



**SUMMARY OF ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED AT  
THE TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING OF  
THE CITES ANIMALS COMMITTEE**  
GENEVA, SWITZERLAND • 15-20 MARCH 2012

AC = Animals Committee • PC = Plants Committee • SC = Standing Committee • RC = Resolution Conf. • Dec. = Decision • CoP = Conference of the Parties  
All meeting documents prepared by the CITES Secretariat unless otherwise indicated.

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>1. Opening of the Meeting</b>  <b>No Document</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Rules of Procedure</b>  <b>AC26 Doc. 2</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contains the Rules of Procedure adopted at AC25 (July 2011) with no recommended changes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme</b>			
3.1	Agenda  <b>AC26 Doc. 3.1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provisional agenda for the meeting is presented for consideration and adoption.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment.</li> </ul>
3.2	Working programme  <b>AC26 Doc. 3.2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provisional working programme for the meeting is presented for consideration and adoption.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Admission of observers</b>  <b>AC26 Doc. 4</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not available at the time this document was prepared.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment.</li> </ul>
<b>5. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) (Decision 15.12)</b>  <b>AC26/PC20 Doc. 5</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision 15.12 directs AC, PC and the Secretariat to participate, subject to external funding, in discussions concerning a possible Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), to provide input into the process and ensure that the role of CITES receives due recognition. The Chairs of AC and PC and the Secretariat shall report to the SC to seek additional guidance.</li> <li>Reports that participants in the first plenary session of IPBES agreed that the platform should respond “to requests from Governments, including those conveyed to it by multilateral environmental</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>urges</u> AC and PC to ensure that, as scientific bodies, they continue to have a formal role in CITES participation in the development and implementation of IPBES.</li> <li>SSN <u>notes</u> that CITES participation in IPBES should be aimed at enhancing its core function of protecting wild species from overexploitation by international trade.</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services as determined by their respective governing bodies.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the latest version of draft elements of the IPBES work program (which will be discussed at the second session of the plenary meeting of IPBES in April 2012) will be distributed as an Annex at AC26 as soon as it is available.</li> <li>• Invites AC and PC to make suggestions for the further input of the Chairs and the Secretariat into the process for creating an IPBES.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6. Climate change (Decision 15.15) – Report of the joint working group</b></p> <p><b>AC26/PC20 Doc. 6</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invites AC and PC to consider the Climate Change Working Group’s findings, to advise on further actions needed to comply with Dec. 15.15, and to report to SC62.</li> <li>• Provides the findings of the Working Group which include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The magnitude and extent of climate change impacts are expected to be highly variable.</li> <li>■ Impacts can be direct, indirect, or human-mediated.</li> <li>■ Species may be positively or negatively impacted.</li> <li>■ Range states may change with climate-related changes in species distributions.</li> <li>■ Impacts may exacerbate current stressors or modify ecological or physiological processes.</li> <li>■ Impacts may affect CITES, such as by reducing the number of range States.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provides recommendations of the Working Group including that Parties employ the best science available, share expertise, and keep informed through workshops, the CITES website, and inclusion of climate change in CITES training materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>congratulates</u> the Working Group on its findings and <u>agrees</u> that many CITES decision-making processes are flexible enough to allow consideration of climate change.</li> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> the Working Group to meet during the joint meeting to consider the need for further guidance, potentially in the form of a Resolution on incorporating climate change into CITES decision-making.</li> <li>• SSN <u>recommends</u> that such guidance include recommendations on the need for Parties to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Use a precautionary approach when considering climate change impacts;</li> <li>■ Use the best available science;</li> <li>■ Develop and use tools to assist in their understanding and consideration of climate change;</li> <li>■ Understand that climate change science projects changes over the next 50 or 100 years or more, and incorporate this time scale into decisions;</li> <li>■ Incorporate climate change into non-detriment findings; and</li> <li>■ Evaluate the add-on impact of trade to species imperiled by climate change.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>7. Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade [Decision 13.67 (Rev. CoP14)]</b></p> <p><b>AC26/PC20 Doc. 7</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides the terms of reference for an evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade (Annex 1) adopted at CoP13 and the <i>modus operandi</i> for conducting the evaluation (Annex 2), and notes the composition of the Advisory Working Group which will meet in June 2012.</li> <li>• Provides case studies of the species selected prepared by TRAFFIC (Annexes 3, 4, 5) and notes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> AC and PC to establish a Working Group to consider the actions directed to them and invite observers to participate.</li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>that the case study of the country-based Review of Significant Trade in Madagascar has not been undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Invites AC and PC to: a) examine the case studies; b) provide an agenda and instructions for the meeting of the Advisory Working Group; and c) prepare a roadmap for the preparation of the final report.</li> </ul>	
