

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



Seventeenth meeting of the Animals Committee
Hanoi (Viet Nam), 30 July – 3 August 2001

SUMMARY RECORD

1. Opening of the meeting (no document)

His Excellency Nguyen Cong Tan, Deputy Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, accompanied by the Honourable Nguyen Van Dang, Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development, welcomed participants to Viet Nam and opened the meeting (Annex 1). Dr Nguyen Ba Thu, the Director of the CITES Management Authority of Viet Nam, provided an overview of biodiversity conservation in Viet Nam and of the implementation of CITES (Annex 2). Opening addresses were also given by the Chairman of the Animals Committee, Dr Marinus S. Hoogmoed (Annex 3), and the Chief of the Scientific Support Unit, Dr Malan Lindeque, of the CITES Secretariat who thanked the host country and the organizers for their excellent arrangements for the meeting and the warm welcome to Viet Nam.

2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure [AC17 Doc. 2 (Rev. 2)]

Several changes to the existing Rules of Procedure were proposed by the Secretariat after consultation with a joint working group of the Animals and Plants Committees, primarily focusing on the submission of documents for meetings of the Animals Committee and the reports on such meetings. Clarification was sought on a number of rules, particularly in relation to the summary report format, the submission of credentials, the communication procedure, the submission of discussion documents by observers and the adoption of the agenda. The Secretariat undertook to consider the issues raised in light of the Rules of Procedure of the Standing Committee and their application to the Animals Committee, and to report back to the Committee. The Chairman proposed that the Rules of Procedure be adopted provisionally to allow the meeting to proceed until the Secretariat could report back.

The Secretariat subsequently reported back to the meeting clarifying the issues on the Rules of Procedure raised in the first session. Regarding Rule 7, written confirmation from the Head of the Management Authority will be accepted as credentials for Party observers. For

observers from non-governmental organizations, written confirmation from the Head of the organization will be accepted as credentials. With regards to Rule 9, it was noted that no change to the current wording was required, given that the agenda was considered provisional until it was adopted at the meeting of the Animals Committee, and therefore regional representatives would be consulted as a matter of course.

With regards to the submission of documents by observers outlined in Rule 17, the Secretariat confirmed that non-governmental organizations could not directly provide discussion documents for consideration by the Animals Committee, and proposed to delete the word "discussion" from the first and second sentences in Rule 17, of the annex to document AC17 Doc. 2 (Rev.1).

Amendments to Rules 4 and 23 were proposed, in order to clarify that alternate regional representatives of the Animals Committee would be entitled to attend meetings of the Committee as observers, and would have the right to participate in open and closed meetings of the Committee without the right to vote.

A revised version of the Rules of Procedure was presented to the meeting with the amendments outlined above. The Secretariat agreed to consult with the Plants Committee regarding the revisions, with the aim of maintaining consistency between the Rules of Procedure of both Committees.

The revised Rules of Procedure were adopted after further discussion¹.

3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme (AC17 Doc. 3.1 and AC17 Doc. 3.2)

A request was made to allow time for a discussion on the status of Appendix-I species in non-range States, with the possibility of forming a small working group to look at the role that the Animals Committee could play in taking this issue forward. The Secretariat advised that it had already been requested by the Standing Committee to prepare a discussion paper on this subject for the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Chairman then proposed that, with the limited time available, this matter not be considered at this meeting. The Secretariat will, if possible, provide a draft of this paper at the next meeting of the Committee, but discussion papers from other Parties will be welcomed.

The provisional agenda and working programme in documents AC17 Doc. 3.1 and AC17 Doc. 3.2 were adopted.

4. Admission of observers (AC17 Doc. 4)

There being no objections from the members of the Committee or representatives of Parties, all organizations listed in the document were formally admitted.

¹ The following statement was submitted by the delegation of Mexico.

The Mexican delegation expressed its concern that the proposed amendment of Rule 18 would considerably reduce the time available to Parties, the Secretariat and NGOs to prepare documents for meetings of the Animals Committee. Moreover, given the dates of CoP12, AC18 will be held in April 2002 and the deadline for submitting documents will consequently be in January, less than five months before the next annual meeting.

5. Regional reports [AC17 Doc. 5 (Rev. 1), AC17 Doc. 5.2 (Rev. 1), AC17 Doc. 5.3 - AC17 Doc. 5.6]

Written reports were presented by the regional representatives of Africa, Asia, Europe, North America and Oceania. An oral report was presented by the regional representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean, who also undertook to provide a written report before the close of the meeting. The Regional Representatives of Africa and Asia undertook to provide updated versions of the regional reports before the end of the meeting, incorporating comments received from Parties within these regions that were present at the meeting. The report from the regional representatives of North America was adopted with a minor amendment. Revised regional reports from Africa and Asia and a regional report from Central and South America and the Caribbean were subsequently presented by the relevant regional representatives. In addition, the observer from China stated that imports of freshwater turtles and tortoises have been suspended from Cambodia, Indonesia and Thailand as well as countries that have not established export quotas for these species. The regional representative of Asia informed the meeting that Thailand has prohibited all exports of the same group of species.

The Secretariat was requested to make further efforts to keep regional representatives informed of other CITES initiatives in their regions, particularly concerning important meetings such as the recent hawksbill turtle range State dialogue meeting in Mexico. The Chairman undertook to inform members of initiatives that come to his attention.

The observer from Germany reminded delegates of the deadline for registration (31 August) for the forthcoming European regional meeting to be held in Bonn (12-16 November 2001). The Secretariat took the opportunity to advise Parties that regional and sub-regional meetings or activities relevant to CITES could be advertised on the CITES website.

6. Report from the Chairman

Liaison with the Standing Committee (AC17 Doc. 6.1)

The Chairman introduced document AC17 Doc. 6.1 and referred the participants to paragraphs 23 and 24, which highlight the budgetary considerations and the demands on time that the role of Chairman of the Animals Committee imposes. The Chairman expressed concern that these demands may prevent some Parties from nominating candidates for the position and had brought this matter to the attention of the Standing Committee.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the language in paragraph 12 would be changed to reflect that while the Animals Committee had not reached consensus on the proposed definitions of 'critically endangered in the wild', 'difficult to keep in captivity' and 'difficult to breed in captivity', the working group established at AC16 had reached consensus.

Review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (no document)

The Chairman urged Parties to provide to the Secretariat by 15 October 2001 comments on the final report of the Criteria Working Group circulated with Notification to the Parties No. 2001/037.

7. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) (Decision 11.106)

Progress on the implementation of Phase IV of the Review of Significant Trade (AC17 Doc. 7.1)

The Secretariat introduced document AC17 Doc. 7.1 and also referred delegates to documents AC17 Inf. 1, AC17 Inf. 2, AC17 Inf. 4 and AC17 Inf. 11. It was noted that some decisions taken by the Standing Committee concerning particular species (*Saiga tatarica* from the Russian Federation and Kazakhstan) were not reflected in document AC17 Inf. 4 (Notification to the Parties No. 2001/043). The Secretariat advised that a revised notification would be circulated to Parties, also including the outcome of cases where the Standing Committee had granted extensions for Parties to establish export quotas or to provide outstanding information.

There was general support for the posting of relevant documents relating to the Significant Trade Process in a separate section of the CITES website.

Review of the implementation of recommendations (Part 1: List of species previously reviewed) (AC17 Doc. 7.2)

The Secretariat introduced the document and outlined further work envisaged on this subject. The document was adopted without amendment.

Progress on the review of species selected at AC16 (no document)

The Secretariat updated participants on progress with reviewing the Acipenseriformes, advising that 14 species have not yet been reviewed. However, in consultation with the Chairman of Animals Committee it has been decided that only four of the remaining species were in commercial trade and would be reviewed. A consultant has been appointed and will report to the next meeting of the Committee. Concerning the five species of testudinids selected at AC16, a consultant has also been appointed and the review will be conducted before AC18.

The Secretariat emphasized, in response to concerns that seizures and illegal trade need to be taken into account in the selection of species to be reviewed, the need for Parties to record seizures in their annual reports in order to ensure that illegal trade was better documented.

Revision of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) and Decisions 11.106 –11.108 (AC17 Doc. 7.4)

The Secretariat presented the document, noting that the consultant, Africa Resources Trust, was unfortunately not able to be represented at the meeting. The importance of simplifying and streamlining the review process was emphasized, and it was acknowledged that this would also require a consolidation of the Resolution and relevant Decisions. During the discussion, several issues were identified for a working group to consider, including threshold levels of trade determined to be safe (currently 100 specimens); definitions of categories 1-3, the establishment of cautious interim quotas, and time-frames of recommendations.

In relation to paragraph 12 of document AC17 Doc. 7.4 it was agreed that the Secretariat needed to keep Parties informed of the current status of significant trade recommendations, particularly to ensure that Parties that are no longer subject to recommendations are not disadvantaged by possible stricter domestic measures adopted by importing countries.

General appreciation of the document was expressed by several representatives and it was agreed that the document should form the basis for discussion of subsequent work to be done by the Committee to draft a revised resolution for CoP12, in conjunction with the Plants Committee.

The Chairman convened a working group to be chaired by himself and comprising the regional representative of North America, observers from China, Spain and the United States of America, IUCN, TRAFFIC network, Creative Conservation Solutions, IWC, the SSN and the Secretariat.

Dr Marco Polo Micheletti, regional representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean, who acted as Chairman of the working group in Dr Hoogmoed's absence, reported on their deliberations during the meeting. Consensus was reached that the Review of Significant Trade should be simplified, and that most of the suggestions made in the document could be supported.

In plenary, the Secretariat suggested that what needed to be considered further was the evaluation of responses; flexibility concerning the selection of species to be included in the review; the period over which recommendations remain applicable; a process of tracking implementation and following up on implementation; expanding the scope of the review to cover re-exports; conducting reviews at national and species-specific levels; focussing reviews on specific exporting countries and not all range States; the value of the current system of categorization; the value of the current distinction between different types of recommendations (primary and secondary); greater flexibility in the response period to recommendations; and notifying Parties when specific countries have been excluded from the review process.

The report of the working group was accepted (Annex 4), and the working group will continue to work intersessionally on a proposed amendment to Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.). The Secretariat was requested to inform the Plants Committee of this process and to seek its participation as well.

Proposal for the first country-based Significant Trade Review (AC17 Doc. 7.5)

The Secretariat introduced document AC17 Doc. 7.5 and requested the Committee to consider a country-based approach to reviewing significant trade on a trial basis, with the aim of establishing a broader and more cost-effective approach concerning the implementation of Article IV at the national level rather than at a species-specific level. Generally positive observations were made and broad support was expressed for the concept in principle, but there was general consensus that this process should not replace the species-specific Review of Significant Trade or consume all remaining funds from the budget allocated to the implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.). The Secretariat informed participants that partial external funding has been secured but that matching funds from the relevant budget line will be essential.

The Animals Committee supported the proposal and agreed to an as-yet undetermined proportion of the Significant Trade Review budget to be used to initiate a country-based Significant Trade Review, for a trial period, with a series of caveats. The Secretariat agreed to:

- i) develop Terms of Reference for the country-based review in consultation with the Animals Committee;
- ii) prepare a budget for the review and continue to seek additional external funding;

- iii) seek the cooperation of candidate countries and identify implications for the nominated country in regards to species which are subject to Phase IV and V of the Review of Significant Trade;
- iv) provide a progress report at the next meeting of the Animals Committee reviewing this initiative; and
- v) communicate the Animal Committee's intentions to the Plants Committee and seek its cooperation where applicable.

Parties and NGOs willing to contribute funding to this process were requested to contact the Secretariat at the earliest opportunity. It was agreed that the Chairman would discuss the selection of a country to be reviewed with members of the Committee after the meeting and inform the Secretariat accordingly. Members of the Committee agreed on a possible candidate country based on a number of general criteria. The name of the country was communicated to the Secretariat.

Selection of species for Phase V of the Significant Trade Review process (no document)

The Chairman advised the Committee that the document on trade data produced by UNEP-WCMC and used to identify potential candidates for inclusion in Phase V, was available and copies were provided for reference.

It was suggested that the selection of additional species to be reviewed be deferred until further progress has been made on the revision of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) and associated Decisions on the first country-based Review of Significant Trade, and on the remaining species already in the process (i.e. testudinids and acipenseriformes). The Committee nevertheless felt that the review of single species should continue in parallel. It was agreed after some discussion that *Strombus gigas* would be included in Phase V and that additional candidates would be restricted to those identified as requiring immediate attention.

8. Periodic review of animal taxa in the Appendices (Resolution Conf. 11.1) (AC17 Doc. 8.1)

The Secretariat introduced document AC17 Doc. 8.1 and referred participants to document AC17 Inf. 6, and reminded participants that reviews were conducted on a voluntary basis and therefore that it was not appropriate to set deadlines for the submission of reports. Noting that several reviews were still outstanding the Secretariat asked that Parties consider the option of using external consultants to carry out some reviews.

