

28th CITES Animals Committee Meeting Summary, 30 August - 03 September 2015, Tel Aviv, Israel

IUCN participated in the 28th meeting of the CITES Animals Committee which took place in Tel Aviv, Israel from 30 August to 03 September 2015. We would like to thank the SSC Specialist Groups for their incredibly helpful work in preparing for and participating in this meeting.

To view more information on this meeting, see: <https://cites.org/eng/com/ac/index.php>. You can also find more information in IISD's Earth Negotiations Bulletin report here: <http://www.iisd.ca/cites/ac28/>. If you have any questions about this report, please contact Dan Challender (dan.challender@iucn.org) or Dena Cator (dena.cator@iucn.org).

28th CITES Animals Committee IUCN Delegation members

Jon Paul Rodríguez – Deputy Chair, IUCN SSC

Richard Jenkins – Deputy Director, IUCN Global Species Programme, United Kingdom (IUCN Delegation Lead)

Dan Challender – Programme Officer, IUCN Global Species Programme, United Kingdom (IUCN Delegation Manager)

Dena Cator - Programme Officer, SSC Network Support, IUCN Global Species Programme, Switzerland (IUCN Remote Delegation Support)

Sarah Fowler – IUCN SSC Shark Specialist Group, United Kingdom

Tomas Waller – IUCN SSC Boa & Python Specialist Group, Argentina

Daniel Natusch – IUCN SSC Boa & Python Specialist Group, Australia

Matt Shirley – IUCN SSC Crocodile Specialist Group, Gabon

Agenda items relevant to SSC Specialist Groups (all other agenda items are general):

Specialist Group	Agenda item(s)	Specialist Group	Agenda item(s)
Amphibians	21.1	Otter	20.1
Birdlife	9.4, 20.1, 20.3.3, 20.3.4, 20.3.5, 20.3.6, 21.1, 21.2, 22.1	Pangolin	9.4
Boa & Python	12, 14, 14.1, 14.2, 14.3	Peccary	9.4
Butterfly	9.4	Primate	9.2, 9.3, 13.2, 20.1
Cat	20.1, 20.3.1, 20.3.2,	Polar Bear	9.4
Caprinae	21.1	Reptile RLA	9.4, 14.3, 20.1, 20.3.7, 21.1
Chameleon	9.4, 21.1	Seahorse, Pipefish & Stickleback	9.4, 21.1
Conservation Breeding	13, 13.1, 13.2	Shark	17, 17.1, 17.1.1, 17.1.2, 17.2, 18
Coral	21.1	Small Carnivore	20.1
Crocodile	12, 13, 13.1, 13.2, 14.2.1, 14.2.2, 20.1, 22.2, 22.3	Sturgeon	11, 16, 16.1, 16.2, 16.3
Hippo	9.2, 9.3	Terrestrial/Freshwater Invertebrate RLA	9.4
Mollusc	19, 20.3.10	Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle	9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 15, 20.1, 20.3.8, 20.3.9
Monitor Lizard	9.4, 20.1, 22.5	Viper	21.1

Agenda item	Lead	Agenda detail	Brief Summary	IUCN position / info
1. Opening of the meeting	Dan Challender		<i>No document</i>	N/A
2. Rules of procedure	Dan Challender		<p>AC28 Doc. 2 (Rev. 1)</p> <p>At their 27th and 21st meetings (Veracruz, April-May 2014), the Animals and Plants Committees were invited by the Secretariat to consider an amendment to Rule 13 of the Rules of Procedure for their meetings concerning the election of the Chair and Vice-Chair of both Scientific Committees (see documents AC27 Doc. 3 and PC21 Doc. 3).</p> <p>The Secretariat suggests two options for filling in the positions of Chair and Vice-Chair immediately following the CoP: a) The regional representatives or their alternates present at the CoP elect a Chair and Vice-Chair immediately following the CoP and in case no quorum is attained, by a postal procedure that is discharged by the previous Chair or Vice-Chair ad interim. b) The previous Chair and Vice-Chair hold office until their successors are elected at the first meeting of the Committee after the regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties.</p> <p>Rule 20 concerns the submission of documents to meetings of the Scientific Committees. In order to provide for exceptional circumstances whereby documents cannot be submitted within the normal deadlines, but also to promote consistency between the Rules of Procedure of the Committees, the Secretariat proposes amending Rule 20. The Committee is invited to adopt the Rules of Procedure as amended.</p>	<p>The Committee adopted amendments to Rule 13, 20 and 22.</p> <p>It also agreed to seek a mandate at CoP17 to review the Terms of Reference of the Scientific Committees contained in Res. Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP16) on <i>Establishment of Committees</i>.</p> <p>For further details see AC28 Sum. 1 (Rev. 1).</p>
3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme	Dan Challender		<i>No document</i>	N/A
	Dan Challender	3.1 Agenda	<i>No summary</i>	N/A
	Dan Challender	3.2 Working programme	<i>No summary</i>	N/A
4. Admission of observers	Dan Challender		<i>No summary</i>	N/A

5. Preparation of the report of the Chair of the Animals Committee for the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties	Dan Challender		<i>No document</i>	N/A
6. Cooperation with other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs)	Dena Cator (<i>Richard Jenkins followed at the meeting</i>).	6.1 Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem services (IPBES) (Decision 16.15)*	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 6.1) has been prepared by Mr. Hesiquio Benítez (Mexico) as Chair of the Standing Committee Working Group on the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), in collaboration with the Secretariat. The document provides an update on the implementation of CITES Decisions on IPBES since their adoption at the last meeting of the Conference of the Parties.</p> <p>The Animals Committee is invited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Take note of the progress on the implementation of IPBES related Decisions, and encourage Parties to follow the upcoming nominations of experts in particular those related to the Sustainable Use Assessment; - In keeping with Decision 16.15, provide additional information, if any, on the activities of the AC Chair in assisting the Standing Committee with the implementation of Decision 16.14; and - Consider whether and how the Chairs of the Scientific Advisory Bodies (CSAB), when serving as observers to the MEP, should coordinate more closely with each other. 	The Animals Committee noted this document.
7. Capacity building	Richard Jenkins	7.1 Report of the Secretariat - overview*	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 7) was prepared by the Secretariat and relates to capacity-building.</p> <p>The Animals Committee may wish to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) a review of activities listed in paragraph 6 above to better harmonize the work under other Decisions that have contributed to the implementation of Decision 16.29 b); make the products mutually supportive; avoid duplication of work; and, where appropriate, examine how to better coordinate similar activities under different Decisions. In this regard, the 	<p>The Committee noted document AC28 Doc. 7.1.</p> <p>The Committee further recommended that the joint intersessional working groups established by the Animals and Plants Committees on capacity-building (pursuant to Decision 16.29) and on identification and guidance material (pursuant to Decision 16.59) work jointly in the future.</p> <p>The Committee also noted the opportunities and suggestions provided for donors to support capacity-building activities.</p>

			Committees may also wish to review the effectiveness of Decisions 16.29 and 16.53 on the basis of the expanded mandate of Resolutions Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP16) and Conf. 16.7; b) the scope of work under Decision 16.29 b) in relation to the mandate of the working group on capacity-building; c) how best the working group on capacity building and the working group on the review of identification and guidance materials may communicate, collaborate, and align their work with each other; and d) the suggestions for new targeted capacity-building activities, including the funding thereof, outlined in paragraph 12.	
	Richard Jenkins	7.2 Report of the joint working group on capacity-building (Decision 16.29)*	This document (AC28 Doc. 7.2) was submitted by the co-Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committee working group on capacity-building, and relates to decisions on capacity-building adopted at CoP16. The Animals Committee is invited to note this document.	The Animals Committee noted this document.
8. Extinct or possibly extinct species (Decision 16.164)*	Dan Challender (<i>Jon Paul Rodríguez followed at the meeting</i>).		This document (AC28 Doc. 8) concerns the provisions in Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16) as they apply to species that are either extinct or possibly extinct. At AC27/PC21 a working group was established and mandated to: (i) review the provisions of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16) on Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II as they apply to species that are either extinct or possibly extinct and report to the Standing Committee on their findings; (ii) develop broad principles that could be applied for treating ‘Extinct’ and ‘Possibly extinct’ species included in Appendices I and II, and address the practical implementation challenges; and (iii) report to AC28/PC22. Two key points: 1. The IUCN definition of ‘extinct’ and the CITES definition of ‘possibly extinct’ are largely identical except that CITES introduces the concept of doubt, i.e. CITES refers to species as ‘possibly’ extinct. 2. It seems species considered ‘Extinct in the Wild’ by	This document was introduced by the representative of Europe (Vin Fleming) who detailed that option one in AC28 Doc. 8 was perhaps the preferred option of the majority of the working group. Various interventions were made both in support of and questioning the proposed way forward. IUCN made an intervention as follows (in Spanish): “IUCN welcomes the attention to this matter and has read the report of the Working Group with interest. We agree that species with the tags ‘possibly extinct’ and ‘possibly extinct in the wild’ should not be covered by the Working Group, and we support the adoption by CITES of the IUCN Red List category and definition of extinct.” The Committee recommended the adoption of the term ‘extinct’ and the IUCN Red List definition thereof for use in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16). The Committee established a working group on agenda item 8 (working group on extinct species) with the following

			<p>IUCN (and even CR(PEW)) should be beyond the scope of the working group because such species are evidently <u>extant</u>.</p> <p>The working group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> recommends that species classed in the IUCN Red List as ‘Extinct in the Wild’ should not be part of the scope of the mandate of this working group because these species are still extant; the provisions of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16) do not, therefore, need to be reviewed for these species. Nor should the Critically Endangered taxa with the tags ‘possibly extinct’ and ‘possibly extinct in the wild’ be part of the scope of this working group. In the latter category, the species are evidently not extinct; whilst in the former, there is doubt about whether they are extinct or not; the precautionary approach for CITES should be to consider them as still extant. recommends that clarification and guidance should be sought from the CITES Secretariat and the Standing Committee on the issue of whether species included in a higher taxon listing but which were known to be extinct before the listing came into force (or, indeed, before the Convention came into force) are considered to be covered by the listing. Some draft text is inserted in brackets in Option 1 (see below and Annex 1) for debate. recommends that CITES adopts the IUCN Red List category and definition of ‘extinct’ instead of the term and definition of ‘possibly extinct’ currently used in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16). <p>Three ways forward are suggested for consideration by AC28/PC22:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Option 1. This option (see Annex 1) incorporates recommendations from AC28 Doc. 8 and provides suggested amendments to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. 	<p>mandate:</p> <p>Taking account of the presentations and discussions in plenary, the working group shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> review the proposals of the working group, the United States of America and Mexico contained in the annexes to document AC28 Doc. 8 concerning the implementation of Decision 16.164; propose a way forward for the Animals Committee to consider, bearing in mind the consultation with the Plants Committee; and advise on the reporting by the Animals and Plants Committees on their findings to the Standing Committee. <p>IUCN was a member of the working group.</p> <p>The working group made the following recommendations (outlined in AC28 Com. 1 (Rev. by Sec.)):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The working group recommends the Committee adopt option 1 of AC28 Doc.8 (Annex 1) with the suggested amendments shown in Annex 1 (a & b) to this working group report for onward transmission to the Plants Committee and subsequently to the Standing Committee. The group noted that these suggested changes to Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16) were the best approach to achieve the mandate of the group. The group noted that Parties remain free to propose any amendments to the Appendices to de-list extinct species if they choose to do so. The group were divided as to whether there was merit in annotating extinct species in the Appendices, noting that such an amendment would require a proposal(s) to the Conference of the Parties. As a result, possible text to use in any annotation is placed in brackets (in section D of Annex 4) for future consideration by the Plants and Standing Committees. However, the group recommends that, regardless of
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>CoP16) to address the broader issues. In short, it suggests a presumption that extinct species should not normally be included in the Appendices but where these species are already listed, they should not be de-listed unless suggested precautionary criteria are met.</p> <p>b. Option 2. This option (see Annex 2), proposed by the United States, would retain extinct species in the Appendices with annotations and with restrictions on the types of trade that are permitted in specimens of extinct species.</p> <p>c. Option 3. This option (Annex 3), proposed by Mexico, would seek to delete extinct species from the Appendices unless there were good reasons to retain them. Where any extinct species were retained in the Appendices, they would be annotated to indicate their retention was on precautionary grounds. This option also proposes a more streamlined mechanism to remove extinct species from the Appendices involving the scientific Committees, IUCN and relevant range States.</p> <p>AC28 is (i) asked to note progress of working group, (ii) consider recommendations of the working group (iii) and offer comment on the options of a way forward, and (iv) forward outcome of deliberations at AC28 to PC22 and subsequent submission to SC66.</p>	<p>whether the Parties choose to annotate extinct species, the Secretariat should be asked to request UNEP-WCMC to ensure that extinct species listed in the Appendices are appropriately flagged / annotated in the Species+ database and the Index of CITES Species.</p> <p>6. With regard to paragraph 20.b of AC28. Doc.8, the group noted that it was not clear if higher taxon listings included species known to be extinct at the time of listing. The group felt that this issue was outside the scope of this working group and recommends to the Committee that it be drawn to the attention of the Standing Committee.</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the recommendations in document AC28 Com. 1 (Rev. by. Sec), as reflected above.</p>
9. Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix II species [Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13)]	Richard Jenkins	9.1 Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade [Decision 13.67 (Rev. CoP14)]*	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 9.1) has been prepared by the Co-Chairs of the Advisory Working Group (AWG) on the Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade.</p> <p>At the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Santiago, 2002), the Animals and Plants Committees sought and received a mandate to develop terms of reference for an evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade. These terms of reference were proposed and adopted at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Bangkok, 2004). The terms of reference give the responsibility for overseeing the evaluation to the Animals and Plants Committees, with the help of an advisory working group</p>	<p>This document was introduced by the Chair of Animals Committee who introduced the work of the advisory Working Group on Evaluation of Review of Significant Trade.</p> <p>Positive feedback was provided by Europe, North America and Oceania on the work of this group, though some issues were also raised (for example on the quality and quantity of data available within the RST, the option of a menu of options for species reviewed, and country reviews).</p> <p>The Committee established a working group on agenda item</p>

		<p>comprising Committee members, Parties, the Secretariat and invited experts.</p> <p>The Advisory Working Group first met 24-28 June 2012 at the International Academy for Nature Conservation on the Isle of Vilm, Germany. The results and recommendations from the Vilm meeting were reported to the 27th meeting of the Animals Committee and the 21st meeting of the Plants Committee (AC27/PC21 Doc. 12.1). The Advisory Working Group first met 24-28 June 2012 at the International Academy for Nature Conservation on the Isle of Vilm, Germany. The results and recommendations from the Vilm meeting were reported to the 27th meeting of the Animals Committee and the 21st meeting of the Plants Committee (AC27/PC21 Doc. 12.1). The Animals and Plants Committee noted the report of the Advisory Working Group and agreed that the Advisory Working Group should continue to work intersessionally aiming to submit a draft revision of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) on Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species at the 28th meeting of the Animal Committee and the 22nd meeting of the Plants Committee for their consideration (AC27/PC21 Sum. 2).</p> <p>The Advisory Working Group (AWG) met again from 27 April to 1 May 2015 at the National Conservation Training Centre (NCTC), Shepherdstown, West Virginia, United States. The goal of the Shepherdstown meeting of the Advisory Working Group was to prepare an updated resolution with new supporting annexes for presentation to the Animals and Plants Committee, as well as review progress and provide recommendations on all aspects of the terms of reference for the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade.</p> <p>The Animals Committee is invited to endorse:</p> <p>a) the revisions to Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) on Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species as found in Annex 3 of this report to be jointly submitted by the Animals and Plants Committees for adoption at the 17th Meeting</p>	<p>9.1 (Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade) with the following mandate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Taking account of the presentations and discussions in plenary, the working group shall review: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the revisions to Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) on Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species, as proposed in Annex 3 of document AC28 Doc. 9.1; b) the guidance to the Secretariat regarding its initial letter to range States, as found in Annexes 1 and 2 of document AC28 Doc. 9.1; and c) the four draft decisions in paragraphs 24, 27 and 28 of document AC28 Doc. 9.1, taking into account the amendment agreed to draft decision 17.XA. 2. The working group shall make recommendations for the Animals Committee to consider, bearing in mind consultation with the Plants Committee. <p>IUCN was a member of this working group.</p> <p>The working group produced the following recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With regards to the decisions proposed in AC28 Doc. 9.1, the Animals Committee adopts the four decisions as amended for consideration by the Plants Committee and transmission to the Conference of the Parties. The amended decisions can be seen in AC28 Com. 4 (Rev. by Sec.). 2. With regards to the guidance to the Secretariat found in Annex 1 of AC28 Doc. 9.1, the Animals Committee adopts the guidance as amended in Annex 1 of this working group report (see here: AC28 Com. 4 (Rev. by Sec.)) for consideration by the Plants Committee and transmission to the Conference of the Parties. 3. With regards to the proposed annex to include in the Secretariat's initial letter to range States found in Annex 2 of AC28 Doc. 9.1, the Animals Committee adopts the guidance
--	--	---	---

