Parties No. 2011/004 and paragraph f) of Notification to the Parties No. 2011/049, prepare draft guidance on the making on non-detriment findings, which can be conveyed to Parties for comment, in line with paragraph d) iii) of Decision 15.24; and
3. on the basis of document AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.5, prepare a discussion paper for consideration at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP16) with options on how to use the workshop outputs, including a draft resolution on the establishment of non-legally binding guidelines for the making of non-detriment findings.

Recommendations

1. The Working Group concludes that the point 1 is included in 3.
2. The Working Group concludes that the Annex Doc. AC26/PC20 Doc.8.4 has to be submitted to the CoP16 as reference and flexible examples for the Parties to make NDF.
3. Regarding point 3: the Working Group recommends the following draft resolution be adopted by the Animals and Plants Committees:

## Non-detriment findings

RECOGNIZING that according to Articles II, III, and IV of the Convention, Parties shall only allow trade in specimens of species included in Appendices I and II in accordance with their provisions, it is required that an export permit shall only be granted when a Scientific Authority of the State of export has advised that such export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species being traded (i.e. non-detriment finding or NDF), which shall be considered an essential requirement for CITES implementation;

RECALLING also that Article IV, paragraph 3, requires a Scientific Authority of each Party to monitor exports of Appendix-II species and to advise the Management Authority of suitable measures to be taken to limit such exports in order to maintain such species throughout their range at a level consistent with their role in the ecosystem [and well above the level at which they would qualify for Appendix I];

NOTING that Resolution Conf. 14.7 (Rev. CoP15) recommends that, when Parties are establishing national voluntary export quotas, they should do so based on a non-detriment finding by the Scientific Authority of the State of export;

RECALLING furthermore that, in Resolution Conf. 10.3 (*Designation and role of the Scientific Authorities*), the Conference of the Parties recommends, amongst other things, that:

- c) Management Authorities not issue any export or import permit, or certificate of introduction from the sea, for species listed in the Appendices without first obtaining the appropriate Scientific Authority findings or advice; and
- h) the findings and advice of the Scientific Authority of the country of export be based on the scientific review of available information on the population status, distribution, population trend, harvest and other biological and ecological factors, as appropriate, and trade information relating to the species concerned;

RECALLING that the effective implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6 (a) will prevent the need to take appropriate actions according to Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) on the *Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species*;

NOTING that the great variety of taxa, life forms and biological characteristics of species included in Appendices I and II supports the idea that there are various ways a Scientific Authority can make non-detriment findings;

AWARE of the challenges Parties face when making scientifically-based non-detriment findings, and that guiding principles and experience sharing for making non-detriment findings would improve implementation of Articles III and IV of the Convention;

RECOGNIZING the outputs of the national and international/regional workshops on CITES non-detriment findings (China, Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Kuwait, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, etc.), the guidance for CITES Scientific Authorities produced by the IUCN and, other capacity-building workshops;

*Note: It was agreed to mention in the preamble the CITES Strategic Vision in its updated version as appropriate [REAFFIRMING Objective 1.5 of the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013 (Resolution Conf. 14.2) adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its 14th meeting (The Hague, 2007), that the best available scientific information is the basis for non-detriment findings].*

### THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

RECOMMENDS that:

- a) Scientific Authorities consider the following, non-binding, guiding principles in advising that trade will, or will not, be detrimental to the survival of a species:
  - i) The non-detriment findings for Appendix-I and -II species is a science-based assessment that verifies that the proposed export is not detrimental to the survival of that species.

- ii) The non-detriment finding considers whether the species is maintained throughout its range at a level consistent with its role in the ecosystems in which it occurs.
- iii) The data requirements for a non-detriment finding depend on the level of risk and shall be influenced by, and be proportionate, to the vulnerability of the target species.
- iv) The making of an effective non-detriment finding relies upon specimen verification and certainty of identification for all specimens.
- v) The origin of the specimen will affect the type of non-detriment finding assessment that is appropriate, and may simplify assessment of risk.
- vi) When making a non-detriment finding, the methodology used should employ flexibility that enables the specific and individual characteristics of different taxa to be considered.
- vii) The implementation of adaptive management, including monitoring, is an important consideration in the non-detriment finding making process.
- viii) The non-detriment finding is based on resource assessment methodologies which may include consideration of, but not limited to:
  - A. species biology and life history characteristics;
  - B. species range – historic and current;
  - C. population structure, status and trends (nationally or in the harvested area);
  - D. threats;
  - E. species-specific levels and patterns of harvest/mortality (e.g. age, sex) - historic and current;
  - F. estimates of species-specific levels of harvest/mortality from all sources combined;
  - G. management measures currently in place and proposed, including adaptive management strategies and consideration of levels of compliance; and
  - H. results of population monitoring.
- ix) The sources of information that may be considered by the Scientific Authorities, but not limited to, in making non-detriment finding includes:
  - A. relevant scientific literature concerning species biology, life history, distribution and population trends;
  - B. details of any ecological risk assessments conducted;
  - C. scientific surveys conducted at harvest locations and at sites protected from harvest and other impacts); and
  - D. relevant knowledge and expertise of local and indigenous communities.
- b) Parties consider as reference for making non-detriment findings the information included in the Annex of AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.4 and any subsequent updates available on the CITES Website (<http://www.cites.org/eng/prog/ndf/index.php>).

ENCOURAGE Parties:

- a) to explore more methods of making non-detriment findings;
- b) to share experiences and examples of making non-detriment findings, including through appropriate regional or subregional workshops, and communicate them to the Secretariat;

- c) to maintain written records of the science-based rationale included in the Scientific Authorities non-detriment finding assessments; and
- d) to offer, on request, cooperative assistance to developing countries, for improvement of capacity regarding non-detriment finding based on nationally identified needs. Such cooperative assistance could take multiple forms, including financial and technical support.

DIRECTS the Secretariat:

- a) to maintain and update regularly with information from the Animals and Plants Committees and Parties, a prominent section, with appropriate categorization of the information, on the CITES web site devoted to the making of non-detriment findings;
- b) to implement a user-friendly mechanism on the CITES website that would allow Parties to easily submit relevant information to be considered for inclusion in the website;
- c) to request that this information is accessible in the Introduction to CITES and non-detriment findings course in the CITES Virtual College; and
- d) to assist identifying possible funding sources to help Parties implementing capacity building activities to make non-detriment findings.

**Results of discussions of the Animals and Plants Committees on item 9  
on *Capacity-building programme for science-based establishment and implementation  
of voluntary national export quotas for Appendix-II species (Decision 12.91) – Report of the joint  
working group, based on document AC26/PC20 Com. 1***

**Document adopted by the Committees**

1. Further report of the working group Co-Chairs.
2. In relation to paragraph 14 d) of document AC26/PC20 Doc. 9, the Plants and Animal Committees are invited to consider the following draft Decision for submission at the 16th Conference of the Parties:

16.XX ***Directed to the Secretariat***

The Secretariat shall:

- a) invite Parties to submit their experiences and the results from workshops, projects or publications related to the making of NDFs for inclusion on the CITES website; and
  - b) ensure this information is available in other formats (e.g. CD-Rom) where appropriate.
3. In order to ensure that the Committees provide scientific advice to the Secretariat on its capacity-building materials on a permanent basis the Animal and Plants Committees are invited to adopt the following suggested text changes to Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP15) on *Establishment of committees* in order to facilitate this work:

In paragraph d) of the first RESOLVES of Annex 2 Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP15) on *Establishment of committees*, add the underlined text:

- d) *cooperate with the Secretariat on the implementation of its programme of work to assist Scientific Authorities and provide scientific advice on training materials used in capacity-building; and*

and

Repeal the text in paragraph c) of Decision 15.24 and repeal the following text from Decision 12.91 as follows:

*“and shall, as appropriate, consult with the Animals Committee and Plants Committee on this programme. This consultation may include:*

- a) *solicitation of input from the Committees regarding materials used in the capacity-building programme for voluntary national export quotas for Appendix-II species; and*
- b) *a request for new information from the Committees on methods used for establishing quotas and for relevant case studies on the establishment of quotas.”*

**Results of discussions of the Animals and Plants Committees on item 11 on  
*Transport of live specimens (Decision 15.59) – Report of the joint working group,*  
based on document AC26/PC20 WG1°Doc.°1**

**Document adopted by the Committees**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

Chair:	Austria;
Parties:	Ireland and United States of America; and
IGOs and NGOs:	Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, Animal Welfare Institute, Alliance of Marine Mammal Parks and Aquariums, International Environmental Resources.

Mandate

The working group shall:

1. review and finalize the draft set of guidelines on non-air transport of live specimens provided by the co-chairs, which would replace the CITES *Guidelines for transport and preparation for shipment of live wild animals and plants* (1981);
2. consider whether the final draft guidelines should be incorporated into an existing Resolution of the Conference of the Parties or the IATA/LAR and IATA/PCR, or be provided to Parties in some other way, and make related recommendations including the repeal of the existing Guidelines;
3. review and, if needed, propose revisions to Resolution Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP14) and Resolution Conf. 12.3 (CoP15); and
4. determine whether one or more draft decisions are needed to provide for and guide future work on the transport of live specimens and, if so, prepare such draft decisions.

Recommendations

1. The Animals and Plants Committees should endorse the finalized CITES Guidelines for the Non-Air Transport of Live Wild Animals and Plants to replace the CITES *Guidelines for transport and preparation for shipment of live wild animals and plants* (1981);
2. The CITES Guidelines for the Non-Air Transport of Live Wild Animals and Plants should be made available on the CITES website and shared with IATA for possible incorporation into the IATA LAR and PCR;
3. The Animals and Plants Committees should endorse the proposed revisions of Resolution Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP14) for onward transmission to CoP16;
4. No revisions to Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP15) are necessary.

## CITES GUIDELINES FOR THE NON-AIR TRANSPORT OF LIVE WILD ANIMALS AND PLANTS

### 1. Introduction

At the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International

Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) (Bern, 1976), it was resolved that guidelines on the care and shipment of live specimens of species listed under the Convention should be prepared. At the special working session of the Conference (Geneva, 1977), it was agreed that such guidelines should apply to all animals and plants, not just those currently listed under the Convention. It was further agreed that such guidelines should cover all forms of transport, be practical, and should be directed to the use of persons actually handling the consignments as well as the enforcement authorities.

The resulting Guidelines for the transport and preparation for shipment of live wild animals and plants were broadly based upon the "Live Animals Regulations" (LAR) of the International Air Transport Association (IATA) and were finalized and made available to Parties in 1981.

At the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Santiago, 2002), Parties determined that the Guidelines were out of date and directed the Animals Committee to consider their replacement. The Animals Committee's Transport Working Group (TWG) subsequently determined that the IATA LAR provided appropriate guidance in most situations for the transport of live wild specimens of all CITES-listed species, regardless of the mode of transport.

At the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Bangkok, 2004), the Parties adopted a Decision directing the Animals Committee, in consultation with the Plants Committee and the Secretariat, to develop up-to-date guidance on the transport of live animals and plants of CITES-listed species to replace the 1981 CITES Guidelines. The subsequent work of the TWG led to a revision of Resolution Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP14) at the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (The Hague, 2007). The revised Resolution recommended that Parties promote the use of the IATA LAR and IATA Perishable Cargo Regulations (PCR- for the transport of Plants) by Management Authorities, and that these IATA Regulations be used as a reference to indicate suitable conditions for transport by means other than air where appropriate. The Resolution also recommended that the LAR and PCR be incorporated into Parties' domestic legislation or policies.

At the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Doha, 2010), the Animals Committee was directed to develop a supplement to the IATA LAR for CITES-listed taxa that required non-air transport conditions different from those listed in the IATA LAR. The Conference also agreed to delete the reference to the use of the Guidelines for the transport and preparation for shipment of live wild animals and plants in box 5 of the CITES permit, leaving references only to the use of the IATA LAR and PCR.

The envisaged supplement to the IATA LAR is presented here. It is a two part document. The first part covers "General Conditions" for the transport of live animals. The second part deals with the "Technical Specifications" that deviate from the IATA LAR in respect to the non-air-transport of certain taxa and only apply to the species listed therein.

Like the IATA LAR, non-air transport methods are continually evolving and this supplement may be amended over time as innovations in live wild animal transport are made. CITES will collaborate with the IATA Live Animals and Perishables Board to determine whether and how this supplement may be included in future IATA editions of the LAR and then made available to Parties.

This supplement was developed to indicate where the IATA LAR is not entirely sufficient for the non-air transport for certain CITES-listed species. The deviations provided in the supplement only apply to the non-air transport of the identified taxa. All wildlife, including the identified taxa herein, may be transported by air, road, rail or ship according to the methods listed in the most current edition of the IATA LAR.

### 2. General Conditions

For the shipment of plants the IATA PCR apply.

IATA LAR are appropriate for the non-air-transport of all species of animals. However, for transports exceeding 48 hours additional provisions may be necessary. Such provisions may include but are not limited to:

- Increase of space available per animal;
- Decrease of density of animals;
- Measures that prevent fecal buildup;
- Additional lighting;
- Behavioural enrichment;
- Temperature and ventilation modifications,

However, for some taxa, deviations from the LAR are equally appropriate and may be the preferred method chosen by the person responsible for the shipment of live animals.

For taxa and deviations refer to the "Technical Specifications".

### **General conditions for the transport of live animals**

The transport of an animal constitutes an unnatural situation for the animal and is most likely to cause it some degree of stress. High levels of stress may increase metabolic rates, hazardous behaviour, chances of injuries and susceptibility to diseases.

For reasons of animal welfare, animal transport should be quick, efficient and strive to avoid as much stress as possible to the animal;

The transport of live animals must be well planned, well prepared and effectively executed!

For long distances, air transport should be the first consideration!

Animals must:

- never be transported in a way likely to cause them unnecessary fear, injury, damage to health or undue suffering;
- be checked for fitness for transport before loading.

An animal that is injured or that has physiological weaknesses or pathological problems should not be considered fit for transport especially if:

- it is unable to move independently without pain;
- it has a severe open wound, or prolapse;
- it is a pregnant female for whom 90 % or more of the expected gestation period has already passed;
- it is a female that has given birth in the previous week;
- it is a new-born mammal in which the navel has not completely healed;
- it is a cervid in velvet;

However, sick and/or injured animals may be transported if:

- the illness or injury is part of a research programme,
- the animals are transported under veterinary supervision for or following veterinary treatment or diagnosis, (i.e the animal is being transported to receive medical treatment for its condition, etc.)

Sedatives should not be used on animals to be transported unless strictly necessary to ensure the welfare of the animals and should only be used under veterinary supervision.

In cases where anaesthesia has been given, the animal must be completely awake, alert and able to balance itself before the transport commences. Detailed information must be clearly noted on the container and accompanying paperwork.

### **Planning obligations for the transport of live animals**

Transporters and organizers of transports have an obligation to plan the transport to ensure that the welfare of the animals is not compromised.

Sound knowledge of the species in transport is of greatest importance. Comprehensive information, when available, about the animal should contain:

- age
- sex
- social structure

- nutrition and feeding requirements
- animal's health and medical history
- environmental requirements including lighting, humidity and temperature
- imprinting
- pedigree
- behaviour profile including individual characteristics and peculiarities.

Weather conditions, status of transport routes, potential causes for delays, border wait times, legal obligations that may include commercial licenses, driver's rest, traffic bans, truck scales, chase vehicles, passport requirements, visas, locations of fuel and repair services, etc. should be investigated and must be taken into account prior to the onset of transport.

National and international laws and regulations as applicable in the countries of origin, transit, and destination must be investigated and complied with. Before preparing a live animal for transport, shippers must always obtain full information well in advance concerning import/export, in-transit permit, veterinary health certificate, veterinary import/export permit, CITES import/export/re-export permit, veterinary examination, pre-arrival declaration, and clearance times, quarantine, ports of entry, border inspection posts and prohibition restrictions, which may include traffic bans, veterinary restrictions as well as restrictions for food and bedding provided for the animal.

Customs and veterinary clearances, as well as other relevant services may not be available on weekends and holidays.

It is the shipper's responsibility to ascertain what national legislation regarding the protection of animals during transport is in force for all countries through which the animals are being transported, and to obtain all necessary documents, permits, certificates and licenses prior to departure.

All necessary advance arrangements in compliance with applicable laws and regulations must be made to minimize the duration of the transport and to meet the animals needs during and after transport. Arrangements must be made for animals to be delivered to the consignee upon arrival at its destination. The shipper is obliged to inform the consignee of the anticipated time of arrival and the receiver should make every effort to be present at the time the animal arrives at its destination.

The shipper is responsible for all necessary marking and labelling regarding the transport and/or containers.

Contingency plans in the event of an emergency are strongly recommended.

Contingency plans should contain information on:

- appropriate measures to be taken if an animal escapes;
- locations and contact details of appropriate repair facilities along the route;
- locations and contact details of appropriate veterinary services along the route;
- locations and contact details of zoos or aquariums along the route;
- emergency telephone codes;
- contact details of appropriate authorities;
- alternative routes;
- locations and contact details of appropriate services along the alternative route;
- any other information that may be appropriate.

### **Means of transport**

The means of transport, containers and their fittings should be designed, constructed, maintained and operated so as to:

- avoid unnecessary fear, injury, damage to health, suffering, cruel treatment, and to ensure the safety of the animal;
- protect animals from inclement weather and adverse changes in climatic conditions;
- provide ambient temperatures appropriate for the transported species at all times during the transport;
- be easily and properly cleaned and disinfected;
- prevent the animal from escaping or falling out and be able to withstand the stresses of movements;
- ensure that air quality and quantity appropriate to the species transported can be maintained;
- animals must not be exposed to exhaust gases;
- present a non-slip flooring surface;

- present a flooring surface that absorbs urines, contains faeces and minimizes the leakage of either outside of the container;
- provide a means of lighting sufficient for inspection and care of the animal during transport.

Special consideration must be given to measures to prevent adverse impacts from climatic changes in the case of transports over long distances or over major differences in elevation.

Partitions and compartments must be strong enough to withstand the weight of the animal.

Access to each individual compartment, without disturbing other animals, should be provided in case an animal is in distress or injured.

Animals should be provided with appropriate bedding or equivalent material which guarantees their comfort appropriate to the species, the number of animals being transported, the transportation time, and the weather. The material should adequately absorb urine and faeces and must not contravene legislation as applicable.

A sufficient supply of bedding material should be carried on the vehicle or should be available en route as required.

The means of transport should be equipped with a roof of light colour that is able to prevent animals from escaping.

Containers must always be kept upright and severe jolts or shaking should be minimized.

Containers must be secured throughout the transport so as to prevent displacement due to the movements and/or vibrations of the conveyance.

Vehicles should be equipped with appropriate-sized fire-extinguishers.

Shippers should crate-train or otherwise acclimate animals to be transported with transport container and vehicle.

Surveillance systems to monitor animals during transport are highly recommended

### **Marking and Labelling**

Vehicles in which animals are transported should be clearly marked indicating the presence of live animals except when the animals are transported in containers that are clearly marked indicating the presence of live animals and with a sign indicating the top of the container.

All markings and labels must be legible, durable and printed or otherwise marked on or affixed to the external surface of the container or vehicle.