<b>8. Non-detriment findings</b>			
<b>8.1</b>	<p>Implementation of Decision 15.23 on Non-detriment findings: background and links with Decisions 15.24, 15.26 and 15.27</p> <p><b>AC26/PC20 Doc.8.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by AC and PC Chairs on behalf of the Intersessional Working Group on Non-Detriment Findings.</li> <li>Decisions 15.23 to 15.27 on non-detriment findings (NDFs) provide, <i>inter alia</i>, a collaborative process to have AC and PC draft non-binding guidelines for the making of NDFs for submission to CoP16. This process allows Parties to participate and communicate their experiences to the Committees through various means including through feedback on the outcomes of the International Expert Workshop on NDFs or the organization of workshops at the national level to better understand what NDFs are and how to enhance the ways to formulate them.</li> <li>Reports that the Joint Intersessional Working Group to work on this issue was formed after AC25.</li> <li>Reports on the activities led intersessionally to implement Decisions 15.23 to 15.27 including, <i>inter alia</i>, the submission of responses to CITES Notifications for consultations and the organization of regional workshops.</li> <li>Invites AC and PC to note the document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC note the document.</li> </ul>
<b>8.2</b>	<p>Summary report based on the responses to Notifications to the Parties [No. 2009/023, paragraph 1. f) of No. 2010/027 and No. 2011/004]</p> <p><b>AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by AC and PC Chairs on behalf of the Intersessional Working Group on Non-Detriment Findings.</li> <li>See description of Decisions 15.23 to 15.27 under <i>Proposed actions</i> for AC26 Doc. 8.1.</li> <li>Provides the Working Group's report on the responses received from Parties on their experience with NDFs or from workshops organized on NDFs. This report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC recommend that the INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUP meet during the session to propose recommendations and to draft possible Decisions for submission to CoP16, and that observers be invited to participate.</li> <li>SSN <u>notes</u> that Decision 15.22 calls on the Secretariat to seek funding to convene a capacity-building workshop and regional meeting for the Africa region before SC62, in order to improve regional implementation of the Convention. SSN <u>recommends</u> that the Committees mandate the</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>concludes, <i>inter alia</i>, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ the "Evaluation of the effects of harvest and subsequent adaptation of the non-detriment finding" and "Assessing the level of risk associated with the NDF" are the most problematic challenges while making NDFs.</li> <li>■ there are more difficulties with some biological groups than others for the making of NDFs</li> <li>■ the outputs of the International Expert Workshop on NDFs and the IUCN's NDF guidelines were considered helpful.</li> <li>■ further workshops and materials for capacity building are necessary.</li> <li>■ the AC and PC should make recommendations to the Secretariat to make the NDF section on the CITES website more prominent and to include information from the NDF workshop, experiences of Parties in making NDFs, other NDF workshop results; and other materials relevant to NDFs.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Invites AC and PC to consider ways to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ spread the best practices and experiences from the Parties on making NDFs;</li> <li>■ facilitate the Parties' capacity building efforts and opportunities to share experiences at regional/subregional levels; and</li> <li>■ formulate draft Decisions, as necessary, to be sent for consideration in the CoP16.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Secretariat to use this workshop and regional meeting as an opportunity to seek further regional input from CITES Parties on this issue based on the priority needs of countries in that region, and to report on this consultation at SC62.</p>
<p><b>8.3</b></p> <p>Progress reports from Parties (Decision 15.23)</p> <p><b>AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Decision 15.23 directs the Parties to, <i>inter alia</i>, report their findings regarding outputs of the NDF workshop and ways to enhance the making of NDFs.</li> <li>● Notes that the results of the NDF workshop and the responses of the Parties to Notifications on these issues are found in CoP15 Doc. 16.2.2, Annexes A and B and the Annex to document PC19 Doc. 10.2 (Rev. 1).</li> <li>● Provides responses from Australia, Canada, the EU, India, Japan and the USA to a request for additional information (CITES Notification No. 2011/049) (Annex).</li> <li>● Invites AC and PC to use the responses and other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ mandate the Joint Intersessional Working Group to meet during the session to propose recommendations and possible Decisions for submission to CoP16 by the Committees; and</li> <li>■ invite observers to participate in the Working Group.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		available feedback submitted by Parties when preparing their draft guidance as a tool for making NDFs, for submission at CoP16.	