			<p>of the Conference of the Parties (2016);</p> <p>b) the guidance to the Secretariat regarding their initial letter to range States (Annex 1 and 2); and</p> <p>c) the four decisions found in paragraph 24, paragraph 27 and paragraph 28, to be jointly submitted by the Animals and Plants Committees for adoption at the 17th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (2016).</p> <p>d) undertaking the preparation of a side event at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties detailing the proposed revisions to Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), to be jointly hosted with the Plants Committee.</p>	<p>as amended in Annex 2 of this working group report (see here: AC28 Com. 4 (Rev. by Sec.)) for consideration by the Plants Committee and transmission to the Conference of the Parties.</p> <p>4. With regards to the proposed revisions to Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) found in Annex 3 of AC28 Doc. 9.1, the Animals Committee agrees to forward the draft Resolution as amended in Annex 3 of this working group report (see here: AC28 Com. 4 (Rev. by Sec.)) for consideration by the Plants Committee and subsequent transmission to the Conference of the Parties.</p> <p>5. Additionally, the Animals Committee recommends the Secretariat provide the Guidance on Formulating Recommendations found in Annex 4 of this working group report (see here: AC28 Com. 4 (Rev. by Sec.)) to each meeting of the Animals or Plants Committee where recommendations are being formulated.</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the recommendations above and outlined in AC28 Com. 4 (Rev. by Sec.).</p>
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins and Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	9.2 Overview of the species-based Review of Significant Trade	This document (AC28 Doc. 9.2) provides an updated list of countries and species currently subject to the Review of Significant Trade process. The document is just to be noted.	The Animals Committee noted this document.
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins and Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	9.3 Species selected following CoP13, CoP14 and CoP15	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 9.3, (Rev. 2)) has been prepared by the Secretariat. It details species selected by the Animals Committee for its Review of Significant Trade following the 13th, 14th and 15th meetings of the Conference of the Parties in compliance with the provisions in Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) on <i>Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix II species</i> and provided an updated status of the cases that remain in the review.</p> <p>The Animals Committee is invited to take note of the information</p>	<p>This document was introduced by the Secretariat. The Animals Committee established a working group on agenda items 9.3 and 9.4 with the following mandate. IUCN was a member of this working group.</p> <p><u>Concerning agenda item 9.3</u></p> <p>1. Review the information on <i>Hippopotamus amphibius</i> provided by Cameroon, and assess its pertinence to the Standing Committee's request for Cameroon to report on a national population survey, and progress with the</p>

			<p>contained in this document.</p> <p>The Animals Committee is invited to review the information provided by Cameroon concerning <i>Hippopotamus amphibius</i>, and assess the pertinence of the information with regard to a national population survey of <i>H. amphibius</i>, and the establishment of science-based quotas and non-detriment findings. The Animals Committee is also invited to formulate findings and recommendations for consideration in the context of the implementation of paragraph q) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13).</p> <p>The Animals Committee is further invited to review the information provided by Cambodia and Viet Nam concerning <i>Macaca fascicularis</i>, and formulate its findings and recommendations for consideration in the context of the implementation of paragraph q) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) (making non-detriment findings for trade).</p>	<p>establishment of science-based quotas and non-detriment findings for the species and prepare comments to be reported to the Standing Committee; and</p> <p>2. Review the information provided by Cambodia and Viet Nam regarding <i>Macaca fascicularis</i>, and provided orally by Peru regarding <i>Podocnemis unifilis</i>, in response to recommendations formulated by the Animals Committee at its 27th meeting, and formulate its findings and recommendations for consideration in the context of the implementation of paragraph q) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13).</p> <p>The working group produced the following recommendations:</p> <p><i>Hippocampus amphibius</i></p> <p>1. With regard to Hippopotamus amphibius from Cameroon the Working Group thanked Cameroon for their oral submission and recommend that they submit the information from the studies referred to in written form to the Animals Committee before the 30th of September, which will allow the Secretariat to assess the additional information in time for the deadline for submission of documents for the next meeting of the Standing Committee.</p> <p>2. In the absence of the written submission from Cameroon, the Working Group recommends that the Animals Committee inform the Standing Committee that Cameroon has not met the recommendations of the Standing Committee and has not demonstrated that Article IV paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6(a) is being correctly implemented. Consequently it is recommended that the species/country combination should be continue to be retained within the review and there should be no increase in the quota.</p> <p><i>Macaca fascicularis</i> / Cambodia and Vietnam</p> <p>1. With regard to Cambodia, the Working Group recommends that the Secretariat inform the Standing</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Committee that the recommendations formulated for this species/country by the Animals Committee at its 27th meeting have not been implemented and that the species/country should be maintained within the review.</p> <p>2. In particular, concerns were raised in relation to the lack of recent population studies, the status of the current ban on harvest of wild specimens and the limitations of the current tagging and tracking system used to distinguish between wild and captive-bred specimens.</p> <p>3. The Working Group recommends that the Secretariat send a letter to Cambodia seeking clarification on the status and legal basis of the current ban on the taking of wild specimens for use in captive breeding operations. Should it be confirmed that the ban will not remain in place following October 2015 when it is due to expire, the following information should be requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Current population size and conservation status, including the methodologies used to determine these; and b. The effect of the removal of the ban on future management of the captive breeding facilities. <p>4. In addition, in response to the request from Cambodia for assistance from the Animals Committee, the Working Group recommends that the Secretariat send a letter to Cambodia asking them to identify their specific needs and problems in terms of managing this species and the captive breeding facilities for this species.</p> <p>5. With regard to Viet Nam, the Working Group recommends that the Animals Committee inform the Standing Committee through the Secretariat that the recommendations formulated for this species/country by the Animals Committee at its 27th meeting have been implemented and that Viet Nam be deleted from the review for this species.</p> <p>6. The Working Group noted the concerns raised in relation to high levels of illegal trade in the species, particularly between Cambodia and Viet Nam, and recommends that the Animals Committee bring these concerns to the attention of</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>the Standing Committee for further consideration.</p> <p><i>Podocnemis unifilis</i></p> <p>1. With regard to <i>Podocnemis unifilis</i> from Peru, the Working Group recommends that the Animals Committee inform the Standing Committee that the recommendations as formulated at AC27 have been implemented and that Peru be removed from the review of significant trade for this species.</p> <p>2. The WG congratulated Peru on the work carried out in conserving this species and consider the management of <i>Podocnemis unifilis</i> in Peru as a good example of sustainable use and community involvement.</p>
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins and Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	Annex 1- Cameroun: Communication du Plan de gestion de l'hippopotame (French only)	AC28 Doc. 9.3 Annex 1	No summary
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins and Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	Annex 2 - Cambodia: Information concerning <i>Macaca fascicularis</i> (English only)	AC28 Doc. 9.3 Annex 2	No summary
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins and Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	Annex 3 - Viet Nam: Information concerning <i>Macaca fascicularis</i> (English only)	AC28 Doc. 9.3 Annex 3	No summary
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins and Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	9.4 Species selected follow16	This document (AC28 Doc. 9.4 (Rev.2)) has been prepared by the Secretariat. It provides details on the 20 animal taxa selected for the Review of Significant Trade at the 27 th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC27, Veracruz, April 2014) on the basis of information provided in document AC27 Doc. 12.5.	<p>The Animals Committee established a working group on agenda items 9.3 and 9.4 with the following mandate. IUCN was a member of this working group.</p> <p><u>Concerning agenda item 9.4</u></p>

	meeting).	<p>In accordance with paragraph f) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the Committee is invited to review the available information and, if satisfied that Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a), is correctly implemented, to eliminate the species mentioned above from the review with respect to the range States concerned.</p> <p>In the event that the species is not eliminated from the review, in accordance with paragraph g) of the same Resolution, the Secretariat will proceed with the compilation of information regarding the species for later consideration by the Committee.</p> <p>Species/country results</p> <p><i>Tayassu pecari</i> Exclude – All range states</p> <p><i>Ursus maritimus</i> Exclude – All range states</p> <p><i>Manis gigantea</i> Exclude – Tanzania Retain – Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Uganda. <i>*This list of range states was provided to the CITES Secretariat by IUCN (from the IUCN SSC Pangolin Specialist Group) on 18 October 2015. CITES Secretariat to finalise selection of range states with the Animals Committee.</i></p> <p><i>Manis tricuspis</i> Exclude – Tanzania Retain – Angola, Benin, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Sierra Leon, Togo and Uganda. <i>*This list of range states was provided to the CITES Secretariat by IUCN (from the IUCN SSC Pangolin Specialist Group) on 18 October 2015. CITES Secretariat to finalise selection of range states with the Animals Committee.</i></p>	<p>3. For the 20 taxa selected by the Animals Committee for its review of Significant Trade following CoP16, the working group shall:</p> <p>a) In accordance with paragraph f) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), review the available information presented in document AC28 Doc. 9.4 (Rev. 2) and the responses from affected range States (which will be made available by the Secretariat to the working group); and</p> <p>b) If satisfied that Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a), is correctly implemented, recommend to the Animals Committee to eliminate the species from the review with respect to the range States concerned.</p> <p>IUCN made a number of interventions in this working, in particular on:</p> <p>Polar bear: In the discussion following Canada’s presentation on how it makes NDFs for this species IUCN made an intervention: thanking Canada for its very helpful presentation; explaining that differences in (sub-)population estimates between the IUCN SSC Polar Bear SG and Canada’s Polar Bear Technical Committee are because of the way that each group, with its own set of experts, analyses and interprets data; that there are only two differences in terms of sub-population estimates; and that it seems from the presentation by Canada that the main concern, for both groups, is the lack of new survey data from certain sub-populations</p> <p>Freshwater turtles: For the freshwater turtles in the RST, IUCN was asked to, and provided the global conservation status for each species.</p> <p>Pangolins: IUCN made a short intervention clarifying details pertaining to the African Pangolin Working Group Conference and the First Pangolin Range States meeting.</p>
--	-----------	---	---

		<p><i>Amazona festiva</i> Exclude – Colombia, Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) Retain – Guyana</p> <p><i>Uromastix ornata</i> Exclude – All range states</p> <p><i>Uromastix aegyptia</i> Exclude – Bahrain, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, and Yemen. Retain – Jordan, Syrian Arab Republic</p> <p><i>Triceros montium</i> Retain - Cameroon</p> <p><i>Varanus ornatus</i> Exclude – Angola, Benin, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal and Sierra Leone. Retain – Togo</p> <p><i>Ophiophagus hannah</i> Exclude - Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, China, Hong Kong SAR, India, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Nepal, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Viet Nam. Retain – Indonesia, Malaysia</p> <p><i>Malayemys subtrijuga</i> Exclude – Cambodia, China, Thailand, Vietnam Retain – Indonesia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Malaysia.</p>	<p>The working group produced the following recommendations:</p> <p>1. In accordance with paragraph f) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev CoP13), the Working Group reviewed the information available in AC28 Doc. 9.4 (Rev 2) and responses from range States to assess if Article IV, paragraph 2(a), 3 or 6 (a) is correctly implemented. Based on the responses received and information provided by members of the WG, the WG made a series of recommendations to the AC to retain or remove species/country combinations from the review. These recommendations are summarized in the Table in Annex A in AC28 Com. 8 (Rev. by Sec.) and reflected in the column to the left.</p> <p>2. The working group noted with some concern the poor response rate from range States to the consultation letter from the Secretariat and the effect this had on their ability to evaluate the species in the Significant Trade Review process. The group expressed the hope that the Advisory Working Group for the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade will suggest ways to improve the response rate. It was further noted that to improve transparency it may be necessary in future to provide a justification for the elimination of a species/country combination from the review.</p> <p>3. The Working Group recommends that, with regard to <i>Ursus maritimus</i>, polar bear range States be encouraged to apply a cautious approach in relation to the management of sub-populations that are assessed as declining or data deficient (uncertain).</p> <p>4. In the case of <i>Uromastix ornata</i>, the working group noted that there is no reported trade from any of the range States. Therefore, it is recommended that this species be deleted</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p><i>Notochelys platynota</i> Exclude – Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia, Myanmar (distribution uncertain), Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. Retain – Indonesia.</p> <p><i>Chelonoidis denticulate</i> Exclude - Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Colombia, Dominica, Ecuador, France, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) Retain – Guyana, Suriname</p> <p><i>Geochelone sulcata</i> Exclude - Central African Republic, Chad, Djibouti (uncertain), Eritrea, Ethiopia, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, and Somalia (uncertain). Retain – Benin, Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Sudan, Togo.</p> <p><i>Testudo graeca</i> Exclude - Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Georgia, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Libya, Moldova (Republic of), Montenegro, Morocco, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Spain, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, and Turkmenistan Retain – Jordan, Syrian Arab Republic</p> <p><i>Hippocampus erectus</i> Exclude – All range states</p> <p><i>Ornithoptera croesus</i> Retain - Indonesia</p> <p><i>Ornithoptera meridionalis</i> Exclude – Indonesia, Papua New Guinea</p> <p><i>Ornithoptera rothschildi</i> Retain - Indonesia</p>	<p>from the review process. However, trade has been reported from a number of non-range States (notably Jordan, Sudan and Syrian Arab Republic). As this is identified as an issue that is not related to the implementation of Article IV, the WG recommends that the AC bring this issue to the attention of the Standing Committee.</p> <p>5. The working group noted that trade in <i>Trioceros montium</i>, which is an endemic species to Cameroon, has been reported by Equatorial Guinea. Since this may not be an issue related to implementation of Article IV, paragraph 2(a), 3 or 6(a), the working group recommends that the Secretariat brings this issue to the attention of the Standing Committee.</p> <p>6. In the case of both <i>Manis gigantea</i> and <i>M. tricuspis</i>, the United Republic of Tanzania was the only range State that provided a response, and since this range State prohibits trade in these species, the working group recommends removing Tanzania from the review for these two pangolin species. The working group brought attention to concerns raised at the First Pangolin Range States Meeting in June, 2015, about the lack of robust biological information on African pangolin species and increasing levels of international trade in these species. In light of the large number of range States that did not respond and concerned that the WCMC CITES trade database do not reflect trade for the most recent years, and that significant trade could be occurring undetected now or in the future, the working group recommends that the AC retain in the review all other range States for <i>M. gigantea</i> and <i>M. tricuspis</i> that do not fully protect these species through national legislation prohibiting their export. To assist this selection process, the working group recommends that the Secretariat consult with UNEP-WCMC and the IUCN Pangolin Specialist Group to identify those range States that do not prohibit trade through national legislation and may therefore require a more detailed review. The Secretariat shall finalize the selection of range States for</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><i>Hirudo medicinalis</i></p> <p>Exclude - Austria, Belarus, Belgium (uncertain), Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia (uncertain), Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg (uncertain), Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.</p> <p>Retain - Turkey (distribution uncertain)</p>	<p>a detailed review in consultation with the Animals Committee.</p> <p>7. The working group noted the concerns raised in Myanmar's response concerning illegal trade in <i>Ophiophagus hannah</i> from Myanmar, and since this is an issue not related to the implementation of Article IV, the working group recommends that the AC refer this issue to the Standing Committee.</p> <p>8. The working group noted the issues Brazil raised in its response concerning likely errors in trade records of <i>Hippocampus erectus</i> due to species identification/taxonomic challenges, and since this may not be an issue related to implementation of Article IV, the working group recommends the AC bringing these issues to the Standing Committee.</p>
10. Review of identification and guidance material (Decision 16.59)*	Dan Challender		<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 10) has been prepared by the Animals and Plants Committee intersessional working group on identification and guidance materials in collaboration with the CITES Secretariat. It relates to decisions adopted on identification of CITES-listed species and identification materials at CoP16.</p> <p>Following adoption of Decisions 16.59-16.61 at CoP16, and in compliance with Decision 16.59 paragraph a), the Animals and Plants Committees established an inter--sessional working group with a mandate to:</p> <p>b) determine, in collaboration with Parties, the current availability of identification and guidance material (printed and electronic) to increase accessibility to Parties;</p> <p>c) consult with Parties to assess the need for additional identification material, including material under production by Parties and requested in Decisions;</p> <p>d) compile a list of outstanding Decisions directing the Parties, the Animals and Plants Committees, and the Secretariat to</p>	<p>The Animals Committee noted this document.</p> <p>Also, the Committee recommended that the joint intersessional working groups established by the Animals and Plants Committees on capacity building (pursuant to Decision 16.29) and on identification and guidance material (pursuant to Decision 16.59) work jointly in the future.</p>

		<p>produce identification and guidance material for CITES-listed taxa;</p> <p>e) review, in collaboration with the Secretariat, and, taking into account new web-based technologies, make recommendations, including amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.19 (Rev. CoP16) on Identification Manual, to promote accuracy and availability of identification and guidance material; and</p> <p>f) report progress at the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.</p> <p>The working group is collaborating with the Secretariat on b) and undertaking c) and d) on which a compilation of outstanding Decisions has been completed and is under discussion by the working group. Regarding e), a project proposal on <i>‘Improvements to the CITES identification materials: options to promote accuracy and availability of identification material to the Parties to CITES</i>, drafted by UNEP-WCMC is under review by the working group and Secretariat.</p> <p>The Committee is invited to note this document.</p>	
11. Identification of sturgeons and paddlefish specimens in trade (Decision 16.137)	Dena Cator (<i>Richard Jenkins and Dan Challender followed at the meeting</i>).	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 11) was prepared by the Secretariat. It focuses on a decision relating to sturgeon made at the last CITES CoP16 meeting to launch a study on molecular, DNA-based and other forensic methods that could assist in identifying the species and populations of Acipenseriformes specimens in trade. At the 27th meeting of the Animals Committee (Veracruz, April 2014), the Secretariat had identified possible experts to undertake the study, but the necessary external funds had not been secured and still haven't been. <u>In the light of this, the Secretariat approached the co-authors of the study "Identification of Acipenseriformes species in trade" conducted for the Secretariat in 2008, regarding an update of the original study.</u> An oral report will be provided by the Secretariat at the Animals Committee on the current status of this effort. For a comprehensive study, donor Parties and stakeholders are invited to contribute the requisite financial support.</p>	<p>The co-authors of the study "Identification of Acipenseriformes species in trade" conducted for the Secretariat in 2008, referenced in the document and who have been asked to provide an oral update on this work at the CITES AC meeting, are the IUCN SSC Sturgeon Specialist Group. Dr. Ludwig's report submitted for the meeting is Inf Doc. 18.</p> <p>The Animals Committee noted this document. It also noted with regret that funds have not yet been made available to support the study requested in Decision 16.136.</p>