Containers carrying animals which can inflict poisonous or venomous bites and stings must be boldly marked "POISONOUS" or "VENOMOUS".

Poisonous or venomous animals should be double-packed to prevent escape. Vehicles or containers carrying animals that can possibly inflict injury must have an additional warning label "This Animal Bites" or "Dangerous Animal".

### **Persons accompanying transports**

Personnel accompanying and handling animals should be appropriately trained and competent for this purpose and should carry out their duties diligently without using methods likely to cause unnecessary fear, injury, damage to health or suffering of the animal(s) or any personnel connected with the transport.

It is strongly recommended that appropriate training and experience with the respective species be a prerequisite for any person accompanying shipments of that animal and any person handling that animal during and after transport.

No person should transport animals or cause animals to be transported in a way likely to cause unnecessary fear, injury, damage to health, suffering or cruel treatment.

An individual deemed competent to accompany a shipment of live animals should possess the following, as appropriate to the species:

- knowledge of transport regulations as applicable;
- knowledge of animal health and welfare regulations, and document requirements applicable to the countries of origin, transit and destination;
- knowledge of the handling and care of animals before, during and after loading/unloading, and transport;
- ability to recognize an animal which is ill or becomes unfit for transport;
- ability to recognize signs of stress and their causes, and how to reduce these;
- ability to handle emergency situations.

All accompanying personnel should possess a valid passport with visas or equivalent identifying documents as required, and means of communication.

### **Loading and unloading**

The loading and unloading facilities should be adequately designed, constructed, maintained, and operated so as to avoid unnecessary fear, injury, damage to health, suffering, cruel treatment, and to ensure the safety of the animals.

Appropriate surfaces and appropriate protections shall be provided so as to prevent animals from escaping.

If ramps are used in the process of loading and unloading they should be installed at a height and angle appropriate for the species, and be so designed as to ensure that the animals can traverse it without risks or difficulties.

All necessary facilities and equipment for crating, hoisting of containers, loading and unloading should be in place and readily available to minimize the time for loading and unloading, to ensure the animal's welfare, and to minimize the risk of unnecessary fear, injury, damage to health, suffering and cruel treatment.

Goods such as feed which are being transported in the same conveyance as animals must be positioned and secured so that they do not interfere with the transport of the animals and cause unnecessary fear, injury, damage to health or suffering to the animals.

Advance arrangements should be made so that all appropriate equipment and personnel are in place at the place of destination at the estimated time of arrival to ensure quick and safe unloading of all animals.

Appropriate lighting should be provided during loading and unloading.

It is essential that specific measures are implemented to safeguard the health and welfare of animals and all personnel during and after loading and unloading.

When containers loaded with animals are stacked on top of each other on the conveyance, the necessary precautions shall be taken:

- to avoid urine and faeces falling on the animals placed underneath;
- to ensure stability of the containers;
- to ensure that ventilation is not impeded.

Animals must be handled and transported separately in the following cases:

- animals of different species;
- animals of significantly different sizes or ages;
- sexually mature males;
- animals with horns
- animals aggressive to each other

This may not apply to animals from proven compatible groups, animals that are acclimated to each other and/or where separation will cause distress, or females accompanied by dependent and/or unweaned young.

All animals should be checked upon their arrival at the place of destination by experienced and trained handlers and/or veterinary personnel.

Animals must be moved with care at all times.

Appropriate provisions should be taken at the destination to allow transported animals to adapt to its new environment.

### **During transport**

Space allowances shall comply with IATA LAR for transports of all modes of transport for up to 48 hours.

For taxa described in the "technical specifications" of this non-air transport supplement, space allowances should comply with the figures laid out therein.

Sufficient ventilation without injurious drafts and adequate protection from the elements must be provided at all times during the transport to ensure that the needs of the animals are fully met. Transporters must take into account the species and number of animals transported, the expected weather conditions during the transport, and the possibility of unexpected stops.

Containers should be stored in a way in which ambient conditions are stable and appropriate, and that does not impede ventilation.

Food and water provided for animals should be appropriate for the species and the individual's size and age. It should be made available, at appropriate intervals, depending on ambient climatic conditions encountered during transport.

Food and water should always be offered in a way that is familiar to the animal and that also minimizes contamination.

The conveyance should carry a sufficient quantity of appropriate food for the animals during the transport. The food must be protected from the weather and from contaminants such as dust, fuel, exhaust gases and animal excrements.

Where specific feeding equipment is used for the feeding of animals, that equipment should be transported in the conveyance.

Where feeding equipment is used, it should be so designed that it is not hazardous to the animals, and if necessary, should be affixed to the container or conveyance to prevent its contents from spillage. When the equipment is not in use, it should be stored away from the animals.

In the case of two or more animals per compartment, the natural behaviour of the animals, particularly social aspects, must be considered, and food and water should be offered in a way as to be accessible to every animal.

An adequate supply of water is essential for most species.

The watering devices should be in good working order and be appropriately designed and positioned for the animal in transport.

Sufficient and appropriate floor area and height should be provided for the animals, appropriate to their species, their size, number of animals transported, and the anticipated duration of the transport.

The transport should be carried out without delay to the destination and the welfare conditions of the animals must be regularly checked and appropriately maintained by competent personnel.

In case of a delay during transport, all necessary actions required to safeguard the welfare of the animals and reduce the risk of unnecessary fear, injury, damage to health and suffering should be taken by the transporter.

Appropriate climate conditions and control must be provided with respect to the particular species and must be maintained throughout the transport-taking into consideration possible heat and wind chill factors, weather conditions, and the possibility of unexpected stops.

Appropriate surveillance systems should monitor the temperatures of the compartments of the transported animals at all times and alert the transporter when the temperature in the compartments where animals are located falls outside of the recommended maximum or minimum ranges..

Animals should be offered a rest period at suitable intervals depending on the species and length of transport, and offered appropriate food and water.

When animals fall ill or are injured during transport, they should receive appropriate veterinary treatment as soon as possible and, if necessary, undergo emergency

euthanasia in a way which does not cause them any unnecessary suffering in compliance with legislation as applicable.

Waste material that contains organic material produced by the animal, animal feed or bedding material, must be handled, collected and disposed of in compliance with applicable legislation/regulation. The legislation/regulation of some countries may prohibit the use of certain organic materials such as hay, straw, and other animal feed. Unloading organic waste may be restricted or prohibited in some countries. Appropriate measures may be taken to store such waste safely and securely for the duration of transit.

### **3. Technical Specifications**

For the shipment of plants the IATA PCR apply.

IATA LAR apply to the non-air-transport of all taxa.

However, the technical specifications contained in this chapter may also be followed, and only apply to the non-air-transport of the taxa listed below.

For purposes of the technical specifications the term "trailer" refers to a vehicle used to transport animals that is pulled by a car, truck, or train.

For purposes of the technical specifications the term "compartment" refers to a separate part, section or chamber within a means of transport.

#### **Invertebrate**

No deviations from the LAR

#### **Crustacean**

No deviations from the LAR

#### **Fish**

Fish species (CR 51, CR 59, CR 60)

#### **Amphibians**

No deviations from the LAR

#### **Reptiles**

No deviations from the LAR

#### **Birds**

Pelican species (CR 21)

Penguin species (CR 22)

Ratite species (CR 24)

Stork and Crane Species (CR 17)

#### **Mammals**

Antelope species (CR 73)

Buffalo and Cattle species (CR 73)

Deer species (CR 73)

Elephant species (CR 71)

Flamingo species (CR 17)

Hippopotamus species (CR 74)

Kangaroo species (CR 83)

Pig species (CR 74)

Pinniped species (CR 76)

Rhinoceros species (CR 74)

Sheep species (CR 73)

Small Camelid species (CR 73)

Tapir species (CR 74)

Wild Ass species (CR 73)

Wild Horse species (CR 73)

### **Fish species CR51/59/60**

#### General Care and Loading

Fish tanks for road transport should be designed so that the lids do not completely seal and can release excess gases without compromising water loss.

### **Ratite species CR24**

#### General Care and Loading

Ostriches, emus, and rheas may be transported loose in trucks, trailers or rail cars. Non-slip floors need to be provided. Trucks, trailers and rail cars must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Birds may not be shipped together in groups if they:

- are unfamiliar with each other;
- display aggression in close quarters;
- are of significantly different sizes or ages;
- are sexually mature males;
- are aggressive to each other;
- are a group of more than 15 individuals.

This shall not apply to animals from proven compatible groups, animals that are accustomed to each other, animals where separation will cause distress, or females accompanied by dependent young.

Only one (1) male per container or compartment.

#### Cassowary

Cassowary may be transported singly in crates but it is preferable to transport sexually mature, adult cassowaries free standing in a trailer compartment.

Sexually mature animals must always be shipped singly.

#### Dimensions and Stocking density

For total transport times up to 48 hours, follow density specifications described in the Container Requirements for Ratites.

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not in motion.

For total transport times over 48 hours air transport is preferred.

Floor space requirements for emus apply to rheas and cassowaries equally.

Food and Water Containers

Containers may not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

### **Flamingo species CR17**

General Care and Loading

Flamingo species may be transported loose in trucks, trailers or rail cars. Flamingos should be transported in clusters or groups rather than in individual compartments as long as they come from an established flock and are familiar with each other. Trucks, trailers and rail cars must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Floor

Floor covering must be firmly fixed to the floor so birds do not slide or lose footing. Soft damp bedding must be provided to prevent the foot webbing from drying out during transportation; e.g., soaked carpeting or 5 cm (2 in) foam rubber.

Dimensions and Stocking density

For transport times up to 48 hours, allow a minimum of 0.2 m<sup>2</sup> (2 sq.ft.) per bird for a compatible group of flamingos.

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not in motion.

For longer transport air transport is preferred.

Food and Water Containers

Containers may not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

### **Stork and Crane species CR17**

General Care and Loading

Stork and crane species may also be transported loose in trucks, trailers or rail cars. Trucks, trailers and rail cars must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Birds may not be shipped together in groups if they:

- are unfamiliar with each other;
- display aggression in close quarters;
- are of significantly different sizes or ages;
- are aggressive to each other.

This shall not apply to animals from proven compatible groups, animals that are accustomed to each other, animals where separation will cause distress, or females accompanied by dependent young.

Large and/or aggressive species of storks and cranes should always be transported in single compartments or crates.

Floor

Floor covering must be firmly fixed to the floor so birds do not slide or lose footing.

Dimensions and Stocking density

For transport times up to 48 hours, allow a minimum of 0,2 m<sup>2</sup> (2 sq.ft.) per bird for a compatible group of storks or cranes.

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not in motion.

For total transport times over 48 hours air transport is preferred.

Food and Water Containers

Containers may not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

## **Penguin species CR22**

General Care and Loading

Temperature is a major concern and cool substrates are needed.

Plastic totes allow better temperature control and avoid leakage of any cooling substrates. Plastic totes may be used instead of other types of containers. Plastic totes must be secured at all times during transport.

Penguin species should not be shipped loose in a trailer.

Penguins should be accompanied by a person specialized in the care of penguins.

Penguin species from a warmer climate can be transported as long as they can be sprayed with water and providing transport does not exceed 8 hours.

It is recommended that penguin species from Antarctic or sub-Antarctic climates should be shipped in a climate controlled vehicle.

For long transportations air transport is recommended.

## **Pelican species CR21**

General Care and Loading

Pelican species may be transported loose in trucks, trailers or rail cars. Trucks, trailers and rail cars must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Birds may not be shipped together in groups if they:

- are unfamiliar with each other;
- display aggression in close quarters;
- are of significantly different sizes or ages;
- are sexually mature males;
- are aggressive to each other.

This shall not apply to animals from proven compatible groups, animals that are accustomed to each other, animals where separation will cause distress, or females accompanied by dependent young.

Animals may be offered tubs of water during transports stops.

Dimensions and Stocking density

For total transport times up to 48 hours, allow a minimum of 0,6 m<sup>2</sup> (7 sq.ft.) per bird for a compatible group of pelicans.

Dalmatian pelican (*Pelecanus crispus*)

For total transport times up to 48 hours, allow 0,9 m<sup>2</sup> (10 sq.ft.) per bird for a compatible group of pelicans.

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not in motion.

For total transport times over 48 hours air transport is preferred.

## **Big cat species CR72**

Big cats may be transported loose in compartments within a truck, trailer or rail car. Compartments must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

## **Bear species CR72**

Bear species may be transported loose in compartments within a truck, trailer or rail car.. Compartments must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

## **Wild horse and ass species CR73**

### General Care and Loading

Wild horse and ass species may be transported loose in trucks, trailers or rail cars. Trucks, trailers and rail cars must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Sexually mature males must be shipped individually and must not be in the same trailer with females.

Females accompanied by unweaned foals may be shipped together if approved by a certified veterinarian.

All other weaned juveniles and mature animals should be transported singly in individual compartments or containers.

### Dimensions

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not in motion. Additional conditions may be required to meet general transport conditions.

### Food and Water Containers

Containers may not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

Feeding of wild horse species should be reduced during the 24 hour period before loading. Wild horse species should not be offered food within three hours before loading.

## **Antelope species CR73**

### General Care and Loading

Antelope species may be transported loose in trucks, trailers or rail cars. Trucks, trailers and rail cars must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Antelope may not be shipped together in groups if they:

- are unfamiliar with each other;
- are different species;
- display aggression in close quarters;
- are significantly different sizes or ages;
- are sexually mature males;
- have horns;
- are aggressive to each other.

This shall not apply to animals from proven compatible groups, animals that are accustomed to each other, animals where separation will cause distress, or females accompanied by dependent young.

Sexually mature males must not be transported in the same trailer with females unless they are in a separate container or a completely segregated compartment.

Antelope species that must be shipped singly include:

- Duiker species;
- Klipspringer
- Reedbuck
- Rhebok
- Sable antelope

It is recommended that all animals be shipped singly in compartments.

Smaller antelope species and antelope species whose normal behaviour includes vertical jumping (e.g. klipspringer) should be transported in containers and not loose in compartments.

Covering the ends of the animal's horns with tubing, elastic material, or other protective devices should be considered.

#### Dimensions

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not in motion. Additional conditions may be required to meet general transport conditions.

#### Food and Water Containers

Containers may not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

### **Sheep species CR73**

#### General Care and Loading

Sheep species may be transported loose in trucks, trailers or rail cars. Trucks, trailers and rail cars must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Sheep may not be shipped together in groups if they:

- are unfamiliar with each other;
- are different species;
- display aggression in close quarters;
- are significantly different sizes or ages;
- are sexually mature males;
- have horns;
- are aggressive to each other.

This shall not apply to animals from proven compatible groups, animals that are accustomed to each other, animals where separation will cause distress, or females accompanied by dependent young.

Sexually mature males must not be in the same trailer with females unless they are in a separate container or a completely segregated compartment.

It is highly recommended that all animals be shipped singly in compartments.

Sheep species whose normal behaviour includes vertical jumping (e.g. bighorn sheep) should be transported in containers and not loose in compartments.

#### Dimensions

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not in motion. Additional conditions may be required to meet general transport conditions.

#### Food and Water Containers

Containers may not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

### **Buffalo and Cattle species CR73**

#### General Care and Loading

Buffalo and cattle species may be transported loose in compartments within trucks, trailers or rail cars. Compartments must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Sexually mature males must be shipped individually and must not be in the same trailer with females.

Females accompanied by unweaned foals may be shipped together if approved by a certified veterinarian.

All other weaned juveniles and mature animals should be transported singly in individual compartments or containers.

#### Dimensions

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not motion. Additional conditions may be required to meet general transport conditions.

#### Food and Water Containers

Containers may not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

### **Deer species CR73**

#### General Care and Loading

Deer species may be transported loose in compartments within trucks, trailers or rail cars. Compartments must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Deer may not be shipped together in groups if they:

- are unfamiliar with each other;
- are different species;
- display aggression in close quarters;
- are significantly different sizes or ages;
- are sexually mature males;
- are bearing hard antlers;
- are aggressive to each other.

This shall not apply to non antler-bearing animals from proven compatible groups, non antler-bearing animals that are accustomed to each other, animals where separation will cause distress, or females accompanied by dependent young.

It is recommended that all animals be shipped singly in compartments.

Deer in hard antlers may be transported without their antlers shed or removed, provided that the animals are individually segregated, and the primary container or compartment has been designed and constructed to prevent the antlers from becoming trapped or injuring the animal itself, other animals nearby, attendants, or cargo handlers. Trailers may be used with extreme care.

It is preferable and highly recommended to ship antler-bearing animals after shedding antlers.

Deer in velvet must not be transported.

#### Muntjacs

Muntjac species should be shipped according to the LAR.

#### Dimensions

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not motion. Additional conditions may be required to meet general transport conditions.

#### Food and Water Containers

Containers may not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

### **Small camelid species CR73**

#### General Care and Loading

Small camelid species may be transported loose in trucks, trailers or rail cars. Trucks, trailers and rail cars must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Small camelids may not be shipped together in groups if they:

- are unfamiliar with each other;
- are of different species;
- display aggression in close quarters;
- are significantly different sizes or ages;
- are sexually mature males;
- are aggressive to each other.

This shall not apply to animals from proven compatible groups, animals that are accustomed to each other, animals where separation will cause distress, or females accompanied by dependent young.

Sexually mature males must not be transported in the same trailer with females.

Dimensions

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not motion. Additional conditions may be required to meet general transport conditions.

Food and Water Containers

Containers may not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

### **Tapir CR73**

General Care and Loading

Tapirs may be transported loose in trucks, trailers or rail cars. Trucks, trailers and rail cars must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Tapirs may not be shipped together in groups if they:

- are unfamiliar with each other;
- display aggression in close quarters;
- are significantly different sizes or ages;
- are sexually mature males;
- are aggressive to each other.

This shall not apply to animals from proven compatible groups, animals that are accustomed to each other, animals where separation will cause distress, or females accompanied by dependent young.

Dimensions

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not motion. Additional conditions may be required to meet general transport conditions.

Food and Water Containers

Containers may not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

### **Pig species CR74**

General Care and Loading

Pigs may be transported singly loose in compartments within trucks, trailers or rail cars. Compartments must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Dimensions

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not motion. Additional conditions may be required to meet general transport conditions.

Food and Water Containers

Containers may not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

## **Elephant, Rhinoceros & Hippopotamus species CR71**

### General Care and Loading

Elephants, rhinos and hippos may be transported in trucks, trailers or rail cars. Trucks, trailers and rail cars must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

### Hippopotamus

Animals should be sprayed at regular intervals throughout transport, depending on ambient conditions.

### Dimensions

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not in motion. Additional conditions may be required to meet general transport conditions.

### Food and Water Containers

Containers should not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

## **Pinnipeds CR76**

### General Care and Loading

Pinnipeds may be transported loose in trucks, trailers or rail cars. Trucks, trailers and rail cars must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Skin moisture and appropriate body temperature should be maintained by e. g. water sprayers or dripping ice.

### Dimensions

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not in motion. Additional conditions may be required to meet general transport conditions.

### Walrus

Walrus must always be shipped in an individual container.

### Food and Water Containers

Containers for food and water do not need to be provided.