Recommendations provided by the reviewing Parties were as follows:

Ara macao (reviewed by Mexico): to retain this species in Appendix I for a period of 10 years. General comments supported this recommendation but without the time limit.

Falco peregrinus (reviewed by United States of America): three options were presented for consideration: (1) maintain the species in Appendix I, (2) transfer the entire species to Appendix II with a zero quota for wild-caught birds, and (3) transfer certain geographic sub-populations to Appendix II with a zero quota for wild-caught birds. Three countries supported the retention of the species in Appendix I and the review was referred to the working group for further discussion and consideration in terms of whether the species meets the biological criteria for retention in Appendix I.

Cnemidophorus hyperythrus (reviewed by the United States of America): to retain this species in Appendix II. The Chairman observed that the primary threat to the species appeared to be habitat destruction and fragmentation rather than trade and was protected in parts of its range States. The review was referred to the working group for further consideration and updating of the report.

Cynoscion macdonaldi (reviewed by Mexico): to retain this species in Appendix I. This recommendation was accepted.

Dr Kurt Johnson as Chairman of the working group reported on their deliberations during the meeting. After considerable discussion, the report of the working group was accepted (Annex 5). An intersessional contact group was established to facilitate the review process. The Secretariat was requested to contact the IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group regarding the possibility of it developing a list of crocodile ranching operations authorized under Resolution Conf. 11.16, and evaluating those operations in the context of the review of the Appendices (see agenda item 11). The Secretariat undertook to evaluate review procedures used by other bodies such as the Plants Committee, IUCN, TRAFFIC and UNEP-WCMC before proposing a methodology for the rapid assessment of larger numbers of species.

**9. Registration and monitoring of animal species bred in captivity
(Resolution Conf.11.14 and Decision 11.101) (no document)**

The Chairman introduced the item and explained that a consensus report had been produced by the working group established at the 16th meeting of the Animals Committee concerning definitions of the terms 'critically endangered in the wild' and 'difficult to breed or keep in captivity'. This report was not adopted at the meeting, and had been considered by the regional representatives intersessionally. He further explained that while he recognized there had been consensus within the working group established at AC16 on the definitions outlined in Decision 11.101, there had been diverging views amongst the members of Animals Committee. While consensus had been reached on the proposed definitions of 'difficult to breed in captivity' and 'difficult to keep in captivity', the members disagreed on the proposed definition of 'critically endangered in the wild'.

The Chairman noted that the meeting in Hanoi had presented the first opportunity for all regional representatives to discuss the issue further, and they had reached agreement on the process to be followed. A pilot project would be initiated to compile three alternative lists of Appendix-I species that are considered difficult to keep or breed in captivity, i.e.: species that are categorized in the 2000 IUCN Red List of threatened species as (1) critically endangered in the wild, (2) critically endangered in the wild or endangered in the wild, and (3) critically endangered in the wild, endangered or vulnerable in the wild. The Animals Committee proposed to limit this exercise to the Reptilia initially, and to review the outcome of the project at the 18th meeting of the Animals Committee.

It was noted in discussion that the working group established at AC16 had concluded that the IUCN categories were too restrictive and that an assessment on a country-by-country basis was required. Other aspects of the definitions proposed by the working group at AC16 have not yet been accommodated, and it would be necessary to clarify the process to be followed prior to the submission of any list to the Standing Committee. It was noted that there were inconsistencies in the wording between Decisions 11.101 and 11.163 and Resolution Conf. 11.14. It was not clear whether the Standing Committee needed to approve the list before the next meeting of the Conference of Parties.

The Secretariat was requested to confirm that the submission of a partial list of Appendix-I species to the Standing Committee will not compromise the implementation of Resolution Conf. 11.14 for other species, as well as to take steps to clarify the inconsistencies mentioned.

It was agreed that once the three lists had been compiled, that range States would be able to propose species that were protected under existing national legislation and found to be in illegal trade (as proposed by the working group at AC16), prior to the submission of any list to the Standing Committee. The results of the pilot project would be submitted at the next meeting of the Animals Committee for consideration and would not be sent to the Standing Committee without the endorsement of the Animals Committee.

**10. Implementation of Resolution Conf.10.21
on transport of live animals (AC17 Doc. 10.1)**

Dr Irina Sprotte (Chairman of the Transport Working Group) introduced the working group report and emphasized the need to review the CITES Transport guidelines which had not been reviewed since they were published in 1980. There was general support for the working group to undertake this work and to determine to what extent the IATA guidelines could be applied to cover all CITES-listed species and all modes of transport. This was seen as a better investment of time than developing a separate set of guidelines on the transport of live animals and plants. The Chairman of the working group was requested to continue collaboration with IATA and in addition seek the advice of veterinary experts. In this regard, the observer from IUCN was requested to contact the Chairman of the IUCN/SSC Veterinarian Specialist Group for advice. The Working Group was also requested to analyze the results of the mortality questionnaires which had been received by the Secretariat and report back at the next meeting of the Animals Committee.

The European Association of Zoos and Aquaria and the American Association of Zoos and Aquaria advised that they were involved in a review of the IATA Live Animal Regulations for specific taxa and that they were willing to supply information to the working group as well as contact details for veterinary specialists.

The Chairman of the working group reported on their deliberations during the meeting. The Secretariat requested the working group to consider, with expert veterinary input that the Secretariat could assist to obtain where necessary, whether the IATA guidelines would be applicable to other forms of transport and to investigate more cost-effective options for containers and packing materials more widely available in exporting countries. After discussion, the report of the working group was accepted (Annex 6).

11. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 11.16 regarding ranching operations

Annual reporting on crocodile ranching operations [AC17 Doc. 11.1 (Rev. 1)]

The Secretariat introduced document AC17 Doc. 11.1 (Rev. 1) relating to compliance with Resolution Conf. 11.16 and largely concurred with the analysis and recommendations in the document, but disagreed that annual reports needed to be submitted to the Secretariat. Such reports appear to be most useful at national level.

There was general support for altering the reporting time-frames to a two-year period. However, any formal proposal to change the reporting requirements was deferred until the Animals Committee had reviewed the status of crocodilian ranching operations subject to Resolution Conf. 11.16. It was agreed to add this matter to the terms of reference of the working group on the periodic review of animal taxa on the Appendices (see agenda item 8).

12. Trade in Hard Corals

Report of the working group (AC17 Doc. 12.1)

Dr Fleming (alternate representative of Europe and Chairman of the working group on trade in hard corals) introduced AC17 Doc. 12.1 and updated the Committee on progress of the coral working group, referring to the tasks and terms of reference as outlined in the Annex. The Secretariat, with reference to collaborative work on the sustainability of trade in hard corals in Indonesia, noted that a similar project should be undertaken in other countries exporting large volumes of specimens, e.g. Fiji. Parties willing to provide financial assistance for such a project were asked to contact the Secretariat.

The Secretariat confirmed that they would be publishing the Identification Manual on Indo-Pacific Hard Corals in colour and would be making this available to Parties.

Mariculture and propagation of coral – response to Notification to the Parties No. 2001/10 (AC17 Doc. 12.2)

The Chairman of the working group on trade in hard corals introduced AC17 Doc. 12.2 and advised that he had now received five formal responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2001/010. He acknowledged that this was a useful starting point to tackle the tasks identified in the terms of reference, but requested that Parties with additional information on coral mariculture practices should submit details for deliberation in the working group.

The Chairman of the working group reported on their deliberations during the meeting and, after discussion, the report of the working group was adopted (Annex 7). Work will continue intersessionally to finalize the tasks outlined in Decisions 11.98 and 11.99 before AC18. In response to questions about the role of the Committee concerning other orders of coral, the Secretariat replied that an amendment to Decisions 11.98 and 11.99 can be proposed at CoP12 to include other orders as well, if required.

13. Implementation of Decision 11.165 on trade in traditional medicines

List of species traded for medicinal purposes (AC17 Doc. 13.1)

The observer from the International Fund for Animal Welfare introduced the Annex to document AC17 Doc. 13.1 which contains a provisional list of animal species used in traditional medicines. It was noted that the list consists of species documented as used in traditional medicines, but not necessarily currently in use or documented in international trade (because CITES-listed species are often traded in processed form as patented medicines and are not recorded in trade). Further analysis of the list against UNEP-WCMC data was required to identify those species currently in trade and eventually identify species that should be included in the Review of Significant Trade. In addition it was noted that source codes, countries of origin and information on trading Parties would also be a useful addition to the list. Concern was expressed that the current draft list does not adequately cover all regions as the result of the lack of available information from some regions.

It was agreed that IFAW would continue to work on refining the document and proceed with analyzing trade data for species on the list.

14. Control of captive breeding, ranching and wild harvest production systems for Appendix-II species [AC17 Doc. 14 (Rev. 1)]

Dr Hank Jenkins (Creative Conservation Solutions) presented an outline of the different management regimes for the production of wild fauna and the application of an appropriate CITES source code for each regime.

There was general consensus that the document and presentation were useful but that given the complexity of the issues, there was a need for further consideration and possibly the formation of a working group.

There was general agreement that clear definitions of the different production systems currently in practise would be particularly useful and would assist Parties in making accurate non-detriment findings. There was, however, debate on the application of codes and whether an increased number of codes would be helpful or whether it would result in added complexity and implementation problems.

Several interventions were made in relation to: the proposed new definition of captive breeding (particularly the removal of the provision relating to second generation production); the proposal to remove source codes F and D; and whether it would be worthwhile considering sub-codes for the various captive-breeding systems, similar to those proposed for the wild-harvest production systems.

The Chairman determined that there was a need for a working group to look at these issues. The Chairman convened a working group to be chaired by Dr Howell (regional representative of Africa), comprising the regional representatives of Asia (Thailand) and of the Central and South America and the Caribbean (Honduras), and the observers from Australia, Bolivia, Botswana, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Mexico, the Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Viet Nam, IUCN, TRAFFIC, Animals Asia Foundation, Creative Conservation Solutions, EAZA, IFAW, IWC, IWMC and WCS.

The Chairman of the working group subsequently reported on their deliberations during the meeting. Discussion focussed on a matrix of production systems which had been drafted by the working group and on relative impacts on wild populations. It was agreed that the matrix should be further refined and that the Secretariat should request Parties through a notification to identify production systems that cannot be accommodated within this framework. The report of the working group was accepted (Annex 8) and the working group was requested to continue to work intersessionally.

15. Universal labelling of caviar

Report of the working group (AC17 Doc. 15.1)

Dr Rod Hay (Regional Representative of Oceania and Chairman of the working group) introduced the report of the working group on the universal labelling of caviar.

The working group was asked to review the current labelling system used by Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation as described in document AC17 Inf. 9; to consider the issue of the labelling of re-exports of caviar; to assess the need to revise Resolution Conf. 11.13 and to formulate practical advice on the information that should be contained in labels.

The Chairman of the working group subsequently reported on their deliberations during the meeting. Consensus was reached that labelling systems should use a standard format, and

the need for a notification to the Parties on such a labelling system. The Secretariat was requested to inform the Parties more explicitly of caviar exporting or re-exporting countries subject to a recommendation from the Standing Committee to suspend imports from those countries. The need for the verification of export documents by the Secretariat was highlighted, as provided for in Resolution Conf. 11.13, but participants were informed that the Secretariat may not be able to undertake this role with current resources. Because a labelling system needed to be comprehensive if it was to be fully effective in combating illegal trade, there was support in general for extending it to cover re-exports of caviar. However, guidelines for such labels would have to be developed since re-export was not covered by Resolution Conf. 11.13.

The report of the working group was accepted (Annex 9). The working group will continue to work intersessionally on proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.13, including the issue of requiring labels for re-exports, and related issues.

16. Trade in *Tursiops truncatus ponticus* (Decision 11.91) (no document)

The Secretariat advised the meeting that responses had been received in relation to Notification to the Parties No. 2001/032 from the Council of Europe (Bern Convention Secretariat), Romania and Bulgaria. The observers from Ukraine and the Russian Federation agreed to provide responses as soon as possible. The Chairman requested that Dr Katalin Rodics (regional representative of Europe) contact Turkey to seek information on this subject.

The meeting was informed that the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Seas and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS) had come into force in June 2001 and that a comprehensive review of *T. t. ponticus* and other species will be considered at the first meeting of the Parties to this agreement.

17. Trade in freshwater turtles and tortoises in Southeast Asia

Report of the working group (AC17 Doc. 17.1)

Dr Tonny Soehartono (regional representative of Asia and Chairman of the working group) introduced the report of the working group outlining the discussions on the preparations of a technical workshop on freshwater turtles and tortoises.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that it had secured USD 92,500 to host the technical workshop and outlined the main issues it would like to see addressed at the meeting. It was agreed that the working group should also identify those countries which should be invited, as a matter of priority, to attend the workshop in Bogor, Indonesia, in November 2001.

The Chairman of the working group reported on their deliberations during the meeting. It was agreed that the working group would be consulted on the draft agenda of the technical workshop. The report of the working group was accepted (Annex 10). To allow further consultation, the working group will continue to work intersessionally.

