



**SUMMARY OF ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED AT  
THE TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING OF  
THE CITES ANIMALS COMMITTEE  
GENEVA, SWITZERLAND • 20-24 APRIL 2009**

AC = Animals Committee • PC = Plants Committee • SC = Standing Committee • RC = Resolution Conf. • CoP = Conference of the Parties

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Opening Remarks by the Chairman  <b>No Document</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>
2. Rules of Procedure  <b>AC24 Doc. 2</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contains the Rules of Procedure adopted at AC23 in Geneva, April 2008</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>
3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme			
3.1	Agenda  <b>AC24 Doc. 3.1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provisional agenda for the meeting is presented for consideration and adoption</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>
3.2	Working Programme  <b>AC24 Doc. 3.2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provisional working programme for the meeting is presented for consideration and adoption</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>
4. Admission of observers  <b>No document</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>
5. Regional reports  <b>AC24 Doc. 5.1-5.6</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports from each region are available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>
6. Cooperation with other multilateral environmental agreements  <b>AC24 Doc. 6</b>		<p>Reports on the activities of the Secretariat and the Chairs of the AC and PC in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><u>Meeting of the Chairs of the Scientific Advisory Bodies of Biodiversity-related Conventions (CSAB):</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second CSAB meeting held in May 2008; PC Chair and a representative of the Secretariat shared information about CITES work</li> <li>CSAB supported CITES suggestion of moving towards harmonization of nomenclature and taxonomy in lists of species used by the Conventions</li> </ul> </li> <li><b><u>2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP):</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The “2010 biodiversity target”, adopted at the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><u>Meeting of the Chairs of the Scientific Advisory Bodies of Biodiversity-related Conventions:</u></b> SSN generally <u>supports</u> harmonizing nomenclature of species among the conventions, and <u>encourages</u> Parties to request that the Secretariat and the AC Chair report on progress made on the discussion of guidelines for doing so. SSN <u>encourages</u> the Secretariat and the AC and PC to promote CITES within other conventions, particularly the CBD. SSN considers that the advice in RC 13.2 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2, should be made known to the advisory bodies of other conventions, and <u>believes</u> that other conventions could utilize relevant provisions of CITES, including recognition that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>wild fauna and flora are an irreplaceable part of the natural systems of the earth (CITES Preamble);</li> <li>species should be maintained throughout their range at a level</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the World Summit on Sustainable Development and included in Millennium Development Goal 7, is "to achieve by 2010 a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at global, regional and national level as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on Earth".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BIP is an initiative to develop and promote indicators for the consistent monitoring and assessment of biodiversity</li> <li>▪ Second technical meeting held in June 2008</li> <li>▪ CITES is a partner for two indicators of 'sustainable use': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--'status of species in trade': <i>"monitors changes in the species threatened by international trade, as listed in the Appendices of CITES"</i> and proposes that <i>"trade data can be used to identify trends in a variety of aspects of sustainable use, including production rates of sustainable and non-sustainable commodities or species, the source and quantity of specimens from specific areas, and trends in harvest rates of species. For example, changes in the CITES Appendices can denote a change in the perceived or actual threat posed by international trade, acting as an indirect proxy for changes in threats to the survival of the species in question"</i></li> <li>--'wild commodities index': <i>"track how the status of wild populations of a selection of highly used species has changed over the last two decades. The index will include 100 to 200 common and endangered animals and plants, all of whom are highly used and of economic and social importance, from different regions and of a range of uses, including, food for human consumption, construction and medicinal plants and animals"</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Invites comment from the AC on <i>"development of indicators for the sustainable use of species in trade"</i></li> <li>▪ final indicators to be published in May 2010</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES):</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ IPBES held consultations 2005-2007 on need for an objective source of information about biodiversity</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>consistent with their role in the ecosystems in which they occur (Article IV);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ any living specimen should be prepared and shipped so as to minimize the risk of injury, damage to health or cruel treatment (Article III, IV, V);</li> <li>▪ the Precautionary Approach should be applied in cases of uncertainty (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14)); and</li> <li>▪ decision-making regarding levels of non-detrimental trade must be scientifically based (RC 14.7).</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership:</u></b> SSN is <u>concerned</u> by the description of CITES under the <i>"status of species in trade"</i> indicator. The CITES Appendices do not reflect whether permitted trade in a listed species is sustainable, nor can trade data alone indicate sustainability. SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC take a formal role in the development and in the final review of these indicators before their adoption in May 2010.</li> <li>• <b><u>Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services:</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SSN welcomes this report.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>change and its impacts on ecosystem services and human wellbeing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An intergovernmental meeting, held in November 2008, considered establishing an international interface between science and policy but did not adopt recommendations (see Doc. 6, Annex)</li> <li>▪ The outcome of the meeting will be presented to the 25th session of the UNEP Governing Council – a request for a second intergovernmental multi-stakeholder meeting will follow</li> </ul>	
<b>7. Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species</b>			
7.1	<p>Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 7.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terms of Reference for an evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade (the Review) were adopted at CoP13</li> <li>• The Secretariat proposes the members of the advisory group and invites the AC to identify and prioritize the case studies for the review, and endorse the <i>modus operandi</i> for the review proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>notes</u> that the great majority of members of the advisory group are major exporting countries. SSN encourages the AC to include an equal number of countries that are not major exporters in the advisory group so that it can provide a balanced view of the Review of Significant Trade.</li> <li>• If there is a limited number of Parties that can be included in the advisory group, we note that while AC23 recommended the group include “<i>representative range States for sturgeon, queen conch, grey parrot, Pericopsis elata,</i>” two range States have been selected for both sturgeon and the grey parrot. Other Parties could be substituted for these additional range States.</li> <li>• SSN <u>recommends</u> that the AC select species that have been inserted more than once into the Review such as the hippopotamus, grey parrot, and queen conch. Case studies of such species will best illustrate problems associated with the Review.</li> </ul>
7.2	<p>Overview of the species-based Review of Significant Trade</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 7.2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides information on recent decisions of the SC in the context of the Review and gives brief updates on ongoing Reviews</li> <li>• SC57 requested AC to re-evaluate its recommendations concerning Malagasy chameleons (<i>Calumma</i> and <i>Furcifer</i> spp.) and day geckos (<i>Phelsuma</i> spp.) on a species by species basis</li> <li>• Provides a study commissioned by the Secretariat that provides information on these species and gives an assessment of whether these species should be traded</li> <li>• Invites the AC to note this document and re-evaluate recommendations regarding Malagasy chameleons</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Regarding <i>Psittacus erithacus</i> (grey parrot):</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Africa Republic (CAR) was categorized as Least Concern in 2006 based on exports that totaled 228 specimens from 1994-2003. Since its exclusion from the Review, CAR’s exports have increased considerably to 850 in 2006 and 2,730 in 2007. These exports were traded as source code ‘C’ but there are no known breeding facilities in the country. .SSN <u>notes</u> that exports of this species have shifted among countries in the past in order to avoid trade bans. In addition, Cameroon, though subject to a zero quota, exported 600 wild specimens in 2007. SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to reinsert CAR in the Review, request the SC to suspend trade of this species from Cameroon, and continue to monitor trade.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Regarding the assessment of Malagasy chameleons (<i>Calumma</i> spp. and <i>Furcifer</i> spp.) and day geckos (<i>Phelsuma</i> spp.):</u></b></p>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	and day geckos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN is <u>concerned</u> that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report states that the trade ban on these species is an “<i>anomalous situation</i>” since “<i>successful conclusion</i>” of the country-based Review. However, though the review of Madagascar was concluded at AC23, the summary record of the meeting states that, “<i>it was also questioned whether Madagascar was yet in a position to make non-detriment findings for all Appendix-II species that were exported</i>”;</li> <li>• For many species, the reported status of populations is not based on quantitative assessment;</li> <li>• Ten years ago (during which time, pressures on the species have likely increased), Brady &amp; Griffiths (1999) made observations unfavorable to trade, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-<i>C. globifera</i>: “<i>...found to occur at relatively low densities and if the trade moratorium is lifted non-sustainable collecting may occur at some of the more easily accessible areas within its distribution range...