## **Kangaroo and wallaby species CR83**

### General Care and Loading

Kangaroo and wallaby species may be transported in padded compartments within an truck, trailer or rail car. Compartments must meet the minimum requirements for container construction regarding strength, stability, safety, and size.

Kangaroos should be shipped singly.

This shall not apply to animals, where separation will cause distress or females accompanied by in pouch young attached to nipple.

### Dimensions

For total transport times over 48 hours the number of rest stops should be increased and additional space offered while not in motion. Additional conditions may be required to meet general transport conditions.

### Bedding

To avoid the hazard of necrobacillosis, prickly material such as straw must not be used.

### Food and Water Containers

Containers may not be affixed inside trailer or compartment.

**Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP14)<sup>24</sup>**

**Transport of live specimens**

CONSIDERING that the Convention, in Articles III, IV, V and VII, requires Management Authorities to be satisfied, before granting export permits, or re-export or travelling exhibition certificates, that specimens will be so prepared and shipped as to minimize the risk of injury, damage to health or cruel treatment;

FURTHER CONSIDERING that the Convention, in Article VIII, requires Parties to ensure that all living specimens, during any period of transit, holding and shipment, are properly cared for so as to minimize the risk of injury, damage to health or cruel treatment;

~~NOTING that the revised version of the Guidelines for transport and preparation for shipment of live wild animals and plants, adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its second meeting (San José, 1979), has been communicated to all Parties; that air transport is the preferred method for transporting many live animals and plants and that there are special requirements necessitated by air transport;~~

FURTHER NOTING the extent to which, in the case of the transport of live animals, the Live Animals Regulations of the International Air Transport Association (IATA) and, in the case of the transport of live plants IATA's Perishable Cargo Regulations, are to be used for transport of live specimens and that the Live Animals Regulations and the Perishable Cargo Regulations are amended annually and are therefore more quickly responsive to changing needs;

~~MINDFUL of the fact that implementation of these Guidelines depends on action to be taken at the national level, and within international organizations and conferences competent to regulate conditions of carriage;~~

~~CONSIDERING that air transport is the preferred method for transporting many live animals and plants and that there are special requirements necessitated by air transport;~~

~~NOTING the extent to which, in the case of the transport of live animals, the Live Animals Regulations of the International Air Transport Association (IATA) and, in the case of the transport of live plants IATA's Perishable Cargo Regulations, are to be used for transport of live specimens and that the Live Animals Regulations and the Perishable Cargo Regulations are amended annually and are therefore more quickly responsive to changing needs;~~

~~WHEREAS Article XIV, paragraph 1, permits any Party to adopt stricter domestic measures for the regulation of trade in all species, whether or not listed in the Appendices;~~

~~NOTING that, while there have been improvements in the transport of live animals and plants, mortality for certain species has not been reduced significantly, despite continuing efforts by the Parties to improve transport conditions, and that trade-related mortality undermines the concept of sustainable trade;~~

~~MINDFUL that, because of a number of biological and other factors, some species are far more difficult to prepare and ship without risk of injury, damage to health or cruel treatment than others;~~

~~RECOGNIZING the important work of the Working Group on the Transport of Live Animals in advising the Parties and providing technical assistance in conjunction with the Secretariat;~~

RECOGNIZING the need to address the transport of all live specimens;

FURTHER RECOGNIZING that the non-air transport of live specimens of certain animal species listed in the Appendices may require transport conditions additional to or deviating from those found in the IATA LAR and PCR;

AGREEING that the effective implementation of Articles III, IV, V and VII of the Convention necessitates from time to time further specific evaluation of transportation issues, analysis of information and recommendations to the Parties for remedial or corrective action;

---

<sup>24</sup> Amended at the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

RECALLING that Article XIV, paragraph 1, permits any Party to adopt stricter domestic measures regarding the conditions for transport of specimens of species listed in the Appendices and to adopt domestic measures restricting or prohibiting transport of species not included in the Appendices;

THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

DIRECTS the Standing Committee, the Animals and Plants Committees to deal with matters related to the transport of live specimens;

RECOMMENDS that:

- a) suitable measures be taken by the Parties to promote the full and effective use by Management Authorities of the IATA Live Animals Regulations (for animals), ~~and the IATA Perishable Cargo Regulations (for plants)~~ and the CITES Guidelines for the Non-Air Transport of Live Wild Animals and Plants for the preparation and transport of live specimens and that they be brought to the attention of exporters, importers, transport companies, carriers, freight forwarders, inspection authorities and international organizations and conferences competent to regulate conditions of carriage by air, land and sea or inland waterways;
- b) Parties invite the above organizations and institutions to comment on and amplify the Live Animals Regulations (for animals) and the Perishable Cargo Regulations (for plants), so as to promote their effectiveness;
- c) the regular communication of the CITES Secretariat and the Standing Committee with IATA's Live Animals and Perishables Board and with the board of directors of the Animals Transportation Association (AATA) be continued and that a relationship with the International Animal Health Organisation (OIE) and the International Plants Protection Convention (IPPC) be developed;
- d) for as long as the CITES Secretariat and the Standing Committee agree, the Live Animals Regulations (for animals), ~~and the Perishable Cargo Regulations (for plants)~~, and the CITES Guidelines for the Non-Air Transport of Live Wild Animals and Plants in their most recent edition be deemed to meet CITES air transport requirements;
- e) the Standing Committee and the Secretariat, in consultation with the Animals and Plants Committees and IATA, regularly review, revise and approve amendments to the CITES Guidelines for the Non-Air Transport of Live Wild Animals and Plants;
- e) ~~where appropriate, the Live Animals Regulations (for animals) and the Perishable Cargo Regulations (for plants) be used as a reference to indicate suitable conditions for carriage by means other than air;~~
- f) the IATA Live Animals Regulations, ~~and the sections of the IATA Perishable Cargo Regulations related to the transport of live plant specimens~~ and the CITES Guidelines for the Non-Air Transport of Live Wild Animals and Plants be incorporated into Parties' domestic legislation or policies;
- g) applicants for export permits or re-export or travelling exhibition certificates be notified that, as a condition of issuance, they are required to prepare and ship live specimens in accordance with the IATA Live Animals Regulations, ~~and the IATA Perishable Cargo Regulations~~ and the CITES Guidelines for the Non-Air Transport of Live Wild Animals and Plants;
- h) in compliance with national laws and policies, shipments of live specimens be examined and necessary action taken to ensure the well-being of the specimens by CITES-designated persons or transport company personnel during extended holding periods at transfer points;
- i) in compliance with national laws and policies where Parties to the Convention have designated ports of entry and exit, holding facilities for live animals and plants be provided; and
- j) in compliance with national laws and policies, Parties ensure that animal- and plant-holding facilities are open for inspection of shipments, with the concurrence of the transport company, by CITES-designated enforcement personnel or designated observers; and that any documented information be made available to the appropriate authorities and transport companies;

DIRECTS the Standing Committee, the Animals and Plants Committees, in consultation with the Secretariat:

- a) to participate in meetings of the Live Animals and Perishables Board of IATA in order to amplify or update the Live Animals Regulations and the Perishable Cargo Regulations and the CITES Guidelines for the Non-Air Transport of Live Wild Animals and Plants;
- b) to examine new or additional references for transport of live specimens for incorporation into the present Resolution, if appropriate;
- c) to examine developments related to the transport of live plant specimens for incorporation into the present Resolution, if appropriate; and
- d) to examine when appropriate, any ~~regularly~~ high mortality shipments of live specimens and make recommendations to relevant Parties, exporters, importers and transport companies on how to avoid this in the future;

ENCOURAGES the Secretariat, Parties and relevant organizations to assist in the distribution and increase public awareness of the IATA Live Animals Regulations, ~~and~~ the IATA Perishable Cargo Regulations and the CITES Guidelines for the Non-Air Transport of Live Wild Animals and Plants;

INVITES non-governmental organizations, particularly veterinary, scientific, conservation, welfare and trade organizations with expertise in the shipment, preparation for shipment, transport, care or husbandry of live specimens, to provide the necessary financial, technical and other assistance to those Parties in need of and requesting such assistance to ensure the effective implementation of the provisions of the Convention for the transport and preparation for shipment of live specimens subject to international trade;

NOTES that in order to improve implementation of the IATA Live Animals Regulations and the IATA Perishable Cargo Regulations and the CITES Guidelines for the Non-Air Transport of Live Wild Animals and Plants by the Parties, there is a need for greatly increased awareness of the Regulations through more effective methods of training of personnel of transport companies, exporters and enforcement agencies; and

REPEALS Resolution Conf. 9.23 (Fort Lauderdale, 1994) – Transport of Live Specimens~~;~~

REPEALS the CITES Guidelines for transport and preparation for shipment of live wild animals and plants (1981).

**Results of discussions of the Animals Committee on item 12 on *Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species*, based on document AC26 WG7°Doc.°1 (Rev.1)**

**Document adopted by the Committee**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

- Co-Chairs: representatives of Europe (Mr Fleming) and North America (Ms Caceres);
- AC Members: representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi);
- Parties: Australia, Canada, China, Czech Republic, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, Poland, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America; and
- IGOs and NGOs: European Union, IUCN – International Union for Conservation of Nature, UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), Animal Welfare Institute, Association of Western Fish and Wildlife Agencies, British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, Conservation International, Defenders of Wildlife, Fundación Cethus, Humane Society International, Humane Society of the United States, Ornamental Fish International, Pet Care Trust, ProWildlife, Species Survival Network, TRAFFIC International and WWF.

Mandate

The working group shall:

Concerning agenda item 12.2

For the 10 taxa selected following the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP14) and retained in the review after the 25th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC25), the working group shall:

1. In accordance with paragraphs k) and l) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13):
  - a) Review the reports in the Annex to document AC26 Doc. 12.2 and the responses received from range States (made available by the Secretariat to the working group), and, if appropriate, revise the preliminary categorizations proposed by UNEP-WCMC for the species concerned; and
  - b) Identify and refer to the Secretariat problems that are not related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a); and
2. In accordance with paragraphs m) to o) of the same Resolution, formulate recommendations for species of urgent concern and of possible concern with deadlines for their implementation.
  - a) For species of urgent concern, these recommendations should propose specific actions to address problems related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a). Such recommendations should differentiate between short- and long-term actions, and may include, for example:
    - i) The establishment of administrative procedures, cautious export quotas or temporary restrictions on exports of the species concerned;
    - ii) The application of adaptive management procedures to ensure that further decisions about the harvesting and management of the species concerned will be based on the monitoring of the impact of previous harvesting and other factors; or
    - iii) The conducting of taxon- and country-specific status assessments, field studies or evaluation of threats to populations or other relevant factors to provide the basis for a Scientific

Authority's non-detriment finding, as required under the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a) or 6 (a); and

- b) For species of possible concern, these recommendations should specify the information required to enable the Committee to determine whether the species should be categorized as either of urgent concern or of least concern. They should also specify interim measures, where appropriate, for the regulation of trade. Such recommendations should differentiate between short- and long-term actions, and may include, for example:
  - i) The conducting of taxon- and country-specific status assessments, field studies or evaluation of threats to populations or other relevant factors; or
  - ii) The establishment of cautious export quotas for the species concerned as an interim measure.

Deadlines for implementation of these recommendations must be appropriate to the nature of the action to be undertaken, and should normally be not less than 90 days but not more than two years after the date of transmission to the State concerned.

3. Review information on *Calumna* and *Furcifer* spp. and *Mantella baroni* provided by Madagascar.

#### Concerning agenda item 12.3

For the 24 taxa selected following CoP15, the working group shall:

1. In accordance with paragraph f) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), review the available information presented in document AC26 Doc. 12.3 and the responses from affected range States (which will be made available by the Secretariat to the Working Group); and
2. If satisfied that Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a), is correctly implemented, recommend to the Animals Committee to eliminate the species from the review with respect to the range States concerned.

#### Recommendations

##### Agenda item 12.2

1. Concerning the categorization of the 10 taxa selected following the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties in accordance with paragraph k) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the working group recommended the following:
  - a) *Tursiops aduncus*: of possible concern for the Solomon Islands.
  - b) *Balearica pavonina*: of urgent concern for Guinea, of possible concern for Nigeria, Sudan and South Sudan, and of least concern for the remaining identified range States.
  - c) *Balearica regulorum*: of possible concern for Rwanda, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania, and of least concern for the remaining identified range States.
  - d) *Mantella aurantiaca*: of possible concern for Madagascar.
  - e) *Huso huso*: of possible concern for the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation, and of least concern for the remaining identified range States.
  - f) *Hippocampus kelloggi*: of urgent concern for Thailand and of least concern for the remaining identified range States. In addition, the working group noted concerns regarding records of imports of seized *Hippocampus* spp. from China, and IUCN's offer to provide relevant data to China for its further examination. It referred this issue to the Secretariat.
  - g) *Hippocampus kuda*: of urgent concern for Thailand, of possible concern for Viet Nam and of least concern for the remaining identified range States.

- h) *Hippocampus spinosissimus*: of urgent concern for Thailand and of least concern for the remaining identified range States. In addition, the working group noted that import and export records of trade from Viet Nam in *Hippocampus* spp. did not match and referred this matter to the Secretariat.
- i) *Pandinus imperator*: of urgent concern for Ghana and Benin, of possible concern for Togo and Guinea and of least concern for the remaining identified range States. The working group noted the possible erroneous use of source codes for trade in this species and referred this matter to the Secretariat.
- j) Regarding *Tridacna* spp. from the Solomon Islands, *T. derasa* is of urgent concern and *T. squamosa*, *T. gigas*, *T. crocea* and *T. maxima* of possible concern.

The proposed recommendations formulated in accordance with paragraphs m) to o) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) are found in **Annex 1** of this report.

For all species, the working group supported the findings in the report from UNEP-WCMC concerning problems that are not related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 or 6(a), and referred these to the Secretariat (see the Annex to document AC26 Doc. 12.2) with the exception of issues relating to *Mantella aurantiaca* which the working group felt had been addressed by Madagascar.

- 2. Concerning the information provided by Madagascar on *Calumma* and *Furcifer* spp., the working group endorsed the export quota for *Furcifer campani* of 250 live specimens for 2012 and 2013, and the zero export quotas for *Calumma brevicorne*, *C. crypticum*, *C. gastrotaenia*, *C. nasutum*, *C. parsoni*, *Furcifer antimena* and *F. minor*. This endorsement will be transmitted to the Standing Committee for its consideration. The working group noted the information on *Furcifer angeli* and the intention of Madagascar to establish an export quota for this species in due time, recognizing that the lifting of current trade suspensions would have to be decided by the Standing Committee. Finally, the working group advised Madagascar that the use of “C-categories”, as suggested in document AC24 Doc.7.2 Annex, was at their discretion.
- 3. Regarding the increase in the export quota for *Mantella baroni* from 5,000 to 10,000 live specimens for 2012, it was noted that the Animals Committee at its 23rd meeting (2008) had removed this species from the Review of Significant Trade as being of ‘least concern’, with a request that Madagascar review the export quota for this species. Madagascar provided information on its review and the basis for the new export quota. The working group agreed with the response from Madagascar.

#### Agenda item 12.3

- 4. Concerning the taxa selected following the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties and their possible retention in the Review of Significant Trade in compliance with paragraph f) and g) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the working group recommendations are found in **Annex 2**. In accordance with paragraph g) of the same Resolution, the Secretariat will proceed with the compilation of information about the biology and management of, and trade in, the species that were retained for later consideration by the Committee. Prior to the compilation of the information called for in paragraph g), range States that were recommended to be maintained in the process due to a lack of response but where no commercial trade was recorded in the UNEP-WCMC database for the most recent 10 years will be removed from the Review of Significant Trade with the agreement of, and in consultation with, the Animals Committee.
- 5. It was noted that some *Hippocampus* spp. were reported to occur in countries that were not identified as range States in the UNEP-WCMC species database. The working group recommended that references or evidence be made available to UNEP-WCMC to support these reports. However, the working group did not feel that it was appropriate to deviate from the standard practice of using the UNEP-WCMC species database to identify range States. The working group recommended that the issue of reported exports of *Hippocampus hystrix* from Thailand and *H. barbouri* from Australia, neither of which are recorded as range States in the UNEP-WCMC species database, be referred to the Secretariat for clarification in compliance with paragraph l) of the Resolution.
- 6. Additionally, the working group noted the difficulty in reviewing the responses from range States in the short period of time they were available and recommended that this issue be referred to the Working Group on the Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade. The working group further recommended that the Secretariat, when asking range States to submit information, request whether they would agree to

make their responses publicly available (in the language as received) through the Review of Significant Trade Management System data base in order to facilitate the early distribution of replies.

