

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



SUMMARY RECORD

Twenty-third meeting of the Animals Committee



Geneva, (Switzerland), 19-24 April 2008

Contents

Agenda item	Page No.
1. Opening of the meeting.....	4
2. Rules of Procedure	
2.1 Current Rules of Procedure.....	4
2.2 Proposed amendments.....	4
3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme	
3.1 Agenda.....	6
3.2 Working programme.....	7
4. Admission of observers.....	7
5. Regional reports	
5.1 Africa.....	7
5.2 Asia.....	7
5.3 Central and South America and the Caribbean.....	7
5.4 Europe.....	7
5.5 North America.....	7
5.6 Oceania.....	7
6. Revision of the Terms of Reference of the Animals and Plants Committees.....	7
7. Cooperation with advisory bodies of other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements.....	8
8. Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species	
8.1 Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade.....	8
8.2 Progress report on the country-based Review of Significant Trade in Madagascar.....	9
8.3 Overview of the species-based Review of Significant Trade.....	10
8.4 Species selected following CoP13.....	10
8.5 Selection of species for trade reviews following CoP14.....	10
8.5.1 Selection of the Solomon Islands population of <i>Tursiops aduncus</i> for inclusion in the Review of Significant Trade.....	15
9. Review of the use of source code 'R'.....	16
10. International expert workshop on non-detriment findings.....	17

11. Periodic review of animal species included in the CITES Appendices	18
11.1 Schedule and responsibilities for species selected for periodic review between CoP13 and CoP15.....	18
11.2 Periodic review of Felidae.....	20
11.3 Periodic review of species selected prior to CoP13.....	18
12. Selection of a representative for the Standing Committee Working Group reviewing the implementation and effectiveness of the universal tagging system and the trade in small crocodylian leather goods	22
13. Sturgeons and paddlefish	22
13.1 Secretariat’s report.....	22
13.2 Evaluation of the assessment and monitoring methodologies used for stocks of Acipenseriformes species shared between different range States.....	22
14. Nomenclatural matters	25
15. Conservation and management of sharks	27
16. Transport of live animals	29
17. Progress report on the Identification Manual.....	32
18. Proposal to transfer the Mexican population of <i>Crocodylus moreletii</i> from Appendix I to Appendix II	32
19. Time and venue of the 24th meeting of the Animals Committee.....	33
20. Any other business	33
21. Closing remarks.....	33

SUMMARY RECORD

1. Opening of the meeting

The Secretary-General of the CITES Secretariat welcomed participants. The Animals Committee confirmed the Committee's provisionally appointed Chairman, Mr Thomas Althaus (representative of Europe), by acclamation.

2. Rules of Procedure

2.1 Current Rules of Procedure

The Secretariat introduced document AC23 Doc. 2.1 and the Committee adopted the Rules of Procedure it contained.

No interventions were made.

2.2 Proposed amendments

This agenda item was first discussed during the joint PC17/AC23 session.

The Secretariat introduced documents PC17 Doc. 2.2 and AC23 Doc. 2.2 and suggested some changes to the proposed Rules of Procedure contained in Annex 2 to those documents. First, that reference throughout the document to regional representatives be changed to refer only to representatives in view of the fact that both Committees now included in their membership nomenclature specialists who did not represent a particular region. Second, that under proposed Rule 22, the sentence 'The documents shall also be provided to all Parties that may be directly affected by any discussion of the documents and to all Parties that request them.' be changed to: The Secretariat shall alert all Parties that may be directly affected by any discussion of the documents and provide copies to all Parties that request them.

It recommended that the Committees adopt the proposed Rules of Procedure, with these changes, to be effective from the close of the present meetings.

After some discussion, a working group (PC17/AC23 WG1) was established to review the proposed Rules of Procedure, taking into account the comments and suggestions made during the discussion. The membership was as follows:

Chairman: PC representative of North America (Mr Gabel);

Members: PC Chairman (Sra. Clemente Muñoz) and AC alternate representative of Asia (Mr Giam).

Parties: China;

IGOs and NGOs: the European Community, IUCN.

The AC Chairman noted that, in establishing working groups, in general only the designated chairman or chairmen of the group and membership by observers would be decided by the Committees. Members of the Committees were free to attend whichever groups they wished.

Later, the PC representative of North America (Mr Gabel), as chairman of PC17/AC23 WG1, orally presented changes to the draft Rules of Procedure in Annex 2 of documents AC23 Doc. 2.2 and PC17 Doc. 2.2 that had been decided within the group by consensus.

There then followed a discussion, chiefly concerning Rule 7, regarding admission of observers, and proposed new Rule 26, regarding potential conflicts of interest.

With respect to Rule 7, some participants in the discussion considered that a limit should be placed on the number of individuals from any given body, agency or organization permitted to attend Committee meetings as observers. The view was also expressed that a Party in which an organization was based should be able to veto attendance at meetings of individuals from that organization. In response, others stated that organizations and individuals were welcomed at meetings because of the scientific and technical expertise that they could bring to bear on items under discussion, and that sometimes such expertise resided in a number of different individuals within a single organization. It was also noted that these proposed increased controls on attendance were more restrictive than those currently in use for meetings of the Conference of the Parties. The current practice gave discretion to the chairman of each committee to decide whether individuals and organizations wishing to attend meetings had the necessary scientific or technical competence to make a positive contribution. A number of participants in the discussion noted that this had worked satisfactorily until now, and did not see the need for radical change.

With respect to proposed Rule 26, the view was expressed that this was essentially an ethical matter, more appropriate to a code of conduct rather than to rules of procedure. The question of how a conflict of interest could be identified, and who might make such a determination was also raised.

Following the discussion, the following changes to the draft Rules of Procedure were agreed:

In Rule 1, add at the end of the first sentence: and the nomenclature specialists elected by the Conference of the Parties.

In Rule 7, paragraph 1, replace the final sentence with The Chairman may limit the number of delegates representing a non-governmental organization to one for practical reasons.

In Rule 7, paragraph 3, delete "and proof of the approval of the State in which the body is located".

In Rule 18, add at the end and the Committee, and in line with any instructions provided by the Conference of the Parties.

In Rule 20, replace '75' with 60.

In Rule 22, after "shall be placed on the Secretariat's website as soon as possible after they are received", add, but no later than 10 days after the submission deadline. Replace the sentence "The documents shall also be provided to all Parties that may be directly affected by any discussion of the documents and to all Parties that request them" with The Secretariat shall alert all Parties that may be directly affected by any discussion of the documents and provide copies to all Parties that request them.

In Rule 23, add at the end the sentence However, such documents may be referred to, if they relate to the existing agenda items, but not discussed.

Rule 26 is deleted.

The Committees agreed that they would leave the Secretariat to modify the text, so that references to representatives and members would be altered to refer as appropriate either to all members, including the nomenclature specialists (who did not have voting rights), or only to regional representatives (who did).

Later in the week, the Animals Committee reviewed the executive summary of its joint session with the Plants Committee (PC17/AC23 Sum. 1). Criticisms were expressed for the delay with which some documents for AC meetings were posted on the CITES website after they had been sent to the Secretariat. The Secretariat explained it reviewed those documents before posting them and sometimes needed to seek clarification from their authors. However, once all concerns had been addressed, the documents were published online without delay. The Chairman supported this practice, arguing that rushing publication could result in endless revisions having to be made to correct errors spotted afterwards. To accommodate both concerns, an

amendment to Rule 22 was suggested to establish a deadline for posting documents after the Secretariat had finished its review.

The Animals Committee decided the following:

- a) In Rule 22, amend the proposed addition "no later than 10 days after the submission deadline" to adopt instead but no later than 10 days after they have been technically agreed upon by both sides. Together with the other amendment recorded above, Rule 22 therefore read as follows:

All documents submitted to the Secretariat by a member, an alternate member or a Party, or submitted by an observer at the request of the Chairman, shall be placed on the Secretariat's website as soon as possible after they are received, but no later than 10 days after they have been technically agreed upon by both sides, in the original language (which shall be a CITES working language) in which they have been submitted. The Secretariat shall distribute printed and translated documents for any meeting to the members and alternate members of the Committee at least 45 days before the proposed date of the meeting where they are to be discussed. The Secretariat shall alert all Parties that may be directly affected by any discussion of the documents and provide copies to all Parties that request them. Documents shall be placed on the Secretariat's website in the three working languages at least two weeks before the meeting in order to be considered for discussion.

- b) Under the same agenda item, under Rule 23, the proposed sentence "However such documents may be referred to but not discussed if they relate to the existing agenda items" was replaced with However, such documents may be referred to if they relate to the existing agenda items, but not discussed;

The Chairman reminded the Committee that the original text, as reported in summary record PC17/AC23 Sum. 1, had been discussed and agreed upon in the joint session. The Plants Committee would therefore have to decide whether to follow the Animals Committee in adopting this new version of Rule 22.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), Europe (Mr Ibero Solana), North America (Mr Medellín) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the AC nomenclature specialist (Ms Grimm), the PC representative of North America (Mr Gabel), the AC alternate representatives of Africa (Mr Zahzah), China, India, the Russian Federation, the European Community, the Humane Society of the United States (speaking on behalf of the Species Survival Network), IUCN, IWMC, Species Management Specialists, the AC and PC Chairmen, and the Secretariat.

3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme

3.1 Agenda

The AC Chairman introduced document AC23 Doc. 3.1. The following additions to the agenda were proposed: an item on regional directories under agenda item 5 (*Regional reports*); an item on functioning of Scientific Authorities for CITES under agenda item 20 (*Any other business*); items on joint meetings of the scientific committees and on nomenclature under *Any other business* during the joint session with the Plants Committee to be held on 19 April 2008.