</i>”</li> <li>-<i>C. parsonii</i>: “<i>...likely to be placed under considerable collection pressure due to its international market retail value. This is of particular concern given...reports of decreasing abundance of C. p. parsonii in those areas that have been most heavily collected. Given the relatively long time that C. p. parsonii requires to reach adulthood, any form of commercial exploitation that involves the collection of sexually mature individuals (especially females) could have an adverse effect on wild populations.</i>”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In some cases, though there is little or no information on population status, a wide distribution alone appears to be the basis for establishing an export quota (e.g., <i>Calumma cucullatum</i>, <i>C. gallus</i>, <i>C. vencesi</i>, <i>Furcifer petteri</i>, <i>F. rhinocerotus</i>, <i>F. tuzetae</i>, <i>F. willsii</i>, and <i>Phelsuma standingi</i>).</li> <li>• Recommendations are made to establish export quotas for species with a limited range described as “not uncommon” or “abundant” although little or no population information is available (e.g., <i>P. breviceps</i>, <i>P. klemmeri</i>, <i>P. seippi</i>, and <i>P. serraticauda</i>).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SSN recommends that the export ban be maintained until Madagascar can provide sound population assessments for all species. Before exports resume, Madagascar must implement “<i>a system to verify the identification of specimens before they are exported</i>” (as required by AC 9), as these species are easily confused and are subject to ongoing taxonomic research, with several species recently described.</li> <li>• Given the current political crisis in Madagascar and reported effects on wildlife and its habitat there, SSN <u>recommends</u> that, at the very least, any decision to re-open trade in these species be postponed to the next AC meeting.</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>7.3</p> <p>Species selected following CoP13</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 7.3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AC23 decided to retain four species from the genus <i>Mantella</i> in the Review: <i>M. crocea</i>, <i>M. expectata</i>, <i>M. milotympanum</i>, and <i>M. viridis</i></li> <li>• The AC also adopted specific recommendations for the following species categorized as Least Concern: <i>M. aurantiaca</i>, <i>M. baroni</i>, <i>M. bernhardi</i>, and <i>M. betsileo</i></li> <li>• Annexes 1 and 2 provide information from Madagascar on these species and other <i>Mantella</i> species for which it has established export quotas for 2009</li> <li>• The AC is requested to revise the preliminary categorization of these species and, if appropriate, formulate recommendations, and identify any problems that are not related to the implementation of Article IV</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Regarding species retained in the Review</b>, for which AC23 asked Madagascar to provide additional data on the population estimates and its non-detriment findings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>M. crocea</i></b>: Endangered (IUCN 2008). SSN is <u>concerned</u> that an export quota of 500 has been set for this species. <i>M. crocea</i> is known from a single location, the extent of its forest habitat is declining, and “<i>the number of mature individuals might also be declining through over-exploitation</i>” (IUCN 2008). Madagascar has provided no additional information on the basis of its non-detriment finding (NDF). SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to reclassify this species as Urgent Concern and recommend a zero export quota be adopted. We note that this species qualifies for listing in Appendix I.</li> <li>• <b><i>M. expectata</i></b>, Endangered (IUCN 2008). SSN is <u>concerned</u> that an export quota of 250 has been set for this species. All individuals are from fewer than five locations, there is continuing decline in the extent and quality of its habitat, and “<i>it is possibly subject to over-collecting for the pet trade leading to a decline in the number of mature individuals</i>” (IUCN 2008). Madagascar states that “<i>new data on its distribution and phylogeography are available</i>”, but provides no data, or information on how this affects the making of a NDF. SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to reclassify this species as Urgent Concern and recommend a zero export quota be adopted. We note that this species qualifies for listing in Appendix I.</li> <li>• <b><i>M. milotympanum</i></b>, Critically Endangered (IUCN 2008). SSN commends Madagascar for setting a zero quota for this species.</li> <li>• <b><i>M. viridis</i></b>. Endangered (IUCN 2008). SSN is <u>concerned</u> that an export quota of 250 has been proposed for this species. Its distribution is severely fragmented, and there is continuing decline in the extent and quality of its habitat. Madagascar states that, “<i>long-term ecological studies are in progress</i>” but trade should be halted until it is known to be non-detrimental. For these reasons, SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to reclassify this species as Urgent Concern and recommend a zero export quota be adopted until sufficient biological information is available on which to base a NDF. We note that this species qualifies for listing in CITES Appendix I.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Regarding species categorized as Least Concern</b>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>M. aurantiaca</i></b>: (Critically Endangered 2008) SSN is <u>concerned</u> that an export quota of 2,500 has been set for this species. Its area of occupancy is probably less than 10km<sup>2</sup>, its distribution is severely fragmented, the extent of its forest habitat is declining, and “<i>the number of mature individuals might also be declining through over-exploitation</i>” (IUCN 2008). This species was classified as Least Concern because there was no trade in the species at the time. SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>reclassify this species as Urgent Concern and recommend a zero export quota. We note that this species qualifies for listing in CITES Appendix I.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>M. baroni</i></b>: (Least Concern 2008) SSN is <u>concerned</u> that an export quota of 5,500 has been set for this species. Madagascar was asked by AC23 to review its quota for this species but Madagascar has provided no additional information beyond the density estimates provided at AC23, which were based on surveys carried out over small areas generally during the breeding season. Because dense or very dense breeding aggregations of some <i>Mantella</i> species may occur, such data are not representative and should not be extrapolated to larger areas. SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to reclassify this species as Urgent Concern and recommend a zero export quota.</li> <li>• <b><i>M. bernhardi</i></b>: (Endangered 2008) SSN is <u>concerned</u> that an export quota of 650 has been set for this species. Listed as Endangered because its area of occupancy is probably less than 500km<sup>2</sup>, its distribution is severely fragmented, the extent of its forest habitat is declining, and the number of mature individuals might also be declining through over-exploitation. Madagascar provides no additional information beyond the density estimates provided at AC23, which were based on surveys carried out over small areas generally during the breeding season.(see note on previous species). This species was classified as Least Concern because there was a zero quota for the species at the time. SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to reclassify this species as Urgent Concern and recommend a zero export quota. This species qualifies for listing in CITES Appendix I.</li> <li>• <b><i>M. betsilio</i></b>: (Least Concern 2008) SSN is <u>concerned</u> that the 2006-2008 export quota of 5,000 specimens was simply divided evenly between the two new species <i>M. betsilio</i> and <i>M. ebenau,i</i> and that Madagascar states that these quotas were based on distribution and density data gathered yet it fails to provide the study or data used. SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to reclassify this species as Urgent Concern and recommend a zero export quota.</li> </ul>
7.4	<p>Selection of species for trade reviews following CoP14</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 7.4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a list of those species selected for review at AC23 and a summary of responses received from the range States. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Hippopotamus amphibius</i></b> (common hippopotamus): (all range States are in the Review except DRC and Rwanda): Vulnerable (IUCN 2008) due to trade exploitation and habitat loss; total population 129,190-152,590; extinct in 4 out of 43 range States, unknown population size in 6, and under 500 in 14. Main traded specimens include</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Regarding the species selected at AC23: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Hippopotamus amphibius</i></b>: SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC classify the species as Urgent Concern for South Africa and Zimbabwe since they did not respond to the Secretariat and for Tanzania because according to the information received, the last survey report was eight years ago, unless information is provided to substantiate a scientific basis for the NDFs. SSN notes that the CITES species database still refers to the 1996 IUCN classification of this species as Lower Risk – Least concern, and encourages the Secretariat to update the website.</li> <li>• <b><i>Heosemys annandalii</i></b>: SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC classify this species</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS																																																																											