18. Conservation of seahorses and other members of the family Syngnathidae (Decision 11.97)

Report of the working group (AC17 Doc. 18.1)

Dr Amanda Vincent (Chairman of the working group) introduced the report of the working group and advised that the focus had been on a) deciding what and how information should

be requested from Parties and b) the nature of the proposed technical workshop. The Chairman confirmed that the Management Authority of the Philippines has agreed to host the technical workshop that is scheduled for early 2002.

The Secretariat has received a total of ten responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2001/023 and hopes that the second more comprehensive Notification to the Parties (No. 2001/034) will encourage further response from Parties.

Funding for the technical workshop on syngnathids has been offered from Australia, the United States of America and the Hong Kong Chinese Medicine Merchants Association. The working group was requested to discuss the purpose and objectives of the workshop as well as identify potential participants.

The Chairman of the working group reported on their deliberations during the meeting and, after discussion, the report of the working group was accepted (Annex 11). Additional funding needs to be secured for the technical workshop. The working group will continue to work intersessionally to assist the Secretariat with preparations for the workshop.

**19. Implementation of Decision 11.94 regarding
the biological and trade status of sharks (no document)**

The Chairman provided an update on liaison with the FAO on this issue and advised that he had received on 4 July 2001 a response from Dr Kevern Cochrane of the FAO. Concerning the implementation of the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-SHARKS), the most recent synthesized information is available in the report "Progress in the Implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and Related International Plans of Action" presented to the 24th Session of COFI (the Committee on Fisheries), FAO Rome (26 February – 2 March 2001). This report is available on the FAO website. FAO has prepared technical guidelines to support the implementation of the IPOA-SHARKS. Countries will be able to use these guidelines to develop and implement national plans of action.

A first assessment of the status of shark stocks has been conducted by a number of countries (Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ecuador, Gambia, Indonesia, Japan, Peru, Philippines, Seychelles, United States of America) and a few countries indicated that a national shark plan would be completed before the 24th Session of COFI in 2001. The European Commission reported that it had not undertaken the assessment but it is hoped that a plan for the European Union will be prepared in 2001. Thailand also indicated that an NPOA-SHARKS (National Plan of Action) will be available before the meeting of COFI in 2001.

The IPOA-SHARKS has been taken into account by IATTC (Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission), in the purse seine fisheries for tuna in the Commission's Resolution on by-catch, while ICCAT (International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas) has started an assessment of pelagic sharks in its mandated area.

Furthermore, on 25 July 2001 the FAO confirmed that there was no additional information because countries are only required to report to FAO at the COFI meeting every two years. Any information received in the interim periods would be so on an informal basis.

20. Implementation of Decision 11.100 regarding trade in alien species

Report of the working group (AC17 Doc. 20.1)

Dr Rod Hay (regional representative of Oceania and Chairman of the working group) introduced the report of the working group (Annex 9) and outlined the primary tasks undertaken by the group. This included maintaining liaison with the IUCN/SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) on the development of guiding principles concerning alien invasive species. These guidelines, being prepared for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), will provide the plain language guidance requested by CITES Parties. The Chairman of the working group also informed the meeting that the ISSG had expressed support for assisting in the development of a list of CITES-listed invasive species as agreed to at AC16, but that the working group needed to identify the purpose and use of such a list prior to its development. Given the assistance of the ISSG, members of the working group agreed to work intersessionally on producing the list. The Chairman of the working group concluded by noting that most issues relating to alien invasive species are best dealt with in the CBD and that the most appropriate role for CITES would be to monitor developments in that forum.

The Chairman of the working group subsequently reported on further discussions during the meeting. Linkages with other global or regional initiatives were emphasized and various representatives undertook to provide the working group with contact details and related information. The Secretariat undertook to inform the Plants Committee of the conclusions of the Animals Committee on this subject, as Decision 11.100 applies equally to plants. The report of the working group (Annex 12) was accepted.

21. Any other business (no document)

The observer from Costa Rica informed the Committee that she was pleased to announce that Costa Rica was offering to host the next meeting of the Animals Committee. This offer was gratefully acknowledged by the Chairman on behalf of the Committee. The provisional date for the next meeting is 8-12 April 2001.

22. Closing remarks (no document)

The Chairman expressed, on behalf of all participants, sincere appreciation for the outstanding work done by the Management and Scientific Authorities of Viet Nam to arrange the meeting, as well as their friendly welcome to everyone. He also thanked the interpreters, rapporteurs and the staff of the Secretariat.

The Secretariat also thanked the Management and Scientific Authorities of Viet Nam for their hard work, patience and the tremendous support provided to the Secretariat for this meeting.

His Excellency Nguyen Cong Tan
Deputy Prime Minister, Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam

Ladies and Gentlemen,
Distinguished National and International Guests,

On behalf of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, I would like to welcome international and national guests to Hanoi, the Capital of Vietnam, to attend the 17th Meeting of the Animals Committee of the CITES Convention.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Fauna and Flora (CITES), established in 1973 with an initial membership of 12 countries, has now extended to include 154 member countries. This indicates that the international community has increasingly shown its concern for the conservation of biodiversity that the nature created for all of us and our next generations and is interested in close collaboration to protect valuable and distinctive natural resources that remain on our planet in order to use them wisely, effectively and sustainably.

The Government of Vietnam has paid particular attention to environment protection and nature conservation. Right in 1962, the Cuc Phuong protected forest was gazetted and later became the first national park of Vietnam. Since then, more than 100 Protected Areas have been established. Over the past 10 years, Vietnam scientists in collaboration with international organizations and scientists have conducted a number of surveys and investigations and discovered some rare and valuable plant and animal species that are endemic not only to Vietnam but also to the region and the world. Newly discovered plant and animal species include, among others, the Sao La (*Pseudoryx nghetinhensis*), Giant Muntjac (*Megamuntiacus vuquangensis*), Truong Son Muntjac (*Caninmuntiacus truongsonensis*). The Government had also promulgated many legal documents and regulations in order to protect and develop the forest as well as endangered wild plant and animal species. Forest ranger, the key force in forest protection and management, has been mandated with more responsibilities, trained and equipped with better facilities to better enforce forest laws. In collaboration with relevant sectors, the forest ranger has prevented illegal traffic in endangered wildlife species with some initial success. Controlled wildlife captive breeding farms have been established in a number of localities, contributing to improve the livelihood of local people.

Recently, the Government has provided guidance to the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development in preparing the Governmental decree on CITES implementation. The decree is being developed favourably with the participation of a number of relevant ministries and sectors.

Ladies and Gentlemen,
Distinguished delegates,

The Annual Meeting of the Animals Committee organized in Hanoi this year, the first year of the new millennium, is an opportunity for international community to exchange experiences and to discuss ways of collaboration in implementing the Convention. We hope this is also a good chance for the member countries to better understand Vietnam and its people, particularly Vietnam's policy on the management, import and export of wild plant and animal species.

I wish the participants good health and happiness.

I wish for the success of the Conference.
Thank you!

Dr Nguyen Ba Thu
Director of the CITES Management Authority of Vietnam

**Strengthening cooperation among CITES member countries to
control international trade in endangered species of fauna and flora**

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Distinguished national and international guests,

First of all, on behalf of the CITES Management Authority of Vietnam, I would like to welcome all international and national guests who come to attend the 17th Meeting of the Animals Committee of the CITES Convention. Your presence in Hanoi, the Capital of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam means great encouragement for nature and wildlife conservationists in Vietnam.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Fauna and Flora (CITES) was established in 1973 with an initial membership of 12 countries. It has now extended to include 154 member countries. This reflects an increasing concern of international community for conserving nature and biodiversity that the nature created for all of us and our next generations. The protection of these extremely valuable and distinctive resources is not only confined to one nation but requires a global integration.

In April 1994, Vietnam officially acceded to the CITES Convention. The Government of Vietnam had appointed a CITES Management Authority and two Scientific Authorities. A CITES Office was also set up to act as a standing body of the CITES Management Authority.

Over the past few years, Vietnam has been making strong efforts to implement activities in accordance with the spirit and content of the Convention and at the same time has fulfilled all obligations of a member country: participated in all meetings of the Conference of the Parties, attended special topic meetings, submitted periodical reports to the Secretariat, maintained regular contact with other member countries, paid annual contributions. In addition, Vietnam has received valuable support from the Secretariat such as training and delivery of CITES's relevant materials, stamps and technical consultancy. On this occasion, I would like to express my sincere thanks to the CITES Secretariat and the Animals Committee for their kind support and assistance.

Thank to the guidance of the Government and support from international organizations, the CITES Management Authority of Vietnam has over the years delivered a number of training courses and has introduced the CITES Convention, Vietnamese relevant legal system, guidelines on export, import of wild plant and animal species to law enforcement bodies, such as the forest ranger, customs, police offices, border army, market administration and veterinary ... Guidelines have also been delivered to the owners of wildlife farms in various localities on suitable breeding facilities and calculation of reproductive capacity for individual animal species to determine annual allowable product limit. All wildlife breeding farms or artificial propagation should be registered at respective provincial forest protection departments. A number of wildlife species can be well bred in captivity such as Python (*Python molurus bivittatus*; *Python reticulatus*), Ky Nhung (*Calotes* spp.; *Physignathus* spp.), Freshwater Crocodile (*Crocodylus siamensis*), Ri voi Snake (*Enhydris bocourti*), Ri ca Snake (*Homalopsis buccata*) and have contributed to improved considerably the livelihood of local people.

The legal system of Vietnam on management and protection of wildlife species has been strengthened over time:

Decree No. 246/TTg of the Governmental Office dated 17/5/1958 stipulating the use of hunting guns;

Instruction No. 134/TTg of the Governmental Office dated 21/6/1960 on the ban of elephant hunting;

Decree 39/CP of the Governmental Council dated 05/4/1963 promulgating temporary regulations on bird and animal hunting;

Forest Protection Act (1972) passed by the Standing Committee of National Assembly;

Law on Forest Protection and Development (19/8/1991);

Governmental Decree 18/HŞBT (17/01/1992) stipulating the list of rare and specious wild plant and animal species and their management and protection;

Instruction 359/TTg dated 29/5/1996 of Prime Minister on urgent measures to protect wildlife species;

Governmental Decree 77/CP dated 29/11/1996 stipulating administrative punishment for violation of regulations on forest and forest product protection and management;

Decision No.08/2001/QŞ-TTg dated 11/01/2001 of the Prime Minister promulgating Regulations on Management of Special-use, Protection and Production Forests;

Governmental Decree No. 46/CP dated 4/4/2001 stipulating importable and exportable items for the period of 2001-2005. Attached to the Decree is Circular 62/BNN-KH of 05/6/2001 of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development providing guidelines to the implementation of the Decree. According to the Decree, the Government bans the export of rare and precious wild plants and animals in the period of 2001-2005;

Recently, the Government has assigned the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development in collaboration with other relevant ministries and sectors to formulate a Governmental Decree on CITES implementation. The document is being prepared to submit to the Government for approval by the end of this year.

Since 1962, more than 100 special-use forests, including national parks, nature reserves and landscape protected areas have been established. These areas have contributed to conserve invaluable biodiversity potentials. Through a number of investigations and surveys carried out by national and international scientists, several endemic wild plant and animal species precious not only for Vietnam but also for the region and the world had been discovered. Some newly discovered species include the Sao La (*Pseudoryx nghetinhensis*), Giant Muntjac (*Megamuntiacus vuquangensis*), Truong Son Muntjac (*Caninmuntiacus truongsoneensis*), Ngoc Linh Garrulax (*Garrulax ngoclinensis*).

The inspection and control over wildlife exploitation, their uses and trade have always been considered as an important task. Forest ranger with approximately 8,500 staff has been mandated with more responsibilities, trained and equipped with better facilities to enable them to enforce better forest laws. They have collaborated closely with the customs, police, border army and quarantine and have prevented illegal trade in endangered wild plants and animals with some initial success. However, illegal wildlife trade can not yet be prevented

comprehensively due to lack of experience, technical facilities and finance. In addition, an effective prevention of illegal cross border wildlife trade needs close cooperation among member countries.

Vietnam has paid particular attention to nature conservation education. A number of posters, leaflets, pictures and identification manuals of illegally traded animals were published and distributed to grassroots levels. In addition, nature conservation clubs, competitions on forest and wildlife understanding and children contests to select slogans for forests protection were organized. Diverse ways of communication to approach people living in and close to the forest such as films poem, essay, music and drama have been used and achieved practical results.

Distinguished delegates,

We highly appreciate that the CITES Secretariat has selected Vietnam as the venue for this Annual Meeting of the Animals Committee. We consider this is a good opportunity for international guests to understand Vietnam and its people, in particular Vietnam's policy on the management, import and export of wild plant and animal species as well as goals we are working for.

We hope that the Conference will also provide a good opportunity for the member countries to exchange experiences and to strengthen their collaboration in the implementation of the Convention.