			The Animals Committee is invited to note this document.	
12. Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species (Decision 15.53)*	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Natusch delivered at the meeting</i>).		This document (AC28 Doc. 12) outlines the decisions that were taken at CITES CoP16 relating to production systems and clarifies that IUCN was contracted to complete a study in this regard. The Animals and Plants Committees are invited to review and provide feedback to the Secretariat on the draft guide to advise the Parties on the appropriate use of source codes.	<p>This document was introduced by the Secretariat and IUCN was asked to report on the study completed by the Boa and Python Specialist Group. The following intervention was delivered:</p> <p>“The CITES Secretariat commissioned IUCN to compile a succinct draft guidance document of 10 pages or fewer for the correct application of CITES Source Codes.</p> <p>We began the work by conducting a comprehensive review of all production systems for all taxa and a review of relevant Resolutions, Definitions, Decisions and guidance Notifications produced by the Secretariat.</p> <p>I think it is well recognised that the issue of source codes is complex. Our task was to provide guidance on source codes as they are currently defined, not to provide guidance on how WE believed the source codes should be used.</p> <p>In keeping with this mandate, for the final guidance we decided upon a simple decision tree, which literally interprets the source codes as they are presently defined, and which can be applied to any existing production system.</p> <p>That being said, we would like to highlight that we uncovered several inconsistencies and contradictions within relevant Source Code Resolutions that make interpretation difficult. While we understand the initial intentions of some source codes, we believe that several are creating confusion while providing little added value. A review of source codes more generally may be warranted.</p> <p>The decision tree we produced has been replicated in two different layouts to allow the Animals Committee and the Parties to decide upon the most user-friendly version. We also included succinct accompanying guidance on captive breeding and ranching, which we felt are the two source</p>

				<p>codes that include several ambiguities in their definitions, and which Parties would benefit from further guidance.</p> <p>To conclude, IUCN hopes the documents are useful for the Parties and looks forward to receiving feedback from the Animals Committee for their improvement”.</p> <p>The Committee established a working group on agenda item 12 with the following mandate. IUCN was a member of the working group.</p> <p>Taking account of the presentations and discussions in plenary, the working group shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Review the draft guides in the Annexes to document AC28 Doc. 12 and provide feedback to the Secretariat towards improving the proposed guide on the appropriate use of source codes.2. Provide suggestions for incorporating examples of different production and cultivation systems into the guidance without overcomplicating the guide. <p>The working group recommended the Animals Committee adopt feedback as follows for transmission to the Secretariat:</p> <p>Regarding the document:</p> <p>The Animals Committee recognized that the goal of the guide was to assist Parties in determining the most appropriate source code for a particular specimen. The Animals Committee noted this document should not provide guidance towards making a non-detriment finding or an export decision. As such, language regarding the appropriateness of an export should be removed.</p> <p>AC28 Com. 7 – p. 2 The Animals Committee reiterated the aim of creating a clear and user-friendly guide. As such, the Animals Committee noted with appreciation the two formats used for presentation of the Application of CITES Source</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Codes document found in Annexes 1 and 2 of AC28 Doc. 12. The Committee indicated that the final version of the document should include both formats of the guidance as, depending on personal preference, both are equally useful. Given the two presentation styles, the Animals Committee recommends both versions include identical information such that the only variance between the guides is the style of the graphics.</p> <p>The Animals Committee recommended that the guidance provided should make consistent reference to the Resolutions that form the sources for the guidance. Additionally, the guidance should not introduce new terms such as “farmed.”</p> <p>The Animals Committee further recommended that the document reflect the definitions for source codes found in Resolution Conf. 12.3 on Permits and Certificates. Regarding source code O, the definition of this code in Annex 2 of Resolution Conf. 12.3 indicates that this code may be used with another code and the guide could provide guidance on how to implement this requirement of the code. The Animals Committee recommended that the document provide more guidance in cases where there is uncertainty as to whether provisions of the relevant resolutions have been met.</p> <p>Regarding examples of different productions systems: In general, the Animals Committee felt the guidance could be improved with the addition of better or more detailed descriptions or advice on how to interpret the language of the Resolutions associated with source codes, including various examples of production systems. For example, Res. Conf. 10.16 on Specimens of animal species bred in captivity indicates that the competent authority should be satisfied that the breeding stock is “managed in a manner that has been demonstrated to be capable of reliably producing second</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>generation offspring in a controlled environment.” Advice on what is meant by this language would be useful.</p> <p>The Animals Committee recommends Parties be invited to propose ideas for case studies on species or types of production systems to support the guide, such as case studies related to the application of source codes for clam mariculture.</p> <p>It was noted that mixed production systems can cause a practical problem with application of source codes.</p> <p>Regarding challenges in the use of source codes: In undertaking the review of this document, the Animals Committee recognized that there is ambiguity within the relevant resolutions associated with source codes and that interpretation can require reference to more than one resolution. These both can result in different interpretations of the use of source codes by the Parties. Some of the challenges identified (noting that there may be others) included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The interpretation of source code F versus source code C or source code W was recognized as ambiguous. For example, some Parties emphasized the part of the definition of source code F that says “born in captivity” when considering the application of source code F whereas other Parties also take into consideration the parental lineage when determining the application of source code F.- Similarly, the Animals Committee noted differences of interpretation regarding the application of source code R versus source code W or source code F, particularly in the case of Appendix II species.- Source code C is defined by referencing Resolution Conf. 10.16 on Specimens of animal species bred in captivity. However the definition of source code C found in operative paragraph i) of Resolution Conf. 12.3 on Permits and Certificates also includes reference to the provisions under
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>which the specimens are traded. Further there can be questions regarding the application of source code C and source code D regarding the purpose of production given the reference to the provisions under which the specimens are traded.</p> <p>Conclusions The Animals Committee recommends a new version of this guidance be prepared taking into account the suggestions provided by the Committee above, the additional comments from Parties at this meeting, and the comments from the Plants Committee.</p> <p>The Animals Committee noted that further feedback from the Standing Committee or Parties, particularly for resolving inconsistent or conflicting direction between existing Resolutions, may be required.</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the recommendations the document AC28 Com. 7, as reflected above.</p>
	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Natusch delivered at the meeting</i>).	Annex 1 - Application of CITES Source Codes - Key 1	This document (AC28 Doc. 12 Annex 1) is IUCN's first document (key) on source codes (e.g. captive bred vs. wild) which sets out to advise Parties on the appropriate use of source codes.	No feedback received from other specialist groups.
	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Natusch delivered at the meeting</i>).	Annex 2 - Application of CITES Source Code - Key 2	This document (AC28 Doc 12 Annex 2) is IUCN's second document (key) on source codes (e.g. captive bred vs. wild) which sets out to advise Parties on the appropriate use of source codes.	No feedback received from other specialist groups.
	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Natusch delivered at the meeting</i>).	Annex 3 - Additional guidance with applying Source Code R and C	This document (AC28 Doc. 12 Annex 3) contains additional guidance on applying source codes R and C in the context of work on guidance for use of CITES source codes under agenda item 12.	No feedback received from other specialist groups.
13. Implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Challenger followed at the</i>	13.1 Report of the Secretariat	This document (AC28 Doc. 13.1) relates to a number of decisions that were taken at CITES CoP16 regarding trade in specimens claimed to be derived from captive breeding or ranching. A	This document was introduced by the Secretariat. It was noted that the contract for developing a draft checklist or guides for the inspection of captive-breeding and ranching

and ranched specimens (Decision 16.65)	meeting).		<p>number of reports relating to these decisions were delivered at previous Animals Committee meetings. At this meeting, the report considering ways to more effectively share available information on captive-breeding and ranching operations and evaluating the utility of a captive-breeding database (including wider application of the existing UNEP-WCMC Captive-Breeding Database being developed for the European Union) is presented (Annex below) is being presented. It was undertaken by Zoo & Wildlife Consulting Services.</p> <p>The contract for developing draft checklists or guides for the inspection of captive-breeding and ranching facilities and reviewing permit applications for captive-bred and ranched specimens was placed with the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and is underway (by the Boa & Python SG). The report will not be available for review in time for the present meeting. It will be presented to the 66th meeting of the Standing Committee (Geneva, January 2016).</p> <p>The report of this intersessional working group can be found in document AC28 Doc. 13.2. The Secretariat intends to prepare its own report to the Standing Committee based on both the results of the contract for the development of draft checklists or guides for the inspection of captive-breeding and ranching facilities and the review of permit applications for captive-bred and ranched specimens, and the recommendations and report of the Animals Committee.</p> <p>The Animals Committee is invited to complete its review of the available reports and prepare its recommendations for the Standing Committee in accordance with Decision 16.65.</p>	<p>facilities and reviewing permit applications for captive-bred and ranched specimens referred to in Decision 16.63 a) vii) is underway and is being completed by IUCN.</p> <p>The Animals Committee established a working group on agenda items 13.1 and 13.2 with the following mandate.</p> <p>IUCN was a member of this working group.</p> <p>Taking account of the presentations and discussions in plenary, the working group shall:</p> <p><u>Concerning agenda item 13.1</u></p> <p>1. Complete the review of the reports mentioned in document AC28 Doc. 13.1, paragraphs 4 and 5, and formulate recommendations.</p> <p>Concerning agenda item 13.1 the working group produced the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The working group notes that AC28 Doc.13.2 provides the considerations of the working group on the issues arising from the documents made available to it, under Decision 16.63.a, at the 27th meeting of the Animals Committee. - The group recommends that the outcome of these considerations by the Animals Committee is brought to the attention of the Standing Committee, noting that the Animals Committee will not be able to the review the document commissioned under Decision 16.63.a.vii because it is not yet available. - With respect to AC28 Doc.13.1, the working group expressed reservations about the value and utility of the development of a captive breeding database; this was seen to be premature at this stage. The working group felt that before any other steps were taken, there was a need to first establish and clarify the intended purpose of any database, who the users might be, what data might be shared and how any database might be maintained and funded? The group
--	-----------	--	---	--

				<p>recommended that the Committee report these observations to the Standing Committee.</p> <p>- The group noted that information on captive production might be shared, where appropriate, through other means.</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the recommendations outlined in AC28 Com. 5, with minor amendments as reflected above (and in AC28 Sum. 4 (Rev. 1)).</p>
	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Challender followed at the meeting</i>).	Annex: REVIEW: Sharing information about captive-breeding and ranching operations	This document (AC28 Doc. 13.1 Annex) is the study undertaken by Zoo & Wildlife Consulting Services referenced to in agenda item 13.1.	See 13.1 above.
	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Challender followed at the meeting</i>).	13.2 Report of the intersessional working group	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 13.2) has been submitted by Marcel Calvar Agrelo (Member for Central and South America and the Caribbean) and Vincent Fleming (Member for Europe) as co-Chairs of the working group on exemptions and special trade provisions.</p> <p>At the 27th meeting of the Animals in Veracruz, Mexico, 28 April – 3 May 2014, the Committee established an inter-sessional working group to take forward the work required by Decision 16.65. This group has worked by email since then and the attached Annex provides a report of its progress. Where some differences still persist within the group on some topics, text has been left in brackets for further discussion. It is intended that members of the working group meet to continue the work of the group during the meeting of the 28th Animals Committee.</p> <p>The Animals Committee is asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) note the progress and conclusions of the working group to-date; b) consider the recommendations of the working group; c) provide comment on the options for a possible compliance mechanism; and d) forward the outcome of discussions at this meeting to the Standing Committee for their consideration at its 66th meeting. 	<p>This document was introduced by the Chair of the Animals Committee. Interventions followed by the EU, US, Mexico, Columbia, Canada, and observers including HIS, CAICSA S.A.S, WWF and Wildlife Conservation Society.</p> <p>The Animals Committee established a working group on agenda items 13.1 and 13.2 with the following mandate. IUCN was a member of this working group.</p> <p>Taking account of the presentations and discussions in plenary, the working group shall:</p> <p><u>Concerning agenda item 13.2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Review the suggestions made in document AC28 Doc. 13.2, including options for a possible compliance mechanisms, and formulate recommendations accordingly; and 3. Prepare advice to be reported by the Animals Committee to the Standing Committee in accordance with Decision 16.65. <p>Concerning agenda item 13.2 the working group produced the following recommendations:</p>

				<p>- The working group recommends that the Animals Committee supports option 4 in paragraph 12 of AC28 Doc.13.2 – namely to suggest a new Resolution in which issues concerning compliance with the Convention for specimens declared as having been produced in captivity could be addressed.</p> <p>- Provisional text for such a Resolution, outlining a potential process, is provided in Annex 1 for consideration by the Committee. The group recommends that the Animals Committee agrees that the provisional resolution in Annex 1 (see AC28 Com.5 (Rev. by Sec.)) is a good starting point, and to provide the provisional text to the Standing Committee for its consideration.</p> <p>- In doing so, the working group recommends that the Standing Committee should be invited to consider how the respective roles of the Standing Committee and of the Animals Committee might be integrated in any future mechanism.</p> <p>- The working group recommends that, to avoid duplication of effort and to achieve maximum efficiency, the outcome of the Animals Committee deliberations on this topic are shared with the Standing Committee working group under Decision 16.39 on implementation and enforcement of the Convention as it relates to trade in species listed in Appendix I.</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the recommendations outlined in AC28 Com. 5, with minor amendments as reflected above (and in AC28 Sum. 4 (Rev. 1)).</p>
14. Snake trade and conservation management (Serpentes spp.)	Dena Cator (Tomas Waller and Dan Natusch delivered at the meeting).	No document	No document	N/A
	Dena Cator (Tomas Waller and Dan Natusch	14.1 Review of studies and activities [Decision 16.103, paragraphs a)	This document (AC28 Doc. 14.1) is an update of all the decisions taken at CITES CoP16 relating to snake trade and conservation management (16.102 and 16.103) and an update on what has	The Secretariat introduced this document and invited IUCN to introduce the four documents (Annexes to this agenda item). An intervention was delivered by the IUCN SSC Boa

	<p><i>delivered at the meeting).</i></p>	<p>and d)]</p>	<p>been done to implement them. This includes the Boa & Python SG having produced 4 of the required reports - from Annex 1 to 4 below.</p> <p>The Animals Committee is invited to review the activities and studies mentioned above, as well as the observations by the Secretariat in paragraphs 15 to 19, and, based on these studies and other information, develop guidance and recommendations for consideration by the Standing Committee at its 66th meeting. The working group on snake trade and conservation management may wish to provide its comments and findings in this regard.</p>	<p>and Python Specialist Group as follows:</p> <p><u>Non-detriment findings introduction</u></p> <p>“TUCN was commissioned by the CITES Secretariat to develop guidance on non-detriment findings for snakes as part of Decision 16.102. Draft guidance has been developed and is available from the CITES Website</p> <p>We would like to start our introduction by saying that snakes exhibit a suite of biological and ecological traits that make them generally very resilient to harvesting. However, these same traits make snake populations remarkably difficult to census, and thus determine harvest impacts using traditional methods. We have therefore taken a slightly novel approach when compiling this draft guidance.</p> <p>When developing the guidance we took into consideration the Cancun Workshop on non-detriment findings in held 2008, CITES Resolution16.7 on NDFs, the general IUCN NDF guidelines produced in 2002, as well as recent NDF guidance on perennial plants, sharks, and seahorses. A draft document was circulated to the snake-working group in June this year, and the feedback was taken on board and assisted in the development of the most recent version.</p> <p>In addition, when developing the NDF guidance we worked very closely with several of the major snake producing range states, to learn lessons and understand the difficulties the parties are facing when undertaking NDFs for snakes.</p> <p>Based on experience and review of available information we have produced guidance that does not closely resemble the other NDF guidance documents produced to date. We believe the guidance to be the most appropriate way to conduct NDFs for snakes, which focuses on directly understanding how wild populations are changing, rather</p>
--	--	----------------	---	--