With these additions, and with the understanding that the mandate for the representative referred to in agenda item 12 would be addressed when discussing this item, the Committee adopted the agenda in document AC23 Doc. 3.1.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by France, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, the Chairman and the Secretariat.

3.2 Working programme

The AC Chairman introduced document AC23 Doc. 3.2. The following changes to the working programme were proposed: agenda item 16 (*Transport of live animals*) to be also discussed during the joint session with the Plants Committee to be held on 19 April 2008; inclusion of discussion of the two items agreed under agenda item 3.1 in the working programme of the joint session with the Plants Committee; deferral of agenda item 18 (*Proposal to transfer the Mexican population of *Crocodylus moreletii* from Appendix I to Appendix II*) to after discussion of agenda item 16 (*Transport of live animals*) on Monday 21 April.

With these changes, and a correction to the numbering in document AC23 Doc. 3.2 of agenda items for discussion at the end of the meeting on Thursday 24 April 2008 (those numbered 18, 19 and 20 should be 19, 20 and 21 respectively), the working programme in document AC23 Doc. 3.2 was adopted.

During discussion of this item, an intervention was made by the representative of Oceania (Mr Hay).

4. Admission of observers

The AC Chairman introduced document AC23 Doc. 4, which the Committee noted.

No interventions were made.

5. Regional reports

The representative of Africa (Mr Bagine) introduced document AC23 Doc. 5.1, providing additional information on capacity-building activities in the region.

The representative of Asia (Ms Prijono) introduced document AC23 Doc. 5.2.

The representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Calvar Agrelo) introduced document AC23 Doc. 5.3, supplementing it with additional information sent by Honduras after the deadline. Argentina intervened to mention that they had produced a management plan for guanaco (*Lama glama guanicoe*) and asked the Committee to take it into account in the Review of Significant Trade.

The representative of Europe (Mr Ibero Solana) introduced document AC23 Doc. 5.4. The Chairman, who is the other representative of that region, thanked him as well as the alternative representative, Mr Ó Críodáin, for preparing this report as he had been busy with his duties as Chairman.

The representative of North America (Mr Medellín) introduced document AC23 Doc. 5.5.

The representative of Oceania (Mr Hay) introduced document AC23 Doc. 5.6. He welcomed the Solomon Islands as a new Party to CITES and mentioned that the number of Parties in the region had doubled since 2006. Mr Hay dispelled rumours that the 24th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC24) may be held in Oceania. The Solomon Islands expressed their satisfaction at the decisions that had been made with regard to *Tursiops aduncus* (see item 8.5.1 below).

The Committee noted the reports presented by the regional representatives.

During discussion of these items, interventions were made by Argentina, the Solomon Islands and the Chairman.

6. Revision of the Terms of Reference of the Animals and Plants Committees

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC17/AC23 session.

The Secretariat introduced documents PC17 Doc. 6 and AC23 Doc. 6.

The Committees noted the document and agreed that there was no need to revise their Terms of Reference at present.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representative of North America (Mr Medellín) and the PC Chairman.

7. Cooperation with advisory bodies of other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements PC17/AC23 Doc. 7

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC17/AC23 session.

The Secretariat introduced documents PC17 Doc. 7 and AC23 Doc. 7.

Cooperation between CITES and other multilateral environmental agreements was supported in principle, but it was also noted that the mandate of CITES was different from that of other agreements. A brief update on progress in development of the proposed International Mechanism of Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity (IMoSEB) was provided, although it was noted that not all Parties supported the development of such a mechanism. Reference was made to existing cooperation between CITES and the Convention on Biological Diversity through the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation.

The United Kingdom stated that its Scientific Authority for Animals would be happy to provide advice on the development of indicators mentioned in Paragraph 7 of the document.

The document was noted.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the PC representative of North America (Mr Gabel), France, the United Kingdom and the PC Chairman.

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

8.1 Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC17/AC23 session.

The Secretariat introduced documents PC17 Doc. 8.1 and AC23 Doc. 8.1, noting that the terms of reference for the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade as adopted at CoP14 were very broad and did not set out a time-line for the completion of the evaluation. They stated that no specific pledges of funding for the evaluation had been received since the document had been prepared.

The desirability of including experts on compliance and process issues in any advisory group was stressed. It was also emphasized that any review should be based on sound and detailed information. Reference was made to the database on Significant Trade. The Secretariat apologized for the amount of time taken to develop the database and reported that in its current form it was not very user-friendly. It stated that it was working with UNEP-WCMC to improve the interface of the database and hoped that this work would be completed soon.

Following the discussion, a working group (PC17/AC23 WG2) was established. The membership of the group was as follows:

Chairmen AC representative of North America (Mr Medellín) and PC nomenclature specialist (Mr McGough);

Parties: Canada, China, Madagascar, the Netherlands, the United States of America;

IGOs and NGOs: UNEP-WCMC, European Community, IUCN, David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation, Humane Society International, Species Management Specialists, TRAFFIC, WWF.

The group was mandated to suggest a time-line for the evaluation; propose next steps; and identify specific areas that could profitably be focused on. In particular, the group was advised to consider possible terms of reference for the working group referred to in paragraph 4 of Annex 1 of document PC17 Doc. 8.1 (AC23 Doc. 8.1) and any specific advice that could be offered to the Secretariat with respect to the content of the evaluation as set out in paragraph 7 and its subsections.

Later, the Committees adopted the report of PC17/AC23 WG2, presented orally by the PC nomenclature specialist (Mr McGough), as co-chairman of the group, as follows:

Guidelines for process

It was agreed that the fundamental question to answer was the contribution that the Review of Significant Trade makes to improve implementation of Article IV.

It was also agreed that the advisory group should identify elements that could be completed and reported on at CoP15.

The advisory group should report at the next AC and PC and any concrete recommendations would be considered by working groups constituted by those Committee meetings.

Suggested representation of the advisory group

- a) The CITES Secretariat, UNEP-WCMC, IUCN, TRAFFIC;
- b) representative range States for sturgeon, queen conch, grey parrot, *Pericopsis elata*;
- c) the European Community, as representing an important importing block;
- d) Madagascar, as a country having been the subject of a country-based review;
- e) representation of the Animals and Plants Committees;
- f) a regional spread;
- g) countries that have been through the Review process; and
- h) countries that are important exporters but that have not been through the review. Parties suggested for inclusion were Argentina, China, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Madagascar, United Republic of Tanzania.

The group should not be too big.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representatives of North America (Mr Medellín) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the PC representative of North America (Mr Gabel), the United Kingdom, the David Shepherd Foundation, Humane Society International, the AC Chairman and the Secretariat.

8.2 Progress report on the country-based Review of Significant Trade in Madagascar

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC17/AC23 session.

Madagascar introduced documents PC17 Doc. 8.2 and AC23 Doc. 8.2, outlining actions undertaken in the implementation of the CITES action plan for the reform of trade in wild species in Madagascar.

In view of the progress that Madagascar had made in implementing its action plan, and the burden placed on Madagascar in continuing to report on progress at meetings of the scientific committees, it was proposed that the country-based Review of Significant Trade in Madagascar be regarded as completed.

Some concern was expressed that no notice had been given for the completion of the review, and that no formal process for ending the review was in place. It was also questioned whether Madagascar was yet in a position to make non-detriment findings for all Appendix-II species that were exported, although there was also general acknowledgement that Madagascar had made very good progress in implementation of the action plan.

The Committees agreed that the country-based Review of Significant Trade in Madagascar was now completed and that Madagascar was no longer required to submit regular reports under this agenda item. The Committees also agreed that the country-based Review of Significant Trade in Madagascar should be included as a case-study in the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade discussed under agenda item 8.1. They noted that animal and plant species from Madagascar were currently included in the species-based Review of Significant Trade and agreed that further species from Madagascar could be selected in future if they were considered to meet the selection criteria. The Committees also advised Madagascar to submit project proposals for those activities in the action plan that were not currently funded for approval through the procedure set out in Resolution Conf. 12.2.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC representatives of Europe (Mr Ibero Solana), North America (Mr Medellín) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the PC representative of North America (Mr Gabel), Madagascar, Switzerland, Humane Society International, Wildlife Management International, WWF, the AC Chairman, the PC Chairman and the Secretariat.

8.3 Overview of the species-based Review of Significant Trade

The Secretariat introduced document AC23 Doc. 8.3. The Chairman explained that the Committee was invited to note the report and asked whether there were any comments. In response to a query on the database on significant trade, the Chairman explained it was still under development and referred to the discussions that had been held on that subject under item 8.1. Regarding *Agapornis fischeri* from the United Republic of Tanzania, the Secretariat explained that it had published the quota submitted by that country but only with a reminder that the Standing Committee had recommended a suspension of trade therein. The United Republic of Tanzania added that it had not issued any export permit for specimens of that species in 2008. It was mentioned that the same applied to *Dendrobates tinctorius* from Suriname.

The Committee noted document AC23 Doc. 8.3.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by Israel, the United Republic of Tanzania, Humane Society International, Species Survival Network, the AC Chairman and the Secretariat.