With this confidence, on behalf of the CITES Management Authority of Vietnam, I would like to wish this Meeting every success and to all participants good health and a memorable stay in Vietnam.

Thank you!

**Dr Marinus Hoogmoed,
Chairman of the CITES Animals Committee**

Your Excellency, ladies and gentlemen,

Good morning and welcome to this 17th meeting of the CITES Animals Committee. It has been a long time since Animals Committee met in Asia. When I am not mistaken this was in Beijing in 1994. It is good that AC is back meeting in Asia again, as several issues on the Agenda deal with Asia and specifically South East Asia. We are working on the ground so to speak and I hope that our meeting here may contribute to a solution of the problems, or rather, using modern language, the challenges, confronting this region. I only have to mention the words coral, turtles and tortoises and seahorses, and you will understand what I mean. It is hoped that this meeting of AC will arouse the interest of larger parts of the Vietnamese population in matters concerning CITES, because so many organisms in this region are directly dependent on CITES regulations or may become so in future. In order to emphasize this, we have selected as our logo for this meeting the Sao-la or Vu Quang ox, an Appendix I species endemic to Viet Nam and Laos.

Already in the plane, filling out my immigration form I noted that there were some remarks about protected wildlife, and at arrival in Hanoi airport I noted a big poster behind immigration notifying arriving passengers about the fact that wildlife is protected. Another testimony was in my conference package, where I found an interesting book in Vietnamese, which unfortunately I cannot read, but the pictures and the scientific names tell me something. I already learned that Appendix I in the Vietnamese language is Phu Luc. I was pleasantly surprised that my home-country, the Netherlands, with others, apparently has been instrumental in the production of this booklet. Also I found the leaflet (in four different languages, no less) that in a simple but very clear way points out the do's and donot's of wildlife buying and eating in Viet Nam (and I would add, generally throughout the world). More countries than is presently the case should have such information material. From all this it is evident that the CITES Authorities in Viet Nam are busy trying to educate the general public on CITES matters. I can only hope that our presence here in Hanoi and our discussions will support the efforts of the Authorities to give CITES a higher profile in Vietnam.

Nearly 8 months ago now we concluded our business in Shepherdstown, U.S.A. and went home to our families for the Christmas season. Climatic circumstances clearly differ between the last and the present meeting (approximately 40 centigrades and two centimeters of snow being the difference) and so are several others factors. Since we said our goodbyes in December many things have happened, generally positive. I want to summarize some of the highlights, emphasizing matters that have not been incorporated in the report of the Chairman to the Standing Committee that is part of the documentation we will deal with throughout this meeting.

One of the first things AC had to tackle was the follow-up of the significant trade review process, under which a number of sturgeon species had received an initial category 1 classification and some others were put in that same category when information requested did not materialize. The drafting of recommendations took a considerable time: they had to be well balanced and take into account all the different aspects of sturgeon fisheries and caviar trade. The process actually continued till early June, when UNEP convened a meeting between Caspian Sea range States for sturgeons in Geneva, in order to facilitate cooperation between all countries involved. This meeting was a success and those countries came to the meeting of the Standing Committee in Paris, with a compromise that included acceptance of

and compliance with all recommendations, except the one that dealt with the quota of caviar to be exported. Further negotiations during the meeting of the Standing Committee finally led to a compromise in which the Caspian Sea range States subject to recommendations did accept the recommendations of the AC and SC and agreed not to harvest sturgeon during the 2001 autumn harvesting season. The Standing Committee accepted the proposed compromise and established a number of deadlines before which certain actions should have been taken. In case there is no compliance, a ban for sturgeon commodities will automatically follow for countries involved. This can be considered a first, small but important step on the long way to bring the sturgeons back from their state of overexploitation and decline. It also shows that CITES is applicable across the entire Animal Kingdom, including fishes.

I noted in the past year that there is confusion about the functioning of and the decision-making process in the Animals Committee. I will explain it again briefly. First of all the Animals Committee deals with issues entrusted to it by the Conference of Parties, the Standing Committee or the Secretariat. Based on the issues referred to it the AC develops its agenda of priorities. No outside organizations can circumvent the agreed procedures and try to directly influence the agenda, although we have noted efforts to do so. The Animals Committee consists of 10 persons only, chosen by the 6 CITES regions to represent them. The Animals Committee is supposed to provide well-founded scientific advice concerning animals to the Parties, the Secretariat and the Standing Committee. It is of fundamental importance to realize this. The Animals Committee meetings are not small CoP's or an open-ended forum for special interests. We are supposed to base opinions and decisions on sound biological information and leave politics out as far as is humanly possible. I know this may not be to everybody's liking, but that is how I see the functioning of the Animals Committee, and that after all is my responsibility. Decisions and recommendations of the Animals Committee should be scientifically sound, and politics may come in at a later stage such as at the CoP's, and not at the beginning because that would undermine the scientific basis of the Animals Committee's work and recommendations to other CITES bodies.

In order to facilitate the work of members of AC and to tap and use the knowledge of observers as well, working groups may be formed to discuss certain items at more depth than plenary allows. The agenda of working groups is also set by the Animals Committee. Reports of these working groups are presented to the full Animals Committee, which then has to take a decision as to whether to accept or not to accept the report, or only parts of it. Thus, even when a working group has reached consensus about a certain subject, it may be that AC rejects the result and does not endorse it. This happened in one case after Shepherdstown and we will deal with this matter later in this meeting. A consensus by a working group does not automatically mean its report and recommendations have been adopted. It means that a consensus report goes to AC. Members of AC then have the last say, and, if need be, vote on it. I hope this explanation makes this issue clear.

A matter that over the years has gradually entered into CITES is the matter of property rights, which actually do not have a place in CITES, they are in the domain of the Convention on Biological Diversity and other international bodies. We have to keep in mind that CITES only is involved in issues concerning endangered species of wild fauna and flora included in the Appendices, and international trade in them. I realize it is the sovereign right of countries to claim property rights over organisms, but they should do that through CBD and not through CITES, although it is clear that in a number of cases there is some overlap or that there are areas of common interest. I only have to mention cross-border movement of tissues and cell cultures, traditional medicines, and artifacts made from animals or plants. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) also has realized the problems that exist concerning property rights and living organisms. To this end they organized a first meeting of the International Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional

Knowledge and Folklore to discuss the subject in Geneva between April 30 and May 3 of this year. At the request of the Secretariat I attended this conference together with Marceil Yeater of the Secretariat. It was clear that there are a number of common issues, touching on all three areas discussed and that CITES may play a role in them. However, it also became clear that cooperation between several international Conventions is necessary in order to prevent that everybody is trying to invent the wheel at the same time again. A second meeting is planned for December of this year. I hope that AC members and observers alike will be able to distinguish in their minds real CITES matters from intellectual property rights ones and try to limit discussions here at AC17 to the matters at hand, and leave political discussions for later stages in the process.

I want to mention another very positive point here. After a long period without a faunal officer in the Scientific Support Unit of the Secretariat this vacancy was filled since April 2, 2001 by Tom de Meulenaer, well known to you in his former life as Director of TRAFFIC Europe. He brings with him a lot of expertise in CITES issues. I would like to take this opportunity and welcome Tom to the Animals Committee in his new capacity, no longer an observer, but an active player within the Secretariat.

I do want to remind you here of the fact that the Transport Working Group of the Animals Committee, of which several NGOs form part, for the past years has been working closely and loyally with IATA in order to get transport regulations for animals that are based on biological and veterinary knowledge and expertise of the animals transported. Several proposals of the working group were adopted and incorporated in the IATA regulations. This of course does not mean that we can influence the actions of IATA partners. It was therefore an unfortunate and regrettable incident that Lufthansa some time ago decided to ban the transport of wildlife. Because of this ban by a large carrier, transport of wild animals now may be moving towards less prestigious carriers, causing detours and difficult connections, all negative points for the well-being of the animals transported. The Secretary General already pointed out these problems and I do not have to repeat his well-taken points. Annoying incidents as just mentioned can jeopardize the fruitful cooperation between the Transport Working Group of the Animals Committee and IATA, and transported animals may be worse off in the end. I hope that the Transport Working Group will be able to continue in a positive way to contribute to the efforts of IATA to ensure the best possible transport of animals.

I would like to thank His Excellency the Deputy Prime Minister for his nice words of welcome, and for his interest in our meeting. His presence here shows the importance Viet Nam attaches to CITES and to this meeting of one of its technical committees, and I am grateful for that. I also want to thank our hosts of the Vietnamese Management Authority, for all the work they have done the past few months, after the venue had been decided. They have really gone out of their way to receive us at the airport, to assist us in obtaining visa, provide us with the right working conditions and all the technical equipment needed for our communications amongst ourselves. I think they have done a marvelous job, bringing us to a very nice place that should be very conducive to good work the coming few days. When we were in the final stages of organizing the meeting our hosts warned me that the present period was not the best one: warm and wet. I now can understand what they mean. So if you have complaints about the climate: blame it on me, it was I who said we would be able to take those "discomforts". Although I must say everything is relative and we will soon get used to the temperature and humidity outside.

I should not forget to mention the unfailing work of Maritza Campos, back at the CITES Secretariat, who was instrumental in the preparations and registration procedures for this meeting. At this moment I want to thank all the staff in the Secretariat I have been working closely with these past few months for their help, their friendship and their professional approach to matters. Especially thanks to Malan Lindeque, Tom de Meulenaer and Paula

Henry who did most of the preparations for this meeting. Unfortunately Paula can not be here, but her place is ably taken by Victoria Zentilli.

I hope we will have a very fruitful and successful meeting.

Thank you.

**Working Group on the Revision of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) and
Decisions 11.106 – 11.108**

Chair: Marco Polo Micheletti, Vice-Chair of Animals Committee and Representative of South and Central America and the Caribbean.

Participants: Regional Representative of Africa (Mike Griffin), Regional Representative of North America, Secretariat, China, Spain, United States of America, Creative Conservation Solutions, IUCN-The World Conservation Union, International Wildlife Coalition, IWMC, Species Survival Network, Traffic Network.

Approach:

The Working Group agreed on the need to simplify and clarify Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) and agreed to integrate Dec. 11.106 with the operative part of the resolution eliminating inconsistencies between the two procedures.

The Working Group reviewed the suggested changes made by the consultant, point by point. A determination was made whether or not there was consensus agreement with the changes. If there was not consensus agreement, then the reasons for each differing point of view is summarized.

The Working Group summary should be provided to the Plants Committee through the Secretariat, so that it may be used in their review of the same consultant document at the next Plants Committee meeting in Malaysia.

It is suggested that combined Animals Committee and Plants Committee Working Group be established to review the amendment drafted by the Secretariat on the basis of the following comments.

Point-by-point review of document AC17 Doc. 7.4:

Paragraph 14 - Provisionally agreed with the suggestion.

The Secretariat indicated that it may be possible to keep the version of the WCMC list available on the CITES website constantly updated. Therefore, the production of a list after each CoP as suggested might not be necessary. UNEP-WCMC was unable to confirm whether this is the case without consultation with their home office.

Paragraph 15 – Agreed with the suggestion

Paragraph 16 – Deleted the 1st sentence of the suggestion because this is already required under the 2nd Directs in the Resolution. Agreed with the suggestion regarding the database.

Paragraph 17 – Agreed with the suggestion.

Paragraph 18 – The three categories should be described with the same terminology following the model of the earlier definitions and including reference to no-detriment findings and whether its being made appropriately by referencing global populations.

Paragraph 19 – Generally agree with the suggestion. The cautious interim quotas are established by the Animals Committee.

It was suggested that there would be value, as a separate exercise, to consider development of standards by which quotas should be set to assist Secretariat, Parties and AC.

Paragraph 20 – Generally agree with the suggestion. But believe that Category II recommendations should include some requirement for Parties to have the ability to monitor the effects of the quotas on the wild populations and have a mechanism available to amend the quotas if need be. As required by the Resolution, cautious interim quotas should be made by Parties in consultation with the Secretariat.

Paragraph 21 – Agree with the suggestion.

Paragraph 22 – Agree with the suggestion if something to the effect of “for the Secretariat to make decisions, they may want to consult with a consultant to verify information received”.

Paragraph 23 – Agree with the suggestion.

It was suggested that the AC should have a role in determining whether Parties have satisfied the recommendations.

Paragraph 24 – Agree with the suggestion.

Paragraph 25 – Delete this suggestion – already covered in the Resolution.

Paragraph 26 – Delete Decision 11.109. The significant trade process incorporates species subject to trade in traditional medicines, as well as other uses.

Paragraph 27 – Plants Committee decision, no opinion.

Report of the Working Group on the Review of the Appendices

Chair: Kurt Johnson, Regional Representative of North America.