				<p>than making inferences on population status based on a variety of other proxies.</p> <p>When producing the guidance and discussing the process with range states, it was clear that the guidance needed to be straightforward. To reflect this, the main NDF document is succinct, and simply explains the recommended steps taken to complete the NDF. For those parties that require specific guidance on certain aspects of the NDF process, or are merely curious about the science underpinning the NDF process, can refer to a larger annex document that delves into great detail on conceptual issues, guidance on methodologies and interpretation, and general elaboration of points made throughout the document.</p> <p>Finally, templates are provided on how to complete the NDF, as well as specific examples for CITES listed snake species presently in trade.</p> <p>We hope the draft guidance is useful for the parties, and look forward to receiving feedback for its improvement.”</p> <p><u>Production systems</u></p> <p>Decision 16.102a[i] - An assessment of the commercial production of CITES-listed snake species in Viet Nam and China</p> <p>“This report is the result of a directive given to the CITES Secretariat to undertake a study of production systems for Asian snakes listed in CITES Appendix II.</p> <p>Since the drafting of Decision 16.102 in 2012, a number of studies have emerged that address some of the primary directives of this decision.</p> <p>*These include (a) a draft inspection manual for reptile</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>captive breeding facilities in Southeast Asia (TRAFFIC 2013), (b) a report on python farming in Southeast Asia by IUCN (Natusch and Lyons 2014), (c) a report on differentiating between wild and captive bred snakes (Decision 16.102a[iv]), draft guidance on the use of CITES source codes for production systems (Decision 15.52 – implementation of the Convention related to Captive Bred and Ranched specimens), and production of guides or checklists for inspection of captive breeding and ranching facilities (Decision 16.63).</p> <p>Because many of these studies have emerged in the intervening period, there was serious risk of duplication of effort for this Decision. Following deliberation with the CITES Secretariat over specific terms of reference, it was decided to focus this new study towards improving baseline knowledge of production systems for specific species, since this remained one of the few outstanding prerequisites for informed decision-making regarding the snake trade.</p> <p>The study therefore aimed to provide baseline knowledge of the farming production systems of snakes bred for medicines and meat – knowledge of which is in its infancy. To increase the body of knowledge on these snake production systems the BPSG of IUCN undertook work in China and Viet Nam.</p> <p>The report produced provides an overview of the trade in several species of snake produced for medicines and meat. It also provides a series of recommendations for how trade, production and regulation can be improved to better comply with CITES.</p> <p>Once again, we hope the document assists Parties to make informed decisions on how to enhance implementation of the Convention related to snakes, and look forward to receiving feedback from the Animals Committee for its</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>improvement.”</p> <p>Decision 16.102a[iii] - An assessment of the impact of the pet trade on five CITES-Appendix II case studies</p> <p>“This report, prepared by the IUCN, is the result of a directive given to the CITES Secretariat under Decision 16.102, to undertake a study of one or more high-value snake species in the pet trade to determine the impacts on wild populations of legal and illegal harvest for international trade, and to provide information required for making non-detriment findings for trade in these species; and propose actions to enforce the Convention as it relates to trade in these species.</p> <p>Five species of snakes were selected for analysis, taking into account expertise available to carry out the assessments and were based on the following criteria: a) reported high levels of international trade, and/or b) unique coloration/morphology, and/or c) uncommon life habits or biological traits, and/or d) restricted range.</p> <p>BPSG specialists prepared the species accounts that are provided as annexes to the main report, summarizing information on the distribution, status, biology, trade and potential impact of trade on wild populations for the following species: Hogg Island Boa constrictor, Ball python, Calabar ground python, Green python and Boelens python.</p> <p>Although most CITES snake species have historically been traded for pets at some level, we found that only 11 species out of the 132 snake species listed in Appendix II are being traded in numbers above 1000 specimens per year. The Ball python (<i>P. regius</i>) is by far the most heavily traded CITES Appendix II-listed species, comprising 80% of all exports during recent years.</p> <p>Although harvesting always results in individuals being removed from the population, the rate at which harvesting occurs and the volumes of trade is in many cases expected</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>to be insignificant compared to the net recruitment of new individuals into the population. Trade does become a concern, however, at very high levels or for species with very limited distributions, which by default also have small absolute population sizes.</p> <p>The report summarizes the general context and potential impact of the pet trade on CITES-Appendix II listed snake species, and outlines key findings, conclusions and recommendations for each case study. The summary report is aimed at being read jointly with the species accounts in the Annexes, where relevant references and supporting data may be found.</p> <p>We hope this document is useful for the Parties and we look forward to the feedback from the Animals Committee to improve the work.”</p> <p>Decision 16.102a[iv] - Methodologies for differentiating between wild and captive-bred CITES-listed snakes</p> <p>“As we saw yesterday, there is significant concerns about wild snakes being collecting and illegally laundered through captive breeding facilities to be exported as captive-bred.</p> <p>To address this problem, the CITES Secretariat has commissioned the IUCN to conduct a study on <i>“Methodologies to differentiate between wild and captive-bred CITES-listed snakes in trade, including parts and derivatives”</i>.</p> <p>The report presented here aims to identify and describe these methods in a user-friendly manner. It also aims to acknowledge their potential limitations, examples of their use and score their applicability to snakes (and their parts and derivatives) in trade. Information on each method was gathered through consultation with relevant experts, scientists and CITES Management Authority staff.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>We believe the report is straightforward and will provide Parties with useful information when making decisions about the types of techniques or methodologies they wish to implement to improve international trade in snakes and compliance with CITES.</p> <p>We look forward to receiving feedback from the Animals Committee for improvement of this document.”</p> <p>The Animals Committee established a working group on agenda items 14.1, 14.2 and 14.3 (working group on snakes) with the following mandate (also see 14.2 and 14.3). IUCN was a member of this working group.</p> <p><u>Concerning agenda item 14.1</u></p> <p>1. Review the activities and studies mentioned in document AC28 Doc.14.1, including the four studies commissioned by the Secretariat and their recommendations, and the observations by the Secretariat in paragraphs 15 to 19 of document AC28 Doc.14.1.</p> <p>2. Based on this review and other information, develop guidance and recommendations that are pertinent to Decision 16.102, paragraphs a) to d), relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Production systems for Asian snakes listed in CITES Appendix II (use of source codes; guidance for monitoring and controlling production systems); – Guidance for NDFs for Appendix-II snake species in trade; – Methodologies to differentiate between wild and captive-bred CITES-listed snakes in trade; and – High-value snake species in the pet trade. <p>The working group produced the following recommendations:</p> <p>Concerning Decision 16.102 and Decision 16.103, the</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>Working Group makes the following recommendation to the Animals Committee:</p> <p>- The Animals Committee invites the Standing Committee to consider the drafting of a Resolution on the conservation, sustainable use of and trade in snakes based on the results achieved under different decision on snakes adopted at CoP16 with a view to increasing coherence, reducing duplication of effort and providing guidance to Parties trading in snakes. The suggested draft to this resolution is found in Annex I of AC28 Com. 6 (Rev. by Sec.).</p> <p>Concerning the recommendation to draft a Resolution on the conservation, sustainable use of and trade in snakes, the Working Group recommends to the Animals Committee to invite the Standing Committee to draft a decision on the conservation, sustainable use of and trade in snakes based on the information below:</p> <p>Encourages the Standing Committee and Animals Committee to:</p> <p>a) Review information on the conservation, sustainable use of and trade in snakes, particularly information on non-detriment findings;</p> <p>b) Instruct the Secretariat to make this information available through the CITES website;</p> <p>c) Recommend revisions to Resolution Conf. 17.XX on the conservation, sustainable use of and trade in snakes in light of this new information as necessary.</p> <p>Concerning document AC28 Doc.14.1 Annex 1 and 3, the Working Group invites the Animals Committee to submit the following recommendations to the Standing Committee:</p> <p>- the Standing Committee recommends that Southeast Asian countries engaged in the snake trade endeavour to</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>verify the origin of animals traded between countries in the region and to ensure the appropriate use of source codes.</p> <p>- the Standing Committee encourages Honduras to ensure that measures are in place to address poaching of and illegal trade in the Cayos Cochinos boa constrictor (<i>Boa constrictor imperator</i>).</p> <p>- the Standing Committee encourages Benin to implement the following measures for the Ball python (<i>Python regius</i>), in particular by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Design and implement a management program for the species; •Make non-detriment findings based on studies of the species, basic demographics, harvest and trade in the species. •Strengthen national regulations relating to trade control and monitoring, including stricter control policies for production systems. <p>- the Standing Committee encourages Ghana, Togo and Benin to implement the following measures for the Calabar ground boa (<i>Calabaria reinhardtii</i>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Make non-detriment findings based on studies of the species, basic demographics, harvest and trade in the species.; •improve systems to monitor harvest, captive breeding, and trade in the species. <p>- The Standing Committee invites Indonesia to improve enforcement of existing laws and take into account the recommendations provided in the document to more effectively regulate the collection of and trade in the populations of the wild green tree python (<i>Morelia viridis</i>) and the Boelen's python (<i>Morelia boeleni</i>).</p> <p>- the Standing Committee invites Parties affected by the above recommendations to report to the Standing Committee at its 69th meeting.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>Concerning document AC28 Doc.14.1 Annex 2, the Working Group invites the Animals Committee to consider the following recommendation</p> <p>The Animals Committee further recommends that the draft guidance to assist Parties in the making of Non-Detriment Findings, management systems for wild populations and the establishment of export quotas for Appendix II snake species as called for under Decision 16.102 a) ii) be reviewed by the intersessional working group and relevant experts and finalized in advance of the 29th meeting of the Animals Committee. The Animals Committee may wish to extend the mandate of the intersessional working group in this regard.</p> <p>Concerning document AC28 Doc.14.1 Annex 4, the Working Group invites the Animals Committee to consider the following recommendation</p> <p>The Animals Committee is invited to take note of document AC28 Doc.14.1 Annex 4 and also invites Parties to make use of the information contained in the document with a view to enhancing opportunities to better differentiate between wild and captive bred CITES-listed snakes in trade. The Animals Committee should draw the attention of the Standing Committee to Annex 4 of document AC28 Doc. 14.1, as it may be important from an implementation and enforcement perspective.</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the working group recommendations in document AC28 Com. 6 with minor amendments as reflected above and outlined in AC28 Com. 6 and AC28 Sum. 4 (Rev. 1).</p>
	Dena Cator (Tomas Waller)	Annex 1: An assessment of the commercial	This document (AC28 Doc. 14.1 Annex 1) is an assessment of the commercial production of CITES-listed snake species in	See 14.1 above.

	<i>and Dan Natusch delivered at the meeting).</i>	production of CITES-listed snake species in Viet Nam and China	Vietnam and China and was produced by the IUCN SSC Boa and Python Specialist Group.	
	Dena Cator (<i>Tomas Waller and Dan Natusch delivered at the meeting).</i>)	Annex 2: Developing CITES non-detriment findings for snakes	This document (AC28 Doc. 14.1 Annex 2) is a report on developing CITES non-detriment findings for snakes and was prepared by the IUCN SSC Boa and Python Specialist Group.	See 14.1 above.
	Dena Cator (<i>Tomas Waller and Dan Natusch delivered at the meeting).</i>)	Annex 3: An assessment of the impact of the pet trade on five CITES-Appendix II-listed snakes	This document (AC28 Doc. 14.1 Annex 3) is an assessment of the impact of the pet trade on five CITES Appendix II listed snakes and was produced by the IUCN SSC Boa and Python Specialist Group.	See 14.1 above.
	Dena Cator (<i>Tomas Waller and Dan Natusch delivered at the meeting).</i>)	Annex 4: Methodologies for differentiating between wild and captive-bred CITES-listed snakes	This document (AC28 Doc 14.1 Annex 4) details methodologies for differentiating between wild and captive-bred CITES-listed snakes and was produced by the IUCN SSC Boa and Python Specialist Group.	See 14.1 above.
	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Challender and Matt Shirley delivered at the meeting).</i>)	14.2 Reptile sourcing and traceability systems [Decision 16.103, paragraphs b) to d)]	<i>No document</i>	<p>The Animals Committee established a working group on agenda items 14.1, 14.2, and 14.3 (working group on snakes) with the following mandate (also see 14.1 and 14.3). IUCN was a member of this working group.</p> <p><u>Concerning agenda items 14.2:</u></p> <p>3. Review the studies concerning traceability of snake skins mentioned in document AC28 Doc.14.2.1 paragraphs 3 and 4 [i.e. the UNCTAD/CITES study on Traceability Systems for a Sustainable International Trade in South-East Asian Python; the Annex to document AC27 Doc. 19.4; and the four studies on the snake trade and conservation management that were commissioned by the CITES Secretariat pursuant to Decision 16.102, paragraph a) and the information provided in document AC28 Doc.14.2.2].</p> <p>4. Examine the findings and recommendations concerning traceability of snake skins in trade in the documents and studies mentioned above.</p>

				<p>5. Draft advice for consideration by the Animals Committee (and subsequent reporting to the Standing Committee) on the feasibility and implementation of a traceability and marking system for snake skins in compliance with Decision 16.103.</p> <p>6. Consider the matters identified in documents AC28 Doc. 14.2.1 and AC28 Doc. 14.2.2 and in the plenary discussion regarding traceability systems more broadly, such as issues of standards and compatibility, and formulate recommendations for consideration by the Standing Committee.</p> <p>The working produced the following recommendations:</p> <p>Concerning document AC28 Doc.14.2.1, the Working Group invites the Animals Committee to consider the following recommendation:</p> <p>The Animals Committee invites the Standing Committee to consider the drafting of a decision on traceability based on the different decisions related to traceability adopted at CoP16 with a view to increasing coherence, reducing duplication of effort and providing guidance to Parties implementing traceability systems. The suggested draft to this decision is found in Annex II in this document.</p> <p>Concerning document AC28 Doc.14.2.2, the Working Group invites the Animals Committee to:</p> <p>Note the report and notes the contribution of the document to the development of guidance on traceability systems.</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the working group recommendations in document AC28 Com. 6 with minor amendments as reflected above and outlined in AC28 Com. 6 and AC28 Sum. 4 (Rev. 1).</p>
	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Challender and Matt Shirley delivered at the</i>	14.2.1 Report of the Secretariat	This document (AC28 Doc. 14.2.1) is an outline of the various decisions that were taken at CITES CoP16 on reptile sourcing and traceability systems and the status of the work to be done in this regard (e.g. work that was completed for the previous	See 14.2 above.

	<i>meeting).</i>		<p>meeting - AC27). This document provides the opportunity for Parties and others to comment on the relevance of various existing studies in terms of this work.</p> <p>Also, the Animals Committee is invited to consider inter-sessional cooperation with the Standing Committee working group on snake trade and conservation management.</p> <p>The Animals Committee is also invited to consider proposing to the Standing Committee the drafting of a resolution on the development of business requirement specifications and use of standards related to track and trace systems to provide guidance in the development and use of such systems.</p>	
	<p>Dena Cator (<i>Dan Challender and Matt Shirley delivered at the meeting).</i></p>	<p>14.2.2 Identification carrier for a global traceability information system for reptile skins</p>	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 14.2.2) is a contribution to the work of the Animals Committee outlined in Decision 16.103. Italy and Mexico have been actively advancing the development of a global traceability information system for reptile skins to complement and strengthen the current CITES permitting system related to this trade. This work has been led by RESP – through its International Working Group on Reptile Skins (IWG-RS). The Animals Committee is invited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Take note of the progress and results presented; -Consider the conclusions of the proof of concept and the recommended next steps; -Provide comments on the options outlined for the development of a global traceability information system for reptile skins; and -Forward the outcome of discussions at this meeting to the Standing Committee for their consideration at their 66th meeting. 	<p>This document was introduced by Mexico.</p> <p>The IUCN SSC Crocodile Specialist Group made an intervention as follows:</p> <p>“The IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group notes the traceability agenda items relating to the python and snake skin trade with great interest. We would like to commend the Secretariat and the Animals Committee for their efforts to address this critically important issue, particularly through evaluation of existing traceability systems for reptiles and as they apply to the needs of the trade in snake skins as set out in Decision 16.103.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that the proposal submitted in document 14.2.2 appears to have extended the original mandate beyond that set out in Decision 16.103 to all reptile skins – well beyond snakes, and to include species such as crocodilians. We are concerned because, as we have already heard this morning, the universal skin tagging system for crocodilians, detailed in Res. Conf. 11.22 (Rev. CoP15), has proven to be a highly effective methodology for ensuring traceability in crocodilian skins in trade. We’d like to reiterate that a particular advantage of the crocodilian system is that it was developed in close collaboration with the range states, producers and industry and, as a result, has been</p>

				<p>operating successfully for nearly 25 years.</p> <p>We feel that the broader mandate outlined in document 14.2.2 is unnecessary and could even undermine the universal tagging system for crocodilians. We would encourage Parties to capitalize on universal skin tagging for crocodilians as an existing, successful model for traceability of snake skins instead of seeking to change it.”</p> <p>The Animals Committee established a working group on snake trade and conservation management. See 14.2 above. IUCN was a member of this working group.</p>
	Richard Jenkins	14.3 IUCN Red List assessments of Asian snake species [Decision 16.104]	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 14.3) has been prepared by the Global Species Programme of IUCN.</p> <p>At its 16th meeting (CoP16, Bangkok, 2013), the Conference of the Parties adopted Decision 16.104, directed to the Animals Committee – <i>The Animals Committee shall, at its 27th meeting, consider the final IUCN red list assessments for Asian snake species and, if available, incorporate new information and data and make appropriate recommendations, including recommendations to the Standing Committee.</i></p> <p>IUCN convened workshops in China (2011) and India (2010) to assess the extinction risk of snake species. A total of 512 species were considered, and the results for 402 species were published on the Red List of Threatened Species (www.iucnredlist.org). An assessment of the remaining 110 species is currently in the process of being finalized.</p> <p>The 27th meeting of the CITES Animals Committee reviewed a provisional list of snake species identified as potentially threatened by trade based on information included in The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. It directed the 28th meeting of the CITES Animals Committee to re-consider the list, following the incorporation of additional information from recently</p>	<p>This agenda item was introduced by the Chair of the Animals Committee and IUCN was asked to report on the IUCN Red List assessment of Asian snake species conducted. The following intervention was delivered:</p> <p>“We evaluated the available information on 115 snake species from south-east Asia that are known to be traded internationally and have been assessed for The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Using the information held on the IUCN Red List accounts, and expert knowledge within the IUCN Species Survival Commission, we classified each species into one of three categories according to the impact of international trade on wild populations. We found that international trade was unlikely to be a major threat to 82 of the species that we assessed. International trade, however, was a potential concern for 29 species and a likely a concern for four species. We present five recommendations for the committee to consider, which include the need for further detailed studies on species considered to be the most threatened by international trade and on the management of aquatic and marine snake species that are traded in high volumes.”</p> <p>The Committee established a working group on snakes</p>