8.4 Species selected following CoP13

and

8.5 Selection of species for trade reviews following CoP14

The Secretariat introduced documents AC23 Doc. 8.4 and AC23 Doc. 8.5. The Chairman indicated he would establish a working group to look at both items, including item 8.5.1. UNEP-WCMC, which had produced the list of species in the Annex to document AC23 Doc. 8.5, indicated that they could make printed copies of a preliminary analysis available to the working group. The Secretariat thanked UNEP-WCMC for taking the initiative to conduct this analysis as it was not included in the contract it had with this institution. The Chairman reminded participants that UNEP-WCMC's analysis was for information only, even though previous analyses conducted by UNEP-WCMC had concurred with those of the Committee.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 1) with the following mandate:

Regarding agenda item 8.4: Review the information in the Annex to document AC23 Doc.8.4 and the responses received from range States:

- a) Propose confirmation and if necessary revision of the proposed preliminary categorizations made by the consultant;
- b) Propose recommendations for the remaining species and range States in compliance with paragraphs m) to o) of the Resolution. Such recommendations should differentiate between short-term and long-term actions, and may include, for example:
 - i) The establishment of administrative procedures, cautious export quotas or temporary restrictions on exports of the species concerned;
 - ii) The application of adaptive management procedures to ensure that further decisions about the harvesting and management of the species concerned will be based on the monitoring of the impact of previous harvesting and other factors; or
 - iii) The conducting of taxon- and country-specific status assessments, field studies or evaluation of threats to populations or other relevant factors to provide the basis for a Scientific Authority's non-detriment finding, as required under the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a) or 6 (a);

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

- c) Identify problems that are not related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 or 6(a) and propose referral of these to the Secretariat in accordance with paragraph l) of the Resolution.

Regarding agenda item 8.5: On the basis of recorded trade levels and information available to the working group, propose species of priority concern for review in accordance with paragraph b) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) on Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species, taking into account also the information in document AC23 Doc. 8.5.1.

The membership was agreed as follows:

Chairman: AC Chairman;

Parties: Argentina, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Japan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, Netherlands, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States, Zambia and Zimbabwe; and

IGOs and NGOs: European Community, IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, Alliance of Marine Mammal Parks and Aquariums, Conservation Force, Conservation International, David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation, Defenders of Wildlife, Humane Society International, Humane Society of the United States, International Environmental Resources, Pan African Sanctuary Alliance, Pet Care Trust, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, Safari Club International Foundation, Species Management Specialists, Species Survival Network, TRAFFIC, Wildlife Management International, World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA) and WWF.

Later in the meeting, the chairman of Working Group 1 introduced document AC23 WG1 Doc. 1 (available in English only). He stated that there had been great participation in this working group and thanked the rapporteur. He noted that, in paragraph 1, under *Regarding agenda item 8.5*, "document AC23 Doc. 8.5.1" should read document AC23 Doc. 8.5, and that the words "additional data" had been written twice by mistake under *Mantella crocea*. He stated that all recommendations in the first table had been made in collaboration with Madagascar. He stressed that the Review of Significant Trade was not meant to push countries into establishing zero

export quotas to avoid the review, but to help them ensure sustainable trade. Nevertheless, species for which such a quota was in place had been deleted from the list. Regarding the proposed additional text for *Huso huso* [see point g) below], questions were raised on the type of scientific information that range States were expected to provide. It was suggested that a template be prepared to assist range States in this task and that the draft be sent to the Animals Committee for comments before it is finalized. Additional text was suggested for some *Mantella* species and some amendments to the text on a few other species were suggested. The Committee agreed to amend the recommendations as follows:

- a) Under *Mantella aurantiaca*, replace "to review its quota when new research results on the population assessment become available" with to inform the Secretariat of any quota that may be set and the Secretariat is to keep the Animals Committee informed;
- b) Under *Mantella crocea*, *M. expectata*, *M. milotympanum* and *M. vidris*, add and on the non-detriment finding after "the population estimates";
- c) Under *Saiga tatarica*, add and to report at AC24 at the end of the paragraph;
- d) Under *Heosemys annandalii* and *H. spinosa*, add , excluding the population of Malaysia (which confirmed a zero export quota) after "To be retained"¹;
- e) Under *Manouria emys*, replace "170" with 150;
- f) Under *Chamaeleo africanus*, add To be retained.; and
- g) Under *Huso huso*, add the sentence The Secretariat and the range States should provide a document at AC24 with detailed scientific information on which to base a decision.

The Committee noted the report, as amended, and adopted the following recommendations:

Regarding agenda item 8.4 (Species selected following CoP13)

Species	Recommendation
<i>Testudo graeca</i> , population from Lebanon	Trade in the species is considered to be of least concern. Elimination from Review of Significant Trade.
<i>Mantella aurantiaca</i>	Trade in this species is of least concern. Elimination from Review of Significant Trade. Madagascar is asked to inform the Secretariat of any quota that may be set and the Secretariat is to keep the Animals Committee informed.
<i>Mantella baroni</i>	Trade of this species is considered of least concern. Elimination from Review of Significant Trade. Madagascar is asked to review the quota of this species and agreed to do so.
<i>Mantella bernhardii</i>	Trade in the species is considered to be of least concern. Elimination from Review of Significant Trade. Should a quota be re-established, then the AC may consider the species again.
<i>Mantella betsileo</i>	Trade in this species is considered to be of least concern. Elimination from Review of Significant Trade. Madagascar is asked to analyse the taxonomic split into two species and adapt the export quota accordingly, which it agreed to do.
<i>Mantella cowanii</i>	Trade in the species is considered of least concern.

¹ Note from the Secretariat: at the request of the AC Chairman, the text under *H. grandis* was amended after the meeting to align the wording with this addition.

Species	Recommendation
	Elimination from Review of Significant Trade.
<i>Mantella crocea</i>	Trade in this species is considered of possible concern. Retain in Review of Significant Trade. Madagascar is asked to provide additional data on the population estimates and on the non-detriment finding in order for the AC to reconsider its status at AC24.
<i>Mantella expectata</i>	Trade in this species is considered of possible concern. Retain in Review of Significant Trade. Madagascar is asked to provide additional data on the population estimates and on the non-detriment finding in order for the AC to reconsider its status at AC24.
<i>Mantella haraldmeieri</i>	Trade in the species is considered of least concern. Elimination from Review of Significant Trade.
<i>Mantella laevigata</i>	Trade in the species is considered of least concern. Elimination from Review of Significant Trade.
<i>Mantella madagascariensis</i>	Trade in the species is considered of least concern. Elimination from Review of Significant Trade.
<i>Mantella manery</i>	Trade in the species is considered of least concern. Elimination from Review of Significant Trade.
<i>Mantella milotympanum</i>	Trade in this species is considered of possible concern. Retain in Review of Significant Trade. Madagascar is asked to provide additional data on the population estimates and on the non-detriment finding in order for the AC to reconsider its status at AC24.
<i>Mantella nigricans</i>	Trade in the species is considered of least concern. Elimination from Review of Significant Trade.
<i>Mantella pulchra</i>	Trade in the species is considered of least concern. Elimination from Review of Significant Trade
<i>Mantella viridis</i>	Trade in this species is considered of possible concern. Retain in Review of Significant Trade. Madagascar is asked to provide additional data on the population estimates and on the non-detriment finding in order for the AC to reconsider its status at AC24.

Regarding agenda item 8.5 (Selection of species for trade reviews following CoP14)

Species pre-selected	Recommendation
<i>Lycalopex griseus</i>	Not retained
<i>Lycalopex culpaeus</i>	Not retained
<i>Lycalopex gymnocercus</i>	Not retained
<i>Ursus americanus</i>	Not retained
<i>Lontra canadensis</i>	Not retained
<i>Prionailurus bengalensis</i>	Not retained
<i>Hippopotamus amphibius</i>	To be retained due to declining populations as well as considerable and increasing trade. All range States will be contacted, excluding the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda.
<i>Lama glama guanicoe</i>	Not retained
<i>Saiga tatarica</i>	Not retained, Secretariat is asked to correspond with China in order to clarify

Species pre-selected	Recommendation
	specific questions (permit category, size of stocks, origin of stocks) and to report at AC24.
<i>Gyps africanus</i>	Not retained
<i>Gyps coprotheres</i>	Not retained
<i>Gyps rueppellii</i>	Not retained
<i>Trigonoceps occipitalis</i>	Not retained
<i>Grus canadensis</i>	Not retained
<i>Agapornis canus</i>	Not retained
<i>Callagur bornoensis</i>	Not retained
<i>Heosemys annandalii</i>	To be retained, excluding the population of Malaysia (which confirmed a zero export quota). Large export numbers, considered endangered due to trade.
<i>Heosemys grandis</i>	To be retained, excluding the population of Malaysia (which confirmed a zero export quota). Large export numbers, considered endangered due to trade.
<i>Heosemys spinosa</i>	To be retained, excluding the population of Malaysia (which confirmed a zero export quota). Large export numbers from Indonesia, considered critically endangered.
<i>Leucocephalon yuwonoi</i>	Not retained. The establishment of a zero quota is confirmed by Indonesia.
<i>Notochelys platinota</i>	Not retained
<i>Orlitia borneensis</i>	Not retained. AC asks the Secretariat to contact the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam, and to seek information concerning trade in this species between the two States.
<i>Siebenrockiella crassicollis</i>	Not retained
<i>Indotestudo elongata</i>	Not retained.
<i>Indotestudo forsterii</i>	To be retained. Species considered Endangered. Indonesia has reduced the quota to 270 for 2008. A population survey is being conducted. Indonesia will report at AC24 on the results of this survey.
<i>Manouria emys</i>	Not retained. Indonesia has set a zero quota, Malaysia has set a quota of 150, a zero quota is to be set by 2010.
<i>Testudo horsfieldii</i>	To be retained. Species is heavily traded. Mainly adult specimens are found in trade. With the exclusion of China, all range States will be contacted.
<i>Amyda cartilaginea</i>	To be retained. Only Indonesia will be contacted and requested to demonstrate its non-detriment finding.
Genus <i>Uroplatus</i>	To be retained. Madagascar is requested to present data on the non-detriment finding.
<i>Brookesia decaryi</i>	To be retained.
<i>Chamaeleo africanus</i> , population of Niger	To be retained. There are large discrepancies between quotas set and exports realized.
<i>Chamaeleo feae</i>	To be retained. Export figures have increased. There are doubts concerning the non-detriment finding in Equatorial Guinea.
<i>Cordylus mossambicus</i>	To be retained. Data are requested concerning this endemic species of Mozambique, whose distribution is restricted and whose populations are presumably small, to determine the reasoning for the quota setting.
<i>Varanus dumerilii</i>	Not retained
<i>Gongylophis muelleri</i>	To be retained. Only Ghana will be contacted.
<i>Naja sputatrix</i>	Not retained
<i>Scaphiophryne</i>	To be retained. Madagascar is asked to provide additional data on the