Participants: Rod Hay (Regional Representative of Oceania), Bill Wall (Safari Club International Foundation), Mark Simmonds (WDCS), Jacques Berney (IWMC), Yoshio Kaneko (Japan), Jiang Zhigang (SA of China), Meng Xianlin (MA of China), Karen Steuer (IFAW), Hesiquio Benitez (SA, Mexico), Javier Alvarez (SA of the United States of America), Charif Tala (MA, Chile), Tim Inskipp (UNEP-WCMC), Angela Barden (TRAFFIC International), Tom de Meulenaer (CITES Secretariat), Borja Heredia (SA of Spain).

Cnemidophorus hyperythrus

The species review was introduced by the delegate from the United States of America. It was emphasized that this was a preliminary draft of the review, with additional information from Mexico to be added, plus clarification of trade data and protective regulations in the State of California. The Working Group decided that consideration of this review should be deferred to AC18, after revisions are completed by the United States of America.

Falco peregrinus

The species review was introduced by the delegate from the United States of America. This is a revision and elaboration of a species review presented at AC17. The reviewer presented three options for consideration by the Animals Committee/Working Group:

1. Maintain the species in Appendix I;
2. Transfer the entire species to Appendix II with a zero quota for wild-caught birds; and
3. Transfer (a) geographic subpopulation(s) with a zero quota on wild-caught birds.

The Working Group discussed this review at length, and arrived at the following consensus statement:

"The Working Group concluded its discussion on the review of the peregrine falcon in recognizing by a large majority that, on a global level, the species did not meet the biological criteria for inclusion in Appendix I. It recognized also that because of concerns expressed about the status of subspecies and small populations, that it could not recommend to the Animals Committee to prepare and submit a proposal of transfer to Appendix II through the depositary government for consideration at a meeting of the COP (as provided for in the terms of reference of the Committee (Resolution Conf. 11.1, Annex 2). This should not prevent any Party from preparing and submitting an amendment proposal for the species as a whole or a geographically separate population."

Remaining Species from AC15 and AC16

The Working Group discussed what to do about taxa that had been selected for review at AC15 or AC16, but had not yet been reviewed. It was agreed that we should continue to pursue completion of most of these reviews, as follows:

- *Agapornis fischeri* (discussions with Tanzania indicate that they intend to conduct this review and, if possible, submit it for consideration at AC18)
- *Cephalophus sylvicultor* (discuss with IUCN Specialist Group to conduct review)
- *Caloenas nicobarica* (discuss with NGO and regional Party)
- *Anas aucklandica* (Regional Rep. from Oceania agreed to try to do review)
- *Dermatemys mawii* (Mexico agreed to try to do review)
- *Ambystoma mexicanum* (Mexico agreed to try to do review)
- *Crocodylus lacertinus* (Netherlands to be requested)
- *Dyscophus antongilli* (Netherlands to be requested)
- *Bufo superciliaris* (Netherlands to be requested)
- *Hoplobatrachus tigerinus* (to be deleted because of recent review in Sig Trade process)
- *Ornithoptera alexandrae* (discuss with NGO and regional Party)
- *Parnassius apollo* (SA of Spain is conducting the review for AC18)

Facilitating the Review Process

The Working Group discussed various ways for the review process to be facilitated. The possibility to involve students in the CITES Master's course was suggested, as was the idea to involve graduate students through IUCN specialist groups. The Working Group agreed on these points:

1. that an inter-session contact group should be constituted to develop written guidelines for selecting species and conducting reviews, based on process and principles agreed to at AC16 (and appearing in the Working Group report from that meeting). Javier Alvarez will take the lead on this. The contact group will prepare a draft of the guidelines for consideration at AC18.
2. that the Secretariat should be requested to conduct a pilot project to develop (based on existing models used by IUCN, the Plants Committee, etc.), test, and evaluate a rapid assessment technique for screening multiple taxa (or higher-level taxa) at one time to determine which should be the subject of more in-depth reviews.

Crocodile Ranching Operations

The Working Group agreed that the Secretariat should be requested to contact the IUCN Crocodile Specialist Group regarding the possibility of compiling a list of crocodile ranching operations authorized under Resolution Conf. 11.16, and incorporating those operations into the Review of the Appendices.

Report of the Working Group on Transport of Live Animals

Chair: Irina Sprotte, Management Authority of Germany.

Members: Katalin Rodics, Regional Representative of Europe, Management Authority of Hungary, Tony Soehartono, Regional Representative of Asia, Scientific Authority of Indonesia, Edson Chidziya, Alternate Regional Representative of Africa, Management Authority of Tanzania, Zihua Zhou, Management Authority of China, Timothy Van Norman, Management Authority of United States of America, Peter Linhart, Management Authority of Austria, Donald Bruning, Wildlife Conservation Society, Kristin Vehrs, American Zoo and Aquarium Association, Robert Atkinson, Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Teresa Telecky, Humane Society of the United States of America.

Other participants:

Mike Griffin, Regional Representative of Africa, Management Authority of Namibia
Tran Quoc Bao, Management Authority of Viet Nam
Pham Trong Hien, Management Authority of Viet Nam
George Saputra, Indonesian Reptile and Amphibian Trade Association
Malan Lindeque, CITES Secretariat

The following items were discussed by the Working Group:

1. Discussion of the report submitted by the Chair of the Working Group to AC17 (AC17 Doc. 10.1):

The Working Group agreed with the report.

2. Implementation of CITES Notification No. 1999/48 on collection of mortality data (via questionnaire):
 - a) The Management Authority of Germany has hired a consultant to compile a report based on the data from the questionnaires on transport mortality that have been returned to the Chair. This report will be provided to members of the Working Group in early 2002. The Chair will ask Regional Representatives who are members of the Transport Working Group to contact those countries that have not provided completed questionnaires to encourage them to respond.
 - b) The Management Authority of China has translated the questionnaire and is in the process of distributing it to airlines and customs authorities and during training courses.
 - c) The Secretariat agreed to the idea to include on the agenda of the workshop on the trade in freshwater turtles and tortoises in Asia, transport-related subjects including: collection of mortality data (Notification No. 1999/48), compliance with the IATA live animals regulations, and incorporation of IATA live animals regulations into national legislation. The Chair of the Working Group will discuss this with the Chair of the working group on trade in freshwater turtles and tortoises in Asia.
 - d) The Secretariat supports the inclusion in the experimental country review under Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.), the same transport related subjects.
 - e) The Chair will discuss with the Secretariat the possibility of sending a reminder Notification to the Parties about Notification No. 1999/048.

3. Evaluation of the CITES Guidelines for Transport and Preparation for Shipments of Live Wild Animals and Plants:
 - a) In February 2001, the Chair provided the Guidelines to all members of the Working Group and asked for comments about the need to review, update or retain the Guidelines. No comments were received. At least one member of the Working Group did not receive the Guidelines from the Chair.
 - b) The Working Group decided not to review and update the twenty-year-old CITES Transport Guidelines.
 - c) Instead, the IATA live animals regulations, which are reviewed and updated every year, will be reviewed to determine:
 - 1) if they need to be updated further, and if so, to prepare recommendations accordingly;
 - 2) if they are applicable to transport by road, rail, or ship; and
 - 3) where they are not applicable to transport by road, rail, or ship, to prepare recommendations accordingly.
 - d) The American Zoo and Aquarium Association agreed to cooperate with other zoo associations and pet trade associations to conduct the review and prepare draft recommendations. The draft recommendations will be provided to the Chair and members of the Transport Working Group by 31st January 2002. Members of the Working Group should share the draft recommendations with other experts and provide comments to the Chair by 15th March 2002. The final recommendations will be prepared at the 18th Meeting of the CITES Animals Committee in April 2002.
4. Collaboration with IATA:
 - a) The Working Group agreed to continue to its collaboration with IATA including to recommend changes to the Live Animals Regulations that result from the review under 3) c) and d) above.
5. Revision of Resolution Conf. 10.21:
 - a) The Working Group agreed to examine Resolution Conf. 10.21 to determine if changes are needed. Members agreed to provide the Chair with their recommendations by no later than 1st December 2001. The Chair will provide a revised version to Members if such suggestions were made.
6. Other:
 - a) The Working Group, with the Secretariat's support, agreed to begin work after CoP12 to address Objective 1.1.6 of the CITES Action Plan by preparing practical advice for Parties on ways to prevent unnecessary loss during catching and storage (animal husbandry). The Secretariat agreed to help raise necessary funds for this activity.
 - b) The Working Group discussed the problem of transportation of live animals for food versus live animals for the pet trade or other purposes. The Representative from Asia and the Indonesian Reptile and Amphibian Trade Association informed the Working

Group that transport conditions of live animals for food, especially reptiles, are particularly bad because traders do not comply with IATA because it is expensive.

Report of the Working Group on Trade in hard Corals

Chair: Vin Fleming, United Kingdom

Participants: Tonny Soehartono, Regional Representative for Asia, Tom Kaveney, Australia, Suharsono, Samedi, Siti Prijono, Indonesia, Simon Nemtzov, Israel, Nancy Daves, Pam Hall, Colin McLiff, United States of America, Yuni Yarman, AKKII, Keith Davenport, OATA, Caroline Raymakers, TRAFFIC, Tim Inskipp, UNEP-WCMC.

The representatives of Belgium and Fiji could not attend the Animals Committee meeting and some of the usual delegates of some countries, IGO and NGOs were also not present.

Can Article IV.3 be used as an alternative to Article IV.2.a for the export of corals?

The group discussed this issue. Some felt that because it was often not possible to identify corals to species level (see below), making non-detriment findings under Article IV.2.a was accordingly more difficult. In addition, corals within a genus often have similar growth forms, occupy similar habitats and have a similar role in the ecosystem. Using Article IV. 3 as an alternative then made more sense. Others felt that it was important to retain non-detriment findings at the level of individual species or taxa. All agreed, however, that a greater emphasis on assessing the impacts of harvesting on the role that corals played in the ecosystems was essential. Indeed, the nature of hard corals, namely that they form the structure of reefs and, accordingly, the basis for an entire ecosystem, means that this ecosystem role is significantly greater than for many other CITES species.

However, the group also felt that that it was not possible to assess whether a species was being maintained at a level consistent with its role in the ecosystem by monitoring exports alone (as suggested by Article IV.3). The group agreed that a more ecosystem-based approach to the management of corals harvested for export was desirable and that Parties should be encouraged to do this. It was agreed that some additional text inserted into Resolution Conf. 11.10 could address this subject and that a draft should be provided for the 18th Animals Committee meeting.

Identifying coral taxa to species or genus level

Building on earlier work at AC16 in relation to Decision 11.99, the group continued their work to produce a proposed list of taxa that may be identified to genus level only and a list of genera which must be identified to species level. The group recognised that this issue was central to much of their work. In particular, determining whether a taxa is identified to species or genus level has significant implications for:

- making non-detriment findings
- recording levels of trade in various species
- the level of detail required in identification guides
- undertaking monitoring of levels of harvests in the wild
- whether some species should be retained on the appendices or not

It may also set a precedent in CITES that others may wish to exploit. Equally, the group noted the genuine difficulties of identifying corals in trade. These include their plastic growth forms, considerable variation within and between species from different areas and when growing in different environmental conditions, and the need to identify their skeletons microscopically for

a definitive identification (not readily visible in live specimens). These features may make it impractical or impossible to identify some corals below the level of genus. Even within a single colony, there can be marked variations in skeletal structure and form. In addition some species are only reliably separated with dead specimens or in other cases with live specimens. Closely related species groups are often capable of hybridisation, whilst individual species from distant regions may no longer be capable of inter-breeding. There is also a minimum of 600 reef-building coral species in the Indo-Pacific alone that may potentially be in trade, many of which are very similar in appearance. Taxonomic problems are widespread.

However, identifying some corals to generic level only has risks and benefits. We assessed these as follows:

Risks of identifying some taxa to genus level only

Non-detriment findings (Article IV.2.a) are more difficult to make at the genus level and the role of a species within an ecosystem (Article IV.3) may not be consistent for all species within a genus.

Less abundant / more vulnerable species in a genus may be exploited at unsustainable levels but this will not necessarily be recognised through analysis of trade data.

Shifting patterns of trade within a genus will not be apparent. Identification to genus only might be used to avoid restrictions / stricter measures imposed by some importing countries.

Species level data can be aggregated to report at the genus level but genus level data cannot be broken down to species level data.

Despite the practical difficulties in identifying many corals to species level, traders often know the species in trade very well and can identify them with certainty.

Benefits of identifying some taxa to genus level only.

The group has already noted the significant practical difficulties of accurately identifying corals to species level; it may be preferable to have accurate identification at genus level than poor or inaccurate data at species level.

The difficulties of identification to species level may lead to shipments being seized if an importing country makes a different identification of a specimen(s) than that on the export permit (even though it is generally simpler for an exporting country to make an accurate identification because they have comparative material to hand).

Greater confidence in trade data from importing and exporting Parties.

Non-detriment findings can still be made to a degree but with a reduced level of confidence in the result (NB for some genera, monitoring data may also only be collected at the generic level rather than the species level?)

There may be considerable redundancy of species within a genus in the role they play within the ecosystem.