8.4	Draft guidance on the making of non-detriment findings  <b>AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by AC and PC Chairs on behalf of the Intersessional Working Group on Non-Detriment Findings.</li> <li>Notes that, "Parties need support and guidance in making NDFs; however a diversity of methodologies for NDFs exists, including the outputs of the Cancun [NDF] workshop and the experience of the Parties". Presents options that have been developed either as exercises of making NDFs, or as deeper research on ways to make NDFs for different taxa of CITES animals and plants (Annex).</li> <li>Recommends that AC and PC consider ways to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>invite Parties to explore these options to decide which is adequate for their needs.</li> <li>share best practices and lessons learned from the Parties.</li> <li>keep the information on NDFs updated and available to the Parties.</li> <li>formulate the draft Decisions, as necessary, to be considered at CoP16.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mandate the Joint Intersessional Working Group to meet during the session to propose recommendations and possible Decisions for submission to CoP16 by the Committees; and</li> <li>invite observers to participate in the Working Group.</li> </ul> </li> <li>SSN <u>notes</u> that Decision 15.22 calls on the Secretariat to seek funding to convene a capacity-building workshop and regional meeting for the Africa region before the 62nd meeting of the Standing Committee, in order to improve regional implementation of the Convention. SSN <u>recommends</u> that the Committees mandate the Secretariat to use this workshop and regional meeting as an opportunity to seek further regional input from CITES Parties on this issue based on the priority needs of countries in that region, and to report on this consultation at SC62.</li> </ul>
8.5	Discussion paper on non-detriment findings  <b>AC26/PC20 Doc. 8.5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by AC and PC Chairs on behalf of the Intersessional Working Group on Non-Detriment Findings.</li> <li>Notes that PC18 agreed on the text of a draft resolution on NDFs but AC 24 decided that it was too early to prepare such a resolution.</li> <li>Provides the text of a draft resolution on NDFs as proposed by the Working Group (Annex).</li> <li>Invites AC and PC to decide whether the draft Resolution is suitable to be submitted for approval to CoP16.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>is concerned</u> that the draft Resolution proposed does not include reference to the Precautionary Principle or to the need for Scientific Authorities to use a precautionary approach when making NDFs in cases of uncertainty as to the impact of trade on a species. SSN <u>believes</u> that the use of the Precautionary Principle is of the utmost importance when providing guidance to Scientific Authorities in the issuance of NDFs and should be referenced in the draft Resolution, possibly under paragraph a).</li> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that the draft Resolution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provide explicit guidance to Parties on what constitutes reliable population data and on the need to use a precautionary approach when such data are missing;</li> <li>be revised to recommend that NDFs must be based on sound scientific information as follows (deletions <del>struck through</del> and additions <u>underlined</u>): "RECOMMENDS that: a) v) The NDF is based on <del>resource-assessment methodologies</del> <u>the best scientific information available (...)</u>"; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ include reference to the need for Scientific Authorities to take into account the potential impact of climate change when making an NDF.</li> <li>● SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ mandate the Joint Intersessional Working Group to meet during the session to propose recommendations and possible Decisions for submission to CoP16 by the Committees; and</li> <li>■ invite observers to participate.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>9. Capacity-building programme for science-based establishment and implementation of voluntary national export quotas for Appendix-II species (Decision 12.91) – Report of the joint working group</b></p> <p><b>AC26/PC20 Doc. 9</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Prepared by Co-chairs of the Working Group on Capacity-Building Programme for Science-Based Establishment and Implementation of Voluntary National Export Quotas for Appendix-II Species.</li> <li>● Decision 12.91 directs the Secretariat to consult AC and PC on the resources that may be used within its capacity-building programme relating to voluntary national export quotas for Appendix II species.