Species pre-selected	Recommendation
<i>gottlebei</i>	population estimates in order for the AC to reconsider its status at AC24.
<i>Huso huso</i>	Not to be retained, to be re-discussed at AC24. The Secretariat and the range States should provide a document at AC24 with detailed scientific information on which to base a decision.
<i>Hippocampus kelloggi</i>	Not retained. Will be included in the workshop on non-detriment findings to be held in 2008. Based on the findings, it may be included in the Review of Significant Trade at AC24.
<i>Hippocampus spinosissimus</i>	Not retained. Will be included in the workshop on non-detriment findings to be held in 2008. Based on the findings, it may be included in the Review of Significant Trade at AC24.
<i>Hippocampus kuda</i>	Not retained. Will be included in the workshop on non-detriment findings to be held in 2008. Based on the findings it may be included in the Review of Significant Trade at AC24.
<i>Pandinus imperator</i>	Not retained. Secretariat is requested to make the report on its missions to the range countries on that subject available to the AC.
Corals	Not retained. Will be included in the workshop on non-detriment findings to be held in 2008. Based on the findings, specific taxa may be included in the Review of Significant Trade at AC24.

Regarding the collection of detailed scientific information on *Huso huso*, the Animals Committee asked the representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) to prepare a draft template for a questionnaire. This draft should be sent to the Secretariat as soon as possible after the present meeting, for circulation to the Committee members. The AC Chairman would set a deadline for them to comment on the draft and the Secretariat would send the final questionnaire to the range States concerned and compile the information received for AC24.

Regarding *Pandinus imperator*, the Secretariat clarified that the missions had been carried out by the French *Muséum national d'histoire naturelle* and not by the Secretariat. The resulting reports were still under discussion between the author and the range States concerned. Once finalized, they would be published on the CITES website.

During discussion of these items, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) and Europe (Mr Ibero Solana), the AC nomenclature specialist (Ms Grimm), Chile, France, Germany, Malaysia, the Russian Federation, the United States, Conservation International, Humane Society International, WWF, the Chairman and the Secretariat.

8.5.1 Selection of the Solomon Islands population of *Tursiops aduncus* for inclusion in the Review of Significant Trade

Israel introduced document AC23 Doc. 8.5.1, stressing that they referred to international trade only, that they were looking at *Tursiops aduncus* specifically and not at any other cetacean species, and finally that this was not a political issue but one of sustainability. They stated that the Solomon Islands had not published non-detriment findings, that available scientific data, although poor, showed a small population of at most a few hundred specimens, and that, consequently, the proposed export of 80 specimens seemed unsustainable.

The lack of sufficient non-detriment findings, the small size of the population of the Solomon Islands and its presumed isolation from others, and the lack of scientific data were acknowledged. Nevertheless, the relevance of including a widespread species in the Review of Significant Trade was questioned by several participants. The limited size of the envisaged export (in view of the species as a whole), the resources it would divert from the review of other species and the precedent it would create all spoke against such a step. Furthermore, the Solomon Islands being a new Party, it was also remarked that there were better ways to support them than by involving them in a

Review of Significant Trade, with the expense and compliance and punitive measures it entailed. It was therefore suggested to try and resolve this issue bilaterally with the Solomon Islands. The representatives of North America and of Oceania suggested that the population of *Tursiops aduncus* of the Solomon Islands become a case study in the forthcoming workshop on non-detriment findings to be held in Mexico later in the year. The Solomon Islands delegation was invited to meet with the representative of North America and the Mexican delegation to discuss this. The meeting on population assessment that IUCN had planned to organize in the region was also mentioned as another forum to discuss this issue, a suggestion which IUCN fully supported. The Solomon Islands were also advised to contact the IUCN Cetacean Specialist Group for assistance in making non-detriment findings.

The Solomon Islands explained that there was a long tradition of fishing dolphins in its territory and that they were trying to move away from killing the animals, whilst maintaining a source of income for poor rural communities. They criticized the reliability of the information Israel had used, stating that scientific studies had been carried out in 2004 and 2007, and that they would have provided them on request. Further studies were planned for 2010, but the Solomon Islands was a poor country and had problems bearing their cost on its own, especially given the huge expanse of marine habitat it covered. Finally, they stated the Solomon Islands would stop exports if new scientific data showed them to be unsustainable. The traditional harvesting of marine mammals allowed in countries such as Canada or the United States as well as the much greater impact of by-catch on populations of cetaceans were also quoted in objection to Israel's proposal to start a review.

Israel and the Chairman clarified that the Review of Significant Trade was a regular CITES procedure meant to help Parties, and that it should not be perceived as an infringement on sovereignty. Israel stated that the scientific studies that had been quoted were not sufficient to constitute non-detriment findings, and that the Solomon Islands should make all studies publicly available. Nevertheless, in the light of what had been said, Israel agreed to withdraw its request to include the population of *Tursiops aduncus* of the Solomon Islands in the Review of Significant Trade.

The Committee encouraged the Solomon Islands to pursue its research on the status of its population of that species and, if necessary, to submit a proposal to seek funding through the procedure laid out in Resolution Conf. 12.2. It further invited the Solomon Islands to participate in two meetings scheduled in 2008: an IUCN meeting on population assessment to be held in the Oceanian region, and a meeting on non-detriment findings (NDF) organized by Mexico. The Committee encouraged the organizers of the NDF meeting to invite the Solomon Islands to participate and to make the population of *Tursiops aduncus* of the Solomon Islands a case study. The Committee also asked the representative of Oceania to report at AC24 on activities carried out between AC23 and AC24 with regard to the population of *Tursiops aduncus* of the Solomon Islands.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), Europe (Mr Ibero Solana), North America (Mr Medellín) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the alternate representative of Asia (Mr Giam), Israel, the Solomon Islands, Humane Society of the United States, IUCN, IWMC World Conservation Trust, Species Management Specialists, WWF and the Chairman.

9. Review of the use of source code 'R'

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC17/AC23 session.

The Secretariat introduced documents PC17 Doc. 9 (Rev. 2) and AC23 Doc. 9 (Rev. 2) which addressed implementation of Decision 14.152. It drew attention to a correction of the tables in Annex 2 of the documents: all exports from Peru in 1994 had been misclassified in the CITES

database of annual report statistics; these should have been reported under source code 'A' and not 'R' and should therefore not have been included in the table.

In order to further implementation of Decision 14.152, a working group (PC17/AC23 WG3) was established. The membership of the group was as follows:

Chairmen: AC representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Alvarez Lemus and Mr Calvar Agrelo), and the Netherlands;

Parties: Canada, China, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Madagascar, Mexico, Namibia, South Africa, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States, Zambia;

IGOs and NGOs: IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, Conservation Force, Defenders of Wildlife, Humane Society International, IWMC World Conservation Trust, Species Survival Network, Wildlife Management International.

Later, the Committees adopted the report of PC17/AC23 WG3 presented orally by the Netherlands as co-chairman of the group, as follows:

- a) Based on the trade data provided in document AC23 Doc. 9 (Rev. 2) a small drafting group will select relevant Parties and species during AC23 from which the working group will seek information on use of code 'R' through a questionnaire. The small group will also draft questions, and will look into how to proceed with the literature review, assisted by NGOs and IUCN.
- b) The co-chairmen of the working group, in consultation with the working group and the relevant regional representatives of the Committees will send a questionnaire to the selected Parties and request a response within 2 months, that is before 1 July 2008.
- c) The co-chairmen of the working group, in consultation with the working group, will review and analyse the information received and decide how to proceed in order to prepare a document for the next AC and PC.
- d) If feasible, a draft document will be sent to the Parties for consultation in September 2008.
- e) A redrafted document will be submitted by the working group to the Animals Committee and Plants Committee in December 2008.
- f) It may be necessary to revise the proposed time-schedule during the process.
- g) Animals and plants will not be merged, but will follow the same process.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the AC Chairman and the Secretariat.

10. International expert workshop on non-detriment findings

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC17/AC23 session.

Mexico introduced documents PC17 Doc. 10 and AC23 Doc. 10, outlining progress that had been made in the organization of the workshop. They reported that the planned dates of the workshop had been changed from those in the document to 17-22 November 2008. They stated that pledges had been received for one third of the workshop's budget, that the deadline for finalizing the budget was the end of July 2008, and that the Secretariat had been asked to look for funding.

The Committees noted the document.

During discussion of this item, an intervention was made by the PC Chairman.

11. Periodic review of animal species included in the CITES Appendices

11.1 Schedule and responsibilities for species selected for periodic review between CoP13 and CoP15

and

11.3 Periodic review of species selected prior to CoP13

The Secretariat introduced documents AC23 Doc. 11.1 and AC23 Doc. 11.3 (Rev. 2). The Chairman reminded participants that the list of *Species selected for periodic review between CoP13 and CoP15* in the Annex to the former document could be amended. He noted that few Parties had volunteered to conduct reviews and that it was pointless to add to the list if no one was going to carry out the reviews.

Japan announced that it had finished its work for the review of *Andrias japonicus* and was referred to Resolution Conf. 14.8 on *Periodic Review of the Appendices*, paragraph i), with regard to the format for presenting its findings. Mexico stated that more data on *Ambystoma dumerilii* would be available for AC24, but that it could already provide preliminary results. Parties interested in conducting reviews were invited to join the working group to be established, and so was IUCN as it had recently carried out studies on mammals and amphibians that could be useful and save time in research. The Chairman supported an intervention to retain *Crossoptilon harmani* in the list of species under review, even though it was now considered a subspecies.