The analysis above suggests that it is still preferable to identify corals in trade to the specific level wherever possible. However, there will be circumstances in which such identification is not possible and identification to the genus level must be acceptable (as provided for in Resolution Conf. 11.17). However, it is also clear that even in the 'difficult' genera, a lot of traders / exporters are exporting a relatively small number of species and are confident of

their species identification. It is clear that such specimens should continue to be identified to species level and allowing identification to genus level only should not be used simply for the sake of expediency.

Following our deliberations, the interim conclusions of the coral working group are that:

Specimens of the following genera **MUST** be identified to species level on CITES permits:

All mono-specific genera (*sensu* Cairns *et al.*, 1999)

*Blastomussa** *Cladocora*, *Dichocoenia*, *Diploria*, *Euphyllia* (live)*, *Galaxea*, *Heteropsammia*, *Hydnophora**, *Merulina*, *Mycedium*, *Pachyseris*, *Physogyra* (live), *Plerogyra* (live), *Podabacia*, *Polyphyllia*, *Seriatopora**, *Sandalolitha*.

All other genera not formally assessed by the coral working group.

Specimens of the following genera **MAY** be identified to genus level only on CITES permits:

Acanthastrea, *Acropora*, *Agaricia*, *Anacrapora*, *Alveopora*, *Astreopora*, *Balanophyllia*, *Barbattoia*, *Caulastrea*, *Colpophyllia*, *Coscinaraea*, *Ctenactis*, *Cyphastrea*, *Dendrophyllia*, *Distichopora*, *Echinophyllia*, *Echinopora*, *Euphyllia* (dead), *Favia*, *Favites*, *Fungia*, *Goniastrea*, *Goniopora*, *Halomitra*, *Leptastrea*, *Leptoseris*, *Lithophyllon*, *Lobophyllia*, *Madracis*, *Millepora*, *Montastrea*, *Montipora*, *Mussismillia*, *Mycetophyllia*, *Oculina*, *Oxypora*, *Pavona*, *Pectinia*, *Physogyra* (dead), *Platygyra*, *Plerogyra* (dead), *Pocillopora*, *Porites*, *Psammocora*, *Scolymia*, *Siderastrea*, *Stylaster*, *Stylocoeniella*, *Stylophora*, *Symphyllia*, *Tubastrea*, *Turbinaria*, *Oulophyllia*, *Solenastrea*.

NB it is expected that Parties will only use identification to genus level on permits when it is genuinely not possible to identify a specimen to species level. These recommendations are expanded upon more fully in the attached Annex.

* whilst we recommend these genera be identified to species level, some difficulties may still arise for the identification of some species within these genera. Indeed, these (and other) genera may require specific guidance in identification to be produced for Parties, enforcement officials and traders and identification is more likely to be accurate in exporting countries than at importing ports of entry. Some species within these genera might still require significant caution before making a positive identification. The group also noted that corals are often inspected in less than ideal conditions, when they are in transit for example, and the coral polyps may be contracted. Additional caution is required in these circumstances and guidance to Customs officials on how best to handle specimens to enable accurate identification is desirable.

Members of the working group are encouraged to do a final consultation with coral taxonomists on these interim conclusions before concluding at AC18.

Should coral taxa that are only to be identified to genus level be retained on the CITES appendices?

The group addressed this issue as part of our Terms of Reference. The consensus view was that simply because species within a genus might not be readily distinguished, one from another, there were no strong grounds to say that the genus itself did not warrant listing on Appendix II. If the genus can be readily distinguished from other genera, and if the genus as a whole meets the criteria for listing under Appendix II, then the group did not see any reason why these genera should not be retained on the CITES appendices.

In particular, it was noted that when the order Scleractinia was proposed for listing in 1990 (CoP7), part of the rationale for listing was for 'look-alike' reasons. The group readily recognises why this was the case. However, we feel that if there are specific examples of genera of concern regarding their inclusion on Appendix II, these should be referred for a formal review as to whether they still meet the criteria for listing or not. We note that one genus, *Goniopora*, is already proposed for review by the Animals Committee. The group also noted that at the 16th Animals Committee, the United States presented a review of black coral Order Antipatharia. Despite the fact that species within genera within this Order cannot be readily distinguished, and this distinction is infrequently made in international trade, the Animals Committee concluded regardless that this genus merited retention in Appendix II.

12 Identification manuals / guidance

The group noted and welcomed the intended production in September, by CITES Secretariat, of the guide to genus-level identification of Indo-Pacific corals provided by the USA. The group felt that it was vital that guides to identification were produced that matched the recommendations of the working group (assuming Animals Committee accepts these). In particular, guidance for identification to species level for those taxa required to be identified to specific level was a priority (especially for those corals most likely to be in trade). Such guidance should also include warnings when identifying a particular species, or group of species, was particularly problematic. The group wondered whether some interim guidance could be included within the forthcoming identification manual but also accepted that the time available to do this was limited.

The group agreed that the 3 volume book on *Corals of the World* by Veron (2000) was often used by those involved in corals, and would rightly continue to be used, though its cost might be prohibitive for some potential users (and it has a focus on the Indo-Pacific). Other interim options, pending completion of a range of identification guides, were considered including posting some species level photographs on the CITES web site or providing some other form of web-based complement to hard copy identification guides. There is the possibility that the United Kingdom Management Authority may have some funds to do the latter. Additionally, the current CITES loose-leaf identification manual would allow the addition of pages for single species to be added as and when the resources were available to produce these.

The priorities identified by the group for future identification guides include the following:

- guide to identification of Indo-Pacific corals which are required to be identified to species level;
- guide to Caribbean corals in trade;
- guidance to distinguishing fossil from non-fossil corals (subject to later deliberations).

13 Standard reference for coral nomenclature

The group also considered the two options available to the group for a standard reference to nomenclature. The option of using the recent production by Veron (2000) was quickly rejected because the book did not cover all the Scleractinia, that a number of names were published in the book for the first time (apparently without peer review), and the book has an Indo-Pacific focus referred to above.

The second option, namely a *List of extant stony corals* (Cairns, Hoeksema & van der Land, 1999), was supported by the majority of the group. This recent checklist is published, peer-reviewed, is readily available and covers all (1574) species of Scleractinia recognised by the

authors. However, UNEP-WCMC remarked that this paper was also not without its shortcomings. In particular, there is a difference in the treatment of some species than that adopted by Veron. More significantly, the checklist does appear to have a number of editorial errors, such as in the spelling of species names. UNEP-WCMC was reluctant to change their database to spellings known to be incorrect. Whilst some of these had been corrected, correspondence was still awaited from one of the authors which would enable UNEP-WCMC to resolve the difficulties. A list of synonyms was also unavailable which would have enabled trade data to be corrected to a standard name.

Considering these problems, the group re-considered its choices. The option of adopting the checklist as a standard and then using the JNCC CITES Checklists (produced by UNEP-WCMC on behalf of the United Kingdom Scientific Authority (Animals)) to subsequently resolve synonymy was considered as was using the checklists as a standard themselves. Considering the problems, the group decided to refer the matter to the Nomenclature Committee for guidance.

Cairns, Hoeksema & van der Land, 1999. List of extant stony corals. Atoll Research Bulletin No. 459. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.

Veron, JEN. 2000. *Corals of the World*. AIMS, Townsville.

Coral mariculture

The group considered a draft report on coral mariculture provided by the US based on formal responses (five in all) to Notification 2001/010 and other information known to the authors and other group members. This comprehensive report reviewed the current extent and methods for the culturing of corals (in both exporting and importing countries), considered possible means of marking cultured corals and considered which CITES source codes might be appropriate. In all, the report notes that coral propagation is underway in 10 countries with at least 14 operations and hundreds of hobbyists known, and 107 taxa are being cultured. The group thanked the United States of America for their excellent report and the work that had gone into it.

The report generated significant discussion, especially regarding the most appropriate source codes. Some noted the similarities to the artificial propagation of plants and that we could learn from the approaches taken by the Plants Committee, others expressed caution over too great a rush to mariculture rather than wild harvests whilst the opposing view, namely that any activity that takes pressure off reefs was to be welcomed, was also expressed. It was also noted that some large polyp corals could also be cultivated and that there were identification problems with some captive bred corals.

With regard to source codes, it was agreed that source codes C and F could be applied to some of the methods used to produce cultured corals in controlled environments on land. There was division over whether source code R or W was most appropriate for corals raised on the seabed. The majority felt that most corals propagated in the sea would only qualify for source code W. It was also noted that this topic had relevance to discussion of document AC17.14.Rev 1 '*Control of captive breeding, ranching and wild harvest production systems for Appendix II species*'. The group felt that coral mariculture on the seabed most easily fell into the new proposed code Wr, though some modifications to the definition might be required. It was felt that it was important that the working groups addressing both issues should liaise.

As the group had had limited time to consider the report, the Chairman invited members of the group to provide detailed comments on the report to the United States of America and the Chair with the intention that a final document is prepared in time for the deadline for AC18.

14 Fossilised corals

The United Kingdom presented a report to the group, which aimed to define fossilised corals and provide a practical assessment of how such corals could be distinguished from non-fossilised corals in trade. Given that this is a complex, technical issue and the report had only been produced in time for the meeting, it was decided to defer full discussion of this item to AC18 when the report could also be presented to the Committee and observers. In the interim, the report will be made available in due course on the United Kingdom CITES web site (www.ukcites.gov.uk).

Working Group on Trade in Hard Corals -
Coral taxa identifiable to species or genus level - preliminary recommendations

17th meeting of the CITES Animals Committee, 30 July - 3 August 2001
Version 5 of 2 August 2001

Taxa	Number spp. in genus	Comments	Working group recommendation
(from Cairns et al 1999)			
Mono-specific genera			
<i>Acrhelia horrescens</i>	1	plus additional undescribed spp?	S
<i>Anomastrea irregularis</i>	1	Caribbean	S
<i>Asteosmilia connata</i>	1		S
<i>Australogyra zelli</i>	1		S
<i>Australomussa rowleyensis</i>	1		S
<i>Boninastrea boninensis</i>	1		S
<i>Catalaphyllia jardinei</i>	1		S
<i>Coeloseris mayeri</i>	1		S
<i>Ctenella chagius</i>	1		S
<i>Cynarina lacrymalis</i>	1		S
<i>Dendrogyra cylindricus</i>	1	Caribbean	S
<i>Diploastrea heliopora</i>	1		S
<i>Duncanopsammia axifuga</i>	1		S
<i>Erythrastrea flabellata</i>	1		S
<i>Eusmilia fastigiata</i>	1	Caribbean	S
<i>Gardineroseris planulata</i>	1		S
<i>Gyrosmilia interrupta</i>	1		S
<i>Heliofungia actiniformis</i>	1		S
<i>Heliopora coerulea</i>	1		S
<i>Helioseris cucullata</i>	1	Caribbean	S
<i>Herpolitha limax</i>	1		S
<i>Horastrea indica</i>	1		S
<i>Indophyllia macassarensis</i>	1		S
<i>Isophyllastrea rigida</i>	1	Caribbean	S
<i>Isophyllia sinuosa</i>	1	Caribbean	S
<i>Leptoria phrygia</i>	1		S
<i>Manicinia areolata</i>	1		S
<i>Meandrina meandrites</i>	1	Caribbean	S
<i>Montigyra kenti</i>	1		S
<i>Moseleya latistellata</i>	1		S
<i>Mussa angulosa</i>	1		S
<i>Nemanzophyllia turbida</i>	1	Genus recognised by Cairns	S
<i>Oulastrea crispata</i>	1		S
<i>Palauastrea ramosa</i>	1		S
<i>Paraclavarina triangularis</i>	1		S
<i>Parasimplastrea simplicitexta</i>	1		S
<i>Physophyllia ayleni</i>	1		S
<i>Plesiastrea versipora</i>	1		S

Taxa	Number spp. in genus	Comments	Working group recommendation
	(from Cairns et al 1999)		
<i>Pseudosiderastrea tayami</i>	1		S
<i>Scapophyllia cylindrica</i>	1		S
<i>Schizoculina fissipara</i>	1		S
<i>Simplastrea vesicularis</i>	1		S
<i>Stephanocoenia intersepta</i>	1	Caribbean	S
<i>Stylarea punctata</i>	1		S
<i>Trachyphyllia geoffroyi</i>	1	Includes <i>Wellsophyllia radiata</i>	S
<i>Tubipora musica</i>	1		S
<i>Zoopilus echinatus</i>	1		S
Other taxa to species level			
<i>Blastomussa</i>	2	Some difficulties may be encountered when trying to distinguish between these species	S
<i>Cladocora</i>	4		S
<i>Dichocoenia</i>	2	Caribbean	S
<i>Diploria</i>	3	Caribbean	S
<i>Euphyllia</i> (live)	9	NB difficulties may be encountered when trying to distinguish between <i>E. glabrescens</i> and <i>E. divisa</i> .	S
<i>Galaxea</i>	4		S
<i>Heteropsammia</i>	2		S
<i>Hydnophora</i>	6	v difficult to id in field - but 2 spp exported usually easy	S
<i>Merulina</i>	3		S
<i>Mycedium</i>	2		S
<i>Pachyseris</i>	4		S
<i>Physogyra</i> (live)	2		S
<i>Plerogyra</i> (live)	4		S
<i>Podabacia</i>	2	Okay to spp level but may need both species together for comparison	S
<i>Polyphyllia</i>	3		S
<i>Sandalolitha</i>	2		S
<i>Seriatopora</i>	2	Some difficulties may be encountered when trying to distinguish between these species	S
Taxa where identification to genus is acceptable (but which should be identified to species where feasible)			
<i>Acanthastrea</i>	10		G
<i>Acropora</i>	127		G
<i>Agaricia</i>	7		G
<i>Alveopora</i>	12		G
<i>Anacrapora</i>	5		G
<i>Astreopora</i>	11		G