Annex 1

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SPECIES OF URGENT AND POSSIBLE CONCERN

<i>Tursiops aduncus</i>	
Solomon Islands (Possible Concern)	<p>Within 90 days, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Immediately establish an annual export quota for this species of no more than 10 specimens as an interim measure and communicate this to the Secretariat;</li> <li>b) Provide to the Secretariat a report of the most recent surveys on the status, estimated abundance, site fidelity and population genetics of <i>Tursiops aduncus</i> in the Solomon Islands; and</li> <li>c) Report on measures taken to ensure that any captures for export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species or sub-populations and will be in compliance with Article IV paragraphs 2 (a) 3 and 6.</li> </ul> <p>Within 2 years the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d) Before amending or revising the interim annual quota established in accordance with paragraph a) and, pending the results of the recent survey referred to in paragraph b), the Management Authority should provide to the Secretariat the justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the export quota will not be detrimental to the survival of the species and is in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6.</li> </ul>
<i>Balearica pavonina</i>	
Guinea (Urgent concern)	<p>Within 90 days, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Immediately establish a zero annual export quota as an interim measure which should be communicated to Parties by the Secretariat</li> <li>b) Clarify what legal protection is afforded to this species in Guinea and inform the Secretariat under what circumstances the present policy allows for export of the species;</li> <li>c) Provide available information to the Secretariat on the distribution, abundance and conservation status of the species, and any current management measures in place for <i>Balearica pavonina</i> in Guinea; and</li> <li>d) Provide justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the quantities of <i>Balearica pavonina</i> exported (between 2001 and 2009) were not detrimental to the survival of the species and were in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</li> </ul> <p>Within 2 years, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e) Conduct a national status assessment, including an evaluation of threats to the species; and advise the Secretariat of the management measures taken on the basis of this status assessment; ;</li> <li>f) Establish a revised annual export quota (if appropriate) for wild taken specimens based on the results of the assessment; and</li> <li>g) Communicate the annual export quota to the Secretariat (including zero quota), and provide a justification for, and explanation of, the scientific basis by which it was determined that the quota would not be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild and was in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</li> </ul>

<p>Nigeria (Possible concern)</p>	<p>Within 90 days, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Clarify what legal protection is afforded to the species in Nigeria and inform the Secretariat whether the present policy allows for export of the species;</li> <li>b) If there is no intent to allow export of wild taken specimens of this species for the foreseeable future establish a zero export quota for such specimens which should be communicated to the Parties by the Secretariat; or</li> <li>c) If trade is allowed, provide the justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the quantities of <i>Balearica pavonina</i> exported are not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild and are in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3; and</li> <li>d) Clarify to the Secretariat if captive breeding of <i>Balearica pavonina</i> takes place in Nigeria, and if so, provide details on the nature and extent of captive breeding (noting that in 2005, the importation had been recorded of 30 live, captive bred <i>Balearica pavonina</i> for commercial purposes and originating from Nigeria).</li> </ul>
<p>Sudan (Possible concern)</p>	<p>Within 90 days, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provide the Secretariat with information on the management measures in place to monitor wild populations of the species and implement the requirements of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3 of the Convention when authorizing exports;</li> <li>b) Provide all available information to the Secretariat on the distribution, abundance and conservation status of <i>Balearica pavonina</i> in Sudan, explaining when the status was established and by what methodology the information was obtained; and</li> <li>c) Provide a justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the quantities of <i>Balearica pavonina</i> exported were not detrimental to the survival of the species and were in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</li> </ul>
<p>South Sudan (Possible concern)</p>	<p>Within 90 days, the competent authorities should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provide the Secretariat with detailed information on management measures in place to monitor wild populations of the species and implement the requirements of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3 of the Convention when authorizing exports.</li> <li>b) Provide available information to the Secretariat on the distribution, abundance and conservation status of <i>Balearica pavonina</i> in South Sudan; and</li> <li>c) Provide justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the quantities of <i>Balearica pavonina</i> exported were not detrimental to the survival of the species and were in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Balearica regulorum</i></p>	
<p>United Republic of Tanzania (Possible concern)</p>	<p>Within 90 days the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Establish a conservative export quota of 50 specimens</li> <li>b) provide the Secretariat with available information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) the distribution and abundance of <i>Balearica regulorum</i> in United Republic of Tanzania; and</li> <li>ii) the justification, and the scientific basis, by which a quota can be established and is considered not to be detrimental to the survival of the species and is in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Within 2 years the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) Conduct a national status assessment, including an evaluation of threats to the species; and advise the Secretariat of the details and any management measures in place;</li> <li>d) Establish a revised annual export quota for wild taken specimens based on the results of the assessment; and</li> <li>e) Provide the justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the quantities of <i>Balearica</i></li> </ul>

	<i>regulorum</i> to be exported would not be detrimental to the survival of the species and are in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.
Rwanda (Possible concern)	<p>Within 90 days, the Management authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Clarify what legal protection is afforded to the species in Rwanda and inform the Secretariat whether the present policy allows for export of the species;</li> <li>b) If there is no intent to allow export of wild taken specimens of this species for the foreseeable future establish a zero export quota for such specimens which should be communicated to the Parties by the Secretariat; or</li> <li>c) If trade is to be allowed, establish a conservative annual export quota and provide a justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the quota is in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, taking into account any potential unregulated and/or illegal off-take and trade.</li> </ul>
Uganda (Possible concern)	<p>Within 90 days, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Clarify what legal protection is afforded to the species in Uganda and inform the Secretariat whether the present policy allows for export of the species;</li> <li>b) If there is no intent to allow export of wild taken specimens of this species for the foreseeable future establish a zero export quota for such specimens which should be communicated to Parties by the Secretariat; or</li> <li>c) If trade is to be allowed, the Management Authority should establish a conservative quota and provide a justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the quota is not detrimental to the survival of the species and is in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, taking into account any potential unregulated and/or illegal off-take and trade.</li> </ul>
<i>Mantella aurantiaca</i>	
Madagascar (Possible concern)	<p>Within 90 days the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Maintain an annual export quota at a level no higher than 550 wild specimens for 2012 and 2013.</li> </ul> <p>Within 2years the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) Provide to the Secretariat a report of the workshop (planned for December 2012) evaluating the implementation of the <i>Mantella aurantiaca</i> Species Conservation Strategy</li> <li>c) The Management Authority should provide information to the Secretariat on the number and location of collecting sites, harvests levels at each site, and period of the year in which collecting is undertaken</li> <li>d) Provide to the Secretariat a justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has established that the export quota for <i>Mantella aurantiaca</i> will not be detrimental to the survival of the species and is in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</li> </ul>
<i>Huso huso</i>	
Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation (Possible concern)	<p>Within 90 days, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provide the Secretariat with written confirmation that the commercial catch of <i>Huso huso</i> is prohibited during 2012.</li> </ul> <p>Within 2 years, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) If planning to resume the commercial catch and export of wild <i>Huso huso</i> in 2013, provide to the Secretariat with a justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that any proposed export quota for <i>Huso huso</i> will not be detrimental to the survival of the species and is in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</li> </ul>

<i>Hippocampus kellogi, H. kuda and H. spinosissimus</i>	
<p>Thailand (Urgent concern)</p>	<p>Within 150 days the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Clarify what legal protection is afforded to these species in Thailand and provide information to the Secretariat on controls or regulation of fishing activity that might otherwise detrimentally impact on seahorse populations;</li> <li>b) Provide available information to the Secretariat on the distribution, abundance, threats and conservation status of, and any current management measures in place for, the three <i>Hippocampus</i> species in Thailand; and</li> <li>c) Provide justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which, it has been established that the quantities of the three <i>Hippocampus</i> species exported will not be detrimental to the survival of the species and in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3 taking into account any potential unregulated and/or illegal off-take and trade.</li> <li>d) Initiate measures to ensure that descriptions on all CITES permits are standardized such that trade is only permitted at <b>species level</b> and that, in compliance with Resolution Conf. 12.3 , XIV e), trade ceases to be reported or permitted at higher taxon levels (genus or family).</li> </ul> <p>Within one year the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e) Undertake studies to provide evidence on variation in the spatial and temporal abundance of the three species of <i>Hippocampus</i> to enable areas of high seahorse density to be identified and provide the results of the analysis to the Secretariat, as the basis for considering area restrictions on nonselective fishing gear that obtains <i>Hippocampus</i> species as bycatch;</li> <li>f) Examine the technical and logistical feasibility of returning to the sea live seahorses taken as bycatch in various types of fishing gear, particularly by inshore gear such as crab gill nets and other traps, as the basis for considering the feasibility of minimum size limits and/or other output controls.</li> <li>g) Develop and implement adequate control measures and inspection to enhance the enforcement of the reported ban on trawling within 3-5 km of the coast, as the main means of reducing incidental capture of these <i>Hippocampus</i> species;</li> </ul> <p>Within 2 years the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>h) Establish a detailed monitoring program of landings of the three <i>Hippocampus</i> species at representative sites, taking into account different gear types and means of extraction and recording catch and effort metrics and provide a report to the Secretariat;</li> <li>i) Conduct a detailed study of the life history parameters of the three <i>Hippocampus</i> species, including growth rate, size and age at maturity, average annual reproductive output, and annual survivorship of different age classes and provide a report to the Secretariat. Based on the outcome of this study, model population responses to exploitation pressures in order to review and revise management measures;</li> <li>j) Implement additional measures, including spatial and/or temporal restrictions on fishing activities, to support non-detriment findings;</li> <li>k) Based on the studies and measures in h), i) and j) above, establish an adaptive management programme for extraction of, and trade in, the three <i>Hippocampus</i> species, enabling management measures to be reviewed and, if necessary, revised to ensure that trade is not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild and complies with Article IV.2.a and IV.3;</li> </ul>

<i>Hippocampus kuda</i>	
Vietnam <sup>25</sup> (Possible concern)	<p>Within 90 days the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Clarify what legal protection is afforded to the species and inform the Secretariat whether the present policy allows for export of wild-taken specimens;</li> <li>b) If there is no intent to allow export of wild specimens of this species for the foreseeable future establish a zero export quota which should be communicated to the Parties by the Secretariat; or</li> <li>c) If trade is to be allowed, provide a justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that export is not detrimental to the survival of the species and is in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, taking into account any potential unregulated and/or illegal off-take and trade;</li> <li>d) Initiate measures to ensure that descriptions on all CITES permits are standardized such that trade is only permitted at <b>species level</b> and that, in compliance with Resolution Conf. 12.3 , XIV e), trade ceases to be reported or permitted at higher taxon levels (genus or family).</li> </ul> <p>Within 2 years the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e) If trade in wild specimens is anticipated in the future conduct a study of the life history parameters of <i>H. kuda</i>, including growth rate, size and age at maturity, average annual reproductive output and annual survivorship of different age classes and make the results available to the Secretariat. Based on the outcome of this study, model population responses to exploitation pressures in order to review and revise export quotas; and if they <i>intend</i> to trade the species in the future,</li> <li>f) Provide to the Secretariat a justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that any proposed export quota for wild specimens of <i>H. kuda</i> will not be detrimental to the survival of the species and is in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3</li> <li>g) If trade in wild specimens is anticipated in the future, establish a detailed monitoring program of landings of <i>Hippocampus kuda</i> at representative sites, taking into account different gear types and means of extraction and recording catch and effort metrics and provide a report to the Secretariat;</li> </ul>
<i>Pandinus imperator</i>	
Benin (Urgent concern)	<p>Within 90 days the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provide the Secretariat with available information on the status, distribution and abundance of <i>Pandinus imperator</i> in Benin;</li> <li>b) Provide a justification and the scientific basis by which the current export quotas of 1,000 (source W) and 7,000 (source R) live specimens were established and considered not to be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild and in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3;</li> <li>c) Provide the CITES Secretariat with detailed information on the control measures used to differentiate between ranched and wild-caught specimens to ensure that the authorized exports of ranched specimens are not augmented by mis-declared wild specimens; and</li> <li>d) As a precautionary measure, impose a size restriction of a maximum total length of 10 cm (or maximum body length, excluding the tail, of 5 cm) for live specimens of source code R to be exported and which should be published with the annual export quota.</li> </ul>

<sup>25</sup> The following issues were referred to the Secretariat to follow up with the Management Authority of Viet Nam and to bring to the attention of the Animals or Standing Committee as appropriate: a) details of methods and facilities used to produce *Hippocampus kuda* in captivity and current and anticipated levels of production; b) measures to ensure that specimens produced from captive production systems are distinguished in trade from genuine wild harvested specimens, that separate export quotas are established and that, with the assistance of Secretariat, source codes appropriate to the production system are used on CITES permits; and c) the development and implementation of adequate control measures and inspection procedures to detect and intercept illegal shipments of specimens of *H. kuda*.

	<p>Within 120 days the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e) Provide full details of <u>all</u> known ranching facilities in Benin for this species including (but not restricted to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Name and address of all known ranching facilities in Benin and date established.</li> <li>ii) A full description of the facilities at each ranching operation including: number and size of enclosures (indoor and outdoor) available for holding, or production of, <i>Pandinus imperator</i>, and associated outbuildings.</li> <li>iii) A description of the husbandry practices employed at each ranching operation including how specimens are kept and feeding arrangements.</li> <li>iv) Annual production levels for last five years for each facility</li> <li>v) Mortality rates of both the juveniles and wild collected specimens</li> </ul> </li> <li>f) Confirm whether any specimens are released into the wild and if so, provide full details of the number of specimens released, their life stage, the location they are released into, and information on the success of these releases.</li> <li>g) Provide details of how the ranching facilities and collection and/or release of wild specimens are monitored and regulated, and provide information to demonstrate how the impact of ranching operations on the wild population is assessed.</li> <li>h) If the Management Authority is unable to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Secretariat in consultation with the Chairman of the Animals Committee, that the current quotas are not detrimental to the survival of the species and in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3 , the Management Authority should establish an interim conservative export quota for this species of zero (source W) and 1,500 (source R) specimens (or lower) and provide details to the Secretariat.</li> </ul> <p>Within 2 years the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Conduct a national status assessment, including an evaluation of threats to the species; and advise the Secretariat of the details and any management measures in place (highlighting where new management measures have been introduced to take into account any new information available on the status of the species in Benin);</li> <li>j) Establish revised annual export quotas (if appropriate) for wild taken and ranched specimens based on the results of the assessment; and</li> <li>k) Provide a justification for, and explanation of, the scientific basis by which it is determined that these quotas would not be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild and is in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;">Ghana (Urgent concern)</p>	<p>Within 90 days, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provide the Secretariat with available information on the status, distribution and abundance of <i>Pandinus imperator</i> in Ghana;</li> <li>b) Provide justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the quantities of <i>Pandinus imperator</i> exported are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3; and</li> <li>c) Establish, in consultation with the Secretariat, an export quota for wild and ranched specimens of this species as an interim measure, based on estimates of sustainable off-take and available scientific information; and</li> <li>d) Make sure that specimens are not traded under source code R until such times that it has provided details to the Secretariat on the management measures that have been put in place to ensure that trade in ranched specimens is not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild and the Secretariat is satisfied that the appropriate source code is being applied and the precautionary quota mentioned in paragraph c) has been established.</li> </ul> <p>Within 2 years, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e) Conduct a national status assessment, including an evaluation of threats to the species; and advise the Secretariat of the details and any management measures introduced, highlighting where new management measures (such as a ranching</li> </ul>

	<p>programme) have been developed to take into account any new information available on the status of the species in Ghana;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f) Establish annual export quotas (if appropriate) for wild taken and ranched specimens based on the results of the assessment; and</li> <li>g) Provide a justification for, and explanation of, the scientific basis by which it is determined that these quotas would not be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild and is in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3 and</li> <li>h) If it is intended to resume trade in source code R specimens and as a precautionary measure, impose a size restriction of a maximum total length of 10 cm (or maximum body length, excluding the tail, of 5 cm) for live specimens of source code R to be exported and which should be published with the annual export quota.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;">Togo (Possible concern)</p>	<p>Within 90 days, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Inform the Secretariat that Togo will maintain an annual export quota at a level not higher than the current published export quota (1000 wild and 16,500 ranched specimens) and as a precautionary measure, maintain the current size restriction of a maximum total length of 10 cm (or maximum body length, excluding the tail, of 5 cm) of live specimens of source code R to be exported which should be published with the export quota; and</li> <li>b) Provide the CITES Secretariat with detailed information on the control measures used to differentiate between ranched and wild-caught specimens to ensure that the authorized exports of ranched specimens are not augmented by mis-declared wild specimens.</li> </ul> <p>Within 2 years the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) Conduct a national status assessment, including an evaluation of threats to the species; and advise the Secretariat of the details and any management measures in place (highlighting where new management measures have been introduced to take into account any new information available on the status of the species in Togo);</li> <li>d) Establish revised annual export quotas (if appropriate) for wild taken and ranched specimens based on the results of the assessment; and</li> <li>e) Provide a justification for, and explanation of, the scientific basis by which it is determined that these quota(s) would not be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild and are in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</li> </ul>
<i>Tridacna derasa</i>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Solomon Islands (Urgent concern)</p>	<p>Within 90 days, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Clarify to the Secretariat the legal status of the species in the Solomon Islands and inform the Secretariat whether present policy or legislation allows for the export of wild-taken specimens of the species;</li> <li>b) Establish immediately a zero export quota for wild-taken specimens;</li> <li>c) Provide to the Secretariat the justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that any exports will not be detrimental to the survival of the species and is in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3;</li> <li>d) Provide details to the Secretariat of the methods, facilities used to produce <i>Tridacna</i> spp. in captivity and current and anticipated levels of production</li> <li>e) The Management Authority should initiate measures to ensure that descriptions on all CITES permits are standardized such that trade is only permitted at species level and that, in compliance with Resolution Conf. 12.3 , XIV e), trade ceases to be reported or permitted at higher taxon levels (genus or family).</li> <li>f) The Management Authority should ensure that appropriate units are recorded on permits for trade in specimens of <i>Tridacna</i> spp., namely to record meat in kilograms, live specimens by number, and shells by number of pieces (weight as secondary unit).</li> </ul>

	<p>Within 180 days the Management Authority should:</p> <p>g) Ensure that specimens produced from captive production systems are distinguished in trade from genuine wild harvested specimens, that separate export quotas are established and that, with the assistance of Secretariat, source codes appropriate to the production system are used on CITES permits.</p> <p>Within 2 years the Management Authority should:</p> <p>h) Prepare, adopt and implement a fishery management plan for <i>Tridacna</i> spp. which should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) stock assessments of clam populations subject to harvest including estimates of abundance, distribution and age/size classes;</li> <li>ii) adaptive management measures including sustainable catch and export quotas based on monitoring of fishery-dependent and fishery-independent data including catch and effort data and a long-term population monitoring programme;</li> <li>iii) appropriate regulatory measures, such as limited entry, licensing of fishermen, size limitations, fishing seasons and no take zones, compatible with any customary systems of marine tenure, and ensure sufficient provisions for the enforcement of such regulations; and</li> <li>iv) measures to enable the recovery of depleted populations, including re-stocking with hatchery produced specimens and restoring population densities to enable effective reproduction.</li> </ul> <p>i) The management plan and supporting evidence of implementation should be supplied to Secretariat for validation.</p> <p>j) Based on the management plan, establish precautionary export quotas, separately for wild and captive-produced specimens (if export of wild specimens is permitted), on a species-specific basis</p>
<i>Tridacna crocea, T. gigas, T. maxima, T. squamosa</i>	
<p>Solomon Islands<sup>26</sup> (Possible concern)</p>	<p>Within 90 days, the Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Clarify to the Secretariat the legal status of the species in the Solomon Islands and inform the Secretariat whether the present policy allows for the export of wild-taken specimens of the species;</li> <li>b) Provide to the Secretariat the justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that any exports will not be detrimental to the survival of the species and is in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</li> <li>c) Provide details to the Secretariat of the methods and facilities used to produce and/or raise <i>Tridacna</i> spp. in captivity and current and anticipated levels of production</li> <li>d) Initiate measures to ensure that descriptions on all CITES permits are standardized such that trade is only permitted at species level and that, in compliance with Resolution Conf. 12.3 , XIV e), trade ceases to be reported or permitted at higher taxon levels (genus or family).</li> <li>e) The Management Authority should ensure that appropriate units are recorded on permits for trade in specimens of <i>Tridacna</i> spp., namely to record meat in kilograms, live specimens by number, and shells by number of pieces (weight as secondary unit).</li> </ul> <p>Within 2 years the Management Authority should:</p> <p>f) Prepare, adopt and implement a fishery management plan for <i>Tridacna</i> spp. which should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) stock assessments of clam populations subject to harvest including estimates of abundance, distribution and age/size classes;</li> </ul>

<sup>26</sup> The Secretariat is requested to remind all Parties that, in compliance with Resolution Conf. 12.3, XIV e), they should not accept permits for specimens of Tridacnidae in trade that are not identified to species level. Similarly, Parties should only accept the appropriate units on permits for specimens of Tridacnidae.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>ii) adaptive management measures including sustainable catch and export quotas based on monitoring of fishery-dependent and fishery-independent data including catch and effort data and a long-term population monitoring programme;</li><li>ii) appropriate regulatory measures, such as limited entry, licensing of fishermen, size limitations, fishing seasons and no take zones, compatible with any customary systems of marine tenure, and ensure sufficient provisions for the enforcement of such regulations; and</li><li>iv) measures to enable the recovery of depleted populations, including re-stocking with hatchery produced specimens and restoring population densities to enable effective reproduction.</li><li>g) The management plan and supporting evidence of implementation should be supplied to Secretariat for validation.</li><li>h) Based on the management plan, establish precautionary export quotas, separately for wild and captive-produced specimens (if export of wild specimens is permitted), on a species-specific basis</li><li>i) Ensure that specimens produced from captive production systems are distinguished in trade from genuine wild harvested specimens, that separate export quotas are established and that, with the assistance of Secretariat, source codes appropriate to the production system are used on CITES permits.</li></ul> |
|--|--|