Spain was commended for its reviews of *Rhea americana* and *Tupinambis merianae*, which had concluded that both species were correctly listed. The fact that this seemed the conclusion of most reviews showed that the selection process could be improved. The idea of consulting range States on the status of pre-selected species was therefore put forward as an effective way to assess the relevance of entering them into the review. This suggestion was supported by several participants.

The Committee then moved on to establish a working group (Working Group 2) with the following mandate:

- a) Regarding agenda item 11.1:
 - i) Propose how the AC should conduct the reviews of species that were selected after CoP13;
 - ii) Propose a schedule for reviewing the biological and trade status of these species; and
 - iii) Propose whether the subspecies, *Crossoptilon crossoptilon harmani* should be retained in the list for the Periodic Review.
 - iv) Consider the present structure and purpose of Resolution Conf. 14.8.
- b) Regarding agenda item 11.3:
 - i) Review the reports submitted by Spain on *Rhea americana* and *Tupinambis merianae* and propose a response to the recommendations about the CITES-listing of these species; and
 - ii) Suggest how to treat the outstanding reviews of species that were selected before CoP13, taking into consideration the process for selection of species for periodic reviews discussed under agenda item 11.1.
 - iii) Reflect on the effectiveness of the Periodic Review process; consider and make suggestions on an evaluation of it.

The membership was agreed as follows:

Chairman: representative of Europe (Mr Ibero Solana);

Parties: Argentina, China, Mexico, United Kingdom and United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: IUCN, Animal Welfare Institute, Association of Western Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Defenders of Wildlife, IWMC World Conservation Trust and Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society.

Later in the meeting, the chairman of Working Group 2, with the help of the WG rapporteur, the observer from IUCN (Mr McGowan), gave an oral report of the conclusions and recommendations of the working group. The representative of Europe stated that he would probably continue chairing the working group intersessionally. He explained that the working group thought its mandate did not conform to Resolution Conf. 14.8 and that it was too early to assess the periodic review. He therefore asked for point b) iii) of the mandate (see above) to be either deleted or clarified. Japan, which had requested that WG2 look at this issue, stated that their intention had simply been to trigger discussion on how to improve a mechanism that had not proven very productive. The Chairman agreed the process was slow and suffered from a lack of volunteers, and stated that this issue was more a matter for the Conference of the Parties to debate. Comments on the ambit and relevance of the periodic review followed, but the Chairman invited participants to provide their suggestions directly to Japan, with a view to propose a revision of Resolution Conf. 14.8, if deemed relevant.

Regarding *Species selected before CoP13 and not yet reviewed*, the Secretariat reminded the Committee that Resolution Conf. 14.8 instructed the scientific committees, and not the range States, to conduct or organize the reviews. It added that it could write directly to the range States, which were few, instead of issuing a Notification to all Parties, as suggested by WG2. It was otherwise pointed out that the private sector might be interested in providing financial support for reviewing species, especially if they were susceptible to be downlisted. The AC Chairman remarked that the Resolution did not preclude this possibility. Nonetheless, it was stressed that the results of reviews should not be anticipated or biased by the origin of funding.

The Committee noted the oral report and adopted the recommendations of WG2, including that it should carry on its work intersessionally, as recorded below. Regarding the effectiveness of the periodic review, it recommended that suggestions on how this could be evaluated be sent directly to Japan.

Species selected for periodic review between CoP13 and CoP15 and for which no Party had volunteered to lead a review

- a) The Secretariat should publish a Notification to Parties as soon as possible and raise awareness of taxa that were still not under review. The Notification should contain a list of these taxa and a schedule. Furthermore, it should contain a call for voluntary financial contributions for contracting experts for the review of taxa for which no voluntary experts could be identified by the AC. Parties should inform the Secretariat if they identified or contracted experts for the review of species.
- b) If funds became available, the Secretariat should consult with the chairmen of the AC and the intersessional WG, and select taxa for review and experts to be contracted, and make according contracts.
- c) The WG should coordinate and monitor the periodic review and submit a report at AC24.
- d) The AC should request the allocation of funds to the periodic review of animal taxa at CoP15. The AC should draft guidelines in time for CoP15, indicating under which circumstances experts may be contracted for reviews of animal taxa.

Crossoptilon crossoptilon harmani

This taxon should be retained in the list for the periodic review.

Present structure and purpose of Resolution Conf. 14.8

As the periodic review of Amphibians and Galliformes species had not yet been completed, it was too early to make comments on the structure and purpose of Resolution Conf. 14.8.

Rhea americana and *Tupinambis merianae*

The proposals made by Spain to retain these species in Appendix II should be adopted.

Species selected before CoP13 and not yet reviewed

The Secretariat should write to the range States concerned and ask for their opinion as to whether these reviews were still required. If a range State replied positively, it would be expected to conduct the review. If the answer was negative, or no reply was received, then the species should be deleted from the list and no review would be conducted.

Effectiveness of the periodic review

Given that the current periodic review had been adopted at CoP14 (June 2007) with Resolution Conf. 14.8, it was felt to be too early to evaluate its effectiveness.

During discussion of these items, interventions were made by the representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Calvar Agrelo), Europe (Mr Ibero Solana), North America (Mr Medellín) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the alternate representative of Asia (Mr Giam), Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Humane Society International, Species Management Specialists, the Chairman and the Secretariat.

11.2 Periodic review of Felidae

The United States introduced document AC23 Doc. 11.2.1 and Mexico introduced document AC23 Doc. 11.2.2. Both Parties were congratulated for their work. Whilst the whole Felidae family was now under review, which represented a huge endeavour, the problem of distinguishing species in the lynx taxon was widely acknowledged as crucial and that the working group to be established should address this issue. In relation to this, Mexico confirmed that they were consulting European experts on *Lynx pardinus*, a critically endangered species native to Europe.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 3) with the following mandate:

Review and discuss the strategy included as Annex 1 to document AC23 Doc. 11.2.1 and propose any recommendations that arise as appropriate.

The membership was agreed as follows:

Co-chairmen: representative of North America (Mr Medellín) and alternate representative of North America (Ms Gnam);

Parties: Botswana, Canada, Czech Republic, Hungary, Namibia, South Africa, Spain, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe; and

IGOs and NGOs: IUCN, Animal Welfare Institute, Association of Southeastern Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Born Free USA and Humane Society of the United States.

Later in the meeting, the co-chairman of Working Group 3 (Mr Medellín) introduced document AC23 WG3 Doc. 1, thanking the members of WG3, in particular Ms Meintjes (South Africa) and Ms Gnam (United States). He explained that *Panthera leo*, *P. pardus* and *P. tigris* had been included in the list of *Species to be eliminated from the periodic review* because they were already mentioned as excluded from the review in document AC23 Doc. 11.2.1. He also clarified that, by classifying some species as "low priority" (paragraph 2), the working group had wanted to give Parties a last chance to volunteer to review them. If no such offer were made, the Committee could review this list at AC24 and make a final decision. He also mentioned that Mexico had volunteered to review *Panthera onca*. The representative of North America agreed with the idea to discuss the issue of updating the Identification Manual sheets under agenda item 17 (*Progress report on the Identification Manual*), but he wished to keep it in the recommendations of WG3.

After deletion of the three species of *Panthera* mentioned above, the recommendations were therefore as follows:

Species to be eliminated from the periodic review

Acinonyx jubatus
Caracal caracal
Catopuma temminckii
Leptailurus serval
Neofelis nebulosa
Pardofelis marmorata
Uncia uncia

Other species listed in document AC23 Doc. 11.2.1, Annex 2

The Secretariat should issue a Notification inviting Parties to conduct reviews on these species, although the following species had a low priority:

Catopuma badia
Felis bieti
Felis chaus
Felis manul
Felis margarita
Felis nigripes
Felis silvestris
Leopardus spp. (*L. braccatus*, *L. colocolo*, *L. geoffroyi*, *L. guigna*, *L. jacobitus*,
L. pajeros, *L. pardalis*, *L. tigrinus* and *L. wiedii*)
Profelis aurata
Puma concolor
Puma yagouaroundi

Prionailurus spp.

A review of this genus, which includes *Prionailurus bengalensis*, *P. iriomotensis*, *P. planiceps*, *P. rubiginosus* and *P. viverrinus*, should be conducted.

CITES Identification Manual

The CITES Identification Manual should be updated for all Felidae species, but especially of the genera *Leopardus*, *Lynx* and *Prionailurus*.

Lynx lynx and *Lynx pardinus*

A meeting should be organized for the management and law enforcement authorities of Canada, Mexico and the United States to meet with range States of the Eurasian lynx (*Lynx lynx*) and Iberian lynx (*Lynx pardinus*) to discuss problems of possible illegal trade in those species. Customs officials of these countries also needed to be present. Case

studies of illegal trade in Eurasian and Iberian lynxes which had been undertaken should be discussed at that meeting.

The Committee noted the report and adopted the recommendations of WG3. Regarding the update to the CITES Identification Manual, the Committee decided that this recommendation should be looked at with agenda item 17.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Europe (Mr Ibero Solana) and North America (Mr Medellín), Mexico, the United Kingdom, the United States, Species Management Specialist, the AC Chairman and the Secretariat.

11.3 Periodic review of species selected prior to CoP13

This item was dealt with together with item 11.1 (see above).