	<p>teeth, skin and trophies. From 2000 to 2006, the largest exporting countries were South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe (see below):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="551 252 1205 727"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>ZA</th> <th>TZ</th> <th>ZM</th> <th>ZW</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bones</td> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carvings</td> <td>801</td> <td>38</td> <td></td> <td>1904</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Feet</td> <td>238</td> <td>65</td> <td>83</td> <td>171</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Horns/plates</td> <td>9</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leather products</td> <td>631</td> <td>93</td> <td>5</td> <td>2925</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Live</td> <td>109</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Skins</td> <td>572&lt;</td> <td>280</td> <td>8212</td> <td>5346&lt;</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Skin pieces</td> <td>558&lt;</td> <td>237</td> <td>1314&lt;</td> <td>1985&lt;</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Skulls</td> <td>107</td> <td>65</td> <td>249</td> <td>73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tails</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>3</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Teeth</td> <td>3329</td> <td>5648</td> <td>5717</td> <td>3040</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Teeth, tons</td> <td>1.9</td> <td>42.2</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>0.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Trophies</td> <td>764</td> <td>1796</td> <td>875</td> <td>1122</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tusks</td> <td>648 &lt;</td> <td>48</td> <td>286</td> <td>1877</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Heosemys annandalii</i></b> (yellow-headed temple turtle): Endangered (IUCN 2000) due to exploitation for trade in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam; population in Malaysia very small. 2002-2006, most exports were from Lao PDR (1,000), Malaysia (9,628) and Vietnam (9,600). Malaysia has adopted a zero export quota</li> <li>• <b><i>Heosemys grandis</i></b> (giant Asian pond turtle): Vulnerable (IUCN 2000). Malaysia has adopted a zero export quota. Exports are recorded from Lao PDR (1,000 in 2005), Myanmar (4,000 in 2006), and Malaysia (35,154 from 2003-2007); Vietnam is recorded as the re-exporter of specimens sourced from Malaysia (600 in 2003), Lao PDR (9,000 in 2005), and Myanmar (1,500 in 2006)</li> <li>• <b><i>Heosemys spinosa</i></b> (sunburst turtle): Endangered (IUCN 2000): “Known trade volumes have declined by about 50% in Indonesia recently despite high demand in the food trade and the species is considered Critically Endangered in Indonesia”. Restricted to small and isolated populations over much of its range. From 2002-2006, largest exports were from Malaysia</li> </ul>		ZA	TZ	ZM	ZW	Bones	4		1	2	Carvings	801	38		1904	Feet	238	65	83	171	Horns/plates	9			3	Leather products	631	93	5	2925	Live	109				Skins	572<	280	8212	5346<	Skin pieces	558<	237	1314<	1985<	Skulls	107	65	249	73	Tails		5	3	23	Teeth	3329	5648	5717	3040	Teeth, tons	1.9	42.2	0.3	0.3	Trophies	764	1796	875	1122	Tusks	648 <	48	286	1877	<p>as Urgent Concern for Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Viet Nam.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Heosemys grandis</i></b> SSN recommends that AC classify this species as Urgent Concern for Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam.</li> <li>• <b><i>Heosemys spinosa, Indotestudo forstenii, Amyda cartilaginea</i></b>: SSN recommends that AC classify these species as Urgent Concern for Indonesia unless it provides the scientific basis for NDFs, particularly for <i>Heosemys spinosa</i> and <i>Indotestudo forstenii</i> which are Endangered.</li> <li>• <b><i>Testudo horsfieldii</i></b>: SSN recommends that AC classify this species as Urgent Concern for Afghanistan, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan and recommend that Kazakhstan establish a zero export quota. SSN notes that Uzbekistan uses the R code for many exports; SSN recommends that AC inquire about the status of breeding and/or ranching operations in Ukraine and Uzbekistan.</li> <li>• <b><i>Genus Uroplatus, Brookesia decaryi, Chamaeleo africanus, Chamaeleo feae, Cordylus mossambicus, Gongylophis muelleri</i></b>: SSN encourages AC to classify these taxa as Urgent Concern because there is insufficient population information available on which to base NDFs.</li> <li>• <b><i>Scaphiophryne gottlebei</i></b>: SSN recommends that AC classify this species as Urgent Concern if Madagascar has not provided a scientific basis for making NDFs for this Endangered species.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding those taxa for which the AC requested more information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Hippocampus kelloggi, H. spinosissimus, H. kuda and corals</i></b>: SSN recommends that AC include these species in the Review. Doc. 9.1 may assist the AC in evaluating the responses of the range States of these species at AC25.</li> <li>• <b><i>Saiga tatarica</i></b>: SSN notes that this species is Critically Endangered (IUCN 2008); the global population is now estimated at 50,000, down from 1,250,000 in the mid-1970s, as a result of poaching and illegal trade in horns and meat. SSN urges the AC to include this species in the Review.</li> <li>• <b><i>Orlitia borneensis</i></b>: If Lao and Viet Nam do not respond, SSN recommends that AC request the SC to inquire about the 9,000 or more specimens of this Endangered (IUCN 2000) species that were exported from Lao PDR (a non-range State) to Viet Nam in 2005.</li> <li>• <b><i>Huso huso</i></b>: See SSN recommendations under Doc. 7.5</li> <li>• <b><i>Pandinus imperator</i></b>: If the field report on this species is not available prior to AC24, SSN recommends that the species be discussed no later than AC25.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	ZA	TZ	ZM	ZW																																																																									
Bones	4		1	2																																																																									
Carvings	801	38		1904																																																																									
Feet	238	65	83	171																																																																									
Horns/plates	9			3																																																																									
Leather products	631	93	5	2925																																																																									
Live	109																																																																												
Skins	572<	280	8212	5346<																																																																									
Skin pieces	558<	237	1314<	1985<																																																																									
Skulls	107	65	249	73																																																																									
Tails		5	3	23																																																																									
Teeth	3329	5648	5717	3040																																																																									
Teeth, tons	1.9	42.2	0.3	0.3																																																																									
Trophies	764	1796	875	1122																																																																									
Tusks	648 <	48	286	1877																																																																									

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>(23,695) and Indonesia (5,059). Malaysia has adopted a zero export quota; Indonesia has established an export quota of 450 for 2009.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Indotestudo forstenii</i></b> (Travancore tortoise): Endangered (IUCN 2000): “<i>Animals occur in substantial numbers in both the food and pet trade.</i>” Indonesia exported 2,081 specimens from 2002-2006 and has established an export quota of 270 for 2009.</li> <li>• <b><i>Testudo horsfieldii</i></b> (Central Asian tortoise): Vulnerable (IUCN 1996). 2000-2007, largest exporters were Afghanistan (2,000), Kazakhstan (41,000), Russia (2,505), Tajikistan (7,000 in 2006), Ukraine (22,880), and Uzbekistan (181,873). During this time, Ukraine reported exporting 55,977 specimens with ‘F’ and ‘C’ codes; Uzbekistan reported 2,000 coded ‘F’ and 50,385 coded ‘R’. For 2009, Tajikistan established a quota of 17,000 wild specimens, and Uzbekistan, a quota of 27,000 wild specimens, 17,000 ranched specimens, and 5,000 eggs [Information on Uzbekistan’s ranching program can be found in AC24 Doc. 8.1]. Kazakhstan states that there is no authorized capture or export of this species</li> <li>• <b><i>Amyda cartilaginea</i></b> (Asiatic softshell turtle), (Review for Indonesia only). Vulnerable (IUCN 2000): “<i>The security of a wide distribution and occurrence in protected areas is offset by specific demand for this species in the consumption trade, currently traded at levels of tons per day.</i>” The most heavily traded wild source Asian turtle. From 2005-2006, Indonesia exported 52,890 wild specimens, 7,900 kg of carapaces, and 7,900 kg of meat. Quota of 25,200 established for 2009</li> <li>• <b>Genus <i>Uroplatus</i></b> (flat-tailed geckos): Endemic to Madagascar (trade figures provided for 2004-2006 and the 2009 quota): <b><i>U. ebenau</i></b> (2,646/2,000), fragmented range, appears to have low population density in the wild; <b><i>U. fimbriatus</i></b> (3,053/2,000) fragmented range, appears to have low population density in the wild; <b><i>U. guentheri</i></b> (153/100) known only in certain forest zones, populations highly fragmented; <b><i>U. henkeli</i></b> (301/200) not abundant, decline in populations in a reserve on Nosy Be attributed to illegal harvesting; <b><i>U. lineatus</i></b></li> </ul>	

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS	
	<p>(2,192/1,000) fragmented range, appears to have low population density in the wild; <b><i>U. malama</i></b> (24/100) rare, very restricted range; <b><i>U. phantasticus</i></b> (3,561/2,000) known only in certain forest zones, populations are highly fragmented; <b><i>U. sikorae</i></b> (2,868/2,000)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Brookesia decaryi</i></b> (spiny leaf chameleon): small range in northeast Madagascar. 862 exported 2000-2004</li> <li>• <b><i>Chamaeleo africanus</i></b> (African chameleon) (population of Niger only): 4,300 exported 2001-2006. Quota of 3,000 established for 2009</li> <li>• <b><i>Chamaeleo feae</i></b> (Fe's chameleon): known only from Bioko Island, Equatorial Guinea. 2,724 exported 2003-2006</li> <li>• <b><i>Cordylus mossambicus</i></b> (Mozambique girdled lizard): no population information on which to base an export quota. 7,613 exported from Mozambique 2000-2008. Quota of 1,500 established for 2009.</li> <li>• <b><i>Gongylophis muelleri</i></b> (Saharan sand boa) (Ghana only): poorly known; no population information on which to base an export quota. 4,114 wild specimens exported 2004-2007.</li> <li>• <b><i>Scaphiophryne gottlebei</i></b> (rainbow burrowing frog) Endangered (IUCN 2008): “Over-collection for the international pet trade could be a significant threat to this restricted-range species.” Endemic to Madagascar. 3,163 exported 2002-2006. Quota of 1,000 set for 2009</li> <li>• AC23 requested additional information on the following species to be used by AC24 when considering whether to include them in the Review: <i>Hippocampus kelloggi</i>, <i>H. spinosissimus</i>, <i>H. kuda</i>, Corals, <i>Saiga tatarica</i>, <i>Orlitia borneensis</i>, <i>Huso huso</i>, and <i>Pandinus imperator</i></li> </ul>		
7.5	<p>Scientific information from the range States of <i>Huso huso</i></p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 7.5</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the course of the implementation of RC. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) on Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish, the Secretariat became concerned about the levels of trade in the species <i>Huso huso</i>, in particular from Azerbaijan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to include the species in the Review.</li> <li>• SSN <u>commends</u> Hungary, the Republic of Moldova, and Serbia for responding to the questionnaire. None of the range States of concern (Azerbaijan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan) responded by the deadline.</li> <li>• SSN <u>notes</u> that the species is classified as Endangered (IUCN 2007); evidence suggests that stocks have declined by 90 percent in the past 20</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In 2007, the AC rejected, via a vote by postal procedure, a call by the Secretariat to include the species in the Review with immediate effect</li> <li>AC23 did not include the species in the Review but did prepare a questionnaire to the range States on the species. The Annex contains the responses of Hungary, the Republic of Moldova, and Serbia</li> <li>Invites the AC to review the information and to decide whether or not to include the species <i>Huso huso</i> in the Review</li> </ul>