</li> <li>● Decision 15.24 paragraph c) directs AC and PC to review the NDF training materials used by the CITES Secretariat when conducting regional capacity-building workshops and provide advice for their improvement.</li> <li>● Provides the report of the joint AC/PC Intersessional Working Group created to implement Decisions 12.91 and 15.24 paragraph c).</li> </ul> <p><u>With respect to Decision 12.91:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Indicates that, at the time of drafting, no comments or case studies had been presented.</li> <li>● Recommends that AC and PC request each Committee member to seek further examples/case studies from their region to provide to the Secretariat, in particular focusing attention on those countries with existing quotas.</li> </ul> <p><u>With respect to Decision 15.24 paragraph c):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presents the recommendations of Working Group regarding the Secretariat's NDF training materials (Annex) and recommends their adoption.</li> <li>● Recommends that AC and PC discuss the possibility of a standalone NDF course within the Virtual College,</li> </ul>	<p><u>With respect to Decision 12.91:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC adopt the recommendations of the Working Group.</li> <li>● SSN <u>recommends further</u> that AC and PC mandate the Secretariat to issue a Notification to the Parties requesting materials or information that may assist Parties in setting export quotas or making NDFs, including case studies that may be used by the Secretariat in its training and capacity building work.</li> </ul> <p><u>With respect to Decision 15.24 paragraph c):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC adopt the recommendations of the Working Group.</li> <li>● SSN <u>supports</u> the creation of a standalone NDF course within the Virtual College and recommends that such course include a section devoted to guiding Scientific Authorities on the use of the precautionary principle in cases of uncertainty as to the impact of trade on a species. This section could provide information about the significance of the precautionary principle within CITES, and concrete examples showing its use. Guidance on the precautionary approach for this section could also be added based on the work emanating from the NDF workshop.</li> <li>● SSN <u>notes</u> that Decision 15.22 calls on the Secretariat to seek funding to convene a capacity-building workshop and regional meeting for the Africa region before the SC62, in order to improve regional implementation of the Convention. SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC ask the Secretariat to use this workshop and regional meeting as an opportunity to seek further regional input from CITES Parties on ways to improve its training material based on the priority needs of countries in that region.</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><b>10. Revision of Resolution Conf. 14.8 on Periodic Review of the Appendices</b></p> <p><b>AC26/PC20 Doc. 10</b></p>	<p>and request that the Secretariat make available the Virtual College in CD form for those without easy access to the Internet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 14.8 on <i>Periodic Review of the Appendices</i> defines a process for AC and PC to conduct periodic reviews.</li> <li>• Both committees have raised concerns about the slow progress and the backlog of species to be voluntarily reviewed; AC25 explored ways to improve performance of the review and decided to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Consider options to improve the pace of reviews such as, <i>inter alia</i>, collaborating with graduate students or seeking financial support;</li> <li>■ Decide, in conjunction with the PC, on amendments to improve RC 14.8.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SC61 agreed that there is a need to accelerate the reviews and that the matter should be considered again at SC62.</li> <li>• Invites AC and PC to identify amendments to RC14.8, to be submitted to SC62, and notes the Secretariat's desire to contribute.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC establish a Working Group during the joint meeting to develop proposed amendments to RC14.8, and invite observers to participate.</li> <li>• SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC propose the following amendments to RC 14.8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Invite collaboration with and input from observer organizations with expertise in the species under review;</li> <li>■ Eliminate from the list of taxa selected for review those taxa for which no one has volunteered to complete the review within three AC or PC meetings after their inclusion in the review.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC ensure that financial support for reviews does not impact the Secretariat's budget, and is limited to external funding.</li> </ul>