12. Selection of a representative for the Standing Committee Working Group reviewing the implementation and effectiveness of the universal tagging system and the trade in small crocodylian leather goods

The Secretariat introduced document AC23 Doc. 12. The Chairman explained that a very large part of the trade in small crocodylian leather goods was legal and that monitoring it drew on Parties' resources without much benefit to wildlife. He reminded participants that this was an issue dealt with by the Standing Committee and that the AC representative would report on progress at AC24. He suggested that Mr Dietrich Jelden of Germany be selected as the AC representative on the Standing Committee Working Group. The Committee agreed to this selection.

No other interventions were made.

13. Sturgeons and paddlefish

13.1 Secretariat's report

The Secretariat introduced document AC23 Doc. 13.1 (Rev. 1), explaining that there had been no changes to the quotas given in paragraph 6 of that document since it had been written. The Secretariat was thanked for its report and efforts to raise money. The United States was also thanked for its work on sturgeons and paddlefishes and it reiterated its willingness to fund research on Acipenseriformes. A call was made to support range States in implementing a system to monitor all trade. Participants were informed that FAO and the World Bank were organizing a workshop in Rome on the Caspian Sea range States. In response to queries, the Secretariat stated that it had provided information on export quotas to Parties that had requested it. Regarding the Amur River stock, the Secretariat explained it would publish the export quotas once China and the Russian Federation had provided all the information requested in Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14). The Resolution did not set a deadline for publication, but the publication of quotas was a matter between the Secretariat and the range States and not for the Committee to discuss. Finally it explained that, whilst the Conference of the Parties has asked Parties to submit information to populate the caviar database, it had not set a compliance mechanism to ensure that they did. Consequently, all the Secretariat or Animals Committee could do was to appeal to Parties to provide that information.

The Committee noted document AC23 Doc. 13.1 (Rev. 1).

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

13.2 Evaluation of the assessment and monitoring methodologies used for stocks of Acipenseriformes species shared between different range States

The Secretariat introduced document AC23 Doc. 13.2 (Rev. 1). It indicated that it could provide copies of the FAO report mentioned in paragraph 4 of that document to any working

group established by the Animals Committee on this subject, as well as further information received since it had been written. It further stated that it had been in contact with FAO and the World Bank and hoped this would result in synergy. Finally, it announced it would attend an FAO meeting in Rome the following week. On behalf of all other Caspian Sea States, the representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) thanked the Russian Federation for its report, which was contained in Annex 1 to the document. He noted that some modifications to format and data could be decided on in the working group, and that the ratio between age groups and populations was an issue. He also noted the lack of surveys in certain part of the Caspian Sea and the absence of a common methodology for the Amur River stock, on which only China had provided information.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 4) with the following mandate:

- a) Review and discuss the assessment and monitoring methodologies for Acipenseriformes species from stocks shared between different range States.
- b) Propose activities required to monitor progress on the relevant provisions of Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) and to carry out, on a three-year cycle starting in 2008, an evaluation of these methodologies. Define a workplan for this review.
- c) Prepare a report to the Standing Committee with the Animal Committees' recommendations on actions to be taken based upon the above-mentioned monitoring of progress and three-year cycle evaluation.

The membership was agreed as follows:

Chairman: representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi);

Parties: Azerbaijan, Canada, China, France, Germany, Kazakhstan, Saudi Arabia, Russian Federation, United Kingdom and United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: European Community, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), IUCN, Association of Northeast Fish and Wildlife Agencies, IWMC World Conservation Trust, Pew Institute and TRAFFIC.

Later in the meeting, the chairman of Working Group 4 introduced document AC23 WG4 Doc. 1 (available in English only). He thanked the observer from IUCN for rapporteuring. The AC Chairman commended the work of WG4. The Committee agreed to amend the Working Group's recommendations on the Caspian Sea stock as follows:

- a) In the first bullet point, add by all the Caspian range States after "currently employed"; and
- b) In the last bullet point, specify the year of the workshop (2008).

The Committee noted the report, as amended, and adopted the following recommendations:

Caspian Sea

- a) The Animals Committee notes that the working group confirmed that the existing stock assessment methodology as presented in document AC23 Doc. 13.2 is the one currently employed by all the Caspian range States and has been used for several years.
- b) The Animals Committee urges the CITES Secretariat to promote the holding of a workshop to review existing sturgeon stock assessment / Total Allowable Catch (TAC) determination methodology and elaborate a scientific methodology that is internationally acceptable, using the FAO review on the Caspian Sea stock assessment methodology.

- c) The participants should be stock assessment experts from range States, intergovernmental organizations [e.g. FAO and the Sturgeon Specialist Group of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)] and other appropriately qualified experts.
- d) The workshop is to take place as soon as possible in 2008 and the results and recommendations should be presented at the next Animals Committee meeting in 2009.
- e) The Animals Committee requests the Secretariat to communicate its recommendations to FAO in order to encourage allocation of funding from the current FAO Technical Cooperation Program (TCP) for Caspian fisheries management to support the above-mentioned workshop. This request could be made at the upcoming joint FAO / World Bank Caspian Fisheries Technical Workshop in Rome, 28-30 April 2008.

Amur / Heilongjiang River

- a) The Animals Committee notes that the documentation made available at its 23rd meeting was incomplete and/or was not up-to-date. The CITES Secretariat should ask the range States to provide to the Animals Committee the updated methodologies used in this basin if they have not done so.
- b) The range States should establish a joint uniform methodology on sturgeon stock assessment. The Animals Committee encourages these range States to discuss this at their next joint meeting in 2008 and to report on progress at AC24.
- c) This agreed methodology should be reviewed in a manner similar to that performed for the Caspian Sea assessment (by FAO if possible) as soon as it is established.
- d) The Animals Committee urges the CITES Secretariat to promote the holding of a workshop to review existing sturgeon stock assessment / Total Allowable Catch (TAC) determination methodology and elaborate a scientific methodology that is internationally acceptable, using the FAO review on the Amur River stock assessment methodology.
- e) The participants should be stock assessment experts from range States, intergovernmental organizations (e.g. FAO and IUCN Sturgeon Specialist Group) and other appropriately qualified experts.
- f) The workshop is to take place as soon as possible and the results and recommendations should be presented at the subsequent Animals Committee meeting.

Black Sea, Danube River and Azov Sea

- a) The Animals Committee notes that the documentation made available at its 23rd meeting did not contain an adequate explanation of the methodologies currently employed in the basins. The CITES Secretariat should ask the range States to provide to the Animals Committee the updated methodologies used in each basin.
- b) The range States should establish a joint uniform methodology for each basin on sturgeon stock assessment.
- c) These agreed methodologies should be reviewed in a manner similar to those performed for the Caspian Sea and Amur River assessments (by FAO if possible) as soon as possible.
- d) The Animals Committee urges the CITES Secretariat to promote the holding of a workshop to review existing sturgeon stock assessment / Total Allowable Catch

(TAC) determination methodology and elaborate a scientific methodology that is internationally acceptable, using the FAO reviews on Caspian Sea and Amur River stock assessment methodology.

- e) The participants should be stock assessment experts from range States, intergovernmental organizations (e.g. FAO and IUCN Sturgeon Specialist Group) and other appropriately qualified experts.
- f) The workshop is to take place as soon as possible and the results and recommendations should be presented at the subsequent Animals Committee meeting.

Funding

Where external funding is needed, the Animals Committee requests the Secretariat to pursue as a priority funding for these recommendations as per Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) and Decision 14.125.

Report to the Standing Committee

The Chairman of the Animals Committee shall report to the Standing Committee on the progress of the work that has been achieved.

With regard to the last recommendation, the AC Chairman indicated that he would use document AC23 WG4 Doc. 1 to report to the Standing Committee at its 57th meeting.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representative of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), China, the Russian Federation and the Chairman.

14. Nomenclatural matters

The AC nomenclature specialist introduced document AC23 Doc. 14, suggesting the establishment of a working group.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 5) with the following mandate:

- a) Discuss the following matters:
 - i) *Checklist of CITES species*: update (UNEP-WCMC);
 - ii) Papilionidae;
 - iii) Corals;
 - iv) Species described after the adoption of the current taxonomic references;
 - v) Specific taxon issues: *Hirudo medicinalis*;
 - vi) Illegal copies of checklists available on CITES website; and
 - vii) Any other business related to nomenclature.
- b) Propose conclusions for the Committee as appropriate.

The membership was agreed as follows:

Chairman: AC nomenclature specialist (Ms Grimm);

Parties: Canada, Mexico and United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: UNEP-WCMC, Conservation International and Humane Society International.