7.6	<p>Activities with regard to the population of <i>Tursiops aduncus</i> of the Solomon Islands</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 7.6</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recalls that the proposal to include the Solomon Islands (SI) population of <i>Tursiops aduncus</i> (Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin) in the Review was withdrawn at AC23 and that the AC had then encouraged the SI to pursue its research on the status of this population and to participate in two technical meetings scheduled in 2008, an IUCN Cetacean Specialist Group (IUCN/SSC/CSG) Indo-Pacific Bottlenose Dolphin Assessment Workshop and the International Expert Workshop on CITES NDFs.</li> <li>Reports that the 2008 workshops took place and that representatives of the SI government either attended or participated in the production of documents for both meetings and responded to inquiries made by the AC representative of Oceania about this population after the meetings</li> <li>Presents the findings of the two meetings organized in 2008, including that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"...the local <i>T. aduncus</i> population used as the source of animals for export from the Solomon Islands would have to be at least 5,000 to 10,000 to sustain the permitted level of exports [of 100]," "it appears that abundance in the area of recent live-captures is well below 5,000" and "...population assessment efforts in this region should be expanded as soon as possible" (IUCN/SSC/CSG Workshop Report).</li> <li>"A credible non-detriment finding to justify further exports [of <i>Tursiops aduncus</i>] will require much more and better quality data than are presently available." (NDF Workshop Report)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Reports that the <i>Tursiops aduncus</i> surveys planned</li> </ul>
		<p>years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to include the SI population of <i>Tursiops aduncus</i> in the Review of Significant Trade</li> <li>Considering the expert nature and extensive scope of the IUCN/SSC/CSG workshop report, and based on the Solomon Islands' participation in the discussions that have assessed the sustainability of the trade in <i>Tursiops aduncus</i>, SSN believes that the requirements laid out for the notification/response of the range State and compilation of information on this species are met and that it is not necessary for the Secretariat to engage further consultants to compile information about the biology and management of, and trade in, this species.</li> <li>SSN <u>considers</u> that the two technical workshops conducted since the last AC meeting demonstrated clearly that the SI is failing to meet the requirements of Article IV.2.(a) and that the SI population of <i>Tursiops aduncus</i> qualifies as a 'species of urgent concern' in accordance with RC 12.8.</li> <li>SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to recommend that the SI immediately adopt a zero export quota for this species and that the zero quota be maintained until the population assessment recommended by IUCN/SSC/CSG has been conducted and, based on this, a sustainable level of removals has been determined</li> <li>No Party should accept export permits from the SI for this species until the population assessment recommended by IUCN/SSC/CSG has been conducted and, based on this, a sustainable level of removals has been determined.</li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>as part of the SI Abundance Project are proposed to run until 2010 and that the SI has developed a proposal for additional surveys that it proposes to conduct shortly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports that the current annual export quota for the species from the SI is 100 live animals and that since AC23, the SI has exported 19 animals to the Philippines</li> <li>• Invites the AC to note this summary of activities.</li> </ul>	
7.7	<p>Development of the Significant Trade online Management System</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 7.7</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports that in December 2008, the Secretariat concluded a Memorandum of Understanding with the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) to develop an online system to manage information on implementation of the Review of Significant Trade in CITES Appendix II species</li> <li>• States that UNEP-WCMC will demonstrate the database at AC24</li> <li>• Invites the AC to note this document</li> </ul>	<p><b>GENERALLY SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to recommend to CoP15 that the database be made accessible to the public</li> </ul>
<b>8. Ranching</b>			
8.1	<p>Review of the use of source code 'R'</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 8.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepared by the by the co-chairs of the Review of the Use of Source Code 'R' Working Group</li> <li>• Provides the responses of select Parties to a questionnaire on the use of the source code 'R'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>commends</u> the Parties that responded to the inquiry/questionnaire.</li> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to recommend that the R code only be applied to those species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II under Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14).</li> <li>• Responses to the questionnaire clearly illustrate that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the 'R' code is widely misapplied;</li> <li>▪ ranching may not be applicable to all taxa (e.g. no mammal species claimed as ranched; "ranched" bird specimens are wild-caught);</li> <li>▪ benefits to wild populations are not clear; and</li> <li>▪ ranching is, in fact, wild harvest, and should meet the same CITES requirements as for specimens exported under the code 'W'.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
8.2	<p>Revision of Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14)</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 8.2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision 14.53 directs the Secretariat to, in consultation with the AC, examine RC 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) on <i>Ranching and trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II</i> with a view to proposing revisions to make its structure more logical, clarify certain recommendations, edit text and reduce overlap between sections, for consideration at CoP15</li> <li>• The Secretariat states that transferring a species from</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to oppose both recommendations made by the Secretariat.</li> <li>• The Parties purposefully created different standards for approval of proposals for trade in ranched specimens of species that qualify for Appendix I, in order to ensure that these operations are not harming and indeed are actually benefiting wild populations of Endangered and Critically Endangered species.</li> <li>• SSN strongly <u>disagrees</u> with the Secretariat that requirements under RC 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) and RC 9.20 (Rev.) are "<i>rendered purposeless</i>" by</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>Appendix I to II under RC. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) on <i>Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II</i> is less restrictive than doing so specifically for ranching under RC11.16 (Rev. CoP14), resulting in fewer ranching proposals in recent years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat proposes two options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ repeal (most parts of) RC 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) on <i>Guidelines for evaluating marine turtle ranching proposals submitted pursuant to RC 11.16</i> (Rev. CoP14) and RC 9.20 (Rev.) “as they are rendered purposeless” by paragraphs A.2. b) and c) in Annex 4 of RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14); or</li> <li>▪ revise these two ranching Resolutions to make them consistent with paragraphs A. 2. b) and c) in Annex 4 of RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), “thereby removing any disincentive” to submit ranching proposals</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14). Their purpose is to ensure that proposals to transfer populations from Appendix I to II for ranching meet criteria that are more protective of wild populations than those to transfer of populations from Appendix I to II when the species no longer qualifies for Appendix I.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If RC 9.20 (Rev.) and RC 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) are repealed, decades of work by CITES Parties to agree on criteria that must be met for trade in ranching specimens of species that qualify for Appendix I, will be lost.</li> </ul>
<p><b>9. International expert workshop on non-detriment findings</b></p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 9</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepared by Mexico</li> <li>• CITES Articles IV and V require Parties to make Non-Detriment Findings (NDFs)</li> <li>• Decisions 14.49 through 14.51 called for the convening of an International Expert Workshop on CITES NDFs the purpose of which is “to enhance CITES Scientific Authorities’ capacities, particularly those related to the methodologies, tools, information, expertise and other resources needed to formulate NDFs.”</li> <li>• Decision 14.50 states that the AC should review the proceedings of the Workshop and prepare for consideration at CoP15 a discussion paper and, if appropriate, a draft resolution on the making of NDFs</li> <li>• The NDF workshop was held in November 2008</li> <li>• AC24 Doc. 9 contains the report of the NDF Workshop, prepared by Mexico, which recommends that the AC consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ creating an email working group of AC and PC to identify how to refine the outcomes and expand the results of the workshop and report to CoP16;</li> <li>▪ reviewing the WG reports and developing documents that could assist Scientific Authorities in making NDFs;</li> <li>▪ capacity building, especially research and use of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to support the recommendations contained in AC24 Doc. 9</li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>information generated by AC and PC;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ how to take the outcome of the workshop into account in the ongoing Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade;</li> <li>▪ drafting a resolution that would draw attention to the outcomes of the workshop and encourage Parties to take these into account when making NDFs.</li> </ul>	
9.1	<p>Working group reports</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 9.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepared by Mexico</li> <li>• Contains the reports of the working groups that met at the NDF Workshop</li> <li>• The AC is requested to consider the reports when preparing documents for CoP15 in response to Decisions 14.135 and 14.143</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>agrees</u> that the reports of the working groups should be considered by the AC when making a report and recommendations to CoP15</li> </ul>
<b>10. Periodic review of animal species included in the CITES Appendices</b>			