		<p>completed surveys and a further round of expert consultation.</p> <p>IUCN reviewed the known conservation status of 115 snake species from Asia that were published on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species and reported to occur in international trade.</p> <p>Given that information and data on the basic biology and trade in most snake species in Asia are lacking, and that some species are subject to apparently high levels of exploitation for international trade, IUCN provides the following recommendations for consideration by the Animals Committee:</p> <p>a) Range States, importing countries, and other Parties are encouraged to conduct more detailed assessments of those species indicated in Table 1 for which available information suggests that international trade is likely to be a threat (4 species) or may be a threat (29 species), focusing on research to determine whether the species warrant inclusion in the Appendices of CITES.</p> <p>b) In particular, range States of <i>Popeia buniana</i> (Malaysia), <i>Popeia nebularis</i> (Malaysia), <i>Cryptelytrops kanburiensis</i> (Thailand and probably Myanmar) and <i>Orthriophis moellendorfi</i> (China and Vietnam) should assess whether existing legislation, protected areas and current levels of trade are compatible with the conservation of these species in the wild, and evaluate the possible listing of these species under CITES (including Appendix III).</p> <p>c) Parties and range States are encouraged to compile more information on the exploitation levels (i.e. direct harvest and as by-catch) of freshwater and marine aquatic snakes subject to high volumes of international trade, including all species of Elapidae (<i>Hydrophis spp.</i>, <i>Kerilia spp.</i>, <i>Lapemis spp.</i>, <i>Laticauda spp.</i>, <i>Thalassophina spp.</i>) and Homalopsidae (<i>Enhydris spp.</i>, <i>Erpeton spp.</i>, <i>Homalopsis spp.</i>) indicated in Table 1 to evaluate the possible listing of these species under CITES (including Appendix III).</p> <p>d) Exporting countries and other Parties may wish to put in place precautionary management measures, such as establishing closed</p>	<p>(agenda items 14.1, 14.2, and 14.3) with the following mandate. Also see 14.1 and 14.2. IUCN was a member of this working group.</p> <p><u>Concerning agenda items 14.3</u></p> <p>7. Review the information on Asian snake species presented in document AC28 Doc.14.3, and any additional information, as relevant.</p> <p>8. Draft recommendations for consideration by the Animals Committee, including recommendations to the Standing Committee, range States, Parties or others as appropriate. Such recommendations may focus on species currently not included in the CITES Appendices, and that are or may be threatened by unregulated international trade.</p> <p>The working group produced the following recommendations:</p> <p>Concerning document AC28 Doc.14.3, the Working Group invites the Animals Committee to consider the following recommendation:</p> <p>The Working Group recommends to the Animals Committee to adopt the recommendations found in document AC28 Doc.14.3 with the following revisions to paragraph 12 a) of the recommendations and the suggested revision to the categorization of two species in Table I.</p> <p>12 a) Range States, importing countries, and other Parties are encouraged to conduct more detailed assessments of those species indicated in Table 1 for which available information suggests that international trade is “likely to be a threat” (4 species) or “may be a threat” (29 species). Range states are encouraged to submit listing proposals for the 4 species categorized as “likely to be threatened by trade” and for the 3 species categorized as “may be threatened by trade” and have an IUCN status (CR, EN, VU), including: <i>Euprepiophis perlacea</i>, <i>Enhydris longicauda</i>, and <i>Cryptelytrops rubeus</i>.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>areas/ seasons, daily seasonal catch quotas, restricting the use of certain types of fishing gear or imposing size-limits, and improved domestic monitoring and reporting mechanisms for aquatic (freshwater and marine) snakes, including all Elapidae and Homalopsidae species indicated in Table 1.</p> <p>e) Parties should encourage research to improve the understanding of the ecology, biology and conservation needs of Asian snakes, inter alia through supporting relevant scientific institutions and promoting additional field studies.</p>	<p>Range states are also encouraged to consider including the remaining species categorized as “may be threatened by trade” with listing in the Appendices.</p> <p>The Working Group recommends to the Animals Committee to categorize two species in Table 1, <i>Acrochordus arafurae</i> and <i>Acrochordus granulatus</i>, as unlikely to be impacted by international trade, and requests IUCN to revise document AC28 Doc. 14.3 accordingly.</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the working group recommendations in document AC28 Com. 6 with minor amendments as reflected above and outlined in AC28 Com. 6 and AC28 Sum. 4 (Rev. 1).</p>
15. Tortoises and freshwater turtles (Testudines spp.) (Decision 16.111)	Dena Cator (<i>Peter Paul van Dijk delivered at the meeting</i>).		<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 15) relates to a number of decisions that were taken at CITES CoP16 regarding trade in tortoises and freshwater turtles. The Secretariat, with generous funding from Switzerland and the European Union, was able to contract IUCN and the Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group of the Species Survival Commission of IUCN (IUCN/SSC) to undertake the study mentioned in Decision 16.109 (Annex 2 below). Pursuant to Decision 16.111, the Animals Committee is invited to review the study undertaken in accordance with Decision 16.109 and make recommendations, as appropriate, for consideration by the Standing Committee and the Parties. The Animal Committee working group on tortoises and freshwater turtles may wish to provide its comments and findings in this regard.</p>	<p>The CITES Secretariat asked IUCN to introduce the NDF document that it authored and to explain how they handled any comments received. An intervention was delivered by Peter Paul van Dijk as follows:</p> <p>“IUCN adds its appreciation to our Israeli hosts for this meeting.</p> <p>The IUCN SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group had the pleasure of preparing a study to provide guidance on Non-Detriment Findings and Trade Management for Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles, to inform CITES Scientific and Management Authorities.</p> <p>An early version of the report was circulated to the Party and Observer members of the AC’s WG on TFT. We like to thank the members who provided review comments and suggestions.</p> <p>The report is <i>not</i> a formulaic document on how to make a NDF for turtles. Instead, it highlights those aspects of tortoise and freshwater turtle biology and trade, that are specifically relevant for consideration in <i>established</i> processes to make NDFs within the context of Res Conf 16.7.</p> <p>In particular, the NDF process developed at the Cancun workshop in 2008, and the NDF process for perennial plants</p>

				<p>developed by the SA of Germany, were inspirational in organizing the information presented.</p> <p>Highlights of the items discussed include:</p> <p>The differential impacts of harvesting eggs and juveniles versus adult turtles on population stability;</p> <p>The effects of protective and management measures that are in effect for the species and population, such as closed areas, closed seasons, rotating closures, regulating capture methods, offtake limits, size restrictions, nest protection and headstarting measures, alternative production systems, and public awareness efforts;</p> <p>And compliance with regulations concerning acquisition of wild specimens for export, as well as for the establishment and operation of captive production systems.</p> <p>The report is closed with an annex that lists easily accessible sources for further information on turtle biology and species identification, as well as an annex with hypothetical case examples.</p> <p>Madam Chair, IUCN hopes that this report will be useful to Parties and others when evaluating the likely impact and <i>potential</i> detriment of wild offtake of Tortoises and freshwater turtles, and looks forward to continue supporting this critical aspect of international trade in these animals.”</p> <p>The document was well received with supportive interventions from the US, Europe and the Wildlife Conservation Society.</p> <p>The Animals Committee welcomed the study contained in Document AC28 Doc. 15 and recommended to the Standing Committee that it be communicated to the Parties.</p>
	Dena Cator (<i>Peter Paul van Dijk delivered at the meeting</i>).	Annex 2: Non-Detriment Findings and Trade Management for Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles - a guide for CITES Scientific and	https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/28/E-AC28-15-Annex2.pdf This is the report produced by the SSC Tortoise & Freshwater Turtle SG as per above.	No action

		Management Authorities		
16. Sturgeons and paddlefish [Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP16)]	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Challenger followed at the meeting</i>).		<i>No document</i>	<i>No action</i>
	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Challenger followed at the meeting</i>).	16.1 Report of the Secretariat	This document (AC28 Doc. 16.1) is a report on the activities of sturgeon and paddlefish range States related to the conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish. By 31 December 2014, none of the range States of Acipenseriformes communicated export quotas for caviar or meat from stocks shared with other range States so the Secretariat published zero export quotas for caviar and meat of wild origin from Acipenseriformes species of all shared stocks which are applicable for the period between 1 March 2015 and 29 February 2016. The document is to be noted.	The Animals Committee noted this document and the intention of the Secretariat to seek further clarifications from the Parties concerning footnote 2 of Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP16).
	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Challenger followed at the meeting</i>).	16.2 Implementation by the Animals Committee of relevant provisions in Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP16)	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 16.2) relates to the requirement of this resolution to carry out on a three-year cycle starting in 2008, and using information from preceding years, an evaluation of the assessment and the monitoring methodologies used for stocks of Acipenseriformes species. For the last six years, none of the range States of Acipenseriformes that are subject to these provisions have established export quotas for caviar or meat from stocks shared with other range States. Therefore, no relevant information or data have been submitted to the Secretariat for these evaluations. Evaluation documents with a focus on the Caspian Sea sturgeon species were prepared for the 24th and 25th meetings of the Animals Committee (see documents AC24 Doc. 12.2 and AC25 Doc. 16.2), but the Committee has not evaluated other stocks of Acipenseriformes that are shared between different range States.</p> <p>At its 65th meeting (Geneva, July 2014), the Standing Committee established an intersessional working group to review Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev.CoP16), taking account of the proposals by Germany in the Annex to document SC65 Doc.47 and the comments made during the debate, and to report at the 66th meeting of the Standing Committee (SC66). The membership of</p>	The Animals Committee noted this document. It also further agreed to report to the Standing Committee its discussion on the role of the Animals Committee as currently mandated in Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP16), and request views on how the Animals Committee could support the conservation and management of sturgeons and paddlefish in the context of a changing fishery.

			<p>the working group was agreed as follows: China, France, Germany (Chair), Italy, Japan, Poland, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Ukraine, United States of America, International Caviar Importers Association, IWMC–World Conservation Trust and UNEP-WCMC, and a representative of the United States state fish and wildlife agencies. IUCN is not currently represented in the group.</p> <p>The Animals Committee is invited to consider the implementation of its mandates under Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP16), i.e.: monitoring of progress with relevant provisions in the Resolution; three-year cycle evaluations of assessment and monitoring methodologies used for shared stocks of Acipenseriformes species that are subject of catch quotas and export quotas for caviar and meat; and reporting to the Standing Committee.</p>	
	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Challender followed at the meeting</i>).	16.3 Sturgeon management in the Russian Federation	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 16.3) has been prepared by the Sturgeon Management Authority of the Russian Federation.* This is an update from Russia informing the Animals Committee that the Caspian littoral countries (the Republic of Azerbaijan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan) did not carry out commercial catch of sturgeons in 2014. Also, all Parties to the Commission (the Republic of Azerbaijan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan) will not be carrying out commercial catch of sturgeons in the Caspian Sea in 2015 and 2016. The Parties have decided not to establish export quotas for caviar and other products from sturgeon species for 2015-2016. The catch of sturgeon fish species in 2015-2016 will be carry out only for research. This is for information.</p>	The Animals Committee noted this document.
17. Conservation and management of sharks [Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP16)]	Dan Challender (<i>Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting</i>).	<i>No document</i>	<i>No document</i>	N/A
	Dan Challender	17.1 Implementation of	<i>No document</i>	N/A

	<i>(Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).</i>	Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP16)		
	Dan Challender <i>(Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).</i>	17.1.1 Report of the Secretariat	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 17.1.1) was prepared by the Secretariat.</p> <p>Regarding the conservation and management of sharks and implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP16), and pursuant to the recommendations from AC27, the Secretariat issued Notification to the Parties (No. 2015/027) of 11 May 2015, requesting Parties to submit relevant new information on shark fishery management measures, with particular emphasis on information pertaining to the shark species and manta rays that were included at Appendix II at CoP16, and since 14 Sep 2014 when Appendix II listings for a number of species entered in force.</p> <p>In response to the notification, the Secretariat has received contributions from: Argentina, Canada, China, Greece, Israel, Jamaica, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore and the US. As of June 2014 two guidelines for making NDFs and four national NDFs have been shared with the Secretariat by Parties. The Secretariat did not receive information regarding NPOA-Sharks or regional plans. However, according to the FAO document repository Malaysia, New Zealand, South Africa and Sri Lanka have revised their NPOA-Sharks since 2013.</p> <p>The Secretariat also observes that it has frequently been approached by Parties regarding guidance for the making of NDFs, in particular for situations where little or no biological or trade data is available and/or where sharks are caught as by-catch. The Committee (AC28) might consider the issue of by-catch of sharks and the making of NDFs, and encourage the development of guidelines or best management practices for the making of NDFs for sharks and rays species in situations where little or no biological information is available, and trade or fisheries data is poor.</p>	<p>This document was introduced by the CITES Secretariat. Parties then reported on progress made on the conservation and management of sharks, including from the US, China, the EU, Japan and Peru. There were also interventions from CMS, Pew Charitable Trusts and WCS.</p> <p>The Committee established a working group on agenda item 17.1.1 (working group on sharks) with the following mandate. IUCN was a member of the working group.</p> <p>1. Taking account of the presentations and discussions in plenary, the working group shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) consider document AC28 Doc. 17.1.1, including the recommendations made therein; b) examine the information provided by range States in response to Notification No. 2015/027 and other relevant data; and c) advise on the reporting by the Animals Committee on progress on shark and ray activities to the 17th Conference of the Parties, which should also contain an analysis of information provided by range States on trade and other available relevant data and information, and if necessary, species-specific recommendations for improving the conservation status of sharks. <p>2. The working group shall make recommendations accordingly for the Animals Committee to consider.</p> <p>The working group made the following recommendations (also outlined in AC28 Com. 9 (Rev. by Sec.)):</p> <p>Non-detriment findings and conservation issues The Animals Committee encourages Parties, in the spirit of improving capacity, sharing information, and improving knowledge of regional harvest levels, to make their NDFs</p>