Taxa	Number spp. in genus	Comments	Working group recommendation
	(from Cairns et al 1999)		
<i>Balanophyllia</i>	56		G
<i>Barabattoia</i>	3	retain ID at genus level - size main distinction, small sized specimens a problem	G
<i>Caulastrea</i>	4	retain ID at genus level - 2 spp regularly in trade -spp distinguished on size? and angle of branching, problems at importing end?	G
<i>Colpophyllia</i>	3	2 spp easy, 3rd difficult? - to be confirmed	?
<i>Coscinaraea</i>	9		G
<i>Ctenactis</i>	3		G
<i>Cyphastrea</i>	7		G
<i>Dendrophyllia</i>	21		G
<i>Distichopora</i>	23		G
<i>Echinophyllia</i>	8		G
<i>Echinopora</i>	9		G
<i>Euphyllia</i> (dead)	9		G
<i>Favia</i>	18		G
<i>Favites</i>	9		G
<i>Fungia</i>	25	Includes Cycloseris & Diaseris	G
<i>Goniastrea</i>	8		G
<i>Goniopora</i>	20		G
<i>Halomitra</i>	2	retain ID at genus level - confusion between Podabacia	G
<i>Leptastrea</i>	6		G
<i>Leptoseris</i>	14		G
<i>Lithophyllon</i>	2		G
<i>Lobophyllia</i>	7		G
<i>Madracis</i>	15		G
<i>Millepora</i>	17		G
<i>Montastrea</i>	9		G
<i>Montipora</i>	56		G
<i>Mussissmillia</i>	3		G
<i>Mycetophyllia</i>	5		G
<i>Oculina</i>	9		G
<i>Oulophyllia</i>	2		G or S??
<i>Oxypora</i>	3		G
<i>Pavona</i>	17		G
<i>Pectinia</i>	5		G
<i>Physogyra</i> (dead)	2		G
<i>Platygyra</i>	9		G
<i>Plerogyra</i> (dead)	4		G
<i>Plerogyra</i>	4		G
<i>Pocillopora</i>	7		G
<i>Porites</i>	41		G
<i>Psammocora</i>	11		G

Taxa	Number spp. in genus	Comments	Working group recommendation
	(from Cairns et al 1999)		
<i>Scolymia</i>	5		G
<i>Siderastrea</i>	4		G
<i>Solenastrea</i>	2	Caribbean - to be confirmed	G
<i>Stylaster</i>	75		G
<i>Stylocoeniella</i>	3	retain id at genus level - small differences between the species, rarely in trade	G
<i>Stylophora</i>	5		G
<i>Symphylia</i>	7		G
<i>Tubastrea</i>	6		G
<i>Turbinaria</i>	12		G

**Report of the Working Group on the Control of Captive Breeding, Ranching and
Wild Harvest Production Systems for Appendix-II Species**

Chair: Kim Howell, Regional Representative of Africa.

Recorder: Pamela Hall.

Participants: Regional Representative of South and Central America and the Caribbean (Marco Polo Micheletti), Regional Representative of Asia (Schwann Tunikorn), Regional Representative for Europe (Katalin Rodics), Secretariat, Chile, Mexico, Netherlands, Bolivia, Botswana, South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom The United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe, China, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Wildlife Conservation Society, International Wildlife Coalition, Traffic, European Association of Zoos and Aquaria, Animals Asia Foundation, European Commission, IUCN-The World Conservation Union, Creative Conservation Solutions, International Fund for Animal Welfare.

Approach:

While the consultant's document made suggestions related to Appendix I production systems, the Working Group agreed to only discuss the suggestions related to Appendix II.

The Working Group agreed on the concept of identifying different production systems in more detail, as described in the consultant's document.

The Working Group agreed that source codes needed better definition to assist exporting Parties when issuing permits and making required findings and importing Parties when accepting permits. It was also noted that these would be finalized once the issue of the terminology for the various production systems have been categorized.

The Working Group had a variety of specific concerns about the suggestions made in the consultant's document. However, the Working Group suggests that Parties' Management and Scientific Authorities be requested to review the Consultant's document to determine if the production systems identified in the document apply to the production systems in use in their countries. Parties should provide information on production systems that fall outside the systems described in the consultant's document. In addition, Parties are requested to provide other comments related to the document.

The attached annex provides a matrix to help Parties analyze production systems in use within their countries with respect to the production systems described by the consultant. The WG suggest it be distributed with the request to Parties.

Comments received from Parties will be further analyzed by the WG of the Animals Committee.

Management systems

			Ranching	Direct wild harvest	Captive rearing	Wildlife farming	Control harvest
Dependence of wildlife populations:	Only at the start	DW1					
	Intermittent	DW2				?	
	Ongoing	DW3	X	X	X		X
Harvest of wild individuals	No	HW1					
	Yes	HW2	X	X			X
	Modified	HW3			X	X	
Rearing of wild- harvested specimens	No	RW1		?		X	X
	Yes	RW2	X		X		
Monitoring of wild populations	Needed to show non detriment	MND	X		X		
	Needed to show conservation benefit	MC	X	X			X
	Not needed	MNN				X	
Captive management	No	MGN		X			
	Yes	MGY					
Export of progeny	No	YgN					
	Yes	YgE			X		
Management of alien species	No	AIN					
	Yes	AIY					X
Pests	No	PeN					
	Yes	PeY					X
Habitat management	No	HaN					
	Yes	HaY				X	

 = Required fields

 = New management systems identified

Report of the Working Group on the Universal Labelling of Caviar

The working group on the universal labelling of caviar has prepared this report.

Chair: Rod Hay, Regional representative for Oceania

Participants: Secretariat, Regional Representative for Europe, Russian Federation, China, Ukraine, United States of America, France, Islamic Republic of Iran, IWMC, TRAFFIC Europe.

The working group agreed on the following agenda in priority order:

Review of label information received from exporting countries;

The content of a Notification needed to provide Parties with guidance on fulfilling Resolution Conf. 11.13;

Noting that Resolution Conf. 11.13 refers only to primary export, the development of a labelling system also applicable to the re-export of caviar;

Any other issues not explicitly required under Resolution Conf. 11.13, but which the working group agrees will facilitate its successful implementation.

Labelling systems submitted by exporting countries

Following clarification provided by the Russian Federation concerning the definition of lot number and the use of secure labels, the working group acknowledged that their proposed system would fulfil the requirements of the Resolution. The label examples provided by Kazakhstan also appeared to be of an appropriate standard, though it was not possible to assess fully their system without further written details. The Islamic Republic of Iran had also furnished an oral description of their labelling system at the meeting of the working group during AC16. Working group members were keen that the universal system be flexible enough to accommodate minor differences between the systems adopted by the individual countries. Notwithstanding this, participants from Iran suggested that the system should be truly universal and undertook to modify their own comprehensive system as required by the Notification. This position was acknowledged and agreed by the group.

The representatives of other exporting countries present (China, Ukraine, United States of America, France) agreed that the system as proposed by the Russian Federation could be adopted.

Notification to Parties

The Working Group agreed on the list of items to be included in a Notification to the Parties and requested that the Secretariat circulate a draft for comment prior to it being distributed. Suggestions for the content of this Notification that should be issued by the Secretariat are provided in an Annex to this report.

Labelling for Re-export

While Resolution Conf. 11.13 strictly applies to the exportation of caviar from the producer country to the initial country of importation, the working group agreed that a system should also apply to re-export if it is to be globally effective and minimise the risk of illegal trade. The

working group agreed that it would be appropriate to provide a recommendation to re-exporting countries, via the Notification, strongly encouraging them to establish a similar labelling system.

Meanwhile, the group also agreed to work intersessionally on a proposed amendment to Resolution Conf. 11.13 to render it comprehensive in scope, including the development of a proposal for CoP 12 this matter if required.

Other implementation issues

Validation and Monitoring

Following extensive discussion on monitoring the proposed labelling system and using it to validate the legality of trade, it was agreed that exporting parties should be encouraged to register their approved exports with the Secretariat by providing a copy of each export permit to the Secretariat immediately after issuance. The use of an electronic registration scheme or clearing house, whereby Parties could check the validity of documentation, was discussed, but it was recognised that this could require significant development. The working group recommended that the Secretariat consider the application of existing systems to this matter. The group considered that such a system would greatly facilitate the restriction of illegal trade by enabling quick checking of documentation for proposed imports.

Turkey

At its 45th meeting, the Standing Committee decided that caviar exports from Turkey should not be accepted by importing Parties. The working group agreed that the Secretariat should inform the Parties again of this through a specific Notification as soon as possible.

EC regulations

The working group was informed that the European Commission has agreed on a regulation that will come into force in October 2001, that its member states will only issue import permits for caviar labelled in accordance with the system agreed by the CITES Conference of the Parties. The group also recommended that this information should be provided to Parties by Notification.

The description codes and units used in Annual Reports

In order to minimise the risk of misinterpretation, the working group agreed to recommend that the Animals Committee work intersessionally on precise and appropriate terms and units to be used for specimens of Acipenseriformes in trade, including caviar, fertilised eggs, live fry, skin, swim bladders and meat.

DRAFT

**Universal labelling of caviar
Implementation of Resolution Conf. 11.13**

Following the adoption of Resolution Conf. 11.13 (Universal labelling system for the identification of caviar), it appeared that a certain number of issues relating to its implementation required clarification. This was referred to the Animals Committee, which established a working group at its 16th meeting (Shepherdstown, United States of America, December 2000) which included in particular several of the Acipenseriformes range States. The working group reconvened at the 17th meeting of the Committee (Hanoi, Viet Nam, July 2001), and formulated recommendations that were approved by the Committee.

The purpose of this Notification is to inform the Parties of the recommendations and clarifications from the Animals Committee regarding the implementation of the above-mentioned Resolution.

The intent of the Resolution is to apply only to commercial shipments of caviar from wild and aquaculture sources entering international trade from countries of origin.

The reference in paragraph a) to the introduction of a uniform marking system for any primary container of "more than 249 grams of caviar" should be interpreted as meaning any container that contains "250 grams or more of caviar". Such a container may only enter international trade when an individual, non-reusable label is affixed to it.

Secondary containers referred to in paragraphs b), d) and e) are containers or wrapping in which one or more primary containers are packed.

In relation to paragraph b), it should be noted that in the event that primary containers with less than 250 grams of caviar are packed in a secondary container and exported, a non-reusable label should be affixed on the secondary container only. A description of its contents should also be indicated on the secondary container.

In relation to paragraph d), referring to the exportation of one or more primary containers of more than 250 grams of caviar that are packed in a secondary container, the information appearing on the label of each of the primary containers of more than 250 grams should also be indicated on the secondary container.

When the secondary container includes primary containers of both less than 250 grams and of 250 grams or more, it will require primary and secondary containers labels as described in paragraph 4 and 5 above and the description of its contents.

Paragraph c) provides for the minimum information that should be contained in the non-reusable labels. This minimum information should be presented in accordance with the formula and the example provided in that paragraph, and should be clearly shown on the label. Although it is recommended to follow as closely as possible the labelling examples provided by the Russian Federation and the Islamic Republic of Iran and communicated in Notifications to the Parties No. 2001/XXX and YYY, the precise layout of the non-reusable label should be left to the exporting country to determine.

Accordingly the formula that should be used on the non-reusable labels should contain as a minimum and in the following order:

the type of caviar, e.g. Beluga, Ossetra, Sevruga;

the standard three-letter species code as provided in the Annex to the Resolution; in case of hybrids, the recommended code is "HYB";

the ISO two-letter code of the country of origin;

the year of harvest indicated in four digits;

the code allocated to the processing plant where the caviar is produced (i.e. "xxxx" in the example provided in this paragraph);

the lot identification number (i.e. "yyyy" in the example provided in the paragraph);

to read, for example, Beluga/HUS/RU/2001/xxxx/yyyy.

The code allocated to the processing plant should be composed of numbers, letters or a combination thereof (the code does not need to be four digits as indicated in the example provided in paragraph c)) that are determined as appropriate by the country of origin. For caviar produced in aquaculture it is recommended that the code be preceded by the letters "AQ".