10.1	<p>Periodic review of species selected before CoP13</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 10.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 11.1 (Rev. CoP14) on <i>Establishment of Committees</i> mandates the AC and PC to undertake a periodic review of species included in the CITES Appendices</li> <li>• AC23 agreed that the Secretariat should write to the range States of the remaining species selected for review prior to CoP13, to ask if a review is still required; if yes, then the Party would be expected to conduct the review; if no, then the species would be deleted from the review.</li> <li>• The Secretariat sent letters to range States in September 2008 and only Ghana answered, regarding <i>Cephalophus silvicultor</i>, stating a review was not necessary</li> <li>• Argentina and Brazil responded later, agreeing that no review was necessary for <i>Mirounga leonina</i></li> <li>• No comments were received regarding <i>Pteropus macrotis</i></li> <li>• USA is currently reviewing <i>Crocodylus lacertinus</i>; however, the review will not be completed by AC24.</li> <li>• Brazil reviewed <i>Callithrix jacchus</i>, which is included in AC24 Doc. 10.1</li> <li>• AC24 Doc. 10.1, prepared by the Chair of the Periodic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>agrees</u> that <i>Cephalophus silvicultor</i>, <i>Mirounga leonina</i>, and <i>Pteropus macrotis</i> should be deleted from the review</li> <li>• Regarding <i>Callithrix jacchus</i>, SSN <u>agrees</u> with Brazil that the species meets the criteria for retention in CITES Appendix II</li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		Review working group, recommends that <i>Cephalophus silvicultor</i> , <i>Mirounga leonina</i> , and <i>Pteropus macrotis</i> .be deleted from the review	
10.2	Schedule and responsibilities for species selected for periodic review between CoP13 and CoP15  <b>AC24 Doc. 10.2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a list of species that were agreed to be included in the Periodic Review, as amended after CoP14</li> <li>Reminds the Parties that <i>Balaenoptera physalus</i> (fin whale) was deleted from the list after CoP14 because of Decision 14.81, which states that "no periodic review of any great whale, including the fin whale, should occur while the moratorium by the International Whaling Commission is in place."</li> <li>Reminds the Parties that <u>all</u> species of Felidae have been included in the list in accordance with Decision 13.93 (Rev. CoP14)</li> <li>Notes that <i>Crossoptilon harmani</i> (Tibetan eared pheasant) is now recognized as a subspecies of <i>C. crossoptilon</i> and requests the AC to decide whether the subspecies, <i>C. c. harmani</i> should be retained in the Review</li> <li>Requests the AC to establish how it will conduct the reviews of species that were selected after CoP13 and establish a schedule</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that the IUCN Cat Specialist Group be requested to undertake phase II (outside of the <i>Lynx</i> complex) of the review of Felidae species in cooperation with the range States. Otherwise, the large number of species (30) to be reviewed may make it difficult to complete the reviews on a timely basis</li> <li>SSN <u>encourages</u> the AC to retain the subspecies <i>Crossoptilon crossoptilon harmani</i> in the review. There is no reason that a change in taxonomic status should affect the review, which in any case breaks down species on a country-by-country basis</li> </ul>
10.3	<b>Periodic review of Felidae – Lynx spp. and look-alike issues (outcome of the workshop)</b>  <b>AC24 Doc. 10.3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by the USA</li> <li>Decision 13.93 (Rev. CoP14) directs the AC to review the family Felidae, in particular the <i>Lynx</i> species complex, which includes species listed because of similarity of appearance, such as the bobcat. AC is to: evaluate the listings against the criteria for inclusion of species in Appendices I and II in RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13); assess the management and enforcement measures available to achieve effective control of trade so as to resolve the continued need for look-alike listings; and review trade information to determine whether these species are actually confused in trade or whether the look-alike problem is merely hypothetical</li> <li>AC23 recommended a meeting of management and law enforcement authorities of the USA, Canada, Mexico and range States of the Eurasian and the Critically Endangered Iberian lynx to discuss possible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>acknowledges</u> efforts made by USA and other <i>Lynx</i> species complex range States to address this issue.</li> <li>SSN <u>concur</u>s with the views expressed by many European range States that removing <i>Lynx rufus</i> from Appendix II would create enforcement problems for Eurasian and Iberian lynx because there is no document trail for traded <i>Lynx rufus</i>,</li> <li>As noted in the report, existing identification tools are not adequate for distinguishing between species in the <i>Lynx</i> complex; SSN <u>believes</u> that all types of <i>Lynx</i> skins and skin specimens in trade (not only those type of specimens most commonly traded) must be identifiable to the species level before deregulation of trade is considered.</li> <li>Regarding the notion of listing <i>Lynx rufus</i> in Appendix III and the EU retaining the species in Annex B of EU regulations, SSN <u>agrees</u> with the EU participants that it would be "inconsistent for the EU to retain <i>Lynx rufus</i> in Annex B for look-alike considerations with <i>Lynx</i> species, while CITES would remove the species from Appendix II on the basis that there are no look-alike risks at stake."</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>problems of illegal trade of those species; the meeting occurred in October 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports the results of the meeting including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ participating countries expressed concern that delisting could allow <i>Lynx lynx</i> to enter trade more easily if there is no document trail for <i>Lynx rufus</i> entering international trade</li> <li>▪ Poland reported that known poaching and seizures were “only the tip of the iceberg,” that even a small increase in poaching will have negative impacts on populations, and that any measure making it easier to enter skins into trade (e.g., delisting <i>Lynx rufus</i>) may create incentive to poaching and illegal trade</li> <li>▪ participating countries suggested that poaching of <i>Lynx lynx</i> is mostly for predator control and domestic animal protection, and that selling the fur is a “byproduct”; more information was needed from <i>Lynx</i> range States not participating in the meeting, to determine whether similar conclusions would apply to them</li> <li>▪ USA reported that delisting efforts have not been pursued to reduce administrative permitting burden but rather the work involved in making non-detriment findings (NDFs) for look-alike species</li> <li>▪ identification sheets in the CITES Identification Manual are inadequate for <i>Lynx</i> species identification at the species level and there would, at a minimum, need to be identification techniques for pelts without ears and tails; there is a need explore and develop identification tools necessary to address the real risks</li> <li>▪ USA will discuss the issue with the Russian Federation; more information is needed on trade between the Russian Federation and China as well as other Asian countries, including enforcement problems; and illegal trade in <i>Lynx lynx</i> to the EU from the Russian Federation should be considered</li> <li>▪ EU will look into a risk analysis for enforcement cases where data of seizures are known and further consideration will be given on the value of placing <i>Lynx rufus</i> on Annex B of EU regulations to preserve the document trail for enforcement purposes if the species were to be down-listed to Appendix III</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>concur</u>s with the need for more information about trade between the Russian Federation and China and other Asian countries including trade enforcement issues, the need for improved identification tools for <i>Lynx</i> spp. pelts and other parts, particularly pelts lacking ears and tufts, and that the report from Mexico on the status of bobcat in that country should be evaluated prior to any further action.</li> <li>• Regarding the USA’s administrative burden for making NDFs for export of <i>Lynx rufus</i>, SSN <u>notes</u> that the USA issues a single NDF to cover the export of all CITES-tagged bobcat pelts; the claim that considerable time and resources are used in the USA to make NDF’s for this look-alike species is questionable.</li> <li>• SSN <u>supports</u> the recommendation of European participants in the meeting that, instead of seeking to remove the species from Appendix II, the USA should conduct NDFs to address the look-alike issue and better explain this to the public.</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports that in a 2008 a survey of USA state and Canadian provincial authorities, no jurisdiction reported that bobcat (<i>Lynx rufus</i>) populations are declining except for Florida USA where population decline is attributable to habitat loss; 27 of 47 states with bobcat populations provided estimates of population size resulting in 1,419,333 to 2,638,738 bobcats; this is considered a very conservative estimate because not all states provided population estimates but is higher than the 725,000 to 1,017,000 bobcats estimated to be in the United States in 1981; and 96% of the <i>Lynx rufus</i> furs exported from the USA during the years 2000-2004 were full pelts with identifying ear tufts and tails</li> <li>• Annex 3 summarizes poaching and illegal trade in Eurasian and Iberian lynx within the EU dating back to as early as 1980 but with most data for the past decade; 7 of 11 range States reported poaching of <i>Lynx</i> spp. totaling 79 confirmed animals, 68 suspected poaching incidents, and 2-3 animals poached annually in Romania; 6 of 14 EU member states reported seizures of Eurasian and/or Iberian lynx totaling 105 specimens</li> </ul>	