			<p>AC28 is invited to consider the present document and examine the information provided by range States on trade and other relevant data in its Annex.</p> <p>Further, AC28 is invited to consider its reporting on progress on shark and ray activities to CoP17, which should also contain an analyses of information provided by range States on trade and other available and relevant data and information, and if necessary, species-specific recommendations for improving the conservation status of sharks.</p>	<p>available to the Secretariat for posting on the CITES Sharks and Rays Portal.</p> <p>The Animals Committee encourages Parties to take up Germany's offer to present NDF guidance at training workshops and to share feedback on the use of the guidance.</p> <p>The Animals Committee encourages Parties to take note of the different approaches to making NDFs and the examples provided in the Sharks and Rays Portal.</p> <p>The Animals Committee notes the availability of the rapid management-risk assessment (M-risk) method (AC27 Inf. 6) that could support the development of NDFs and be used to identify stocks and species of concern, and further notes that examples of the application of this methodology are available [e.g. in document AC28 Inf. 27 (Rev.)].</p> <p>Collaboration with other relevant UN Bodies The Animals Committee congratulates the Secretariat, FAO and CMS on their ongoing collaboration to date in relation to the implementation of the shark and ray Appendix II listings agreed at CoP16 and requests that this collaboration be continued and expanded.</p> <p>Recognising that several species of sharks and rays are listed in the Appendices of CITES and CMS, the Animals Committee asks the Standing Committee to remind Parties that CMS Parties should normally not be able to issue legal acquisition findings under CITES for the products of those species (e.g. Manta rays) listed in Appendix I of CMS. The Standing Committee should remind Parties that some RFMOs have conservation and management measures for sharks taken in their fisheries, including prohibitions on the retention or landing of certain CITES-listed shark and ray species. The Animals Committee requests the Secretariat to provide on the CITES Sharks and Rays Portal clear and</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>regularly updated information on these additional measures for CITES listed species.</p> <p>The Animals Committee recommends that the Secretariat continues to expand its collaboration with FAO and RFBs, and post relevant studies and reports related to the conservation and management of CITES-listed shark species on the Sharks and Rays Portal.</p> <p>The Animals Committee recommends that the CITES Secretariat, FAO, and interested Parties and international organizations collaborate to report progress on implementation of the CITES shark and ray listings to the 32nd Session of the FAO's Committee on Fisheries in 2016, and to the CITES CoP 17, also in 2016.</p> <p>The Animals Committee directs the Secretariat to draw to the attention of Parties and FAO, in the context of the finalisation of FAO's Voluntary Guidelines on Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (the SSF Guidelines), that CITES listed species occur in small scale fisheries and that NDFs will need to be prepared if the products of those fisheries enter international trade.</p> <p>Regional Cooperation</p> <p>The Animals Committee recommends that the Secretariat seek funding to address some of the important issues raised at regional implementation meetings (Casablanca, Dakar and Xiamen) that are found in Annex 1 to this report.</p> <p>The Animals Committee urges Parties that are also Members of Regional Fisheries Bodies to work through the respective mechanisms of these RFBs, particularly where sharks are taken pursuant to Regional Fisheries Management Organization (RFMO) fisheries, and to adopt and implement conservation and management measures for CITES-listed</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>shark species, if they have not yet done so.</p> <p>The Animals Committee urges all Parties that are also Members of Regional Fisheries Bodies to encourage the RFBs to make CITES-listed species a priority for data collection, data collation and stock assessments, and to provide these data to their Members.</p> <p>The Animals Committee urges Parties to cooperate regionally with research, stock assessments, data sharing, and analysis, to help Parties to develop legal acquisition findings and NDFs for shared stocks.</p> <p>The Animals Committee urges Parties to continue to cooperate regionally on training initiatives for CITES Authorities, fisheries staff and Customs officers, in cooperation with the CITES and FAO Secretariats.</p> <p>New information for consideration by AC 29 The Animals Committee directs the CITES Secretariat issue a notification similar to 2015/027, requesting Parties to provide new information prior to AC 29 on their national legislation and shark and ray activities.</p> <p>The Animals Committee directs the Secretariat to post a list of CITES Parties that have adopted stricter domestic measures for CITES-listed shark and ray species, the species that are covered in this way, the dates of these measures, and links to the measures, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal protection for CITES-listed shark and ray species; • Zero quotas for CITES-listed shark and ray species; • Parties to CMS that have agreed to protect CMS Appendix I species; • Members of RFMOs with measures that prohibit retention, landing, or trade of CITES-listed species.
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>The Animals Committee requests the Secretariat to provide a summary of the information from the CITES trade database on levels of trade since September 2014 in its report to AC 29.</p> <p>Identification and traceability issues Recognising that improving traceability from catch to consumer is critical, the Animals Committee urges the CITES Secretariat to work with FAO to explore extending the existing iSharkFin tool to the identification of dried and skinned shark fins; and with the World Customs Organization to expand Customs Codes for species and product categories.</p> <p>The Animals Committee urges Parties to share knowledge of the techniques for DNA testing of shark species to allow rapid and cost-effective identification of shark products.</p> <p>The Animals Committee recommends the Standing Committee recognises the broad issues of identification and traceability and prioritizes those issues, during the deliberations of the Standing Committee's Intersessional Working Group on the Conservation and Management of Sharks and in its report to SC66.</p> <p>Bycatch of species listed in the CITES Appendices The Animals Committee urges Parties and Regional Fisheries Bodies to develop and improve methods to avoid bycatch of sharks and rays (particularly where retention, landing, and sale of these species is normally prohibited under CMS or RFMO requirements) and reduce their mortality, including by exploring gear selectivity and improved techniques for live release.</p> <p>Small-scale and artisanal fisheries Recognising that CITES-listed species (particularly hammerhead sharks) form an important component of small-</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>scale fisheries catches, the Animals Committee encourages Parties to exchange information on how the impact of artisanal fishing on total mortality is taken into consideration in the development of NDFs.</p> <p>Species-specific issues The Animals Committee recommends that the Standing Committee recognises problems of species identification, look-alike issues, and traceability raised by Parties at the Animals Committee, including for: i) the Manta rays and closely related Mobula rays, and reminds Parties that these species may not normally be exported by CMS Parties because they are all listed in Appendix I of CMS; and ii) the hammerhead sharks, and urges Parties to endeavor to identify hammerhead sharks to species level in fisheries and landings data.</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the recommendations in AC28 Com. 9, with slight amendments, as reflected above and in AC28 Com. 9 and AC28 Sum. 4 (Rev.1).</p>
	Dan Challender (Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).	Annex 1 - Reply from Argentina (Spanish only)	This document (AC28 Doc. 17.1.1 Annex 1) is the reply from Argentina.	<i>No intervention or feedback</i>
	Dan Challender (Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).	Annex 2 - Reply from Canada (English only)	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 17.1.1 Annex 2) is the reply from Canada.</p> <p>The directed fishery for Porbeagle in Canada was suspended in 2013. Harvest of Porbeagle in Canada is expected to continue to decrease in the near future due to the absence of a targeted fishery and the current low market value and low market demand for Porbeagle meat.</p>	<i>No intervention or feedback</i>

			The CITES Scientific Authority issued a standing Non-Detriment Finding for Porbeagle products in August 2014 for 2014 and 2015. Since, implementation, there has been no export of any Porbeagle products from Canada to date. The Scientific Authority will review the Standing NDF in the fall of 2015 for 2016.	
	Dan Challenger (Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).	Annex 3 - Reply from China (English only)	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 17.1.1 Annex 3) is the reply from China.</p> <p>In response to the notification China reports that it has conducted industry surveys, conducted shark and Manta ray implementation training, authorised the verification of an inventory of Pre-Convention stocks, strengthened capacity building and conducted public awareness raising activities on conservation and management measures.</p>	<i>No intervention or feedback</i>
	Dan Challenger (Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).	Annex 4 - Reply from Greece (English only)	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 17.1.1 Annex 4) is the reply from Greece.</p> <p>During 2014 no species of CITES Appendix II, including those that were included at CoP16 has been 'fishing' (assuming this means permitted and assuming refers to species covered by the notification only).</p>	<i>No intervention or feedback</i>
	Dan Challenger (Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).	Annex 5 - Reply from Israel (English only)	<p>This document (AC28 Doc 17.1.1 Annex 5) is the reply from Israel.</p> <p>The INPA (Israel Nature and Parks Authority) has conducted campaigns to increase awareness of the need to protect these species (Sharks and Rays) and has increased enforcement efforts against fishing of these species.</p> <p><i>Species of concern</i> We have seen media reports about fishing of large aggregations of Giant Devil Ray <i>Mobula mobula</i> in the east Mediterranean, outside of Israel's territorial waters. It is of concern to us (Israel) that this population could be under threat and that it is being affected by unregulated fishing in the region.</p>	<i>No intervention or feedback</i>

	Dan Challenger (Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).	Annex 6 - Reply from Jamaica (English only)	<p>This document (AC28 Doc 17.1.1 Annex 6) is the reply from Jamaica.</p> <p>Jamaica does not have a fishery for sharks or rays. Over the past ten years, the Fisheries Division of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries has recorded one report of a manta, which was caught in a fishing net. No CITES Permits have been issued by the Natural Resources Conservation Authority, Jamaica's Management Authority, to trade in these species</p> <p>Jamaica has participated in the training programme on the identification of CITES listed sharks. iSharkfin has also been distributed to relevant stakeholders.</p>	<i>No intervention or feedback</i>
	Dan Challenger (Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).	Annex 7 - Reply from Mexico (Spanish only)	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 17.1.1 Annex 7) is the reply from Mexico.</p>	<i>No intervention or feedback</i>
	Dan Challenger (Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).	Annex 8 - Reply from New Zealand (English only)	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 17.1.1 Annex 8) is the reply from New Zealand.</p> <p>New Zealand's CITES Scientific Authority has prepared its pre-emptive non-detriment finding for Porbeagle shark and smooth hammerhead shark following the German/IUCN TRAFFIC model.</p> <p>There have been difficulties in identification of imported dried shark fins where the skin has been removed.</p> <p>A new NPOA-Sharks 2013 was adopted in January 2014 and will be fully reviewed again in 2017. To support NPOA-Sharks 2013, and the elimination of shark finning, the New Zealand government made amendments to Fisheries regulations.</p> <p>No applications for the export of porbeagle shark or smooth hammerhead shark products from New Zealand have been received since the species became listed on Appendix II.</p>	<i>No intervention or feedback</i>

	Dan Challenger (Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).	Annex 9 - Reply from Singapore (English only)	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 17.1.1 Annex 9) is the reply from Singapore.</p> <p>It remains challenging to identify and differentiate parts and products of CITES-listed shark species to effectively enforce CITES.</p> <p>To address challenges, the Agri-Food and Veterinary Authority (AVA) implemented a shark surveillance programme in October 2014 to monitor trade (including DNA testing). To engage industry, AVA has held meetings with traders, issued circulars, and raised public awareness by presenting advisory notices at fishery ports.</p> <p>AVA is working towards the prohibition of live shark-finning practices and an NPOA for Sharks.</p>	<i>No intervention or feedback</i>
	Dan Challenger (Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).	Annex 10 - Reply from the USA (English only)	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 17.1.1 Annex 10) is the reply from the US</p> <p>In response to the notification, the US updated its National Plan (in 2014); final US regulations to implement the measures that the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) adopted for oceanic whitetip, silky and whale sharks were published in February 2015; and final US regulations to implement the measure that the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) adopted for whale shark were published in 2014.</p> <p>The US also made positive NDFs for the export of Porbeagle shark (<i>Lamna nasus</i>) and the three species of hammerhead shark (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>, <i>S. mokarran</i>, <i>S. zygaena</i>).</p>	<i>No intervention or feedback</i>
	Dan Challenger (Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).	17.1.2 Conservation and management of sharks - species of concern	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 17.1.2) was prepared by Israel.</p> <p>It is eight years since the Animals Committee first provided a list of shark species of concern for the consideration of the Conference of Parties (CoP14 Doc 59.1, Annex 3). This list was</p>	<p>This document was introduced by Israel and reference made to recent IUCN Red List assessments and analyses. Specifically the following two papers:</p> <p>(i) Nieto <i>et al.</i> (2015) <i>European Red List of marine fishes</i>, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.</p>

		<p>subsequently updated with reference to the FAO list of primary species for monitoring of fisheries and trade (AC24 Inf. 6) and reviewed at CoP15 (CoP15 Doc 53 Table 1). More recently, the list was further refined in consideration of the responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2011/049, which asked Parties to identify species that they believed required additional action to enhance their conservation and management (AC26 Doc. 16.1 and AC26 Doc. 16.2, including Israel's response in AC26 Doc. 16.2, Annex IL). The responses to Notification 20011/049 were discussed by AC26 (AC26 Doc. 16.1) and AC27 (AC27 Doc. 22.1), and AC27 established a working group for further work on Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP16) in preparation for CoP 17. The Secretariat issued Notification to the Parties No. 2015/027 asking for new information on fishery management measures for sharks, for discussion at AC28.</p> <p>This document revisits the earlier lists of species of concern, compiled in Table 1. It pays particular attention to the Mediterranean and shark and ray species for which Israel is a range state, but incorporates nominations for species of concern from other regions, submitted by Parties and listed in AC26 WG4 Doc. 1 Annex.</p> <p>AC28 is invited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) to take note of this document and to endorse it for the AC Shark Working Group; b) to draw attention of Parties to the potential use of the M-Risk assessment method developed by TRAFFIC for the UK for determining priority species; c) to recommend that the Sharks working group and the Parties review the role of trade in contributing to the threatened status of the <i>Mobula</i> devil rays, Guitarfishes, Threshers and Tope shark, all of which have been included for many years in the lists of species of concern produced by CITES and FAO, undertake M-risk assessments for species that do not yet have them, and discuss whether these species would benefit from more detailed attention under CITES; 	<p>(ii) Dulvy <i>et al.</i> (2014). Extinction risk and conservation of the world's sharks and rays. <i>eLife</i> 3, e00590.</p> <p>The Committee noted the information contained in document 17.1.2, including the information in paragraph 13 on a new method for determining species at risk of overexploitation through examining their intrinsic biological vulnerability and management risk (M-Risk).</p> <p>The Committee further noted the usefulness of risk assessments to identify challenges and appropriate mitigation measures in the context of the conservation and management of sharks.</p>
--	--	--	--

			d) to add the angelsharks (Family Squatinidae), and the Smoothhounds (<i>Mustelus spp.</i>), to the list of species of concern for attention by the Animals Committee.	
	Dan Challender (Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting).	17.2 Guidance for making non-detriment findings for CITES-listed sharks	<p>This document (AC28 Doc 17.2) was submitted by Germany.</p> <p>In 2013, the German Scientific Authority (Fauna) commissioned a report under a project to develop guidance for the development of non-detriment findings (NDFs) for shark species listed in Appendix II of CITES, including a review of existing management measures and the development of guidelines and practical recommendations. The aim was to make this guidance available by September 2014, when the Appendix II listings adopted by the 16th Conference of the Parties (CoP16) in March 2013 would come into force.</p> <p>Progress with this project was reported to the 27th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC27, Veracruz, April 2014) in document AC27 Doc. 22.3.</p> <p>Based on the advice from the Animals Committee's working group on the conservation and management of sharks and additional correspondence from Parties, ten NDF case studies were commissioned from experts. An expert workshop held in Bonn, Germany during August 2014 analysed the results of the case studies presented, recognised the need to streamline the guidance, and achieved consensus on 20 recommendations. The procedures and guidance notes were revised accordingly and the report finalised before the Appendix II listings, adopted by CoP16 in March 2013, came into force. The revised guidance report was submitted to the CITES Secretariat and has been placed on the CITES homepage section for sharks and mantas (http://www.cites.org/eng/prog/shark/index.php), in English and Spanish.</p> <p>At the kind invitation of the Government of Colombia, the NDF Guidance was presented at the three day International CITES shark workshop on experiences and strategies for the</p>	<p>This document was introduced by Germany who deferred to IUCN to report on this agenda item. IUCN delivered the following intervention:</p> <p>“In 2013, the German Scientific Authority commissioned the preparation of a guidance framework to assist Scientific Authorities in making Non-Detriment Findings for shark species listed in Appendix II. This process drew upon the expertise of the IUCN Shark Specialist Group, TRAFFIC and other experts, including the authors of the NDF guidance documents for perennial plants and seahorses. We presented the draft guidance to the 27th meeting of the Animals Committee in Mexico, last year.</p> <p>The comments and advice of the Animals Committee Shark Working Group and several Scientific Authorities were used to select ten case studies to test the Shark NDF Guidance. The German government then hosted a small expert workshop in Bonn last August where the case studies on a selection of shark and manta ray populations listed in Appendix II were presented and the guidance notes reviewed. The workshop produced, by consensus, 20 recommendations for revising and streamlining the NDF procedures and guidance notes to make them a more practical tool to assist CITES Parties in making NDFs for sharks. We adopted all these recommendations and finalised the guidance notes shortly before the shark and manta ray Appendix II listings adopted by CoP 16 came into force, in September last year. The revised NDF procedures and guidelines are posted, in Spanish and English, on the CITES homepage for sharks and mantas.</p> <p>At the kind invitation of the Government of Colombia, the NDF Guidance was presented in November at the three day International CITES shark workshop on the implementation of the listing of shark species in Appendix II, held in Santa</p>

			<p>implementation of the listing of shark species in Appendix II, held in Santa Marta, Colombia, November 2014. The workshop discussed mechanisms for control and traceability of the trade in CITES-listed shark species and the process for making a non-detriment finding to ensure that any international trade in species listed in Appendix II of CITES is sustainable and legal. The guidance document presented by the German delegation was welcomed and the workshop recommended that it be promoted.</p> <p>AC28 is invited to:</p> <p>a) take note of this document,</p> <p>b) recommend that Parties and institutions make use of the offer in paragraph 9b (workshops) and</p> <p>c) recommend that Parties and institutions who use the NDF Guidance report back to the Scientific Authority of Germany with their experiences and advice for further improvements.</p>	<p>Marta, Colombia. The workshop welcomed the guidance document and recommended that it be promoted.</p> <p>Future activities planned by the German Scientific Authority under this project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · > to translate the NDF Guidance into French, subject to the availability of resources; · > if invited to do so, to present the NDF guidance and methodology at future CITES shark workshops and capacity-building meetings; and, · > recognizing that these are living documents, which will evolve with input from the CITES community, to continue to improve the NDF guidance based upon advice from and the practical experiences of Parties and institutions using the document. <p>AC 28 Doc 17.2 asks the Animals Committee to note the report;</p> <p>to recommend that Parties and institutions make use of the German Scientific Authority's offer to present the NDF guidance to their workshops and capacity-building workshops; and</p> <p>to invite Parties to report back to the Scientific Authority of Germany with their experiences and advice for further improvements".</p> <p>The Committee noted document AC28 Doc 17.2 encouraging Parties to use the guidance for making non-detriment findings for CITES-listed sharks developed by Germany and to report back to Germany with their experiences and advice for further improvements.</p>
18. Freshwater stingrays (Family Potamotrygonidae) (Decisions 16.131 and 16.132)	Dan Challender (<i>Sarah Fowler delivered at the meeting</i>).		<p>This agenda item (AC28 Doc. 18) concerns work of the Animals Committee working group on freshwater stingrays, further to Decisions 16.131 and 16.132).</p> <p>The Freshwater Stingray (Family <i>Potamotrygonidae</i>) Expert Workshop took place in Bogotá, Columbia (October 2014). Annex I of this document is the workshop report.</p>	<p>This document was introduced by Columbia as Chair of the working group on Freshwater Stingrays.</p> <p>A working group was established (on stingrays), chaired by the representative of Central/South America, with the following mandate:</p> <p>1. Taking account of the presentations and discussions in plenary, the working group shall:</p>