Later in the meeting, the chairman of Working Group 5 introduced document AC23 WG5 Doc. 1 (available in English only). Canada indicated that the third bullet point under paragraph 2 should read as follows:

~~Canada recognized that the new mammal reference identifies a high number of valid subspecies of Puma concolor. Since 1975 Puma concolor coryi, Puma concolor cougar and Puma concolor costaricensis are listed on Appendix I of CITES, all other Puma concolor specimens subspecies are covered by Appendix II. According to the new mammal reference not only the Appendix-I Puma concolor coryi but also quite a number of Appendix-II specimens subspecies are now regarded as part of Puma concolor cougar listed in Appendix I. However, the adoption of a new nomenclature cannot change the intent or effect of the original listing.~~

The Committee noted the report, as amended, and adopted the following recommendations:

- a) The Secretariat should issue a Notification to the Parties to inform them that:
 - i) The three bird species *Glaucidium mooreorum*, *Micrastur mintoni* and *Pionopsitta aurantiocephala* were accidentally omitted and the Animals Committee will propose to recognize them at CoP15. All three species should be included in the *Checklist of CITES species* and UNEP-WCMC database with an annotation or footnote that they are included in anticipation of future corrections;
 - ii) Domesticated forms of dogs and dingoes are not regarded to be covered by the CITES listing of *Canis lupus* and the Animals Committee will submit an amendment proposal to that effect at CoP15; and
 - iii) With regard to the subspecies of *Puma concolor*, the Appendices, the *Checklist of CITES species* and the UNEP-WCMC database are left as they are and that the Animals Committee will submit an amendment proposal to that effect at CoP15. This proposal will suggest adding *Puma concolor* to those species that are still treated according to the former mammal reference of 1993.
- b) Because Papilionidae and corals have no standard references and no funds are available to outsource the development of standard reference for these groups, the Animals Committee requests all Parties, NGOs and IGOs to provide to its nomenclature specialist (grimmu@bfn.de) names of specialists in Papilionidae and corals or addresses of known respective international databases in order to assist her in continuing the work towards a future standard reference for Papilionidae and coral species.
- c) The Animals Committee requests all Parties, IGOs and NGOs to send to its nomenclature specialist information on newly described species published after the publication of adopted standard references.
- d) The Animals Committee requests all Parties, IGOs and NGOs either to volunteer to research the issue of whether several European *Hirudo* species are covered by the current listing of *Hirudo medicinalis*, or to provide information on specialists in this field to its nomenclature specialist.
- e) Because of the illegal sale of copies of checklists for turtles and tortoises on the CITES website, the following footnote has since been inserted in the PDF file: "Copyright © 2006 by [AUTHORS], All rights reserved, Reproduction for commercial purposes prohibited". The Animals Committee recommends that future checklists include a similar footnote and that they be published when possible.
- f) The Animals Committee recognizes the specificity of each Multilateral Environmental Agreement. The AC Chairman and/or the Secretariat should raise the issue of working

towards better harmonization of the taxonomy and nomenclature of species covered by the respective conventions at the next meeting of the CSAB² and report at AC24.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Europe (Mr Ibero Solana) and Oceania (Mr Hay), the nomenclature specialist (Ms Grimm), Canada, Humane Society International and the Chairman.

15. Conservation and management of sharks

The Secretariat introduced documents AC23 Doc. 15.1, AC23 Doc. 15.2 and AC23 Doc. 15.3, and the Chairman announced a working group would be established to look at the issues they raised.

Regarding document AC23 Doc. 15.1 (*Reports from Parties on commodity codes, opportunities to improve monitoring, verification and reporting of catch, bycatch and discards, market and international trade data*), Mexico indicated it had sent its response after the deadline set in Notification to the Parties No. 2007/033. It therefore informed the Committee that it did not harvest any of the three CITES-listed sharks, except for scientific purposes. Mexico had also put in place a system that allowed it to monitor fishing at the species level and to gather a lot of data. Zambia explained that its records of imports and exports indicated the type of trade and that a draft document was to be gazetted to implement the FAO IPOA-SHARKS. The review of all governmental processes that had led to the new draft policy had started in 1994, but the process had been very long. Zambia asked whether funds from FAO would still be available to implement the IPOA and, if so, what the requesting procedure was. Finally, it explained that it reported all data on bycatch to FAO and other relevant agencies, such as ICCAT.

Regarding document AC23 Doc. 15.2 (*Identification of shark species of concern that require consideration for inclusion in the Appendices if their management and conservation status does not improve*), the United States drew the participants' attention to the information document it had submitted on *Recommendations on the refinement of the list of shark species of concern (document AC23 Doc. 15.2): an example using the requiem shark group* (document AC23 Inf. 6). The representative of Oceania (Mr Hay) summarized that there were three issues: reports on commodity codes, the need to refine the list of species of concern for the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP15), and the need to analyse Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) fishing. Regarding the first point, he indicated the working group should reflect on the way forward and focus on critical issues. Regarding the second point, document AC23 Inf. 6 could be considered in addition to previous work done by the Committee. Finally, regarding the last point, he indicated that Australia would submit a report for AC24.

Regarding document AC23 Doc. 15.3 (*Linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat and Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing*), the Chairman suggested asking the Standing Committee clearing house whether the Animals Committee should be involved in this, given that it seemed more of a technical or implementation issue. The representative of Oceania supported this idea and, at the very least, recommended deferring this matter until AC24, as Australia had commissioned a report from TRAFFIC that would assist in making a decision.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 6) with the following mandate:

- a) Examine reports provided in accordance with Decisions 14.106 and 14.115 and propose follow-up actions by the Committee as appropriate. Define the critical issues.
- b) Examine information in document AC23 Doc. 15.2 and other available relevant documents, with a view to identifying key species and examining these for consideration and possible listing under CITES.

² Meeting of the chairmen of the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions.

- c) If necessary, propose species-specific recommendations on improving the conservation status of sharks and the regulation of international trade in these species which the Committee could propose at a future Conference of the Parties.
- d) Discuss the progress made in the implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.6 and Decision 14.107, and decide on future activities, work plans and timelines.
- e) Regarding agenda item 15.3 assess whether this issue is a matter for the Animals Committee to deal with in the future.

The membership was agreed as follows:

Chairman: representative of Oceania (Mr Hay);

AC members and Parties: Alternate representative of Asia (Mr Giam), Canada, China, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Solomon Islands, Spain, South Africa and United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: European Community, FAO, IUCN, Greenpeace, Ornamental Fish International, Species Management Specialists, Swan International, TRAFFIC and WWF.

Later in the meeting, the chairman of Working Group 6 introduced document AC23 WG6 Doc. 1 (available in English only). He stated that the rapporteurs had been Ms Claudine Gibson and Ms Sarah Fowler of the IUCN SSC Shark Specialist Group. TRAFFIC clarified that the terms "IUU sharks" in the first bullet point under "IUU Fishing (Decision 14.117)" and "IUU fishing" in the first recommendation should both read "IUU fishing for sharks". The Secretariat apologized for having overlooked the report from Cuba when compiling document AC23 Doc. 15.1³.

The Committee noted the report, as amended, and adopted the following recommendations:

- a) Australia is encouraged to take into account available sources, including the outcomes of the forthcoming shark fisheries workshop of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the non-detriment findings workshop, when preparing its paper on IUU fishing for sharks, and to present this report at AC24 for further discussion;
- b) The Secretariat is requested to monitor discussions within the World Customs Organization regarding the development of a Customs data model, and the inclusion therein of a data field to report trade at a species level, and to notify Parties regarding the existence of these discussions and significant developments therein;
- c) The Standing Committee is encouraged to identify and assess options for developing a more universal tracking system, including but not limited to the approach highlighted in document AC23 Inf. 2;
- d) Parties are encouraged to develop and utilize Customs codes for shark fin products that distinguish between dried, wet, processed and unprocessed fins;
- e) The United States is requested to head the work of an intersessional group on the implementation of Decision 14.107 and to prepare a paper for discussion at AC24. This will include progress on previous recommendations and prioritize future actions for species of concern;
- f) Range States of sawfishes (Pristidae) that have not already done are urged so to adopt appropriate national conservation and management measures to protect species, mitigate bycatch, and identify and protect critical habitat;

³ Note from the Secretariat: this report is included in document AC23 Doc. 15.1 Addendum.

- g) Parties' CITES Authorities and fishery departments are asked to consider the Secretariat's request for financial support for the proposed workshop on South American stingrays; and
- h) Parties' CITES Authorities and fishery departments are asked to consider the Secretariat's request for financial support for the proposed capacity-building workshop on the conservation and management of sharks.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representative of Oceania (Mr Hay), the AC nomenclature specialist (Ms Grimm), Mexico, the United States, Zambia, TRAFFIC, the Chairman and the Secretariat.

16. Transport of live animals

This agenda item was first discussed during the joint PC17/AC23 session.

The Secretariat introduced documents PC17 Doc. 15 (*Transport of live plants*) and AC23 Doc. 16.

In order to coordinate work in the Committees on transport of live animals and plants, a working group (PC17/AC23 WG4) was established. The membership of the group was as follows;

Chairman (at outset): AC Chairman (Mr Althaus);

Parties: Austria, Germany, Mexico, United States;

IGOs and NGOs: European Association of Zoo and Wildlife Veterinarians, Humane Society of the United States, International Air Transport Association, Pan African Sanctuary Alliance, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society.

Later, the report of working group PC17/AC23 WG4 was presented orally by the Chairman of the Animals Committee and Austria. Its recommendations were adopted as follows:

- a) The working group participants unanimously elected Andreas Kaufmann from Austria as the new Chairman of the Working Group to direct the work through to CoP15.
- b) The working group participants agreed that the Annex to document AC23 Doc. 6 section 4 on "action required" regarding Resolution Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP14): *Transport of Live Specimens*, should be in **bold** indicating joint AC/PC activities.
- c) The working group participants agreed that, should any members participate in IATA, OIE, or other relevant meetings, they could note that they are on the CITES Transport Working Group, but not claim to speak on behalf of the group, and that they should report back to the Working Group as to the deliberations of the meeting or relevant decisions taken.

The PC Chairman noted that the observer from Austria (Mr Kiehn) would represent the Plants Committee on this issue.

This information was relayed to the participants in AC23 the following week and the Secretariat re-introduced document AC23 Doc. 16. It advised the Animals Committee that, since the writing of that document, it had attended the 20th meeting of IATA's Live Animals and Perishables Board (LAPB). The LAPB had shown great interest in CITES and it was hoped that close collaboration could ensue. Thanks to IATA's financial support, the Secretariat had also been able to participate in a Cargo Symposium meeting held in Rome the previous month.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 7) with the following mandate:

Decide on the actions needed to implement the instructions in paragraphs 2 and 3 of document AC23 Doc. 16; and set a schedule for this work.

The membership was agreed as follows:

Chairman: Austria (Mr Kaufmann);

Parties: Austria (Mr Kiehn, as a representative of the Plants Committee, not present during AC23), Germany, Madagascar and United States; and

IGOs and NGOs: International Air Transport Association, Birds International Inc., Born Free USA, Fundación Cethus, International Environmental Resources, Pan African Sanctuary Alliance, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and WAZA.