<p>11. Implementation and effectiveness of the universal tagging system in the trade in small crocodylian leather goods</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 11</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepared by the AC representative to the SC Working Group (WG) on the Universal Tagging System and Trade in Small Crocodylian Leather Goods.</li> <li>• Decision 14.62 directs the SC to establish a working group (WG) to: a) examine the implementation and effectiveness of the universal tagging system; b) examine the implementation and effectiveness of issuing CITES documents for small crocodylian leather goods and related trade controls; c) consider possible ways and conditions to alleviate the administrative burden related to trade in small crocodylian leather goods and to guarantee the legal origin of the specimens; and d) report to the Standing Committee on the results of its work at its 58<sup>th</sup> meeting. Decision 14.63 directs the SC to consider the results of the WG at SC58 and submit recommendations to CoP15.</li> <li>• The AC agreed to a draft strategy that was provided to the SC WG Chair; the SC WG adopted a strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to postpone discussion of proposed amendments to RC 11.12 until responses to the two questionnaires circulated by the SC WG Chair can be evaluated, analyzed, and documented; this is consistent with the decision of the SC WG Chair and even if analysis of the responses is made available at AC 24, additional time may be required by the Parties to consider the analysis.</li> <li>• If the AC elects to review the proposed revisions to RC 11.12 (Doc. 11, Annex 2), SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support the revision indicating that illegal trade in crocodylian skins has been and remains a threat to the survival of certain populations of crocodylians.</li> <li>▪ Support the removal of references to resolutions that are no longer in effect and/or statements that are redundant.</li> <li>▪ Support the insertion of language that would provide incentives for the development of new and superior tagging methods to prevent the misuse or reuse of tags, including the use of bar-coding on tags.</li> <li>▪ Support language requiring that the tagging of all crocodylian skins, chalcos, flanks, and other parts that may be split or divided at any stage during the manufacturing process must include serial identification</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>largely consistent with the AC submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AC prepared and sent a draft revision of RC 11.12 on Universal tagging system for the identification of crocodilian skins which was sent to the SC WG Chair who decided to postpone discussion of amendments pending receipt and analysis of responses to two questionnaires regarding the implementation of RC 11.12, one on trade in large amounts of small leather products and the other on overall implementation and effectiveness of RC11.12. No evaluation of responses has been undertaken.</li> <li>• The SC WG Chair also suggested that a paper be prepared on what is meant by the term ‘small crocodilian leather goods’; the AC representative coordinated the preparation of the paper and submitted it to the SC WG Chair noting that the drafting group could not agree on the size limit for small crocodilian leather products.</li> </ul>	<p>numbers and double tagging. To prevent or minimize fraud, each part, including parts that are divided or cut at any time during the collection or manufacturing process, must be individually identified through a tag that remains affixed to the part throughout the manufacturing process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support language to clarify the meaning of the term ‘year of production’ to be defined as the year when the animal was killed and skinned.</li> <li>▪ Support language requiring that the number of skin pieces be included on the description of the contents of transparent, sealed containers used to ship crocodilian parts.</li> <li>▪ Seek revision of paragraph (i) to require that the country of origin, standard species codes, and years of production be included on re-export tags</li> <li>▪ Support the revision of paragraph (k) to ensure that its interpretation is not in conflict with trade suspensions recommended by the SC for Appendix II species subject to Review of Significant Trade recommendations.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the AC elects to discuss the definition of ‘small crocodilian leather products’ (Doc. 11, Annex 3), SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Oppose any effort to rescind existing requirements for the issuance of CITES documents for trade in crocodilian leather products, including ‘small crocodilian leather products.’ Though Annex 3 reports that the trade is “<i>well and effectively regulated,</i>” any weakening of the CITES requirements could result in an increase in fraud and illegal trade. The proposed revisions to RC 11.12 state that illegal trade in crocodile parts remains a threat to the “<i>survival of certain populations of crocodilians and has undermined the efforts of producer countries to management their crocodilian resources on a sustainable basis.</i>”</li> <li>▪ Although SSN opposes an exemption for small crocodilian leather products, if the AC considers rescinding the requirement for CITES documents for ‘small crocodilian leather products’ it should consider a step-wise, precautionary approach that limits the definition of these products to those not exceeding a surface area of 100 cm<sup>2</sup>, and monitors the results of this decision, and, depending on those results before expanding the definition to include products with larger surface areas (e.g., 500 or 1000 cm<sup>2</sup>)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>12. Sturgeons and paddlefish</b>			
12.1	Secretariat’s report <b>AC24 Doc. 12.1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) on <i>Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish</i> directs the Secretariat to provide at each AC meeting a written report on activities related to the conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish</li> </ul>	SSN <u>recommends</u> that the AC note this report

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the time of writing the report (1 February 2009) the Secretariat had not received any proposals for sturgeon caviar and meat export quotas for the quota year 1 March 2009 to 28 February 2010 that met the requirements of RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP14)</li> <li>Regarding the AC's evaluation of the assessment and the monitoring methodologies used for shared stocks of Acipenseriformes, reports that Caspian Fisheries Technical Workshops were held in April and November 2008 and, regarding shared stocks other than in the Caspian Sea, reports that the Secretariat received information on Azov Sea and Amur/Heilongjiang River shared stocks</li> <li>Requests the AC to note the report</li> </ul>	
12.2	Assessment and monitoring methodologies used for shared stocks of Acipenseriformes species  <b>AC24 Doc. 12.2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides the results of a Caspian Fisheries Technical Workshop held in Rome on 11-13 November 2008 by the FAO in which participants agreed on the <i>modus operandi</i> for the requested workshop on stock assessment and Total Allowable Catch determination methodologies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>No comment</b></li> </ul>
	<b>13. Nomenclatural matters</b>  <b>AC24 Doc.13</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by the specialist on zoological nomenclature</li> <li>Recommends adopting a number of changes arising from the adoption of new standard references for birds and mammals at CoP13, including correcting the listing of <i>Puma concolor</i> (under the new references some subspecies now contain both Appendix I and Appendix II populations)</li> <li>Recommends that the AC prepare a proposal for CoP 15 adding the following annotation to the listing of <i>Canis lupus</i>: "<i>Excludes the domesticated form and the dingo which are referenced as Canis lupus familiaris and Canis lupus dingo.</i>"</li> <li>Identifies recent nomenclatural changes applying to listed species; proposes asking the Nomenclature Working Group to recommend which changes to accept; suggests a conservative approach to recognizing changes</li> <li>Reports on an offer to assist in preparation of a checklist for <i>Lepidoptera</i> species under CITES</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>supports</u> adoption of the recommendations of the specialist on zoological nomenclature</li> </ul>
13.1	Revision and publication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that the revision of the Appendices after CoP14</li> </ul>	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
of the CITES Appendices <b>AC24 Doc.13</b>	<p>was delayed because of the large number of nomenclatural and other changes required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To alleviate this problem after CoP15, the Secretariat will prepare a draft revision in advance showing all proposed changes that would be required by proposals to amend the Appendices</li> <li>To deal with problems caused by the adoption of a new standard nomenclatural reference, the Secretariat recommends that any proposal to the CoP to change a standard nomenclatural reference for CITES species should contain a list of the amendments that would have to be made to the Appendices if the proposal were adopted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN welcomes the idea of a draft revision, and suggests that it be prepared in cooperation with the specialists on zoological and botanical nomenclature</li> <li>While SSN supports the Secretariat's recommendation in principle, we are concerned that the time, effort and expense involved in preparing a list of amendments, especially for references dealing with higher taxonomic groups, could delay the adoption of new standard references or even prevent proposals from coming forward (though we note that the recommendation applies to the Appendices only, not to changes in the CITES Checklist). SSN <u>recommends</u> that the AC consider ways to streamline this process, and notes that as it may have budgetary implications it may be necessary to bring this matter forward to the SC</li> </ul>
13.2 Harmonization of nomenclature and taxonomy with other Multilateral Environmental Agreements <b>AC24 Doc.13</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by the Secretariat in cooperation with the nomenclature specialist of the Animals Committee</li> <li>Reports on progress in exploring ways of harmonizing the nomenclature used by CITES and other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), in particular the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS)</li> <li>Recommends following the International Whaling Commission (IWC) and CMS in adopting a new standard reference for marine mammals; Annex 2 notes the changes doing so would require for Cetacea</li> <li>Notes the CMS suggestion of a nomenclature and taxonomy panel that could work towards harmonization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>supports</u> the recommendations of the Secretariat</li> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that the AC follow up on the CMS recommendation by expressing its interest in the idea and asking the Chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of biodiversity-related conventions (CSAB) to consider legal, budgetary and other issues that might be involved</li> <li>SSN <u>notes</u> that CITES should reserve the right to depart from harmonized nomenclature if changes would make it more difficult for the Convention to protect listed species and asks the AC to take this into account when engaging in further discussions on the issue</li> </ul>
<b>14. Conservation and management of sharks</b>		
14.1 Activities concerning shark species of concern (Decision 14.107) <b>AC24 Doc.14.1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by the USA, Chair of an intersessional Working Group on Implementation of Decision 14.107.</li> <li>RC 12.6 on Conservation and management of sharks, directs the AC to examine information provided by range States in shark assessment reports and other documents, to identify key species and examine these for consideration and possible listing under CITES.</li> <li>Decision 14.107 directs the AC to continue activities under RC12.6, including refinement of the list of shark species of concern, in collaboration with FAO, taking account of those referenced in Annex 3 to document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>welcomes</u> the report prepared by the USA.</li> <li>SSN <u>regrets</u> that the Working Group was unable to reach consensus on future actions as many shark populations are declining rapidly and the situation is urgent</li> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that the AC, identify as "<i>species of concern</i>" the species listed in this document as "<i>undecided</i>", including <i>Squalus acanthias</i> (spiny dogfish shark) and <i>Lamna nasus</i> (porbeagle shark), and encourage Parties to submit proposals to list these species in Appendix II at CoP15</li> <li>If the AC cannot reach consensus on future actions, SSN <u>encourages</u> the USA to seek additional information on the species addressed and submit</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS	