## Annex 2

WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TAXA SELECTED FOLLOWING  
THE 15TH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

<b>Taxon</b>	<b>Retain in the Review of Significant Trade</b>	<b>Remove from the Review of Significant Trade</b>
<i>Macaca fascicularis</i>	Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritius, Palau, Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam	China, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand
<i>Psittacus erithacus</i>	Angola, Benin, Central African Republic, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Togo, Uganda	Gabon, Guinea Bissau, United Republic of Tanzania
<i>Chamaeleo gracilis</i>	Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Uganda	Democratic Republic of the Congo, United Republic of Tanzania, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau
<i>Chamaeleo melleri</i>	Mozambique	Malawi, United Republic of Tanzania
<i>Chamaeleo quadricornis</i>	Cameroon, Nigeria	
<i>Chamaeleo senegalensis</i>	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Cote d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo	Guinea-Bissau
<i>Kinyongia fisheri</i>	United Republic of Tanzania	
<i>Kinyongia tavetana</i>	United Republic of Tanzania, Kenya	
<i>Ptyas mucosus</i>	Afghanistan, Bhutan, Cambodia, India, Iran, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nepal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Viet Nam	China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Thailand
<i>Naja sputatrix</i>	Indonesia	
<i>Python reticulatus</i>	Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam	Myanmar, Thailand
<i>Podocnemis unifilis</i>	Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, Suriname, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Colombia, France, Guyana
<i>Kinixys homeana</i>	Benin, Cameroon, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Togo	
<i>Hippocampus barbouri</i>	Philippines	Indonesia, Malaysia
<i>Hippocampus trimaculatus</i>	Cambodia, India, Philippines, Singapore, South Africa, Thailand, Viet Nam	Australia, China, France, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Myanmar
<i>Hippocampus algiricus</i>	Algeria, Angola, Benin, Cote d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone	
<i>Hippocampus histrix</i>	Egypt, India, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federal State of), Mozambique, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, South Africa, Viet Nam	China, France, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Seychelles, Tonga, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America

<i>Mantella bernhardi</i>		Madagascar
Antipatharia	Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Cape Verde, China (Province of Taiwan), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Grenada, Honduras, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Netherlands, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, France, Guyana, Indonesia, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, Myanmar, New Zealand, Pakistan, Seychelles, Tonga, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States
<i>Catalaphyllia jardinei</i>	Fiji, Maldives, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Viet Nam	Australia, Indonesia, Japan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Seychelles
<i>Euphyllia cristata</i>	Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Viet Nam	Australia, China, France, Indonesia, Japan, United States
<i>Plerogyra simplex</i>	Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Viet Nam	Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, United States
<i>Plerogyra sinuosa</i>	Djibouti, Egypt, Fiji, India, Israel, Kenya, Kiribati, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam	Australia, China, France, Indonesia, Japan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Thailand, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States
<i>Trachyphyllia geoffroyi</i>	Egypt, Fiji, India, Israel, Jordan, Maldives, Mozambique, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Viet Nam	Australia, France, Indonesia, Japan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Myanmar, Seychelles, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania

**Results of discussions of the Animals Committee on item 13 on *Periodic Review of Animal Species included into CITES Appendices*, based on document AC26 WG1 Doc. 2**

**Document adopted by the Committee**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

- Co-Chairs: AC Chair (Mr Ibero) and alternate representative of North America (Ms Gnam);
- AC members: Representative of Africa (Mr Kasiki);
- Parties:** **Australia, China, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Namibia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zimbabwe; and**
- IGOs and NGOs:** **European Union, IUCN, Born Free USA, Humane Society International, Humane Society of the United States, International Fund for Animal Welfare and ProWildlife.**

Mandate

The working group shall:

1. Review the table in the Annex of document AC26 Doc. 13.1 and provide comments as appropriate for consideration by the Committee;
2. For species selected for review from CoP13 to CoP15:
  - a) Taking into account the information presented in document AC26 Doc. 13.2 and the discussions in plenary regarding responses to Notification No. 2011/038, consider options to deal with or terminate the reviews of the remaining species; and
  - b) Review the information and report presented in document 13.2.1 and its Annex, and make recommendations to the Committee regarding the listing in the Appendices of the 16 species of Galliformes under review; and
3. For species selected for review from CoP15 to CoP17:

Based on the information presented in documents AC26 Doc. 13.3 (and possibly additional information that the Secretariat would make available to the Working Group), make recommendation to the Committee regarding the final selection of taxa to be reviewed. For the selected taxa, provide guidance on how the reviews should be organized, and how information, participation and support from the range States could be obtained in compliance with paragraph h) of Resolution Conf. 14.8.

Recommendations

The Working Group recommends the following:

Species	Recommendation
<b>REVIEW PERIOD COP13 (2004) TO COP15 (2010): Taxa discussed at AC26</b>	
<b>AMPHIBIA</b>	
<i>Rheobatrachus silus</i>	Delete from Appendix II ( <b>Australia, extinct</b> )
<i>Rheobatrachus vitellinus</i>	Delete from Appendix II ( <b>Australia, extinct</b> )
<b>AVES</b>	
<i>Argusianus argus</i>	Retain in Appendix II
<i>Catreus wallichii</i>	Retain in Appendix I
<i>Crossoptilon harmani</i>	Retain in Appendix I
<i>Gallus sonneratii</i>	Delete from Appendix II ( <b>New Zealand</b> )
<i>Ithaginis cruentus</i>	Delete from Appendix II ( <b>New Zealand</b> )

Species	Recommendation
<i>Lophophorus impejanus</i>	Retain in Appendix I
<i>Lophophorus lhuysii</i>	Retain in Appendix I
<i>Lophophorus sclateri</i>	Retain in Appendix I
<i>Lophura imperialis</i>	<del>Refer to nomenclature specialist</del> <b>Delete from Appendix I (France)</b>
<i>Mitu mitu</i>	Retain in Appendix I
<i>Polyplectron bicalcaratum</i>	Retain in Appendix II
<i>Polyplectron germaini</i>	Retain in Appendix II
<i>Syrmaticus humiae</i>	Retain in Appendix I
<i>Tetraogallus caspius</i>	Transfer from Appendix I to II <b>(New Zealand)</b>
<i>Tetraogallus tibetanus</i>	Transfer from Appendix I to II <b>(New Zealand)</b>
<i>Tragopan melanocephalus</i>	Retain in Appendix I
<b>MAMMALIA</b>	
<i>Catopuma badia</i>	Terminate review
<i>Felis bieti</i>	Terminate review
<i>Felis chaus</i>	Terminate review
<i>Felis manul</i>	Terminate review
<i>Felis margarita</i>	Terminate review
<i>Felis nigripes</i>	Terminate review
<i>Felis silvestris</i>	Terminate review
<i>Leopardus braccatus</i>	Terminate review
<i>Leopardus colocolo</i>	Terminate review
<i>Leopardus geoffroyi</i>	Terminate review
<i>Leopardus guigna</i>	Terminate review
<i>Leopardus jacobitus</i>	Terminate review
<i>Leopardus pajeros</i>	Terminate review
<i>Leopardus pardalis</i>	Terminate review
<i>Leopardus tigrinus</i>	Terminate review
<i>Leopardus wiedii</i>	Terminate review
<i>Prionailurus bengalensis</i>	Terminate review
<i>Prionailurus iriomotensis</i>	Terminate review
<i>Prionailurus planiceps</i>	Terminate review
<i>Prionailurus rubiginosus</i>	Terminate review
<i>Prionailurus viverrinus</i>	Terminate review
<i>Profelis aurata</i>	Terminate review
<i>Puma yagouaroundi</i>	Terminate review
<b>REVIEW PERIOD COP15 (2010) TO COP17 (2016): Taxa discussed at AC26</b>	
<b>MAMMALIA</b>	
<i>Rupicapra pyrenaica ornata</i>	Review in progress (EU)
<i>Aonyx capensis microdon</i>	Review needed
<i>Monachus tropicalis</i>	Review in progress (USA)
<i>Prionodon pardicolor</i>	Review needed
<i>Pteropus brunneus</i>	Delete from Appendix II (Australia, extinct)
<i>Pteropus subniger</i>	Delete from Appendix II (Mauritius, Réunion, extinct)
<i>Pteropus tokudae</i>	Review in progress (USA)
<i>Sminthopsis longicaudata</i>	Transfer from Appendix I to II (Australia)
<i>Thylacinus cynocephalus</i>	Delete from Appendix I (Australia, extinct)
<i>Onychogalea lunata</i>	Delete from Appendix I (Australia, extinct)
<i>Caloprymnus campestris</i>	Delete from Appendix I (Australia, extinct)
<i>Chaeropus ecaudatus</i>	Delete from Appendix I (Australia, extinct)
<i>Macrotis leucura</i>	Delete from Appendix I (Australia, extinct)
<i>Saguinus martinsi</i>	Review needed
<i>Semnopithecus dussumieri</i>	Review needed
<i>Semnopithecus entellus</i>	Review needed
<i>Semnopithecus schistaceus</i>	Review needed
<i>Phaner pallescens</i>	Review needed
<i>Cacajao melanocephalus</i>	Review needed

Species	Recommendation
<b>AVES</b>	
<i>Chondrohierax uncinatus wilsonii</i>	Review in progress (Cuba)
<i>Grus canadensis nesiotis</i>	Review in progress (Cuba)
<i>Grus canadensis pulla</i>	Review in progress (USA)
<i>Lichenostomus melanops cassidix</i>	Review in progress (Australia)
<i>Dryocopus javensis richardsi</i>	Review needed
<i>Podilymbus gigas</i>	Delete from Appendix I (Guatemala, extinct)
<i>Cyclopsitta diophthalma coxeni</i>	Review in progress (Australia)
<i>Pionopsitta pileata</i>	Review needed
<i>Psephotus dissimilis</i>	Review in progress (Australia)
<i>Psephotus pulcherrimus</i>	Delete from Appendix I ( <b>Australia</b> )
<i>Ninox novaeseelandiae undulata</i>	Review in progress (Australia)
<i>Sceloglaux albifacies</i>	Delete from Appendix II (New Zealand, extinct)
<b>REPTILIA</b>	
<i>Caiman crocodilus apaporiensis</i>	Review needed
<i>Sphenodon punctatus</i>	Review needed
<i>Phelsuma gigas</i>	Delete from Appendix II (Mauritius, extinct)
<i>Varanus bengalensis</i>	Review needed
<i>Varanus flavescens</i>	Review needed
<i>Epicrates inornatus</i>	Review in progress (USA)
<i>Bolyeria multocarinata</i>	Retain in Appendix I
<b>INSECTA</b>	
<i>Papilio hospiton</i>	Review in progress (EU)
<b>BIVALVIA</b>	
<i>Epioblasma sampsonii</i>	Review needed

Other recommendations of the Working Group:

1. *Panthera leo*

**The Animals Committee encourages Kenya and Namibia to continue and finalize their review and submit it as soon as possible to the Animals Committee for its consideration, including by postal procedure. The Animals Committee greatly appreciates the responses received to date from Benin, Central Africa Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Namibia, Rwanda, South Africa, South Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. The Animals Committee urges range States that have not yet submitted information to Kenya and Namibia to do so. It asks that the Secretariat contact range States that did not respond to the request for information to encourage them to reply, and facilitate further communication.**

2. The Animals Committee requests the Secretariat to include the following columns in future versions of the table "Overview of Species under Review" (**Annexes 1 and 2 of document AC26 Doc. 13.1**): **the Appendix in which the species is listed; the IUCN Red List category and assessment date; the range States; and the status of the review including: reviews completed, naming the Party who undertook the review; reviews ongoing (in progress), naming the Party who is undertaking the review; and reviews and proposals that are pending where a Party is needed to undertake the review or prepare a proposal.**
3. For future Notifications **to the Parties** on Periodic Review, the Animals Committee requests the Secretariat to include a list of range States of species for which reviews **or proposals** are requested, as well as contact information for the relevant IUCN/SSC Specialist Group.
4. The Animals Committee requests the Secretariat to issue a Notification to the Parties with the list of species identified in the table above as "Review needed" **or "Proposal needed"**, requesting volunteers to conduct the reviews **or prepare proposals**.
5. The Animals Committee requests regional representatives to circulate periodic review requests to range States in their regions.

**Results of discussions of the Animals Committee on item 14 on *Criteria for the inclusion of species in Appendices I and II (Decision 15.29) – Report of the working group, based on document AC26 WG2 Doc. 1***

**Document adopted by the Committee**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

- Co-Chairs: representatives of Africa (Mr Kasiki) and North America (Ms Caceres);
- AC Members: representative of Oceania (Mr Robertson);
- Parties: Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Germany, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Spain, Thailand and United States of America; and
- IGOs and NGOs: European Union, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), IUCN – International Union for Conservation of Nature, UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Fundación Cethus, Humane Society International, International Environmental Law Project, IWMC – World Conservation Trust, PEW Environment Group, SEAFDEC – Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, Species Management Specialists, SWAN International, TRAFFIC International and WWF.

Mandate

The working group shall:

1. Review the responses from the members of the working group to the questions outlined in paragraph 10 of document AC26 Doc. 14;
2. Develop guidance on the application of criterion B and the introductory text of Annex 2 a to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) to commercially exploited aquatic species proposed for inclusion in Appendix II;
3. Recommend the best way to incorporate this guidance for use when applying the Resolution without affecting its application to other taxa; and
4. Draft a document for review and adoption by the Animals Committee, and subsequent submission at the 62nd meeting of the Standing Committee.

Recommendations

1. During the 26th meeting of the Animals Committee, the Criteria Working Group held three cordial and productive meetings to continue its intersessional discussions which involved extensive contributions from Working Group members, using the online CITES Forum.
2. The conclusions and recommendations of the Working Group are provided below. The Animals Committee is invited to adopt the following report for submission to the 62nd meeting of the Standing Committee in fulfilment of Decision 15.29.

Report of the Animals Committee to the 62nd meeting of the Standing Committee

3. At CoP15 (Doha, 2010) Parties agreed to Decision 15.29, which is directed to the Animals Committee as follows:

*The Animals Committee shall:*

- a) *on receipt of any or all of the reports referred to in Decision 15.28, and having sought the participation of representative(s) of the Plants Committee, IUCN, TRAFFIC, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and other appropriate experts, develop guidance on the application of criterion B and the introductory text of Annex 2 a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) to commercially exploited aquatic species proposed for inclusion on Appendix II;*
  - b) *recommend the best way to incorporate the guidance for use when applying Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) to commercially exploited aquatic species, without affecting the application of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) to other taxa; and*
  - c) *submit its conclusions and recommendations at the 62nd meeting of the Standing Committee.*
4. Regarding the application of Annex 2a criterion B and the introductory text to commercially exploited aquatic species, the Animals Committee noted that:
- a) While there are diverse approaches to the application of Annex 2a criterion B, there is commonality in that all Parties and those reviewing listing proposals should take a taxon-specific approach that is sensitive to species vulnerabilities and they are mindful of the precautionary approach as outlined in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24.
  - b) Vulnerability is defined in Annex 5 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) as the susceptibility to intrinsic or external effects which increase the risk of extinction, and examples of intrinsic and extrinsic factors are provided. Further, the footnote to decline in Annex 5 reiterates that “account needs to be taken of taxon- and case- specific biological and other factors that are likely to affect extinction risk.”
  - c) When considering whether a species qualifies for listing on CITES Appendix II, Parties and those reviewing listing proposals should be aware that, where numerical guidelines or thresholds are provided, they are presented only as examples, since it is impossible to give numerical values that are applicable to all taxa because of differences in their biology.
  - d) When considering whether a species qualifies for listing on CITES Appendix II, the analysis done by Parties and those reviewing listing proposals are influenced by their level of risk tolerance, which itself is informed by the quality and quantity of available information, their objectives, and their experiences. The variability in Parties’ and those reviewing proposals’ risk tolerance may be more pronounced when considering commercially exploited aquatic species.
  - e) The foregoing points are useful to consider and be mindful of when preparing or evaluating proposals to list commercially exploited aquatic species on Appendix II.
5. The Animals Committee finds that there are diverse approaches to the application of Annex 2a criterion B in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15). The Animals Committee finds that it is not possible to provide guidance preferring or favouring one approach over another. The Animals Committee recommends that Parties, when applying Annex 2a criterion B when drafting or submitting proposals to amend the CITES Appendices, explain their approach to that criterion, and how the taxon qualifies for the proposed amendment.
6. When drafting and submitting proposals to amend the CITES Appendices with respect to commercially-exploited aquatic species, the Animals Committee encourages Parties to elucidate the vulnerabilities, as defined in Annex 5 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP 15), and mitigating factors including, but not limited to, large absolute numbers, refugia and fisheries management measures that they have considered.
7. The Animals Committee notes the lack of a definition of commercially-exploited aquatic species in the existing body of CITES documentation, and further notes that FAO documentation indicates that

commercially-exploited aquatic species refer to fish and invertebrate species found in marine environments or in large freshwater bodies and subject to commercial exploitation (FAO 2001)<sup>27</sup>.

8. The Animals Committee noted the issue of how to determine whether a commercially exploited aquatic species qualifies for listing on CITES Appendix II when that species is found in multiple stocks or subpopulations with varying statuses. The issue was raised in the papers provided by the CITES Secretariat, FAO and IUCN/TRAFFIC (AC25 Doc. 10), further discussed by Germany (AC25 Inf. 10) and referenced in discussions of the Animals Committee working group on criteria. There was recognition of the complexity of the issue and differing views on how to approach this matter. The Animals Committee invites the Standing Committee to consider the merit of continuing a discussion on this matter within CITES.

---

<sup>27</sup> *Second technical consultation on the suitability of the CITES criteria for listing commercially-exploited aquatic species, [www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/003/Y1455E.htm](http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/003/Y1455E.htm).*

**Results of discussions of the Animals Committee on item 15 on *Sturgeon and paddlefish*  
based on document AC26 WG3 Doc. 1**

**Document adopted by the Committee**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

- Chairs: representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) as Chair and representative of Africa (Mr Zahzah) as Co-Chair;
- Parties: Canada, China, Germany, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and United States; and
- IGOs and NGOs: IUCN – International Union for Conservation of Nature, Association of Northeast Fish and Wildlife Agencies, ICIA – International Caviar Importers Association, IWMC – World Conservation Trust and TRAFFIC International.

Mandate

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

1. Review Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) regarding caviar labelling, product sources and species identification, etc., and, if necessary, propose draft amendments for consideration by the Committee.
2. Consider the actions proposed in documents AC26 Doc. 15.1 and 15.2 and provide recommendations to the Committee on amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) concerning:
  - i) Written reporting by the Secretariat at each meeting of the Animals Committee on its activities relating to the conservation of and trade in sturgeon and paddlefish; and
  - ii) The instructions given to the Animals Committee to: monitor progress with relevant provisions of the Resolution; undertake three-year cycle evaluations of stock monitoring methodologies; and report to the Standing Committee.