<p><b>11. Transport of live specimens (Decision 15.59) – Report of the joint working group</b></p> <p><b>AC26/PC20 Doc. 11</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepared by the Co-chairs of the Joint Transport Working Group, in consultation with AC and PC Chairs and the Secretariat.</li> <li>• Decision 15.59 directs AC and PC to a) proceed with replacing the CITES Guidelines for transport and preparation for shipment of wild animals and plants (1981) with new guidelines for non-air-transport of live animals and plants for consideration at CoP16; b) consult with experts and stakeholders, <i>inter alia</i>, to gather information related to non-air-transport; c) propose revisions to RC 10.21 (Rev. CoP14) on <i>Transport of live specimens</i> and RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP15) on <i>Permits and certificates</i> for consideration at CoP16; and d) report on the implementation of this decision at CoP16.</li> <li>• Reports that the Working Group will report on a draft addendum to the IATA Live Animals Regulations (IATA/LAR) that includes modifications for certain taxa and, that the group agrees that the IATA Perishable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC take note of the report and adopt the recommendations contained in this document.</li> <li>• SSN <u>notes</u> that no information is provided in this document about the implementation of Decision 15.60 paragraph b) on the incorporation of transport-related guidance in the CITES National Legislation Project, and that little information is provided on the implementation of Decision 15.60 paragraph a) on the establishment of enhanced cooperation between CITES and organizations that deal with transport. SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC and PC request an update from the CITES Secretariat on the implementation of these provisions.</li> <li>• SSN <u>also notes</u> that the introduction of new guidelines for non-air-transport of live animals and plants at CoP16 is likely to represent a challenge to implementation in developing countries, and <u>recommends</u> that, in addition to the revisions of RC10.21 and RC12.3 introducing these guidelines, the Committees propose the adoption of a Decision at CoP16 mandating the Secretariat to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ explore priorities for capacity-building on this issue in developing countries;</li> <li>■ liaise with relevant transport organizations to provide training and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>Cargo Regulations (PCR) seem to cover all transport requirements for living plants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends that AC and PC reach agreement on: the proposed IATA/LAR which contain guidance on non-air transport of live specimens of identified taxa; any proposed revisions to RC 10.21 (Rev CoP14) and RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP15); and, any draft decisions or working documents for CoP16.</li> <li>• Recommends that AC and PC request the Working Group Co-chairs and the Secretariat to liaise with the IATA Secretariat on the possibility of having the addendum on non-air transport adopted by the appropriate IATA body.</li> <li>• Request the Secretariat to explore the best way in which the CITES and IATA Secretariats might facilitate use of the IATA/LAR and the IATA/PCR by CITES Parties.</li> </ul>	<p>equipment as necessary; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ present a report to CoP17 indicating progress made and making recommendations for further action on capacity-building as necessary.</li> <li>• SSN <u>also recommends</u> that AC and PC urge the SC to request that the Secretariat report on individual Parties' progress in adopting transport requirements under the National Legislation Project.</li> </ul>
<b>12. Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species</b>			
<b>12.1</b>	<p>Overview of the species-based Review of Significant Trade</p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 12.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) on <i>Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species</i> (hereafter Review) directs the Secretariat to report at each meeting of AC on the implementation by the range States concerned of the recommendations made by AC.</li> <li>• Provides information on recent decisions of the SC in the context of the Review and gives brief updates on ongoing Reviews.</li> <li>• Presents a list of species that were selected for Review after CoPs 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 and for which the Review is ongoing, including an indication of the current status of the Review (Annex).</li> <li>• Invites AC to note the document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC note this document.