	<p>CoP14 Doc. 59.1 and report on these activities at CoP15.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The USA circulated a discussion document but the Working Group was not able to reach consensus on recommendations for future actions (the Annexes provide the document and comments received)</li> <li>The Working Group Chair hopes that this document and the comments can form the basis for work at AC24</li> </ul>	<p>the document for discussion at CoP15</p>	
14.2	<p>Regional workshop on South American freshwater stingrays</p> <p><b>No document</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>No comment</b></li> </ul>
14.3	<p>Linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat, and illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc.14.3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by Australia</li> <li>Decision 14.117 directs the AC, in consultation with FAO (U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization), to, “<i>examine and report on linkages between the international trade in shark fins and meat and IUU shark fishing activities, including where possible: a) the main species of sharks taken by IUU fishing; and b) the relative importance of fins compared to meat in international trade arising from IUU fishing</i>”</li> <li>AC23 encouraged Australia “<i>to take into account available sources, including the outcomes of the forthcoming shark fisheries workshop of the FAO and the NDF workshop, when preparing its paper on IUU fishing for sharks, and to present this report at AC24 for further discussion</i>”</li> <li>Australia contracted TRAFFIC to prepare the report, <i>Illegal, unreported and unregulated shark catch: A review of current knowledge and action</i></li> <li>Provides a brief summary of the report and notes that the analysis indicates that the key impediment to better understanding catch and trade of sharks is lack of species-specific data on shark catch and trade</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>welcomes</u> the report prepared by Australia/TRAFFIC on this issue.</li> <li>SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to act upon the urgent need to gather species-specific information on shark catch and trade.</li> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that the AC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>acknowledge that allowing the landing of detached shark fins poses serious challenges to the effective identification of species in trade, the gathering of accurate species-specific catch and trade data, and the determination of the portion of that trade derived from IUU fishing;</li> <li>recommend that RC 12.6 on <i>Conservation and management of sharks</i> be amended to recognize the language agreed by the U.N. General Assembly in December 2007 urging that sharks should be landed with fins naturally attached, and encourage the Parties to ban the practice of shark finning;</li> <li>recommend that Parties participating in international shark trade take measures to effectively reduce IUU fishing for sharks, including requiring installment of VMS (vessel monitoring systems) on all longline and other deep sea fishing vessels, prohibiting the reflagging of vessels, and prohibiting the transshipment of shark fins; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>support the request made by the government of Costa Rica at the U.N. FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) meeting in March 2009 for an FAO workshop on landing sharks with fins naturally attached.</li> </ul>
14.4	<p>Other Animals Committee’s tasks related to conservation and management of sharks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that CoP14 agreed that Parties should report on a number of subjects related to sharks with a view to facilitating discussions at AC24</li> <li>These reporting requirements were communicated to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN is <u>concerned</u> that, in response to Notification to the Parties No. 2008/058, only the European Union, Canada, Thailand, the U.K.and the USA provided reports by the deadline and only one additional country, Spain, has provided information since then. SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to develop and undertake a proactive plan to secure from Parties, particularly those</li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p><b>AC24 Doc.14.4</b></p>	<p>the Parties via Notification to the Parties No. 2008/058 of 24 September 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doc. 14.4, Annex I, provides a summary of responses from Parties to this Notification and Annex 2 provides the full text of responses</li> <li>• Invites the AC to note the document and to consider the responses to the Notification, the outcome of the International expert workshop on NDFs and outputs from the FAO Technical Workshop on the Status, Limitations and Opportunities for Improving the Monitoring of Shark Fisheries and Trade</li> </ul>	<p>reporting the highest levels of international trade in shark products, the information requested in Decisions 14.106 and 14.115.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As of early 2009, only a handful of FAO COFI Members had implemented a National Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (NPOA), as directed by the FAO IPOA-Sharks (See: <a href="http://www.fao.org/fishery/ipoa-sharks/npoa/en">http://www.fao.org/fishery/ipoa-sharks/npoa/en</a>). Many of the most important shark trading Parties have failed to implement NPOAs, including Indonesia, India, Argentina, Thailand, Pakistan, Brazil, Sri Lanka, Iran, New Zealand, Nigeria, and many EU countries. The AC should encourage these Parties to implement NPOAs.</li> <li>• SSN <u>recommends</u> that the AC <u>commend</u> the EC for its recent release of the European Community Action Plan for Sharks; SSN <u>urges</u> rapid and thorough implementation of the plan with strict finning bans by all the EU countries.</li> <li>• SSN believes that, because of lack of implementation, the IPOA clearly is not having the positive impact on shark conservation that was intended. This makes the adoption of binding management measures under other agreements, including CITES, even more urgent.</li> <li>• Recognizing that Parties' responses regarding shark species of concern have been limited, SSN <u>recommends</u> that the AC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ identify additional information needed on the status, catch and trade of shark species of concern and undertake a proactive plan to secure this information; and</li> <li>▪ recommend the use of Appendix III listings as a tool for obtaining international trade data on shark species of concern.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>15. Transport of live animals</b></p>			
<p>15.1</p>	<p>Activities of the Transport Working Group and information on cases of high mortality of specimens</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 15.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepared by the Chair of the Transport Working Group</li> <li>• RC 10.21 (Rev. CoP14) on <i>Transport of live specimens</i> directs the AC to: a) participate in meetings of the Live Animals and Perishables Board of IATA (International Air Transport Association); b) examine additional references for transport of live specimens for incorporation into RC10.21 (Rev. CoP14); c) examine developments related to the transport of live plant specimens for incorporation into RC10.21 (Rev. CoP14); and d) examine regularly high mortality shipments of live specimens and make recommendations to relevant Parties, exporters, importers and transport companies on how to avoid this in the future</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>supports</u> the efforts of the Parties to ensure that living specimens are prepared and shipped so as to minimize the risk of injury, damage to health or cruel treatment (as required in CITES Articles III, IV and V</li> <li>• SSN <u>agrees</u> with the recommendations of the TWG but also recommends that the development of the CD demonstrating the general principles of transport be accompanied with the development of material adapted to the needs of countries with no or little computer access</li> <li>• SSN is <u>concerned</u> that information on high-mortality shipments needed to address paragraph (d) of RC 10.21 (Rev. CoP14) was requested only from Parties and not other sources. SSN urges AC24 to request the Secretariat to reissue a Notification to the Parties indicating that information from all sources will be considered</li> <li>• SSN is <u>concerned</u> that many countries, particularly developing countries, still do not have sufficient access to training and documentation on the</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision 14.59, directs the AC <i>inter alia</i> to: a) participate in the regular meetings of the OIE (World Organization for Animal Health) Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission and the reviews of the OIE Guidelines for the Transport of Animals by Sea, by Land, and by Air; b) collaborate with OIE in the development of its web portal with information on regulations and guidelines for transport for live animals other than by air; c) examine new or additional references for transport of live animals; and e) report to CITES CoP15, including proposals to amend RC 10.21 (Rev.CoP14)</li> <li>• AC 23 agreed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the Chair of Transport Working Group (TWG), will participate in meetings of the Live Animal and Perishables Board of IATA and report on developments at AC24;</li> <li>▪ the CITES Secretariat will be asked to provide funding to allow the Chair of the TWG to monitor meetings of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission;</li> <li>▪ the Chair and other members of the TWG will 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;</li> <li>▪ the TWG will work intersessionally 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 (LAR);</li> <li>▪ the CITES Secretariat will send a Notification to the Parties: requesting Parties interested in receiving a current IATA LAR Manual to respond so that the level of funds needed can be assessed and the funds located; providing IATA contact information to Parties to facilitate training opportunities regarding the IATA LAR; and requesting Parties to send information concerning cases of high mortality of live specimens.</li> <li>▪ the TWG will seek to identify likely causes of mortality, and, where possible, make recommendations to address the identified problem</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Doc. 15.1 summarizes actions taken by the TWG</li> </ul>	<p>regulation of transport of live animals (such as the IATA LAR) and that this remains a serious impediment to their ability to implement the Convention. SSN recommends that the AC, with the CITES Secretariat, assess the Parties' needs and undertake follow-up actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN recommends that the AC request the Secretariat to report on how live animal transport is incorporated into capacity-building and training programs organized by the Secretariat. SSN believes such integration to be essential</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS	