Recommendations

Point 1:

The working group proposed the following draft amendment for the consideration of the committee:

In paragraph “g” under first RECOMMENDS, to delete first sentence and three words of second sentence. Paragraph read as:

“All caviar from shared stocks subject to export quotas should be exported before the end of the quota year (1 March – last day of February) in which it was harvested and processed. For this purpose the export permits for such caviar should be valid until the last day of the quota year at the latest. Parties should not import caviar harvested or processed in the preceding quota years”.

In Annex 1, in paragraph b: the definition of non-reusable label should read as:

“Non-reusable label: any label or mark that cannot be removed or transferred undamaged to another primary container, which may seal the primary container. If the non-reusable label does not seal the primary container, caviar should be packaged in a manner that permits visual evidence of any opening of the primary container”.

The working group agreed that the word non-reusable is not correctly translated in the French version and recommends that this be corrected. The correct words should be “non réutilisable”.

The definition of secondary container should read as:

Secondary container: receptacle into which primary containers or groups of primary containers are placed.

Point 2:

- i) the working group agreed that Secretariat should continue to produce a written report at each meeting of the Animals Committee on its activities relating to the conservation of and trade in sturgeon and paddlefish.
- ii) Working group recommends to Animals Committee to submit the following recommendation for consideration by Standing Committee:

“Noting that limited progress has been reported since the 61st Meeting of the Standing Committee on the recommendations endorsed at that meeting (SC61 Doc. 48.2 annex), and that the Animals Committee continues to support these recommendations as important steps toward the conservation and management of sturgeon and paddlefish, the Animals Committee requests that the Standing Committee consider ways to facilitate the implementation of these recommendations”.

**Results of discussions of the Animals Committee on item 17 on *Snake trade and conservation management (Decision 15.76) – Report of the working group, based on document AC26 WG5 Doc. 1***

**Document adopted by the Committee**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

- Co-Chairs: representative of Asia (Mr Soemorumekso) and alternate representative of Europe (Mr Lörtscher);
- Parties: China, Indonesia, Ireland, Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia and United States; and
- IGOs and NGOs: IUCN – International Union for Conservation of Nature, Animal Welfare Institute, Conservation International, Eurogroup for Animals, Helholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Humane Society of the United States, ProWildlife, Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Species Management Specialists, Species Survival Network and TRAFFIC International.

Mandate

In support of the activities of the Standing Committee Working Group on Snakes (WGS), the working group shall:

1. Review the collation and evaluation of existing identification materials for live snakes, parts and derivatives, and make recommendations regarding additional materials and ways to bring these to the attention of the Parties;
2. Review the outputs of the IUCN Red Listing process for Asian snakes and make recommendations for consideration by the Parties with regard to amending the CITES Appendices; and
3. Consider other actions that could support the work of the WGS.

Recommendations

1. In an intersessional working group, the AC shall until the end of 2012
  - a) Compile a list of existing identification materials for Asian live snakes, skins and products made of snake leather, including national and local enforcement guides;
  - b) Search for existing scientific literature about the identification of parts and derivatives of snakes, including meat, gall bladders, blood and body fat etc.; and
  - c) Provide this information to the CITES Secretariat.

The Secretariat shall be instructed to make this information available to the Parties in a notification with an indication where this information can be found on the CITES website.

2. In a Notification to the Parties, the Secretariat shall:
  - a) inform the Parties about the IUCN red listing assessments of Asian snakes when the red list update has been published; and
  - b) encourage those Parties that are range states for species which are classified as vulnerable (VU), endangered (EN) or critically endangered (CR) and affected by international trade to consider appropriate actions.

3. Recommend a decision to be forwarded to CoP16

***Decision directed to the Animals Committee***

The Animals Committee shall at its 27th meeting consider the final IUCN red list assessments for Asian snake species and, if available, new information and data and make appropriate recommendations, including recommendations to the Standing Committee.

4. The Animals Committee recommends that the Standing Committee's Working Group on Asian snakes, in its deliberations and recommendations, consider the results of the UNCTAD Biotrade Initiative's Working Group about the "International Traceability System for Snake Skins" as well as the results of the ITC study on the "Trade of Python snakes in Asia" and make appropriate recommendations to CoP16.

**Results of discussions of the Animals Committee on item 18 on *Tortoises and freshwater turtles*  
(Decision 15.79), based on document AC26 WG6 Doc. 1**

**Document adopted by the Committee**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

- Co-Chairs: representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Calvar and Mr Álvarez);
- Parties: Canada, Chile, China, Indonesia, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Switzerland, United Republic of Tanzania and United States; and
- IGOs and NGOs: IUCN – International Union for Conservation of Nature, Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Animal Welfare Institute, Conservation International, Helholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Humane Society International, Pet Care Trust, ProWildlife, Species Management Specialists, Species Survival Network, SWAN International, TRAFFIC International and Wildlife Conservation Society.

Mandate

In support of the activities of the Standing Committee intersessional Working Group on Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles, the working group shall:

1. Assess progress, if any, with the study to identify and discuss factors that are of particular relevance to make non-detriment findings for tortoises and freshwater turtles, including (but not limited to) turtle population status and dynamics, trade dynamics, and the trade in parts, products and derivatives. As this study should provide guidance for Parties to make non-detriment findings for tortoises and freshwater turtles, advise on its integration into recommendations and actions emanating from agenda item 8; and
2. Review the results of the North American Turtle Trade Workshop, held in Saint Louis in September 2010, and the Asian Turtle Conservation Workshop, held in Singapore in February 2011, and additional pertinent information, and make recommendations for consideration by the Committee, which could make recommendations at the 62nd meeting of the Standing Committee or 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, as appropriate.

Recommendations

1. a) Draft Decision 16.XX, directed to the Secretariat:

The Secretariat shall, subject to external funding, contract independent consultants to undertake a study, taking into account the findings of the Cancun NDF workshop and other pertinent sources of information, to identify and discuss factors that are of particular relevance to make non-detriment findings for tortoises and freshwater turtles, including (but not limited to) tortoises and turtle population status and dynamics, trade dynamics, production systems, and the trade in parts and derivatives. This study should provide guidance to make non-detriment findings for tortoises and freshwater turtles. The Secretariat shall make the results of the study available to the Animals Committee for its consideration.

- b) Draft Decision 16.XX, directed to the Animals Committee:

The Animals Committee should review the study undertaken in Decision 16.XX and make recommendations, as appropriate, to the Standing Committee and the Parties.

c) Draft Decision 16.XX, directed to the Standing Committee:

The Standing Committee should review the study undertaken in accordance with Decision 16.XX and the Animals Committee recommendations, and make its own recommendations, as appropriate, for communication to the Parties or for consideration at the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

2. The Animals Committee requests the Secretariat to prepare a Notification to inform Parties that the reports of the workshops on conservation of tortoises and freshwater turtles held at St. Louis (September 2010) and Singapore (February 2011) are available at ([http://www.fws.gov/international/DMA\\_DSA/CITES/animals/turtles.html](http://www.fws.gov/international/DMA_DSA/CITES/animals/turtles.html)) and at the WCS website [<http://www.cites.org/common/com/AC/26/SG-Tortoise-&-Freshwater-Turtle-Workshop-Report.pdf>], and that the IUCN study of progress on conservation of and trade in CITES-listed tortoises and freshwater turtles in Asia is available on the CITES website (AC25 Doc. 19, Annex).

The Animals Committee requests that the Secretariat include in this Notification the following:

The Animals Committee encourages Parties to take note of the information and recommendations contained in these documents, and, if appropriate, to consider preparing amendment proposals or formulate and implement appropriate domestic and other measures to address the conservation of tortoises and freshwater turtles.

3. The AC recommends that the SC review the reports of the workshops on conservation of tortoises and freshwater turtles, held at St. Louis (September 2010) and Singapore (February, 2011), available at ([http://www.fws.gov/international/DMA\\_DSA/CITES/animals/turtles.html](http://www.fws.gov/international/DMA_DSA/CITES/animals/turtles.html)) and at the WCS website [<http://www.cites.org/common/com/AC/26/SG-Tortoise-&-Freshwater-Turtle-Workshop-Report.pdf>], and make its own recommendations, as appropriate.

**Results of discussions of the Animals Committee on item 19 on *Sea cucumbers* [Decision 14.100 (Rev CoP15)] – Report of the working group, based on document AC26 DG1 Doc. 1**

**Document adopted by the Committee**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

Co-Chairs: representative of Oceania and United States of America;  
Parties: Australia, China and Japan; and  
IGO: FAO.

Mandate

Draft a Notification to the Parties drawing attention to the report from the CITES workshop in 2003 (see document CoP14 Doc. 62), the FAO documents on these species and any other relevant publications, and encouraging range States to use this and other information to manage their fisheries.

Recommendations

1. Recommend that the Secretariat issue a notification to the Parties drawing their attention to FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper 516 and 520 arising from the FAO Workshop on the Sustainable Use and Management of Sea Cucumber Fisheries, conducted in 2007. And furthermore draw attention to the abridged version of Technical Paper 520, entitled “Putting into practice an ecosystem approach to managing sea cucumber fisheries”, and drawing their attention to the forthcoming publication of an FAO catalogue “Commercially important sea cucumbers of the World”.
2. Encourages range countries to promote conservation and management of sea cucumbers which occur in their own jurisdiction, taking advantage of the information in these and other documents available from FAO, the report from the CITES workshop in 2003 (CoP14 Doc. 62), and other publications, and taking into account the status of stocks, fisheries and use of sea cucumber as well as social, economic and historical factors of each region, and where appropriate, with the help of FAO and/or regional fishery-related bodies, manage their sea cucumber fisheries in a sustainable way.
3. Recommend that these recommendations fulfil the mandate of Decision 14.100 (Rev CoP15), and so the work of the Sea Cucumber WG is complete.

**Results of discussions of the Animals Committee on item 20 on *Nomenclatural matters*,  
based on document AC26 WG9 Doc. 1**

**Document adopted by the Committee**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

- Chair: AC nomenclature specialist (Ms Grimm);
- Party observers: Mexico, Switzerland and United States; and
- IGOs and NGOs: UNEP-WCMC, Conservation International, Helholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Humane Society of the United States, Ornamental Fish International, IWMC – World Conservation Trust, Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and Species Survival Network.

Mandate

The working group shall:

1. On the basis of document AC26 Doc. 20 and its Annexes, develop recommendations for consideration by the Committee on all nomenclatural changes identified in paragraphs 2, 7, 8 and 9 of the document for which the Committee has not taken decisions;
2. Review progress with the implementation of: Decisions 15.62, paragraph a) (on the basis of material provided by the Secretariat); 15.63; and 15.64 paragraph a). Develop specific recommendations as necessary; and
3. Draft text about the implementation of the nomenclature Decisions directed to the Animal Committee for review by the Committee and subsequent submission at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Recommendations

1. On the basis of document AC26 Doc. 20 and its Annexes, develop recommendations for consideration by the Committee on all nomenclatural changes identified in paragraphs 2, 7, 8 and 9 of the document for which the Committee has not taken decisions;

The AC:

- a) recommends to not add a footnote to Primates spp. explaining that *Homo sapiens* is not covered by this higher taxon listing as the preamble of the Convention clearly indicates that human beings are not subject to the provisions of the Convention;
- b) recommends to adopt the extract of the online database “Amphibian Species of the World, an online reference”, version 5.5 of 2011 (AC26 Doc20 Annex 2) in combination with BROWN et al. (2011) (see below) as new nomenclatural standard reference for all Amphibian species, BROWN, J. L., TWOMEY, E., AMÉZQUITA, A., BARBOSA DE SOUZA, M., CALDWELL, L. P., LÖTTERS, S., VON MAY, R., MELO-SAMPAIO, P. R., MEJÍA-VARGAS, D., PEREZ-PEÑA, P., PEPPER, M., POELMAN, E. H., SANCHEZ-RODRIGUEZ, M. & SUMMERS, K. (2011: A taxonomic revision of the Neotropical poison frog genus *Ranitomeya* (Amphibia: Dendrobatidae). – *Zootaxa*, **3083**: 1-120;
- c) recommends to adopt the extract of the online database “Catalog of Fishes”, editors ESCHMEYER, W.N. & FRICKE, R. , downloaded November 30 2011 (AC26 Doc20 Annex 4) as new nomenclatural standard reference for all fish species except for the genus *Hippocampus*;
- d) recommends to adopt a number of nomenclatural changes outlined in document AC26 Doc. 20, Annex1 marked accordingly in the Annex to this recommendation; and

- e) recommends to not adopt a number of nomenclatural changes outlined in document AC26 Doc. 20, Annex1, marked accordingly by striking through in the Annex to this recommendation.
2. Review progress with the implementation of Decisions 15.62, paragraph a) (On the basis of material provided by the Secretariat); 15.63 and 15.64, paragraph a). Develop specific recommendations as necessary

**Decision 15.62, paragraph a)**

- a) recommends to adopt the following publications as nomenclatural standard references for *Uroplatus* spp. in addition to the already adopted reference for *Uroplatus giganteus* in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP15):
- Raxworthy, C.J. (2003): Introduction to the reptiles. – In: Goodman, S.M. & Bernstead, J.P. (eds.), The natural history of Madagascar: 934-949. Chicago;
  - Ratsovavina, F.M., Louis jr., E.E., Crottini, A., Randrianiaina, R.-D., Glaw, F. & Vences, M. (2011): A new leaf tailed gecko species from northern Madagascar with a preliminary assessment of molecular and morphological variability in the *Uroplatus ebenau* group. – Zootaxa, **3022**: 39-57. (for *Uroplatus finiavana*);
  - Böhle, A. & Schönecker, P. (2003): Eine neue Art der Gattung *Uroplatus* Duméril, 1805 aus Ost-Madagaskar (Reptilia: Squamata: Gekkonidae). – Salamandra, **39**(3/4): 129-138. (for *Uroplatus pietschmanni*);
  - Raxworthy, C.J., Pearson, R.G., Zimkus, B.M., Reddy, S., Deo, A.J., Nussbaum, R.A. & Ingram, C.M. 2008. Continental speciation in the tropics: contrasting biogeographic patterns of divergence in the *Uroplatus* leaf-tailed gecko radiation of Madagascar. Journal of Zoology 275: 423–440. (for *Uroplatus sameiti*);
- b) recommends to adopt the other nomenclatural changes for the Gekkonidae as suggested by Frank Glaw in his email to the CITES Secretariat; they are part of the Annex to this recommendation;
- c) recommends to adopt Kluge, A.G. (1983): Cladistic relationships among gekkonid lizards. – Copeia, 1983(no. 2): 465-475 as reference [for *Nactus serpensinsula*]; and
- d) recommends to adopt the nomenclatural changes in Malagasy Chamaeleonidae as suggested by Frank GLAW in his email to the CITES Secretariat, however, with the retention of *Furcifer monoceras* as valid species; they are part of the Annex to this recommendation.

**Decision 15.63**

Recommends that the Conference of the Parties consider Decision 15.63 concluded

**Decision 15.64, paragraph a)**

- a) recommends to adopt the list of species currently used by WCMC for the CITES Species Database and the Checklist of CITES Species (document AC26 Doc. 20, Annex 6) including the species changes as outlined in AC26 Doc. 20, Annex 1 page 14-15 as nomenclatural standard reference for coral species; and
- b) recommends, subject to external funding, that the Secretariat launches a project to revise the afore mentioned standard reference, focussing first on the major taxa in trade.
3. Draft text about the implementation of the nomenclature Decisions directed to the Animals Committee for review by the Committee and subsequent submission at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

**Decision 15.62 paragraph a)**

- a) Identified changes with regard to the Malagasy species of mammals, reptiles and amphibians as outlined in document AC26 Doc.20 Annex 1 and email information received by a specialist for reptiles in this region have been evaluated by the Animals Committee; and

- b) Resulting nomenclatural changes recommended by the Animals Committee for adoption by the Conference of the Parties are reported in document CoP16 Doc, XX, Annex XX, marked by the capital letter M.

**Decision 15.62 paragraph b)**

- a) The contents of this paragraph of Decision 15.62 refers to continuous advisory activities of the nomenclature specialist and not a single time-limited one; and
- b) The Animals Committee therefore recommends to the Conference of the Parties to insert the following clause at the end of letter f) in the recommendation section of Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP15):

“If nomenclature changes are identified affecting Appendix-III listings, the nomenclature specialist of the Animals Committee should advise the Secretariat whether these changes also result in changes of distribution affecting the countries issuing certificates of origin”

**Decision 15.63**

The Animals Committee undertook the analysis to identify species listed in the Appendices that might be included under the name of a higher taxon (document AC26 Doc. 20, Annex 5). The Committee determined that it could not, with certainty, identify changes that would not alter the scope of the original listings.

It turned out that shifting to a higher taxon always bears the potential of widening the scope of the original proposal in cases where species newly described are true species and not split from listed ones.

The Animals Committee therefore recommends that the Conference of the Parties consider Decision 15.63 concluded.

**Decision 15.64 paragraph a)**

- a) This decision has directed the Animals Committee to identify existing coral reference material that could be adopted as nomenclature standard reference for CITES listed corals which has been lacking so far. Intensive efforts by the Animals Committee have revealed that for the time being no comprehensive and consistent standard references exist to be recommended for this task;
- b) The Animals Committee therefore recommends to adopt the list of species currently used by WCMC for the CITES Species Database and the Checklist of CITES Species (see document CoP16 Doc. XX, Annex) as nomenclatural standard reference for coral species; and
- c) The Animals Committee also recommends, subject to external funding, that the Secretariat launches a project to revise the aforementioned standard reference, first focussing on the major taxa in trade.