			<p>Recommendations</p> <p>AC28 is invited to examine the information in the present document and to consider how it intends to complete the tasks entrusted to it by Decisions 16.131 and 16.132, and in particular the form in which it will submit a report at the 17th Conference of the Parties on the progress made by the working group, and its recommendations and conclusions, in accordance with Decision 16.132 c).</p> <p>AC28 is also invited to consider the options in Annex I relating to possible proposals to list freshwater stingrays in the CITES Appendices.</p>	<p>a) examine the information in the document AC28 Doc. 18 and other relevant information;</p> <p>b) consider how the Animals Committee and its working group should complete the tasks entrusted to it in Decisions 16.131 and 16.132;</p> <p>c) consider and advise on the discussions and conclusions presented in the Annex of document AC28 Doc. 18, including options for the possible inclusion of freshwater stingrays in the CITES Appendices; and</p> <p>d) consider the reporting by the Animals Committee to the 17th Conference of the Parties on the progress made by the working group, and its recommendations and conclusions, in accordance with Decision 16.132 c).</p> <p>IUCN was a member of this working group.</p> <p>The working group made the following recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urge Parties to take note of the report of the Freshwater Stingray (family Potamotrygonidae) Expert Workshop in Colombia (October 28-29, 2014) contained in the Annex to AC28 Doc. 18, including the identified priority species of concern* and the need to enhance currently available population information. 2. That all the range States of freshwater stingrays (family Potamotrygonidae) add all species of concern** in the family to Appendix III. 3. Urge Parties, particularly range States, to continue to consider options for listing on Appendix II. 4. Continue to exchange information on these species between the range States. 5. Request that the CITES Secretariat, NGOs, IGOs (including FAO) and Parties provide range States with support for mathematic modeling of population trends for freshwater stingrays. 6. Urge Parties and NGOs to research the captive breeding industry for freshwater stingrays (family Potamotrygonidae)
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>at the global level, including the species involved, numbers produced, and source of parental stock as well as the international trade demand.</p> <p>7. Parties take note of additional information provided in AC28 Inf. Doc. 25 (ENG); AC28 Inf. Doc. 25 (SPA).</p> <p>8. The report to CoP 17, requested in Decision 16.132 c), should include the recommendations above in paragraphs 1-7 and the report of the Freshwater Stingray (family Potamotrygonidae) Expert Workshop in Colombia (October 28-29, 2014 contained in Annex I of AC28 Doc. 18.</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the recommendations in document AC28 Com. 2 (Rev. by Sec.), as reflected above.</p>
19. Regional cooperation on the management of and trade in queen conch (<i>Strombus gigas</i>)	Dena Cator (<i>Dan Challender followed at the meeting</i>).		<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 19) was submitted by Columbia. The Animals Committee is invited to take note of the progress in relation to the management and conservation of the species that is described in this document in order to fulfil the commitments made at the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, taking into account the need for continuity in the work performed by the countries of the Caribbean region in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -With regard to conversion factors, it is important that countries consider having their own conversion factor a priority, because of the spatial variability and characteristics of the species. -Continue the participatory work between countries in the region to establish more appropriate guidelines and directions for the making of non-detriment findings for trade in <i>S. gigas</i>. -Every country in the region should develop conservation plans for the management and conservation of the Queen Conch, in which sustainability criteria should be included to ensure environmentally and economically favourable fishing. In addition, participatory work should continue on the development of the regional plan. -With regard to improving traceability in the value chain, it is important to be familiar with the components of the value chain in order to enable tracking of the entire process. Ecological 	<p>Columbia introduced this document. The Animals Committee noted document AC28 Doc. 19 and congratulated the range States of queen conch for their activities in response to Decision 16.141.</p>

			<p>certification stamps that guarantee sustainable production and consumption, as well as pilot projects with local communities could be used in that regard.</p> <p>-Maintain the continuity of education programmes and outreach to product users, focusing on responsible catching, trade, control and consumption.</p>	
20. Periodic Review of species included in Appendices I and II [Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP16)]	Dena Cator (<i>Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting</i>).		<i>No document</i>	<i>No action</i>
	Dena Cator (<i>Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting</i>).	20.1 Overview of species under review	<p>This agenda item (AC28 Doc. 20.1 (Rev. 1)) is an update of the various species that have gone through or are going through the CITES Periodic Review process. There are 11 species that remain to be reviewed between CoP15 and CoP17.</p> <p>The Animals Committee is invited to consider the replies of the range States of the 11 species selected for review between CoP15 and CoP17, and decide on retaining or removing species for which no range State proposed to review.</p> <p>The species and results are below:</p> <p>Bengal monitor <i>Varanus bengalensis</i> Removed from the Periodic Review.</p> <p>Yellow monitor lizard, <i>Varanus flavescens</i> Pakistan proposed to review. Species selection pending official confirmation</p> <p>Northern plains gray langur, <i>Semnopithecus entellus</i> Removed from the Periodic Review.</p> <p>Nepal gray langur, <i>Semnopithecus schistaceus</i> Removed from the Periodic Review.</p>	<p>This document was introduced by the Secretariat. The Animals Committee noted this document and agreed to remove from the Periodic Review those species which were selected for review between CoP15 and CoP17 and for which no range States had volunteered to undertake the review. This constitutes 11 species.</p> <p>The Committee further welcomed Bhutan's expression of interest in reviewing <i>Semnopithecus schistaceus</i> and <i>Varanus bengalensis</i>, but noting its request for financial support for undertaking this review and the lack thereof, agreed to remove both species from the Periodic Review.</p> <p>The committee encourages Parties and organisations to continue to undertake reviews.</p>

			<p>Southern plains gray langur, <i>Semnopithecus dussumieri</i> Removed from the Periodic Review.</p> <p>Pale fork-marked lemur, <i>Phaner pallescens</i> Removed from the Periodic Review.</p> <p>Indochinese box turtle, <i>Cuora galbinifrons</i> China to review. Review received from Vietnam (see AC28 Doc. 20.3.8)</p> <p>Vietnamese pond turtle, <i>Mauremys annamensis</i> Review received from Vietnam (see AC28 Doc. 20.3.9). Removed from the Periodic Review.</p> <p>Spotted linsang, <i>Prionodon pardicolor</i> Removed from the Periodic Review.</p> <p>African clawless otter, <i>Aonyx capensis microdon</i> Removed from the Periodic Review.</p> <p>Rio Apaporis Caiman, <i>Caiman crocodilus apaporiensis</i> Columbia proposes to review.</p> <p>Tristram's Woodpecker, <i>Dryocopus javensis richardsi</i> Republic of Korea proposes to review.</p> <p>Tuatara – reptile, <i>Sphenodon punctatus</i> Review received from New Zealand (AC28 Doc. 20.3.7). Removed from the Periodic Review.</p>	
	Dena Cator (<i>Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting</i>).	20.2 Report of the intersessional working group*	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 20.2) was prepared by the Co-Chairs of the intersessional working group on the periodic review.</p> <p>The Animals Committee is invited to review the conclusions of the working group and provide guidance on the questions regarding the format of the review (paragraph 11) and the selection of species for review (paragraph 15).</p>	<p>This item was introduced by the Chair of the Animals Committee and Co-Chair of the inter-sessional working group.</p> <p>The Committee established a working group on agenda item 20.2 (working group on periodic review) with the following mandate:</p>

			<p>The Animals Committee is further invited to endorse, and recommend the Plants Committee endorse the proposed modifications to Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP16) on <i>Periodic review of species included in Appendices I and II</i> found in the Annex to this document, and submit the revised Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP16) to the Conference of the Parties.</p>	<p>1. Review document AC28 Doc. 20.2 and the conclusions presented therein.</p> <p>2. Draft guidance on the questions regarding the format of the Periodic Review (paragraph 11 in document AC28 Doc. 20.2) and the selection of species for Periodic Review (paragraph 15 in the same document).</p> <p>3. Review the amendments to Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP16) proposed in the Annex to document AC28 Doc. 20.2, and draft recommendations for the Animals Committee to consider, bearing in mind the consultation with the Plants Committee.</p> <p>IUCN was a member of the working group.</p> <p>The working group made the following recommendations:</p> <p>The working group had a productive discussion and identified four further modifications to the proposed revised Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP16) specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deletion of “particularly for challenging species” in the final operative paragraph of the preamble; - Replacing “request that UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre” with “undertake or appoint consultants to” in operative paragraph b) i); - Replacing “the need to” with whether they support a in operative paragraph d); - Addition of “ideally” in operative paragraph e); and; - Introduction of new operative paragraph h) and the new language in paragraph h) ii). <p>For full text and amendments see AC28 Com. 3 (Rev. by Sec.).</p> <p>Also, the working group recommends the Animals Committee adopt the following recommendation:</p> <p>The Animals Committee agrees to the following modifications to Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP16) (Periodic review of species included in Appendices I and II),</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>and recommends its transmission to the Plants Committee and submission to the 17th Conference of Parties for adoption.</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the recommendations as outlined in AC28 Com. 3 (Rev. by Sec.) and reflected above.</p>
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	20.3 Species review	No document	No action
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	20.3.1. Periodic review of <i>Panthera leo</i>	No document	<p>This agenda item was introduced by Namibia who reported that Namibia and Kenya are still working on this review and as such there is no document.</p> <p>IUCN provided the draft, revised Red List account for this species to Namibia and Kenya in 2014 and the Red List account published in 2015 and was thanked for its assistance in this regard. The Red List account for <i>Panther leo</i> was provided to the meeting in Inf Doc 16.</p> <p>The Animals Committee noted the work done by Kenya and Namibia, and their intent to submit a final Periodic Review document of <i>Panthera leo</i> to the Animals Committee for its decision by postal procedure prior to the 66th meeting of the Standing Committee.</p>
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	20.3.2 Periodic review of <i>Puma concolor coryi</i> and <i>Puma concolor cougar</i>	The review by Canada and the US (AC28 Doc. 20.3.2) indicates that the transfer of these subspecies from Appendix I to Appendix II would be appropriate because there is no risk to these subspecies from trade.	<p>This document was introduced by Canada and reported that <i>Puma concolor cougar</i> has been considered extinct since early 1900s. Also, that <i>Puma concolor coryi</i> is subject to protective measures.</p> <p>The Animals Committee agreed with the recommendation in</p>

				this Period Review that it would be appropriate to transfer these species to Appendix II.
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	20.3.3 Periodic review of <i>Lichenostomus melanops cassifix</i>	This document (AC28 Doc. 20.3.3) was prepared by Australia which recommended the transfer of this species from Appendix I to Appendix II.	The document was introduced by Australia. The Animals Committee agreed with the recommendation in this Periodic Review to transfer <i>Lichenostomus melanops cassifix</i> to Appendix II.
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	20.3.4 Periodic review of <i>Cyclopsitta diophthalma coxeni</i>	This document (AC28 Doc. 20.3.4) was prepared by Australia and recommends maintaining this species in Appendix I.	This document was introduced by Australia. The Committee agreed with the recommendation in this Periodic Review to maintain <i>Cyclopsitta diophthalma coxeni</i> in Appendix I
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	20.3.5 Periodic review of <i>Psephotus dissimilis</i>	This document (AC28 Doc. 20.3.5) was prepared by Australia and recommends maintaining this species in Appendix I.	This document was introduced by Australia. The Committee agreed with the recommendation in this Periodic Review to maintain <i>Psephotus dissimilis</i> in Appendix I.
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	20.3.6 Periodic review of <i>Ninox novaeseelandiae undulata</i>	This document (AC28 Doc. 20.3.6) was prepared by Australia. It Australia recommends the transfer of this species from Appendix I to Appendix II.	This document was introduced by Australia. The Committee agreed with the recommendation in this Periodic Review to transfer <i>Ninox novaeseelandiae undulata</i> to Appendix II.
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	20.3.7 Periodic review of <i>Sphenodon spp.</i>	This document (AC28 Doc. 20.3.7) was submitted by New Zealand. New Zealand recommends retention of the genus <i>Sphenodon spp.</i> in Appendix I.	The document was introduced by New Zealand. The Committee agreed with the recommendation in this Periodic Review to maintain <i>Sphenodon spp.</i> in Appendix I.
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	20.3.8 Periodic review of <i>Cuora galbinifrons</i>	This document (AC28 Doc. 20.3.8) was submitted by Vietnam with the support of the Wildlife Conservation Society and the IUCN SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group. The document recommends the transfer of the species from Appendix	This document was introduced by Vietnam. The Committee agreed with the recommendation in this Periodic Review to transfer <i>Cuora galbinifrons</i> to Appendix I.

	<i>followed at the meeting).</i>		II to Appendix I.	
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	20.3.9 Periodic review of <i>Mauremys annamensis</i>	This document (AC28 Doc. 20.3.9) was submitted by Vietnam with the support of the Wildlife Conservation Society and the IUCN SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group.	Vietnam introduced this document. The Committee agreed with the recommendation in this Periodic Review to transfer <i>Mauremys annamensis</i> to Appendix I. Also, the Committee agreed that the implementation of Decision 16.124 had been concluded with the considerations of Agenda items 20.3.8 and 20.3.9.
	Dena Cator (Richard Jenkins/Dan Challender followed at the meeting).	20.3.10 Periodic review of <i>Epioblasma sampsonii</i>	This document (AC28 Doc. 20.3.10) was submitted by the USA. The USA recommends to de-list the extinct species from the Appendix I.	This document was introduced by the US. In light of discussions on extinct or possibly extinct species in the context of the implementation of Decision 16.164, the Committee agreed to defer a decision regarding recommendations in on this agenda item until the 29 th meeting of the Animals Committee.
21. Standard nomenclature [Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP16)]	Dan Challender		<i>No document</i>	<i>No action</i>
	Dan Challender (Followed by Peter Paul van Dijk followed at the meeting).	21.1 Report of the specialist on zoological nomenclature	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 21.1) was prepared by the specialist on zoological nomenclature, with contributions from the Secretariat. A number of nomenclatural tasks have been referred to the Animals Committee by CoP16:</p> <p><i>Hippocampus</i> taxonomy (paragraph 2) Following discussion between Australia and the IUCN/SSC Seahorse, Pipefish and SticklebackSG between AC27 and AC28, Australia withdraws <i>Hippocampus bleekeri</i> and <i>H. elongatus</i> from its request where it concurs with IUCN, but retains six species in its request to amend taxonomy. A response was received extremely late by the IUCN/SSC Seahorse, Pipefish and SticklebackSG (Annex 10).</p> <p>Coral (paragraph 3)</p>	<p>This document was introduced by the nomenclature specialist. The Committee established a working group on agenda items 21.2 and 21.2 (working group on nomenclature) with the following mandate:</p> <p><u>Concerning agenda item 21.1:</u> 1. Review document AC28 Doc. 21.1 and its annexes, and the proposals made therein, and make recommendations for the Animals Committee to consider. IUCN was a member of this working group.</p> <p>The working group made the following recommendations (also outlined in AC28 Com. 10):</p> <p><i>Hippocampus</i> taxonomy (paragraph 2)</p>