	<p>since AC23 and recommends preparing or developing: a Notification to the Parties to encourage purchase of IATA LAR; a survey of the Parties to determine the frequency of use of sea transport; a checklist with essential elements to be addressed prior to land transport and good practices for all types of transport; an information document on strategies, philosophy and general good practices for land transport; a CD on general principles of transport; a compilation of transport references and a list of specialists to contact for advice; a list serve or forum on the CITES web site to allow transporters to seek and exchange information on transport procedures; and a program to train airline personnel; the Doc. also recommends that the review of guidelines on transport by land and sea be continued.</p>		
15.2	<p>National Legislation Project - Analysis of the Parties' legislative provisions and draft legislative guidance</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 15.2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision 14.59 directs AC24 to review the following documents from the Secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) an analysis of the Parties' legislative provisions on the transport of live animals by road, rail and ship contained in materials gathered under the CITES National Legislation Project; and</li> <li>b) draft legislative guidance for the transport of live specimens</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provides background information on this issue, CITES provisions related to the transport of living specimens, and an overview of the transport guidance provided by international organizations</li> <li>• Provides a brief analysis of Parties' legislative provisions on the transport of live animals gathered under the CITES National Legislation Project</li> <li>• Provides a set of legislative guidance elements which are categorized as essential (derived from the Convention), desirable (derived from applicable Resolutions) and optional (derived from Parties' additional and perhaps stricter domestic measures)</li> <li>• Invites AC24 to provide comments on the draft legislative guidance and recommends that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ways of enhancing the involvement of exporting countries in relevant activities should be explored, particularly the review and further development of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>recommends</u> that the AC support the draft legislative guidance</li> <li>• SSN <u>agrees</u> that the Guidelines are outdated and <u>recommends</u> that they should not be repealed until some guidance is given to Parties regarding transport by means other than air.</li> <li>• SSN is <u>concerned</u> by the recommendation that guidance or standards should not be "overly burdensome", "unreasonable" or "not cost-effective for private sector parties" or "technical barriers to trade". Some Parties and animal industries may consider these to be apt descriptions of the IATA regulations. However, only by implementing IATA regulations can Parties comply with CITES Articles III, IV and V to ensure that live specimens are "prepared and shipped as to minimize the risk of injury, damage to health or cruel treatment." Issues of convenience cannot be used to circumvent the clearly-worded requirements of the Convention.</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS	
	<p>IATA regulations, as well as other technical guidance or standards for the transportation of live specimens</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “efforts should be made to avoid technical guidance or standards that could be overly burdensome for developing countries, unreasonable or not cost-effective for private sector parties or technical barriers to trade”</li> <li>▪ means for providing reduced cost or no-cost copies of the IATA regulations to CITES Management Authorities should be explored</li> <li>▪ CITES Parties should take a final decision on whether the <i>CITES Guidelines for transport and preparation for shipment of live wild animals and plants</i> should be updated or wholly repealed, as they are now outdated</li> </ul>		
15.3	<p>Distribution of the current IATA <i>Live Animal Regulations</i></p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 15.3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AC24 Doc. 15.3 reports that the Secretariat issued a Notification to the Parties asking them to contact the Secretariat by the end of October 2008 if they wished to receive a copy of the IATA LAR; twelve Parties responded and received a CD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN recommends that AC24 request the Secretariat to reissue this Notification to the Parties twice annually in order to ensure that all CITES Parties have sufficient access to updated copies of the IATA LAR.</li> <li>• SSN <u>thanks</u> IATA for providing the CDs free of charge and encourages it to continue to do so in future. SSN also encourages IATA to facilitate the distribution of paper copies of the IATA LAR and relevant training material in developing countries where the availability of computers is limited or lacking entirely.</li> </ul>
<p><b>16. Sustainable use and management of sea cucumber fisheries (Decision 14.100)</b></p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 16</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decisions 14.98 and 14.99 direct the Secretariat to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ bring Annex 1 to document CoP14 Doc. 62 on sea cucumbers to the attention of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO);</li> <li>▪ bring the recommendations of the AC to range States of these taxa and Parties that are engaged in their trade;</li> <li>▪ promote cooperation with FAO by bringing the outcomes of the FAO Workshop on Sustainable Use and Management of Sea Cucumber Fisheries to the attention of the Parties and supporting relevant capacity-building activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Decision 14.100 directs the AC to evaluate the outcomes of the FAO Workshop on Sustainable Use and Management of Sea Cucumber Fisheries held in 2007, and recommend follow-up actions at CITES CoP15</li> <li>• Reports that the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper No. 516 <i>Sea cucumbers: A global</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The FAO Technical Paper reports that, except for some temperate northern hemisphere populations, sea cucumber stocks are under intense fishing throughout the world and many high-valued species are depleted or overfished. Its authors “<i>concur on the need for immediate actions to stop the trend of sequential depletion of species if we are to conserve stocks biodiversity and sustain the ecological, social and economic benefits of these resources</i>”.</li> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> the AC to recognize the need for immediate action and to recommend that the listing of sea cucumber species in Appendix II is the most effective means of accomplishing many of the aims of Decision 14.98 including development of management and trade standards for these species,</li> <li>• SSN urges the AC to encourage Parties to propose listing species of conservation concern.</li> </ul>	

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<i>review of fisheries and trade</i> is available on-line and is part of the outcome of the FAO Technical Workshop	
<b>17. Progress report on the Identification Manual</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>No comment</b></li> </ul>
<b>No document</b>			
<b>18. Proposals to amend the Appendices for possible consideration at CoP15</b>			
18.1	<p>Possible deletion of <i>Anas oustaleti</i> from Appendix I</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 18.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Marianas mallard, <i>Anas oustaleti</i>, has been on Appendix I since CoP1 (1973)</li> <li>No confirmed sightings of the species have occurred since 1979 and it is considered extinct by USA</li> <li>Recommends a proposal be submitted to delete the species from Appendix I</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that the AC support this proposal</li> </ul>
18.2	<p>Proposal to reconcile the CITES appendices for <i>Puma concolor</i> with the standard nomenclature reference for mammals agreed to in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14)</p> <p><b>AC24 Doc. 18.2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by Canada</li> <li>Since 1975, three subspecies of <i>Puma concolor</i> (<i>P. concolor cougar</i>, <i>P. concolor coryi</i>, and <i>P. concolor costricensis</i>) have been on Appendix I, and the remaining subspecies have been on Appendix II as part of the family Felidae</li> <li>At CoP14, a new standard nomenclature reference for mammals was approved that includes a number of formerly Appendix II subspecies in <i>P. concolor cougar</i>, effectively providing these with Appendix I protection</li> <li>To avoid this, the Nomenclature Committee recommended, and AC23 agreed, that the Secretariat should issue a Notification to the Parties regarding <i>Puma concolor</i> stating, “<i>The standard nomenclature reference for mammals agreed to in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP14) does not recognize the subspecies of Puma concolor listed in Appendix I. The Animals Committee will therefore submit a proposal at CoP15 to recommend that Puma concolor be added to the list of species that are still treated according to the former mammal reference of 1993.</i>”</li> <li>This was communicated to the Parties in Notification 2008/051</li> <li>In AC24 Doc. 18.2, Canada seeks guidance from AC on how to submit a proposal to CoP15 that would</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that the AC recommend to Canada that it not pursue this proposal, which is inconsistent with the recommendations agreed at AC23</li> <li>SSN further <u>recommends</u> that AC should advise Canada that such a proposal is not merely a “<i>technical matter</i>” but rather a proposal to delete species from Appendix I; as such, the proposal should follow the format in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14).</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	incorporate the standard reference approved at CoP14 and delete <i>P. concolor cougar</i> (including <i>P. concolor coryi</i> ) from Appendix I; the taxon would remain in Appendix II under the Family Felidae	
<b>19. Preparation of the Chairman's report for CoP15</b>  <b>No document</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document</li> </ul>	<b>No comment</b>
<b>20. Time and venue of the 25th meeting of the Animals Committee</b>  <b>No document</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document</li> </ul>	<b>No comment</b>
<b>21. Any other business</b>  <b>No document</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document</li> </ul>	<b>No comment</b>
<b>22. Closing Remarks</b>  <b>No document</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document</li> </ul>	<b>No comment</b>



## SPECIES SURVIVAL NETWORK

2100 L Street NW, Washington DC 20037 USA • Tel: +1-301-548-7769 Fax: +1-202-318-0891 • [info@ssn.org](mailto:info@ssn.org) • [www.ssn.org](http://www.ssn.org)