Species name	CITES Appendix	Comments on origin: lumping, splitting, new name, new genus
<b>CHORDATA</b>		
<b>MAMMALIA</b>		
<b>ARTIODACTYLA</b>		
<b>BOVIDAE</b>		
<del><i>Budorcas bedfordi</i>, <i>B. tibetana</i>, <i>B. whitei</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>B. taxicolor</i></del>
<del><i>Capricornis maritimus</i></del>	<del>†</del>	<del>Split from <i>C. milneedwardsii</i></del>
<del><i>Cephalophus brookei</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>C. ogilbyi</i></del>
<del><i>Cephalophus castaneus</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>C. dorsalis</i></del>
<del><i>Cephalophus crusalbum</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>C. ogilbyi</i></del>
<del><i>Cephalophus curticeps</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>C. silvicultor</i></del>
<del><i>Kobus ansolli</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Described as a new species in 2005, but previously treated as a taxonomically indistinct subpopulation of <i>K. leche</i></del>
<del><i>Kobus kafuensis</i>, <i>K. smithemani</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>K. leche</i></del>
<del><i>Nemorhaedus (sic) = Naemorhedus bedfordi</i></del>	<del>†</del>	<del>Split from <i>N. goral</i></del>
<del><i>Nemorhaedus (sic) = Naemorhedus evansi</i></del>	<del>†</del>	<del>Split from <i>N. griseus</i></del>
<del><i>Ovis arabica</i>, <i>O. hodgsoni (sic) = hodgsonii</i>, <i>O. jubata</i>, <i>O. karelini</i>, <i>O. nigrimontana</i>, <i>O. polii</i></del>	<del>##/†</del>	<del>Split from <i>O. ammon</i></del>
<del><i>Ovis bechariensis</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>O. vignei</i></del>
<del><i>Ovis collium</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>O. ammon</i></del>
<del><i>Ovis cycloceros</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>O. vignei</i></del>
<del><i>Ovis darwini</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>O. ammon</i></del>
<del><i>Ovis gmelini (sic) = gmelinii</i></del>	<del>†</del>	<del>Previously known as <i>O. orientalis ophion</i></del>
<del><i>Ovis punjabiensis</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>O. vignei</i></del>
<del><i>Ovis sovortzovi</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>O. vignei</i></del>
<del><i>Philantomba aequatorialis</i>, <i>P. anchietae</i>, <i>P. bicolor</i>, <i>P. congica</i>, <i>P. defriesi</i>, <i>P. hecki</i>, <i>P. lugens</i>, <i>P. melanorhoa</i>, <i>P. simpsoni</i></del>	<del>##</del>	<del>Split from <i>P. monticola</i></del>
<del><i>Rupicapra ornata</i></del>	<del>†</del>	<del>Split from <i>R. pyronaica</i></del>

Species name	CITES Appendix	Comments on origin: lumping, splitting, new name, new genus
<b>CERVIDAE</b>		
<del><i>Axis annamiticus</i></del>	†	Split from <i>A. porcinus</i>
<del><i>Corvus bactrianus, C. barbarus, C. hanglu</i></del>	I/III	Split from <i>C. olaphus</i>
<del><i>Corvus wallichii</i> (including <i>hanglu</i>)</del>	I/NC	Split from <i>C. olaphus</i>
<del><i>Panolia oldii</i></del>	†	Transferred from <i>Rucorvus</i>
<del><i>Panolia siamensis, P. thamin</i></del>	†	Transferred from <i>Rucorvus</i> and split from <i>P. oldii</i>
<b>HIPPOPOTAMIDAE</b>		
<del><i>Cheoropsis hestepi</i></del>	II	Split from <i>C. liberionensis</i>
<b>SUIDAE</b>		
<del><i>Porcula salvinia</i></del>	†	Transferred from <i>Sus</i>
<b>TAYASSUIDAE</b>		
<del><i>Pecari angulatus</i></del>	Excluded from II	Split from <i>P. tajacu</i>
<del><i>Pecari crassus</i></del>	I/NC	Split from <i>P. tajacu</i>
<del><i>Pecari maximus</i></del>	II	New species Not adopted at CoP15 or by Taber et al. (2011)
<b>CARNIVORA</b>		
<b>CANIDAE</b>		
<del><i>Canis himalayensis</i></del>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15 & not even mentioned by Sillori-Zubiri (2009)
<del><i>Canis indica</i></del>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15 & not even mentioned by Sillori-Zubiri (2009)
<b>CHIROPTERA</b>		
<b>PTEROPODIDAE</b>		
<del><i>Pteropus banakrisi</i></del>	II	Described in 2002, but subsequently found to be based on subadult <i>P. alecto</i> Not adopted at CoP15
<b>PERISSODACTYLA</b>		
<b>EQUIDAE</b>		
<del><i>Equus hartmannae</i></del>	II	Split from <i>E. zebra</i>
<del><i>Equus hemippus</i></del>	II	Split from <i>E. hemionus</i>
<del><i>Equus khur</i></del>	†	Split from <i>E. hemionus</i>
<b>RHINOCEROTIDAE</b>		
<del><i>Coratotherium cottoni</i></del>	†	Split from <i>C. simum</i>

Species name	CITES Appendix	Comments on origin: lumping, splitting, new name, new genus	
<b>TAPIRIDAE</b>			
<del><i>Acrocordia indica</i></del>	†	Transferred from <i>Tapirus</i>	
<del><i>Tapirella bairdii</i></del>	†	Transferred from <i>Tapirus</i>	
<b>PRIMATES</b>			
<b>CALLITRICHIDAE</b>			
<i>Mico rondoni</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>CEBIDAE</b>			
<i>Aotus jorgehernandezi</i>	II	New species Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Cacajao ayresi</i>	II	New species Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Cacajao hosomi</i>	II	New species Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Callicebus aureipalatii</i>	II	New species Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Callicebus caquetensis</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Cebus flavius</i>	II	Revalidated species Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>CERCOPITHECIDAE</b>			
<i>Macaca munzala</i>	II	New species Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<del><i>Presbytis bicolor</i></del>	#	<del>Split from <i>P. molalophos</i></del>	
<del><i>Presbytis fredericæ</i></del>	#	<del>Split from <i>P. comata</i></del>	
<del><i>Presbytis mitrata</i></del>	#	<del>Split from <i>P. molalophos</i></del>	
<del><i>Presbytis sibiru</i></del>	#	<del>Split from <i>P. potenziani</i></del>	
<del><i>Presbytis sumatrana</i></del>	#	<del>Split from <i>P. molalophos</i></del>	
<i>Rhinopithecus strykeri</i>	I	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Rungwecebus kipunji</i>	II	1) new species & 2) generic change from <i>Lophocebus</i> Not adopted at CoP15 3) verification of distinctness of genus	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>Trachypithecus villosus</b>	II	Replacement name for <i>T. cristatus</i> Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>CHEIROGALEIDAE</b>			
<del><i>Microcebus bongolavensis</i></del>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15	
<del><i>Microcebus danfossi</i></del>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15	

Species name	CITES Appendix	Comments on origin: lumping, splitting, new name, new genus
<i>Microcebus lehilahytsara</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Microcebus lokobensis</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Microcebus macarthurii</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Microcebus mamiratra</i>	†	New species (but see Weisrock et al., 2010) Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Mirza zaza</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<b>HYLOBATIDAE</b>		
<i>Nomascus annamensis</i>	I	New species Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>INDRIDAE</b>		
<i>Avahi botsiloe</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Avahi cloosei</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Avahi meridionalis</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Avahi mooreorum</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Avahi peyrierasi</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Avahi ramanantsoavani</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<b>LEPILEMURIDAE</b>		
<i>Lepilemur aocelis</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Lepilemur hollandorum</i>	†	New species
<i>Lepilemur manasamody</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Lepilemur mittoimei</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Lepilemur otto</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15
<i>Lepilemur randrianasolei</i>	†	New species Not adopted at CoP15

Species name	CITES Appendix	Comments on origin: lumping, splitting, new name, new genus	
<del><i>Lepilemur sahalazensis</i></del>	†	<del>New species Not adopted at CoP15</del>	
<del><i>Lepilemur scottorum</i></del>	†	<del>New species Not adopted at CoP15</del>	
<b>TARSIIDAE</b>			
<i>Tarsius tumpara</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>AVES</b>			
<b>APODIFORMES</b>			
<b>TROCHILIDAE</b>			
<i>Chlorostilbon lucidus</i>	II	Name has priority over <i>C. aureoventris</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Phaethornis aethopyga</i>	II	Split from <i>P. longuemareus</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<del><i>Thalurania nigricapilla</i></del>	†	<del>New species</del>	
<b>FALCONIFORMES</b>			
<b>ACCIPITRIDAE</b>			
<i>Buteo socotraensis</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>PSITTACIFORMES</b>			
<b>PSITTACIDAE</b>			
<i>Aratinga maculata</i>	II	Name has priority over <i>A. pinto</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Forpus modestus</i>	II	Name has priority over <i>F. sclateri</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Pyrrhura griseipectus</i>	II	Split from <i>P. leucotis</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>REPTILIA</b>			
<b>RHYNCHOCEPHALIA</b>			
<del><i>Sphenodon guntheri</i></del>	†	<del>Lumped with <i>S. punctatus</i></del>	
<b>CROCODYLIA</b>			
<b>CROCODYLIDAE</b>			
<i>Crocodylus johnstoni</i>	II	Change in spelling of listed <i>Crocodylus johnsoni</i>	Already suggested by AC 25 for adoption by CoP
<del><i>Crocodylus suchus</i></del>	<del>II</del>	<del>Split from <i>Crocodylus niloticus</i></del>	
<b>SAURIA</b>			
<b>AGAMIDAE</b>			
<i>Saara asmussi</i> , <i>S. hardwickii</i> , <i>S. loricata</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Uromastyx</i>	Already suggested by AC 25 for adoption by CoP
<i>Uromastyx lepteni</i>	II	Lumped with <i>Uromastyx aegyptia</i>	Already suggested by AC 25 for adoption by CoP
<i>Uromastyx nigriventris</i>	II	Split from <i>U. acanthinura</i>	Already suggested by AC 25 for adoption by CoP
<i>Uromastyx shobraki</i>	II	Split from <i>U. yemenensis</i>	Already suggested by AC 25 for adoption by CoP

Species name	CITES Appendix	Comments on origin: lumping, splitting, new name, new genus	
<b>CHAMAELEONIDAE</b>			Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Archaius tigris</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Calumma</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Bradypodion kentanicum</i> , <i>B. melanocephalum</i>	II	Split from <i>B. pumilum</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Bradypodion ngomeense</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Bradypodion nkandlae</i>	II	Lumped with <i>B. nemorale</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Bradypodion occidentale</i> , <i>B. taeniabroncchum</i>	II	Split from <i>B. pumilum</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Brookesia peyrierasi</i> , <i>B. tuberculata</i>	II	Split from <i>B. minima</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Brookesia ramanantsoai</i>	II	Resurrected from <i>B. dentata</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Calumma tarzan</i>	II	Split from <i>C. furcifer</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Calumma vohibola</i>	II	New species of <i>C. nasutum</i> group	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Furcifer timoni</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Kinyongia asheorum</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Kinyongia magomberae</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Kinyongia uluguruensis</i>	II	Correct spelling from <i>K. uluguruense</i> (adopted at CoP15)	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Kinyongia vanheygeni</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Nadzikambia baylissi</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Nadzikambia mlanjensis</i>	II	Correct spelling from <i>N. mlanjense</i> (adopted at CoP15)	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Trioceros spp.</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Chamaeleo</i> (including <i>C. affinis</i> , <i>C. balebicornutus</i> , <i>C. bitaeniatus</i> , <i>C. camerunensis</i> , <i>C. chapini</i> , <i>C. conirostratus</i> , <i>C. cristatus</i> , <i>C. deremensis</i> , <i>C. eisentrauti</i> , <i>C. ellioti</i> , <i>C. feae</i> , <i>C. fuelleborni</i> , <i>C. goetzei</i> , <i>C. harenae</i> , <i>C. hoehnelii</i> , <i>C. incornutus</i> , <i>C. ituriensis</i> , <i>C. jacksonii</i> , <i>C. johnstoni</i> , <i>C. kinetensis</i> , <i>C. laterispinis</i> , <i>C. marsabitensis</i> , <i>C. melleri</i> , <i>C. montium</i> , <i>C. narraioca</i> , <i>C. ntunte</i> , <i>C. oweni</i> , <i>C. pfefferi</i> , <i>C. quadricornis</i> , <i>C. rudis</i> , <i>C. schoutedeni</i> , <i>C. schubotzi</i> , <i>C. tempeli</i> , <i>C. weneri</i> , <i>C. wiedersheimi</i> )	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Trioceros hanangensis</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Trioceros nyirit</i>	II	New species in the <i>Trioceros</i> (former <i>Chamaeleo</i> ) <i>biataeniatus</i> group	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Trioceros peretti</i>	II	Transferred and split (former subspecies) from <i>Chamaeleo wiedersheimi</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Trioceros serratus</i>	II	Transferred and split from <i>Chamaeleo wiedersheimi</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP

Species name	CITES Appendix	Comments on origin: lumping, splitting, new name, new genus	
<i>Triceros sternfeldi</i>	II	Transferred and split from <i>Chamaeleo rudis</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>GEKKONIDAE</b>			
<i>Nactus serpensinsula</i>	II	Genus change from former <i>Cyrtodactylus</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Phelsuma borai</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Phelsuma dorsivitta</i>	II	Split from <i>P. lineata</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Phelsuma gouldi</i>	II	New species of the <i>P. mutabilis</i> group	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Phelsuma hoeschi</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Phelsuma parva</i>	II	Split from <i>P. quadriocellata</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Phelsuma roesleri</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Uroplatus finnavana</i>	II	New species of the <i>P. ebenau</i> group	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Uroplatus sameiti</i>	II	New species, split (former subspecies) from <i>U. sikorae</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>IGUANIDAE</b>			
<i>Conolophus marthae</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>VARANIDAE</b>			
<i>Varanus bitatawa</i>	II	New species	Already suggested by AC 25 for adoption by CoP
<i>Varanus lirungensis</i>	II	New species	Already suggested by AC 25 for adoption by CoP
<i>Varanus obor</i>	II	New species	Already suggested by AC 25 for adoption by CoP
<i>Varanus palawanensis</i>	II	New species	Already suggested by AC 25 for adoption by CoP
<i>Varanus rasmusseni</i>	II	New species	Already suggested by AC 25 for adoption by CoP
<b>SERPENTES</b>			
<b>BOIDAE</b>			
<i>Candoia paulsoni</i>	II	Split from <i>C. carinata</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Candoia superciliosa</i>	II	Split from <i>C. carinata</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Corallus batesii</i>	II	Split from <i>C. caninus</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Epicrates alvarezii</i>	II	Split from <i>E. cenchria</i> , former subspecies	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Epicrates assisi</i>	II	Split from <i>E. cenchria</i> , former subspecies	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Epicrates crassus</i>	II	Split from <i>E. cenchria</i> , former subspecies	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Eryx borrii</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>PYTHONIDAE</b>			
<del><i>Broghammerus reticulatus</i></del>	<del>II</del>	<del>Transferred from <i>Python</i></del>	
<del><i>Broghammerus timoriensis</i></del>	<del>II</del>	<del>Transferred from <i>Python</i></del>	
<i>Leiopython bennettorum</i>	II	Split from <i>L. albertisii</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Leiopython biakensis</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Leiopython fredparkeri</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Leiopython hoserai</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Leiopython huonensis</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP

Species name	CITES Appendix	Comments on origin: lumping, splitting, new name, new genus	
<del>Morelia azurea</del>	#	Split from <i>M. viridis</i>	
<i>Python bivittatus</i>	II	Split from <i>P. molurus</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Python kyaiktiyo</i>	II	Split from <i>P. brongersmai</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>TESTUDINES</b>			
<b>EMYDIDAE</b>			
<i>Graptemys pearlensis</i>	III	Split from <i>G. gibbonsi</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>TESTUDINIDAE</b>			
<i>Gopherus morafkai</i>	II	Split from <i>G. agassizi</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<del><i>Testudo arizonae</i>, <i>T. perses</i></del>	#	Split from <i>T. graeca</i>	
<b>TRIONYCHIDAE</b>			
<i>Lissemys ceylonensis</i>	II	Split from <i>L. punctata</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Nilssonina gangeticus</i>	I	Transferred from <i>Aspideretes</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Nilssonina hurum</i>			
<i>Nilssonina nigricans</i>			
<b>AMPHIBIA</b>			
<b>ANURA</b>			
<b>AROMOBATIDAE</b>			
	II	New family (various genera incl. <i>Allobates</i> )	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Allobates femoralis</i>	II	Transferred from Dendrobatidae	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Allobates hodli</i>	II	New species in <i>A. femoralis</i> complex	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Allobates myersi</i> , <i>A. rufulus</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Epipedobates</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Allobates zaparo</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Dendrobatidae</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>BUFONIDAE</b>			
<i>Altiphrynoides osgoodi</i>	I	Transferred from <i>Spinophrynoides</i> Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Amietophrynus superciliaris</i>	I	Transferred from <i>Bufo</i> Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Incilius periglenes</i>	I	Transferred from <i>Bufo</i> Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>DENDROBATIDAE</b>			
<i>Adelphobates</i> spp.	II	Transferred from <i>Dendrobates</i> (incl. <i>A. castaneoticus</i> , <i>A. galactonotus</i> , <i>A. quinquevittatus</i> ) Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP

Species name	CITES Appendix	Comments on origin: lumping, splitting, new name, new genus	
<i>Ameerega</i> spp.	II	Transferred from <i>Epipedobates</i> (incl. <i>A. andina</i> , <i>A. bassleri</i> , <i>A. bilinguis</i> , <i>A. boehmei</i> , <i>A. boliviana</i> , <i>A. braccata</i> , <i>A. cainarachi</i> , <i>A. erythromos</i> , <i>A. flavopicta</i> , <i>A. hahneli</i> , <i>A. ingeri</i> , <i>A. labialis</i> , <i>A. macero</i> , <i>A. maculata</i> , <i>A. parvula</i> , <i>A. petersi</i> , <i>A. picta</i> , <i>A. peruviridis</i> , <i>A. planipaleae</i> , <i>A. pongoensis</i> , <i>A. pulchripecta</i> , <i>A. rubriventris</i> , <i>A. silverstonei</i> , <i>A. simulans</i> , <i>A. smaragdina</i> , <i>A. trivittata</i> , <i>A. yungicola</i> ) Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ameerega altamazonica</i>	II	New species Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ameerega ignipedis</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ameerega pepperi</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ameerega peruviridis</i>	II	New species Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ameerega yoshina</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Andinobates</i> spp.	II	Transferred from <i>Ranitomeya</i> (incl. <i>A. abditus</i> , <i>A. altobueyensis</i> , <i>A. bombetes</i> , <i>A. claudiae</i> , <i>A. daleswansonii</i> , <i>A. dorisswansonae</i> , <i>A. fulguritus</i> , <i>A. minutus</i> , <i>A. opisthomelas</i> , <i>A. viridis</i> , <i>A. virolensis</i> )	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Dendrobates azureus</i>	II	Lumped with <i>D. tinctorius</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Epipedobates machalilla</i>	?	Described in 1995 in <i>Colostethus</i> (a genus not covered by CITES controls) but transferred to <i>Epipedobates</i> in 2006	No recommendation taken, Ecuador is preparing Proposal to include <i>Epipedobates machalilla</i> in Appendix II
<i>Excidobates</i> spp.	II	Transferred from <i>Dendrobates</i> ( <i>E. captivus</i> , <i>E. mysteriosus</i> ) Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Hyloxalus azureiventris</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Cryptophyllobates</i> Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Minyobates steyermarki</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Dendrobates</i> Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Oophaga</i> spp.	II	Transferred from <i>Dendrobates</i> (incl. <i>O. arborea</i> , <i>O. granulifera</i> , <i>O. histrionica</i> , <i>O. lehmanni</i> , <i>O. occultator</i> , <i>O. pumilio</i> , <i>O. speciosa</i> , <i>O. vicentei</i> ) Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Oophaga sylvatica</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Dendrobates</i> and split from <i>D. histrionicus</i> Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP

Species name	CITES Appendix	Comments on origin: lumping, splitting, new name, new genus	
<i>Ranitomeya</i> spp.	II	Transferred from <i>Dendrobates</i> (incl. <i>R. abdita</i> , <i>R. altobueyensis</i> , <i>R. amazonica</i> , <i>R. biolat</i> , <i>R. bombetes</i> , <i>R. claudiae</i> , <i>R. dalesswansonii</i> , <i>R. dorisswansonae</i> , <i>R. duellmani</i> , <i>R. fantastica</i> , <i>R. flavovittata</i> , <i>R. fulgurita</i> , <i>R. imitator</i> , <i>R. lamasii</i> , <i>R. minuta</i> , <i>R. opisthomelas</i> , <i>R. reticulata</i> , <i>R. rubrocephala</i> , <i>R. uakarii</i> , <i>R. vanzolinii</i> , <i>R. variabilis</i> , <i>R. ventrimaculata</i> , <i>R. viridis</i> ) Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya benedicta</i>	II	New species Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya cyanovittata</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya defleri</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya duellmani</i>	II	Lumped with <i>R. ventrimaculata</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya ignea</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Dendrobates</i> and split from <i>D. tinctorius</i> Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
	II	Lumped with <i>R. reticulata</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya intermedia</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Dendrobates</i> and split from <i>D. imitator</i> Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
	II	Lumped back with <i>R. imitator</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya lamasii</i>	II	Lumped with <i>R. sirensis</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya sirensis</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Dendrobates</i> and split from <i>D. imitator</i> Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya summersi</i>	II	New species Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya tolimensis</i>	II	New species Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya toraro</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya virolinensis</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Dendrobates</i> (and spelling corrected) Not adopted at CoP15	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Ranitomeya yavaricola</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>DICROGLOSSIDAE</b>		New family (incl. <i>Euphlyctis</i> and <i>Hoplobatrachus</i> )	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>MYOBATRACHIDAE</b>		New family (incl. <i>Rheobatrachus</i> )	Suggested for adoption by CoP

Species name	CITES Appendix	Comments on origin: lumping, splitting, new name, new genus	
<b>ACTINOPTERYGII</b>			
<b>SYNGNATHIFORMES</b>			
<b>SYNGNATHIDAE</b>			
<i>Hippocampus paradoxus</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Hippocampus pontohi</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Hippocampus satomiae</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Hippocampus severnsi</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<i>Hippocampus tyro</i>	II	New species	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>ARTHROPODA</b>			
<b>ARACHNIDA</b>			
<b>ARANEAE</b>			
<b>THERAPHOSIDAE</b>			
<i>Brachypelma albiceps</i>	II	Transferred from <i>Aphonopelma</i>	Suggested for adoption by CoP
<b>ANNELIDA</b>			
<b>HIRUDINOIDEA</b>			
<b>ARHYNCHOBDPELLIDA</b>			
<b>HIRUDINIDAE</b>			
<i>Hirudo orientalis</i>	II	New species, part of <i>H. medicinalis</i> complex	Suggested for adoption by CoP

**Results of discussions of the Animals Committee on item 21 on *Identification of CITES-listed corals in trade [Decision 15.64 b]* – Report of the working group, based on document AC26 WG10 Doc. 1**

**Document adopted by the Committee**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

- Co-Chairs: representatives of Asia (Mr Soemorumekso) and Europe (Mr Fleming);
- Parties: Australia and United States or America; and
- IGOs and NGOs: Ornamental Fish International and TRAFFIC.

Mandate

Draft a proposed update of the list of coral taxa for which identification to genus level was acceptable, but which should be identified to species level where feasible.

Recommendations

1. The working group agreed to use the following criterion to determine which species be considered for adding to the list of coral taxa for which identification to genus level is acceptable but which should be identified to species level where feasible.

*It is not possible even for an informed non-specialist, with reasonable effort, to be able to distinguish between all the species in the genus with confidence without recourse to a specialist taxonomist*

2. The group recommends that the Animals Committee adopt the revised list (attached as Annex A) of coral taxa for which identification to genus is acceptable and provide this to the Secretariat for dissemination as a Notification to Parties.
3. The working group noted that the list will require revision to conform to a standard nomenclature reference for CITES-listed corals (arising from work under Decision 15.64.a), should one be adopted, and with any subsequent changes to this reference.
4. The group noted the difficulties of identifying corals, especially by non-specialists, but recommend that Parties should be reminded, in the Notification, that coral specimens not in this list of genera should be identified to species level.

CORAL TAXA WHERE IDENTIFICATION TO GENUS LEVEL IS ACCEPTABLE\*,  
BUT WHICH SHOULD BE IDENTIFIED TO SPECIES LEVEL WHERE FEASIBLE

[Changes to current list in Notification 2010/014 shown in **bold**]

Taxa	Number of species in the genus
<i>Acanthastrea</i>	10
<i>Acropora</i>	127
<i>Agaricia</i>	7
<i>Alveopora</i>	12
<i>Anacropora</i>	5
<i>Astreopora</i>	11
<i>Balanophyllia</i>	56
<i>Barabattoia</i>	3
<b><i>Blastomussa</i></b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Caulastrea</i>	4
<i>Coscinaraea</i>	9
<i>Ctenactis</i>	3
<b><i>Cycloseris</i></b>	<b>11</b>
<i>Cyphastrea</i>	7
<i>Dendrophyllia</i>	21
<b><i>Diaseris</i></b>	
<i>Distichopora</i>	23
<i>Echinophyllia</i>	8
<i>Echinopora</i>	9
<i>Euphyllia</i> (dead)	9
<i>Favia</i>	18
<i>Favites</i>	9
<i>Fungia</i>	25
<b><i>Galaxea</i></b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Goniastrea</i>	8
<i>Goniopora</i>	20
<b><i>Heterocyathus</i></b>	<b>3</b>
<b><i>Heteropsammia</i></b>	<b>2</b>
<b><i>Hydnophora</i></b>	<b>7</b>
<b><i>Isopora</i></b>	<b>?</b>
<i>Leptastrea</i>	6
<i>Leptoseris</i>	14
<b><i>Lithophyllon</i></b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Lobophyllia</i>	7
<i>Madracis</i>	15
<i>Millepora</i>	17
<i>Montastrea</i>	9
<i>Montipora</i>	56
<i>Mussismilia</i>	3
<i>Mycetophyllia</i>	5
<i>Oculina</i>	9
<i>Oxypora</i>	3
<b><i>Pachyseris</i></b>	<b>12</b>
<i>Pavona</i>	17
<i>Pectinia</i>	5
<i>Physogyra</i> (dead)	2
<i>Platygyra</i>	9
<i>Plerogyra</i> (dead)	4
<i>Pocillopora</i>	7
<i>Porites</i>	41

Taxa	Number of species in the genus
<i>Psammocora</i>	11
<b><i>Seriatopora</i></b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Scolymia</i>	5
<i>Siderastrea</i>	4
<i>Styaster</i>	75
<i>Stylocoeniella</i>	3
<i>Stylophora</i>	5
<i>Symphyllia</i>	7
<i>Tubastraea</i>	6
<i>Turbinaria</i>	12

- \* Parties are reminded that specimens of stony corals not in the genera listed above should continue to be identified to species level.

**Results of discussions of the Animals Committee on item 25 on *Review of objections to the registration of operations that breed Appendix-I animal species in captivity for commercial purposes*, based on document AC26 WG8 Doc. 1**

**Document adopted by the Committee**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

- Chair: AC Chair (Mr Ibero); and
- Members: members and alternate members of the Committee.

Mandate

On the basis of document AC26 Doc. 25 and the documentation in its Annexes, the working group shall review the objection, and provide comments for the Secretariat to forward to the Parties concerned in compliance with the provisions in Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP15).

Recommendations

1. The Committee considered the objections by Indonesia to the registration of captive breeding operation in the Philippines for xxx and xxx and provide the comments below as required by Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP15), Annex 2, paragraph 3.

**Legality of founder stock**

2. The Committee noted that it was a requirement of Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP15) that the Management Authority of the State in which the breeding operation is situated should provide evidence that the parental stock had been obtained in accordance with national measures and with the provisions of the Convention. Indonesia's concerns and objection were thus within the scope of the Resolution.
3. The Committee felt that the Philippines seemed to have provided as much evidence as they are able to do, given that the founder stock were acquired before the species were listed on the Convention (c30 years ago). This evidence cannot include CITES documentation such as export permits because there was no such requirement for them at the time.
4. Whilst determining legal origin of specimens is not a function of the Animals Committee, the Committee felt able to advice on the likelihood of the species being in trade at the time.
5. The Committee noted that the proposal to list these species (as Psittaciformes, made to CoP3 in 1981), noted the availability, as a result of international trade, of specimens of *C. moluccensis* and *C. sulphurea*, in non-range states. Equally, immediately following the listing of the two species, CITES trade data indicate significant volumes of birds were traded from Indonesia, the sole range state, from 1982 onwards. But trade was also recorded from many other non-range states thus indicating that trade to these countries must have taken place before listing. In other words, the Committee felt that it was likely that significant trade in these species had occurred before listing of the species.

**Registration of the operation in the Philippines should be delayed pending the adoption of an action plan between Indonesia and the Philippines**

6. The Committee was encouraged to note that a Memorandum of Understanding between Indonesia and the Philippines, addressing support to the *in situ* conservation of Indonesian *Cacatua* spp. as encouraged in Resolution Conf. 13.9, had been signed by both Parties.
7. It noted that a draft action plan was under consideration between the two Parties and that a meeting to discuss this was planned for April 2012. The Committee hoped that this would result in a productive solution acceptable to both Parties.

8. However, the Committee did not consider that an objection on these grounds was a legitimate reason to prevent registration taking place because such cooperative agreements, whilst encouraged in Resolution Conf. 13.9, are voluntary actions and are not a requirement for registration under Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP15).

**Results of discussions of the Animals Committee on items 16 and 26.2 20 on  
Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP15) on Conservation and management  
of sharks (Class Chondrichthyes) and Draft proposal to include *Lamna nasus* in Appendix II,  
based on document AC26 WG4 Doc. 1.**

**Document adopted by the Committee**

Membership (as decided by the Committee)

- Chairs: representative of Oceania (Mr Robertson) as Chair and alternate representative of Asia (Mr Ishii) as Vice-Chair;
- Parties: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom and United States; and
- IGOs and NGOs: Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, European Union, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, IUCN – International Union for Conservation of Nature, SEAFDEC – Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, Animal Welfare Institute, Defenders of Wildlife, Fundación Cethus, Humane Society of the United States, Pew Environment Group, Project AWARE Foundation, Shark Advocates International, Species Management Specialists, Species Survival Network, SWAN International, TRAFFIC International and Wildlife Conservation Society, WWF.

Mandate

In support of the implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP15) and reporting by the Animals Committee at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP16), the working group shall:

1. Examine the information provided by range States on trade and other relevant data in response to Notifications to the Parties Nos. 2010/027 and 2011/049 and taking into account discussions in plenary, together with the final report of the joint FAO/CITES *Workshop to review the application and effectiveness of international regulatory measures for the conservation and sustainable use of elasmobranchs (Italy, 2010)* and other relevant information;
2. Draft an analysis of the information mentioned in paragraph 1 above, including recommendations, for consideration by the Committee and subsequent reporting at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and
3. Review the draft proposal to include *Lamna nasus* in Appendix II, presented in document AC26 Doc. 26.2, and provide comments for consideration by the Committee.

Recommendations

1. Parties take note of the above documents submitted to the Animals Committee and the Secretariat inform Parties when the final version of the UK Report on assessing the intrinsic vulnerability of harvested sharks (AC26 Inf. 9) becomes available;
2. The CITES Secretariat contact the top 26 shark fishing Member States (i.e. those taking >1% of the global catch of sharks) that did not respond to CITES notifications (2010/027 and 2011/049 – as they relate to sharks) or to the FAO questionnaire on the status of implementation of the FAO IPOA–Sharks, and encourage a response, and the Secretariat to make this information publicly available to the Parties;
3. The CITES Secretariat invite Parties that responded to CITES Notification 2011/049, but did not provide the following information on trade in sharks and on domestic measures (e.g. laws or regulations) regulating the import or export of shark parts and products (fins, meat, skin, organs, etc.), to do so, and the Secretariat to make this information publicly available to the Parties;

4. The CITES Secretariat issue a notification alerting Parties when the FAO report "*The Implementation of the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks*" (in preparation for the upcoming COFI meeting in July 2012), becomes available and provide a link to this document;
5. The summary list of shark species submitted by Parties in response to Notification 2011/049 a) ii, that they believe require additional action to enhance their conservation and management, be appended to this Working Group report;
6. Recognising the MOU between the CITES and FAO Secretariats, ask the CITES Secretariat to request from FAO the terms of reference for the FAO assessment to be undertaken regarding all commercially exploited aquatic species listed in the CITES Appendices, make this information available to Parties through a notification, and request FAO to report on progress in its reports to CoP16 and AC27;

#### Draft Decisions

##### **Directed to the Secretariat**

- 1) RECOGNIZING that it is difficult for Parties to avoid importing illegally-obtained shark products if they are unaware of the domestic legislation and regulations of other Parties, or of measures adopted by RFMOs, and hence to enable importing Parties, where applicable, to assist exporting Parties with the enforcement of their laws, and to assist the Animals Committee to inform the Parties as required under Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev CoP15), the Conference of the Parties directs the Secretariat to:
  - i) issue a Notification to Parties requesting them to summarise their domestic laws and regulations that prohibit the landing or trade of shark species and products, and provide copies of or links to these instruments; in order for the Secretariat to make this information available on the CITES website; and
  - ii) collaborate with the FAO Secretariat in the development of a single, regularly updated, source summarising current RFMO measures for shark conservation and management, with information on species, fisheries, Members/Contracting Parties, and the geographical areas covered and excluded;

##### **Directed to the Parties**

- 2) RECALLING the CITES/CMS Joint Work Plan,

ENCOURAGES Parties to engage with the work of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), as appropriate, particularly for shark species listed in the relevant Appendices to CITES and CMS, recognising that CMS Parties are required to strive towards strictly protecting species listed in Appendix I to CMS, including by prohibiting the taking of these species, and to implement other measures through the Migratory Sharks MOU;

#### Draft amendment to Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP15)

The following wording (underlined) to be added to operative paragraphs 6 and 8:

URGES Parties that are shark fishing States but that have not yet implemented an NPOA-Sharks, to develop their own NPOAs at the earliest opportunity and take steps to improve research and data collection on both fisheries and trade as a first step towards their Shark Plans, particularly the necessity to improve the collection of catch and trade data at the lowest taxonomic level possible (ideally by species), and to report these data to the relevant national, regional and international authorities;

ENCOURAGES Parties to improve data collection, data reporting, management and conservation measures for shark species, implementing, enhancing and enforcing these actions through domestic, bilateral, RFMOs or other international measures;

DIRECTS the Animals Committee to examine new information provided by range States on trade and other available relevant data and information, and report their analyses at meetings of the Conference of the Parties.

## Annex

### LIST OF SHARK SPECIES (CLASS CHONDRICHTHYES) SUBMITTED BY PARTIES

The Animals Committee notes that the following list of shark species (*Class Chondrichthyes*) were submitted by the Parties in response to CITES Notification to the Parties No. 2011/049, which invited Parties to submit a list of shark species (*Class Chondrichthyes*) that they believe require additional action to enhance their conservation and management, including if possible any concrete measures which they believe to be needed (for more details, see documents AC26 Doc. 16.1 and AC26 Doc. 16.2).

#### **Australia** (AC26 Doc. 16.2 Annex AU)

School shark (*Galeorhinus galeus*)  
Gulper sharks (*Centrophorus harrissoni*,  
*C. moluccensis*, *C. zeehaani*)

#### **Colombia** (AC26 Doc. 16.2 Annex CO)

Silky shark (*Carcharhinus falciformes*)  
Oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*)  
Scalloped hammerhead (*Sphyrna lewini*)

#### **European Union** (AC26 Doc. 16.2 Annex EU)

Shortfin (*Isurus oxyrinchus*) and longfin Mako  
(*Isurus paucus*)  
Porbeagle (*Lamna nasus*)  
Bigeye thresher (*Alopias superciliosus*)  
Silky shark (*Carcharhinus falciformes*)  
Scalloped hammerhead (*Sphyrna lewini*)  
Spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*)

#### **India** (AC26 Doc. 16.2 Annex IN)

Whale shark (*Rhincodon typus*)  
Knifetooth sawfish (*Anoxypristis cuspidate*)  
Pondicherry shark (*Carcharhinus hemiodon*)  
Ganges shark (*Glyphis gangeticus*)  
Speartooth shark (*Glyphis glyphis*)  
Ganges stingray (*Himantura fluviatilis*)  
Largetooth sawfish (*Pristis microdon*)  
Longcomb sawfish (*Pristis zijsron*)  
Giant guitarfish (*Rhynchobatus djiddensis*)  
Porcupine ray (*Urogymnus asperrimus*)

#### **Israel** (AC26 Doc. 16.2 Annex IL)

Sharpnose guitarfish (*Glaucostegus granulatus*)  
Halavi Guitarfish (*Glaucostegus halavi*)  
Clubnose guitarfish (*Glaucostegus thouin*)  
Common shovelnose Ray, Giant shovelnose Ray  
(*Glaucostegus typus*)

#### **Japan** (AC26 Doc. 16.2 Annex JP)

Whale shark (*Rhincodon typus*)  
Basking shark (*Cetorhinus maximus*)  
Great white shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*)

**Montenegro** (this submission was provided after the deadline and will be posted as an information document on the CITES website)

Porbeagle (*Lamna nasus*)  
Blue shark (*Prionace glauca*)

#### **New Zealand** (AC26 Doc. 16.2 Annex NZ)

Deepwater Nurse Shark (*Odontaspis ferox*)  
Manta Ray (*Manta birostris*)  
Spinetail Devil Ray/Spinetail Mobula (*Mobula japonica*)  
Shortfin Mako Shark (*Isurus oxyrinchus*)  
Longfin Mako Shark (*Isurus paucus*)  
Porbeagle (*Lamna nasus*)  
Scalloped Hammerhead Shark (*Sphyrna lewini*)  
Great hammerhead Shark (*Sphyrna mokarran*)  
Smooth Hammerhead Shark (*Sphyrna zygaena*)  
Oceanic Whitetip Shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*)

#### **United States of America** (AC26 Doc. 16.2 Annex US)

Spiny dogfish shark (*Squalus acanthias*)  
Porbeagle shark (*Lamna nasus*)  
Freshwater stingrays Family Potamotrygonidae  
Sawfishes Family Pristidae  
Gulper sharks genus *Centrophorus*  
School, tope, or soupfin shark (*Galeorhinus galeus*)  
Guitarfishes, shovelnose rays Order  
Rhinobatiformes  
Requiem and pelagic sharks  
Devil rays Family Mobulidae  
Leopard sharks (*Triakis semifasciata*)  
Hammerhead sharks (*Sphyrna* spp.)  
Dusky shark (*Carcharhinus obscurus*)  
Thresher sharks (*Alopias* spp.)  
Shortfin mako (*Isurus oxyrinchus*)  
Silky shark (*Carcharhinus falciformis*)  
Oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*)  
Blue shark (*Prionace glauca*)  
Sandbar shark (*Carcharhinus plumbeus*)  
Bull shark (*Carcharhinus leucas*)  
Tiger shark (*Galeocerdo cuvier*)