Later in the meeting, the chairman of Working Group 7 introduced document AC23 WG7 Doc. 1 (available in English only). In reply to a query, he explained he was not aware of any definition of "high mortality". In relation to paragraph 2, the Secretariat clarified that the Conference of the Parties had allocated no funds for this activity. It was also uncomfortable with the recommendations in paragraph 4. a) and with requests for funds coming from the Animals Committee or a working group. It suggested that paragraph 4) be deleted and that, instead, the Animals Committee propose to the Conference of the Parties to strengthen the text of Resolution Conf. 10.21 (*Transport of live animals*).

After a short side meeting with the working group during a break, the Committee agreed to amend the report as follows:

- a) In Recommendation 4 a), replace "(available October 2008)" with by the end of October 2008, and "the TWG Chairman" with the CITES Secretariat;
- b) In Recommendation 5, delete "regularly occurring"; and
- c) In Annex 1, add "Age of individuals" under "Specimens in shipment".

The Committee noted the report, as amended, and adopted the following recommendations:

- a) The Chairman of the Transport Working Group (TWG), who will participate in meetings of the Live Animal and Perishables Board of IATA on behalf of Austria, is mandated to monitor such meetings on behalf of the Animals Committee, as directed in Resolution Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP14) paragraph a), and to report on developments to the TWG at AC24;
- b) The CITES Secretariat is asked to provide funding to support the Chairman of the TWG to monitor, on behalf of the Animals Committee, as directed in Decision 14.59 paragraph 3. a), regular meetings of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission, and the TWG should assess the utility of such participation to its work;
- c) The Chairman and other members of the TWG should participate in ongoing reviews of the OIE Guidelines for the Transport of Animals by Sea and the OIE Guidelines for the Transport of Animals by Land;
- d) The CITES Secretariat should issue a Notification to the Parties:
 - i) Requesting that Parties interested in receiving a current IATA Live Animal Regulation Manual and CD-ROM by the end of October 2008 indicate their interest to the CITES Secretariat to facilitate the TWG's assessment of the level of interest and funds that would be required to meet the demand. The TWG will consider possible sources of funds to facilitate Parties' access to these materials; and
 - ii) Providing contact information of IATA's Manager for Special Cargoes of Live Animals and Perishables (Eric Raemdonck) to Parties to facilitate inquiries concerning opportunities and options for training on compliance with IATA Live Animal Regulations;
- e) The CITES Secretariat should issue a Notification to the Parties requesting them to send to the TWG Chairman information concerning cases of high mortality of live specimens,

including available information corresponding to the items listed in the *Reporting form for shipment mortality*. The TWG will consider such information, seek to identify likely causes of mortality, and, where possible, for purposes of assisting Parties, make recommendations to address the identified problem; and

- f) The TWG should work intersessionally on a scoping exercise to determine the need for and feasibility of creating CITES guidelines on transport of live animals by land and/or sea as a supplement to the IATA Live Animal Regulations, taking into account OIE Guidelines and any other existing guidance documents and calling upon experts from WAZA and other organizations to contribute. Depending on the outcome of the scoping exercise, the TWG should proceed with development of such guidelines or prepare a request for funding for this work by an external consultant for consideration by the Animals Committee.

REPORTING FORM FOR SHIPMENT MORTALITY

GENERAL INFORMATION

Date of shipment
Country of export
Transit country
Country of import
Exporter
Importer
Transport company(/ies)
Routing details including mode(s) of transport and flight numbers
Other information regarding transport details of carrier (for land/sea transport: model of vehicle, licence number, etc.)
Name, qualification and affiliation of any accompanying individuals

DOCUMENTS

CITES permit information
Export / Import licence information
Transit permits
Health certifications
Air waybill/bill of lading information
Other special instructions (food, water, medication)

SPECIMENS IN SHIPMENT

Species (scientific and common name)
Identification (microchip, leg band, etc.)
Number of individuals (by species)
Age of individuals
Number dead on arrival (by species)
Veterinary care record before or during shipment, including records of sedatives or other medicines
Post-mortem report (including necropsy if performed) for deceased specimens

CONTAINER

IATA container requirement numbers
Full description of container (including picture, ventilation, dimensions, construction materials, bedding, food and water, etc.)
General description of incident, suspected problems, etc.:

Date:

Contact information of Management Authority submitting the report:

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi) and Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Álvarez Lemus), Austria, Germany, the AC and PC Chairmen, and the Secretariat.

17. Progress report on the Identification Manual

The Secretariat introduced document AC23 Doc. 17, which was simply for information. It explained that a presentation had been planned for the following day but that the early closure of the meeting would not make it possible.

The Committee noted document AC23 Doc. 17.

No interventions were made.

18. Proposal to transfer the Mexican population of *Crocodylus moreletii* from Appendix I to Appendix II

The Chairman reminded the Committee that it was only expected to provide comments on amendment proposals from Parties from a scientific point of view. The Committee was not to make a recommendation. The Chairman also stated there would be not working group on this agenda item.

Mexico introduced document AC23 Doc. 18, for which it was generally commended. It was noted that the proposal draft was very exhaustive and might perhaps provide too detailed information. Nevertheless, it would benefit from including the opinion of the IUCN Crocodile Specialist Group (CSG). It was also noted that no follow-up to the monitoring of the population had been developed. Even though the proposal covered Mexico's population only, consulting other range States was stressed as an important step to gather support. It was argued that, from a biological point of view, Section 5 on *Threats* was not the most appropriate section to mention cannibalism and hybridization. Mexico was also asked to explain how they intended to transfer their population to Appendix II when they claimed that they did not harvest wild specimens, and how they hoped to distinguish wild specimens from captive-bred ones. Regarding *Parts and derivatives in trade* (Section 6.3), it was asked whether these specimens were from captive-breeding operations and considered as non-commercial. In Figure 7 on *International trade on 13 spp. of Crocodylus 1996-2006* (Section 6.5 on *Actual or potential trade impacts*), the use of "current trade" to predict what the trend would be if it were transferred to Appendix II was questioned, given that it was now in Appendix I. In answer to a query on the apparent contradiction between IUCN's estimate of "10,000 mature individuals in the wild" and Mexico's estimate of "100,000 individuals and nearly 20,000 adults in the wild", IUCN explained that its CSG was collaborating with Mexico, and that its estimate dated back to 2000. Since then, the population may have doubled and no longer meet the criteria for inclusion in Appendix I. Given that Mexico was home to 85 % of the world's population, it was suggested that Mexico propose transferring the whole species, rather than just its own population, to Appendix II.

Mexico thanked everyone for their input. It explained that it was working on a monitoring programme and had established contacts with Belize and Guatemala regarding the species on the basis of the 'Tri-national Belize-Guatemala-Mexico Strategy for Conservation and Sustainable Use of *Crocodylus moreletii*'. Guatemala had expressed interest in applying the same methodology as Mexico to study its crocodylian populations. Cannibalism and hybridization had been included as threats because Mexico had decided to take a very cautious approach and to include all possible impacts in its study. Regarding trade, all specimens came from registered captive-breeding operations and were tagged. No wild specimens were in trade and there was no plan to harvest them. Should the issue arise, non-detrimental findings would be made. Mexico also said it would speak with IUCN about the diverging estimates. It said it would consider the suggestions made, including extending the proposal to cover all populations of the species, for possible amendment of the draft proposal.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia (Mr Pourkazemi), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Álvarez) and Europe (Mr Ibero Solana), Israel, Mexico, Humane Society International, IUCN, IWMC World Conservation Trust and the AC Chairman.

19. Time and venue of the 24th meeting of the Animals Committee

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item.

Owing to the date of the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (January 2010), The Secretariat explained that AC24 would have to be held in April 2009. No Parties offered to host it and, unless they did by 15 June 2008 at the latest, the following meeting would be held in Geneva. It was remarked that several Parties might be interested but would require financial support.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the Netherlands, the AC Chairman and the Secretariat.

20. Any other business

The following items were discussed during the joint PC17/AC23 session.

Japan reported that they intended to submit a document on revision and publication of the CITES Appendices at the 57th meeting of the Standing Committee. They intended this document to discuss the information that should be included in proposals presented at the CoP to amend standard references for nomenclature, in particular changes to taxa included in the Appendices, and review obstacles to acceleration of the publication of the revised Appendices. They sought input from members of the Committees and others before submitting the document.

The Committee noted Japan's request for input, and suggested that the nomenclature specialist on the Animals Committee (Ms Grimm) contact Japan directly.

Mexico noted that there had been no formal decision by the CoP regarding back-to-back meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees and that Parties had to incur greater costs when meetings were held at different times and in different locations. They outlined the advantages they believed Parties drew from such meetings.

It was noted that, this time, back-to-back meetings were not currently planned because they were more expensive to organize than separate meetings, and because there had been no offer to host them jointly.

The Committees noted Mexico's comments and agreed to review the situation regarding back-to-back meetings in the future.

The following week, and in response to a query on the compilation of regional directories of zoologists, the AC Chairman explained that the heavy maintenance they required had prevented their production.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, the AC and PC Chairmen, and the Secretariat.

21. Closing remarks

The Chairman commended the spirit of collaboration and the excellent progress that had marked the meeting, and thanked the Committee members, the Parties, the IGOs and the NGOs for their input and efficiency. He also thanked warmly the Secretariat, and in particular Mr Mariano Gimenez Dixon, Senior Scientific Officer, who was due to leave the Secretariat shortly after the meeting, and the interpreters who had never hesitated to work overtime. The Netherlands thanked the AC Chairman for his guidance and expertise. The meeting was closed on 23 April at 6:37 p.m.