		<p>Decision 15.64 a) requires the AC to “<i>identify existing coral reference materials that could be adopted as standard nomenclatural references for CITES-listed corals</i>”.</p> <p>Decision 15.64 b) requires the AC to “<i>update its list of coral taxa for which identification to genus level is acceptable, but which should be identified to species level where feasible, and to provide the updated list to the Secretariat for dissemination</i>”.</p> <p>Regarding Decision 15.64 a), and according to specialist comments solicited, the online database WoRMS (www.marinespecies.org) represents at the moment the best source of information on the taxonomy of corals.</p> <p>No progress has been made with regard to Decision 15.64 b).</p> <p>Layout for list of Standard Nomenclature References (paragraph 4)</p> <p>Layout of nomenclatural references in Resolution Conf. 12.11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the Animals Committee agrees, the Secretariat would be prepared to collaborate with the nomenclature specialist to review the lay-out, presentation and content of the Annex to Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP16) for consideration at CoP17. <p>Nomenclature reference for overall animals groups (paragraph 5)</p> <p>Nomenclature references for species suggested for inclusion in the CITES Appendices not covered by the nomenclature references listed in Res. Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP16).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Secretariat will continue to reach out to the relevant copyright holders and, upon request, provide an oral update at the Animals Committee meeting. <p>Nomenclature reference for the whole genus <i>Ovis</i> (paragraph 6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a need to reconsider the taxonomic reference for <i>Ovis vignei</i>. This could potentially be achieved by adopting the 3rd edition of Wilson & Reeder (2005). 	<p>1. Prior to the working group meeting Australia had supplied information to the nomenclature specialist that indicates that, based on ongoing/preliminary genetic analyses in Australia, at least two of the remaining six species in document AC28 21.1 Annex 2 should be regarded as valid species. Thus there remain different opinions between Australia and the IUCN/SSC Seahorse, Pipefish & Stickleback Specialist Group regarding the taxonomy of these six taxa. To resolve this issue further information is needed. Therefore the AC remains unable to resolve this issue at its 28th meeting and recommends to forward this issue to the discussion of the parties at CoP17, in the expectation that additional information will be available by then.</p> <p>Coral (paragraph 3)</p> <p>2. With regard to Decision 15.64 a), two different reference sources have been identified by the AC that might serve as basis for general nomenclature reference for corals: 1) a time-specific version of the WoRMS database, and 2) a new website for Corals of the World by John VERON which is in preparation.</p> <p>3. The AC recommends that the CITES Secretariat continues its efforts to explore the possibility of receiving a time-specific version of both with regard to coral species that serves the needs of a CITES nomenclature reference and to report back its progress to CoP17.</p> <p>4. With regard to WoRMS the AC recommends parties to undertake an internal assessment of the WoRMS database with regard to consistency with their own internal coral nomenclature databases and report back to the AC at AC29 latest.</p> <p>5. Considering the current state of information on possible options for a nomenclature reference for corals the AC recommends to continue using the interim checklist currently used as standard nomenclature reference for this animal group.</p> <p>6. The list of coral taxa in Notification No. 2013/35 – with</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Bird nomenclature (paragraph 7) General nomenclature reference for bird genera and species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The EU commissioned WCMC to compile a comparison of the currently used and proposed generic and species taxonomies to assist the Committee in considering whether a change of current general nomenclature may be appropriate or not. <p><i>Poicephalus robustus</i> (paragraph 8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In document AC27 Doc. 25.2, South Africa requested the Committee to consider split-listing of the <i>Poicephalus robustus-suahelicus-fuscicollis</i> complex. South Africa has provided the nomenclature specialist with an identification guide (Annex 5) and nomenclature reference. <p>Taxonomic Checklist for all Chamleonidae species and the genus <i>Phelsuma</i> (paragraph 9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The German Scientific Authority commissioned Frank Glaw to compile a taxonomic checklist for all species of the family Chameleonidae and the genus <i>Phelsuma</i>. It is suggested to recommend these publications as new nomenclature references. Nomenclatural changes resulting from adoption are in Annex 6. <p>Amphibians (paragraph 10) Taxonomic checklist of Amphibian species listed by CITES and EC Regulation 338/97 implementing CITES in the European Union.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A new checklist has been compiled by the nomenclature specialist. The new checklist is suggested to replace the one that is currently in place for CITES. It results in two taxonomix changes (Annex 9). <p>Fish species except the genus <i>Hippocampus</i> (paragraph 11) Taxonomic checklist of Fish species (except the genus <i>Hippocampus</i>) covered by CITES and EC Regulation 338/97 implementing CITES in the European Union</p>	<p>the changes indicated - is in line with the currently adopted interim nomenclature reference for corals. Contacted coral specialists have indicated that they felt uncomfortable with the taxonomy used and therefore did not give an advice with regard to the identification question of the species covered under the genera mentioned there.</p> <p>7. For the time being the AC therefore recommends with regard to Decision 15.64 b) to adopt the list of corals that may be traded on genus level as outlined in Notification 2013/35) and to review this list once a decision has been taken with regard to a new standard nomenclature reference for corals.</p> <p>Layout for list of Standard Nomenclature References (paragraph 4) The AC welcomes the offer by the CITES Secretariat in this paragraph and recommends that the CITES Secretariat in collaboration with the nomenclature specialist reviews the lay-out, presentation and content of the Annex to Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP16) for consideration at CoP17.</p> <p>Nomenclature reference for overall animals groups (paragraph 5) The AC commends the CITES Secretariat for continuing its efforts to explore the possibilities for time-specific versions of the databases for amphibians, fish and spider species, and requests the Secretariat to report back on its progress to CoP17.</p> <p>Nomenclature reference for the whole genus <i>Ovis</i> (paragraph 6) 10. During the meeting of the Nomenclature Working Group the representative of the IUCN has pointed out that the taxonomy as reflected in WILSON & REEDER (2005) is not in line with taxonomy currently accepted by the IUCN/SSC Caprinae Specialist Group. However, CMS has adopted this publication as standard nomenclature reference for the Ovis</p>
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A new checklist (see Annex 8) has been compiled by the nomenclature specialist, and it is suggested that it replaces the one currently adopted by CITES. <p>Other nomenclatural changes (paragraph 12) Other identified nomenclature changes in mammal, reptile, amphibian, and invertebrate species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The EU Commission commissioned WCMC to identify changes with regard to the nomenclature of mammals, reptiles (other than Chameleons and <i>Phelsuma</i> species), amphibian and invertebrate species covered by CITES and the EU Regulation implementing CITES (Annex 9). The Committee has already recommended adoption of respective changes to for the nomenclature of the New Zealand Gecko, genera <i>Naultinus</i> and <i>Hoplodactylus</i>, and a new nomenclature reference for the whole family of Cordylidae. - Adopting a change to the taxonomy of <i>Daboia russelii</i> would result in a split-listing. <p>Harmonization of nomenclature with other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Secretariat, in close collaboration with the nomenclature expert, continues its efforts to ensure harmonization of nomenclature with other MEAs. 	<p>species listed in the CMS appendices.</p> <p>11. In the spirit of harmonizing the nomenclature used in the CMS and CITES appendices as far as possible the AC recommends to adopt WILSON & REEDER (2005) for all <i>Ovis</i> species listed on CITES appendices as well. This will result in the following changes:</p> <p>Appendix I: <i>Ovis orientalis ophion</i> changed to <i>Ovis aries ophion</i> as well as <i>Ovis vignei vignei</i> changed to <i>Ovis aries vignei</i>.</p> <p>Appendix II: <i>Ovis vignei</i> (Except the subspecies included in Appendix I) changed to <i>Ovis aries</i> (Except for the domesticated form <i>Ovis aries aries</i>, the subspecies <i>isphahanica</i>, <i>laristanica</i>, <i>musimon</i>, and <i>orientalis</i> which are not covered by CITES and the subspecies included on Appendix I).</p> <p>Bird nomenclature (paragraph 7) 12. The two new publications outlined in this paragraph (“The Howard and Moore Complete Checklist of the World” 4rd edition and “HBW and BirdLife International Illustrated Checklist” for non-passeriform bird species) have only been published recently, while the passeriform volume of the latter is not yet available. So far there has not been adequate time yet for a critical evaluation and adoption to be completed by the international ornithological community. The AC therefore recommends to postpone the decision on the possible adoption of a new standard nomenclature reference for all bird species to CoP18.</p> <p><i>Poicephalus robustus</i> (paragraph 8) 13. The AC recommends the adoption of a split-listing of the <i>Poicephalus robustus-suahelicus-fuscicollis</i> complex into the following species based on the publication listed in this paragraph which has been published now. This would result in the following nomenclature: <i>Poicephalus robustus</i> and</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p><i>Poicephalus fuscicollis</i> (including the subspecies <i>fuscicollis</i> and <i>suahelicus</i>).</p> <p>Taxonomic Checklist for all Chamleonidae species and the genus <i>Phelsuma</i> (paragraph 9) 14. The AC recommends the adoption of the new checklists as outlined in paragraph 9 in AC28 Doc. 21.1 as new standard nomenclature references for the whole family Chamaeleonidae and the genus <i>Phelsuma</i>, thus adopting of the changes outlined in AC28 Doc 21.1 Annex 6.</p> <p>Amphibians (paragraph 10) 15. The AC recommends the adoption of the new download from the online-database “Amphibian Species of the World”, AC28 Doc. 21.1 Annex 7, as new standard nomenclature reference for Amphibian species thus adopting of the nomenclatural changes outlined in Annex 9 of Doc. 21.1 for this animal group.</p> <p>Fish species except the genus <i>Hippocampus</i> (paragraph 11) 16. The AC recommends the adoption of the new download from the online-database “ESCHMEYER & FRICKE’s Catalog of Fishes”, AC28 Doc. 21.1 Annex 8, as new standard nomenclature reference for “Fish species except the genus <i>Hippocampus</i>”.</p> <p>Other nomenclatural changes (paragraph 12) 17. The AC recommends the adoption of the publication by STANLEY & al. (2011) in combination with GREENBAUM & al. (2012) as new standard nomenclature references for the whole family of Cordylidae, thus adopting the nomenclatural changes outlined in AC Doc. 21.1 Annex 9.</p> <p>18. The AC recommends the adoption of the publication of NIELSEN & al. (2011) as new standard nomenclature</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>reference for the gecko genera <i>Naultinus</i> and <i>Hoplodactylus</i> thus adopting the nomenclatural changes outlined in AC Doc. 21.1 Annex 9.</p> <p>19. The AC also recommends the adoption of a number of additional changes outlined in the attached revised version of AC Doc. 21.1 Annex 9. Changes not recommended for adoption are in strike-through text in this revised annex attached to this document; all other changes are recommended for adoption.</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the recommendations in AC28 Com. 10, as reflected above.</p>
	Dan Challenger	Annex 1: Response from IUCN SSC Seahorse, Pipefish and Stickleback Specialist Group regarding AC27 Doc 25.1: Report of the specialist on zoological nomenclature with respect to item 2: <i>Hippocampus</i> taxonomy	AC28 Doc. 21.1 Annex 1	See 21.1 above.
	Dan Challenger	Annex 2: Requested changes to Australian <i>Hippocampus</i> nomenclature in CITES	AC28 Doc. 21.1 Annex 2	See 21.1 above.
	Dan Challenger	Annex 3: Development of taxonomy within Eurasian <i>Ovis</i> species during the last decades	AC28 Doc. 21.1 Annex 3	See 21.1 above.
	Dan Challenger	Annex 4: Bird taxonomy - Comparison of the generic and species taxonomies in the 3rd and 4th editions of The	AC28 Doc. 21.1 Annex 4	

		Howard & Moore complete checklist of the birds of the world, and in the non-passerine volume of the HBW and BirdLife International illustrated checklist of the birds of the world, relating to taxa listed in the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations (which include all CITES-listed species)		
	Dan Challenger	Annex 5: Cape Parrot Identification Guide	AC28 Doc. 21.1 Annex 5	See 21.1 above.
	Dan Challenger	Annex 6: New species and other proposed taxonomic changes resulting from the new checklists for Chamaeleonidae species and the <i>Phelsuma</i> spp.	AC28 Doc. 21.1 Annex 6	See 21.1 above.
	Dan Challenger	Annex 7: Taxonomic Checklist of Amphibian Species listed in the CITES Appendices and the Annexes of EC Regulation 338/97	AC28 Doc. 21.1 Annex 7	See 21.1 above.
	Dan Challenger	Annex 8: Taxonomic Checklist of Fish species listed in the CITES Appendices and EC Regulation 338/97	AC28 Doc. 21.1 Annex 8	See 21.1 above.
	Dan Challenger	Annex 9: Animal taxonomy and nomenclature - New	AC28 Doc. 21.1 Annex 9	See 21.1 above.

		species and other proposed taxonomic and nomenclatural changes relating to animal species (mammals, most reptiles, amphibians and invertebrates) listed in the EU wildlife trade regulations (which include all CITES listed species)		
	Dan Challender	Annex 10: Meristic data for Australian species of <i>Hippocampus</i> 24 June 2015	AC28 Doc 21.1 Annex 10	See 21.1 above.
	Dan Challender	21.2 Revised nomenclature for four species of birds of paradise (Paradisaeidae)	This document (AC28 Doc. 21.2) has been submitted by the USA and relates to proposed amendments to the taxonomy of four species of birds of paradise (Paradisaeidae).	<p>The Committee established a working group on agenda items 21.2 and 21.2 (working group on nomenclature) with the following mandate:</p> <p><u>Concerning 21.2:</u> 2. Evaluate the nomenclature changes recommended by the Ornithological Council in document AC28 Doc, 21.2, and provide guidance to the Animals Committee on this nomenclature matter. IUCN was a member of this working group.</p> <p>The working group produced the following recommendations, also outlined in AC28 Com 10: 20. The request of the Ornithological Council refers to a change in bird nomenclature on family level with regard to four species currently recognized by CITES as being part of the family Paradisaeidae. 21. While the AC recognizes that the current standard nomenclature reference for bird taxonomy on family and order level needs to be reviewed and updated it does not support the request outlined in this document which refers just to four single species among all bird species covered by</p>

				<p>the CITES appendices. The AC emphasizes that these species are clearly covered by CITES, as demonstrated by the Index of CITES Species on the CITES homepage as well as the Species+ database.</p> <p>22. Correctly assessing the nomenclature of birds at the family and order names is a highly complex issue and requires a deep and detailed knowledge. Therefore the AC recommends to the CITES Secretariat that it should – subject to the availability of funds – commission the analysis of the implications of adopting a new standard nomenclature reference birds at the family and order names taking into account the ongoing discussion with regard to a new nomenclature standard reference for birds on genus and species levels (see AC28 Doc. 21.1 Paragraph 7, Bird Nomenclature).</p> <p>The Animals Committee adopted the recommendations in AC28 Com. 10, as reflected above.</p>
22. Proposals for possible consideration at CoP17	Dan Challender			
	Dan Challender	<p>22.1 Assessment of three bird species included in Appendix III (<i>Crax rubra</i>, <i>Meleagris ocellata</i> and <i>Penelope purpurascens</i>) based on the criteria of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16)</p>	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 22.1) concerns the assessment of three bird species included in Appendix II. During a study coordinated by CONABIO (Mexico's Scientific Authority) and carried out by TRAFFIC North America, the great curassow (<i>Crax rubra</i>), ocellated turkey (<i>Meleagris ocellata</i>), and the crested guan (<i>Penelope purpurascens</i>), were identified as species that, as a result of the magnitude, record or trends in international trade of between 2005 and 2010, and their conservation status, could meet the criteria for inclusion in CITES Appendix I or II. In response, CONABIO organised a workshop on the conservation status, use and management of these species (May 2015, Mexico City).</p> <p>It is recommended the Animals Committee take note of the results and conclusions of the workshop organised by CONABIO, particularly based on the amendment criteria for the</p>	<p>The Animals Committee noted this document.</p>

			<p>CITES Appendices, none of the three species merits being listed in Appendix I or II (paragraph 10.3), since international trade does not represent a threat to the populations of any of these species; and</p> <p>Encourage the Parties to identify relevant species in international trade and develop assessment initiatives similar to those described in this document.</p>	
	Richard Jenkins	22.2 Draft proposal to remove the zero quota for trade in wild specimens of the Mexican population of Morelet's crocodile (<i>Crocodylus moreletii</i>) for commercial purposes	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 22.2) concerns a draft proposal to remove the zero quota for trade in wild specimens of the Mexican population of Morelet's crocodile (<i>Crocodylus moreletii</i>) for commercial purposes.</p>	<p>This document was introduced by Mexico. Among other interventions, IUCN delivered the following intervention: "The IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group commends the considerable management efforts that Mexico has made for its population of <i>Crocodylus moreletii</i> and continues to welcome any sustainable use measures that generate conservation benefits for crocodilians and which are linked to livelihoods."</p> <p>The Animals Committee noted this document.</p>
	Richard Jenkins	22.3 Proposal for the transfer from Appendices I to II of <i>Crocodylus porosus</i> in Malaysia	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 22.3) concerns a potential proposal for the transfer of <i>Crocodylus porosus</i> from Appendix I to II in Malaysia.</p>	<p>This document was introduced by Malaysia. Among other interventions, IUCN delivered the following intervention: "The IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group recognizes the significant potential for a wild harvest program to help the Malaysian authorities better manage their <i>Crocodylus porosus</i> populations. We understand that this is a proposal to downlist Malaysia's population to Appendix II pursuant to Resolution Conference 9.24 and not a proposal to transfer the Sarawak population to Appendix II for ranching pursuant to Resolution Conference 11.16.</p> <p>Are they to develop a proposal for consideration by Parties at the CoP, we encourage the Proponent to more explicitly detail aspects of the actual management program and control measures, as well as ongoing and future monitoring efforts, so that the Parties can be assured that adequate precautionary measures, as detailed in Resolution Conf 9.24 Annex 4, are in place."</p>

				The Animals Committee noted this document.
	Richard Jenkins	22.4 Status of conservation, use, management of and trade in the species of the genus <i>Abronia</i>	<p>This document (AC28 Doc. 22.4) concerns the status, management, trade and use of the genus <i>Abronia</i>.</p> <p>The Committee is invited to review the attached document (ANNEX 1), which contains the compiled information on the Mexican species from the <i>Abronia</i> genus, and to issue recommendations that it considers relevant for Mexico to present a proposal for amendment of the Appendices for the consideration of the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention (South Africa, 2016), to include in Appendix II the species that make up the <i>Abronia</i> genus.</p>	The Animals Committee noted the proposal.
	Richard Jenkins	22.5 Proposal to list <i>Lanthanotus borneensis</i> in Appendix I in Malaysia	This document (AC28 Doc. 22.5) concerns a potential proposal to list the Earless Monitor Lizard <i>Lanthanotus borneensis</i> in Appendix I in Malaysia.	This document was introduced by Malaysia. The Animals Committee noted this document.
23. Regional reports	Dan Challender	23.1 Africa	<i>No document</i>	The Animals Committee noted that, upon its completion, the representative of Africa (Mr. Kasiki) had agreed to send the regional report of Africa to the Secretariat for publication on the CITES website.
	Dan Challender	23.2 Asia	<i>No document</i>	The Animals Committee noted the report in this document.
	Dan Challender	23.3 Central and South America and the Caribbean	AC28 Doc. 23.3	The Animals Committee noted the report in this document.
	Dan Challender	23.4 Europe	AC28 Doc. 23.4	The Animals Committee noted the report in this document.
	Dan Challender	23.5 North America	AC28 Doc. 23.5	The Animals Committee noted the report in this document.
	Dan Challender	23.6 Oceania	AC28 Doc. 23.6	The Animals Committee noted the report in this document. The Animals Committee noted that the recent appointment of Dr. Rod Hay, Alternate Representative of Oceania, as lead of the Management Authority of New Zealand, did not constitute a conflict of interest in the context of Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP16).
24. Any other business	Dan Challender		<i>No document</i>	N/A

25. Time and venue of the 29 th meeting of the Animals Committee	Dan Challenger		<i>No document</i>	N/A
26. Closing remarks	Dan Challenger		<i>No document</i>	N/A

* This agenda item is addressed to the Animals and Plants Committees.