The lot identification number should be a serial number (the code does not need to be four digits as indicated in the example provided in paragraph c)) that corresponds to information related to the caviar trade tracking system implemented by the exporting country.

Regarding paragraph e), the information on the labels should be mentioned in block 9 of the standard CITES export permit or in an annex attached to the permit as an integral part of it, in accordance with the provisions of Resolution Conf. 10.2 (Rev.) [section I, paragraph e) under AGREES].

In accordance with paragraph g), the Management Authorities of the exporting, re-exporting and importing Parties should send to the Secretariat a copy of each export permit for caviar immediately after issuance or upon receipt, as appropriate.

The Parties exporting caviar, when informing the Secretariat of the labelling system they are implementing, should provide a list of registered processors and of their registration codes.

Pursuant to Resolution Conf. 11.13, the above set of procedures should be implemented as soon as possible for export quotas for the year 2001. With this regard, the Parties must be informed that the European Commission will adopt a regulation under which import permits for caviar shall only be issued by Member States for caviar that has been marked in accordance with the method approved by the Conference of the Parties to CITES. This regulation will enter into force in October 2001.

In order to assist the exporting countries in their effort to prevent illegal trade in caviar, the **Animals Committee** strongly recommends that Parties re-exporting caviar implement a system of labelling similar to the universal labelling system described above.

Report of the Working Group on Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia and Other Regions

Chair: Tonny Soehartono, Regional Representative for Asia

Participants: Mike Griffin; Kim Howell, Regional Representatives for Africa, C.H. Giam, Alternate Regional Representative for Asia, Marinus Hoogmoed, Chairman of the Animals Committee, Tom de Mulenaer, CITES Secretariat, Ingo Pauler, DGHT, Ronald Orenstein, International Wildlife Coalition, George T. Saputra, IRATA, Nobuo Ishii, Japan Wildlife Research Center, Meng Xian Lin, Zhou Zhihua, Fan, Zhiyong, Management Authority of China, Phoebe Sze, Management Authority of Hong Kong, Tim Van Norman, Management Authority of the United States of America, Chang Man Won, Republic of Korea, Siti. N. Priyono; Suharsono, Scientific Authority of Indonesia, Harald Martens, Scientific Authority of Germany, Peter Paul van Dijk, TRAFFIC South-East Asia, Bryan Stuart, Wildlife Conservation Society.

The Working Group met with the primary objective of determining arrangements for the Workshop mandated by Decision 11.150, whose objective is "to establish conservation priorities and actions to achieve sustainable trade in freshwater turtles and tortoises". The Working Group agreed that the focus of the Workshop should be on implementation and enforcement, and should aim at producing tangible and ongoing results.

The preferred date for the Workshop, to be held in Bogor, Indonesia, is the end of November 2001. However, it was noted that this date falls in the middle of Ramadan, and the Secretariat agreed to investigate other possible dates.

Funding limitations requires that participation in the workshop be limited to 40, although experts able to provide their own funding could attend, to a maximum of 60 participants. Participants must be in a position to be useful and relevant to the issue, and countries invited must be those with significant levels of trade.

The following list of countries that will be invited to send representatives was tentatively agreed to: Bangladesh, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore, China [including Hong Kong and Taiwan], Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Pakistan, India, and Papua New Guinea. Japan, Sri Lanka, Korea, and the Philippines are also possible invitees. The Secretariat will be represented by two delegates, and the Chair of Animals Committee will also attend. The Working Group recommended that a representative of the European Union and the North American, African and Central and South American Representatives for Animals Committee should also be invited. Although donors will not be invited as a matter of course, organizations with specific expertise should be included. The Secretariat should issue invitations to the appropriate government authorities by no later than the end of August 2001.

The Working Group formed a subcommittee to develop the agenda for the Workshop, including Chelonian Research Foundation, TRAFFIC Southeast Asia, Wildlife Conservation Society, and the Asian Representative for Animals Committee. The Working Group suggests that captive breeding issues not be discussed at the Workshop, but that education and public information be included as part of the discussion on enforcement and capacity building. The Working Group expressed the hope that the results of the workshop could be carried on in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding or Action Plan.

The Working Group agreed that arrangements for the Workshop can be left to the Secretariat and the Organizing Committee established by the Government of Indonesia. In addition to the requirement that the Secretariat report the results of the Workshop to the Animals Committee, the Working Group suggested that a venue such as the Turtle and Tortoise Newsletter published by the Chelonian Research Foundation be found for publication of any reports or communiques arising from the Workshop.

The Working Group noted the request by the Chair of the Transport Working Group that humane transport issues be included in the Workshop agenda, but felt that these were a lower priority. It was agreed, though, that the need for mortality data could be expressed at the Workshop. The Working Group also considered potential candidates for future listing proposals for the CITES appendices, and agreed that it would be willing to remain constituted through the next meeting of the Animals Committee if this would be considered of use.

Working Group on Seahorses and other Syngnathids Summary Report

Chair: Amanda Vincent, Project Seahorse.

15 Participants: Kim Howell, Regional Representative for Africa, Rod Hay, Regional Representative for Oceania, Tom Kaveney, Australia, Meng Kian Lin, Zhou Zhihua, Fan Zhiyong, China, P.K. Sen, Ashok Kumar, India (new member of working group), Suharsono, Indonesia, Scientific Authority, Yoshio Kaneko, Japan, Keith Davenport, OATA, Boris Kwan Sai Ping, Project Seahorse, Juma Kayera, United Republic of Tanzania (observer to working group at AC17), Caroline Raymakers, TRAFFIC Europe (Brussels), Julie Thomson-Delaney, TRAFFIC Southeast Asia (Vietnam), Vladimir Domashlinets, Ukraine (observer to working group at AC17), Nancy Daves, Colin McIff, United States of America.

16 Regrets:

Kris Vehrs, AZA
Karen Steuer, IFAW

The Syngnathid Working Group met twice, for a total of 2.5 hours, and considered four major items of business.

New information on the international trade in seahorses and other syngnathids.

Responses to CITES Notifications on syngnathids.

Plans for the Technical Workshop

Funding for the Technical Workshop.

All points below represent the consensus view of the Working Group, unless otherwise noted.

Members of the Working Group exchanged information on new developments in syngnathid trade research, domestic legislation, monitoring processes, aquaculture, and industry attitudes. Project Seahorse reported that it intends to seek input from relevant CITES management authorities on its new global review of syngnathid trade, in collaboration with TRAFFIC.

The ten formal responses to CITES Notification to the Parties No. 2001/023 were judged to represent a good start on information gathering for the technical workshop. Members of the Working Group were encouraged to prompt other Parties (particularly major exporters and importers) to respond to the Notification 2001/034 before the deadline of 31 October 2001. Most Parties with coastlines are Range States for the family Syngnathidae, which comprises at least 300 species of seahorses, seadragons, pipefishes and pipehorses.

The Philippines has offered to host the technical workshop on syngnathids, probably in Cebu and probably in February 2002, as suggested by the Chair of the Animals Committee. The timing means that outputs from the workshop will inevitably fail to meet the deadline for submission to the Secretariat, 90 days in advance of the AC18 in April. The Working Group seeks flexibility from the Secretariat, and notes that adding a translation line item to the workshop budget may facilitate its understanding.

The goals of the workshop are identified in Decision 11.153 (paragraphs b and c) and Decision 11.97 (paragraphs a and b). In summary, the workshop will (i) gather all available knowledge on the biology, status, catches and bycatches of syngnathids and on the trade in and domestic legislation for syngnathids, (ii) derive recommendations for CITES action (if any) on syngnathids, and (iii) draft a discussion document for CoP12. Discussions on the biology and trade of syngnathids, that comprise the focus for the workshop, should be considered in the context of habitat loss and degradation. Analyses of domestic legislation for syngnathid conservation may offer useful ideas for CITES action.

The range of options for suggested CITES actions coming out of the workshop is completely open and should remain so, in order not to prejudice the deliberations of the workshop.

The workshop should last four days. The first day should largely provide a review the biology, trade and management of syngnathids. The second day should focus on specific issues of importance, probably in breakout groups. The third day should be devoted to a field trip to fishing communities that rely heavily upon seahorses, with informal discussions. The fourth day should be devoted to formulating recommendations and planning a discussion document for consideration by the AC.

The process underway on freshwater turtles and tortoises should provide useful parallels for work on syngnathids, including composition and format of the workshop. Some members of the Working Group cautioned, however, that CITES work on syngnathids is at an earlier stage than that for freshwater turtles and may need to proceed differently. The Working Group noted that the technical workshop might recommend further CITES action beyond CoP12 even if listing were not proposed.

A target of about 40 participants was thought reasonable in order to ensure that the following constituencies are adequately represented at the workshop: (i) scientists/biologists, (ii) traditional medicine community, (iii) ornamental fish industry and public aquaria, (iv) traders in curiosities, (v) policy-makers (Secretariat and Parties), (vi) aquaculture community, (vii) NGOs and IGOs, with the possible addition of (viii) fisheries managers. People without specialised syngnathid knowledge may well be able to offer valuable expertise. Possible participants will be identified in e-mail consultation and forwarded to the Secretariat.

Syngnathids are a global taxon with global trade patterns, and not all of the very large number of Range States and trading Parties can be invited to the workshop. It would be advisable for the Secretariat to select a small subset of Parties (probably primarily Asian) to participate in the workshop, based on their syngnathid biodiversity or dominant role in trade, and then ask appropriate AC Committee members to represent other regions.

Working Group members offered to contact industry groups and multilateral agencies to elicit additional information that might be useful to deliberations at the workshop. In addition, the Working Group will send a list of questions about mandated areas of concern to participants in advance of the workshop, to focus preparation for the meeting and elicit new material.

The workshop should draft a discussion document with recommendations to AC18 and CoP12. Other possible outputs may be identified by participants, at the workshop.

The workshop may cost about USD 90,000 for 40 people. Only about USD 35,500 is currently available to the Secretariat. Working Group members agreed to seek and suggest ideas for additional funding to the Secretariat.

Logistics will be discussed by e-mail over the next six months. The working group suggests that, for cost reasons, the meeting be conducted entirely in English.

Report of the Working Group on Trade in Alien Species

Chair: Rod Hay, Regional representative of Oceania.

Participants: Sixto Inchaustegui, Regional Representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean, Michael Griffin, Regional Representative of Africa and representatives from Israel (Simon Nemptov), Italy (Marco Apollonio – rapporteur), United States of America (Pamela Hall), Spain (Carlos Ibero Solana) and IUCN (Alison Rosser).

The working group agreed on the following agenda in priority order:

- a. The production of the list of potentially invasive CITES species agreed on at AC16;
- b. Liaison with other bodies, including the IUCN Invasive Species Specialist Group and the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- c. The applicability of the IUCN Guidelines to CITES Parties as “plain language” guidelines;
- d. Linkages with Plants Committee;
- e. The risks to biodiversity of organisms carried with CITES species imported for trade;
- f. Impacts of non-CITES invasive species on CITES-listed species in their natural range.

The working group agreed that the first item would constitute the bulk of its work and that some of the other items would be covered in the discussion on that matter.

The list of CITES-listed alien invasive species

The group agreed that the purpose of such a list is to provide parties with information on examples of CITES species that have become invasive. This would give suggestions for management and scientific authorities when considering the overall impacts of trade in these or similar species.

It was acknowledged that IUCN is already developing a comprehensive database on invasive species and their impacts and that it would be inappropriate for CITES to duplicate such work. For that reason the group agreed that the next step for us would be to consult further with IUCN about preparing the CITES list using information from both organizations. The chairman indicated that he had already received a commitment from IUCN/SSC/ISSG to collaborate on the project. The chair and the representative from the USA agreed to undertake this work initially, to circulate a first draft to the members of the working group and then to prepare a list of candidate species for presentation to AC18.

The IUCN Guidelines were presented to the CBD SBSTTA Meeting in March 2001 as a basis of Guiding Principles for the Parties to that Convention. While these have not yet been finalized by CBD, the group agreed that it would be inappropriate for CITES to develop or request from IUCN a plain language version specifically for CITES Parties as requested at AC15.

Discussion on the content and structure of the list canvassed whether it should be a comprehensive list of species, whether there should also be a comprehensive assessment of risk including risk of genetic pollution and the impact of traded non-CITES species on local CITES-listed species.

The group agreed that the list should be concise, providing key examples of CITES species which are known to have become invasive. These would be simply categorized as to whether

that risk or impact was on indigenous biodiversity, as a pest of agricultural systems, or involved a specific impact on particular species, including any others listed under CITES and, where possible, to also categorise the type of risk involved.

Following discussion about whether Parties should be asked to provide this information, the group concluded that a Notification requesting it would not be appropriate at this stage. Rather, this could be reconsidered after the initial analysis of details held by the ISSG and other readily available sources.

The group suggested that the Chair of the Animals Committee approach his colleague in the Plants Committee requesting that they consider producing a matching list.