</li> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> AC to request the Secretariat to provide an oral report on the development of the Significant Trade Online Management System, which is not addressed in documents for this meeting. SSN <u>urges</u> AC to request that this database be made accessible to the public as the information is essential for selection of species for inclusion in the Review.</li> <li>• <b>Chameleons from Madagascar:</b> AC25 agreed that the Secretariat would clarify with Madagascar discrepancies in documents submitted in response to the recommendations made at SC58 concerning <i>Calumma brevicorne</i>, <i>C. crypticum</i>, <i>C. gastrotaenia</i>, <i>C. nasutum</i>, <i>C. parsoni</i>, <i>Furcifer antimena</i>, <i>F. campani</i>, and <i>F. minor</i> and that AC26 would reconsider the response of Madagascar. SSN <u>notes</u> that this issue is not included in AC26 Doc. 12.1 nor were the related documents distributed for this meeting. SSN <u>urges</u> AC to uphold the trade suspensions established for these species in 1995 until all recommendations adopted at SC 58 are fully complied with. As up-to-date population estimates are lacking, no estimates of sustainable offtake can be calculated; in addition, Malagasy chameleons feature prominently in illegal trade and those species for which resumption of trade is suggested are look-alikes to</li> </ul>



ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>12.2</p> <p>Species selected following CoP13 and CoP14</p> <p>AC26 Doc. 12.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides an update on the status of species selected following CoP13 and CoP14.</li> <li>Provides a report from the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) on taxa selected following CoP14 and retained in the review after AC25 including preliminary categorizations (urgent concern, possible concern, least concern) of each species (Annex). Invites AC to review the report, finalize categorization of each species, and refer problems that are not related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a), to the Secretariat.</li> </ul>	<p>species under zero quota.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed categorization of species reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><i>Tursiops aduncus</i></b> (Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin): Data deficient (IUCN 2011); SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC classify the species as Urgent Concern for <b>Solomon Islands</b> because there are no reliable data available on which to base a NDF. In addition, SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC request information on the difference between the number of dolphins exported and the number taken from the wild, as export quotas are unlikely to reflect accurately the total number of dolphins captured and removed from the wild. Given the small size of island dolphin populations and their site fidelity, this information is crucial for understanding the biological and ecological impact of the capture/export program, particularly if captures are reported for each subpopulation.</li> <li><b><i>Balearica pavonina</i></b> (black crowned crane): Vulnerable (IUCN 2011); IUCN (2011) states that recent surveys have shown a rapid population decline which is predicted to continue. SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC classify this species as Possible Concern for Benin and Urgent Concern for Guinea, Nigeria, Sudan and South Sudan. In <b>Benin</b>, the population was estimated to be 50 individuals in 2004; though the species is reportedly fully protected, 10 wild-caught individuals were exported in 2001 and data for two of the intervening years are not available. In <b>Guinea</b>, the capture of live individuals for export to international markets is reported to be a significant problem. Between 2000 and 2010, 73 wild specimens were exported from Guinea; the national population is estimated at only 200 individuals. In <b>Nigeria</b>, trade is considered to be the major cause of population declines. In <b>Sudan [including South Sudan]</b>, an estimated 600 individuals were reportedly exported between 2001 and 2005; trade is considered to be a significant threat to the species in Sudan. SSN <u>urges</u> AC to direct the Secretariat to bring to the attention of the SC illegal trade in Chad, Cameroon, Guinea, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, and Sudan. Regarding <b>South Sudan</b>, SSN <u>suggests</u> that AC request the SC to consider the situation in South Sudan with respect to trade in any CITES-listed species coming out of that country, to take steps to assist South Sudan to become a Party, and to apply any outstanding or pending recommendations for any species in Sudan to South Sudan if the species occurs there, with appropriate modifications.</li> <li><b><i>Balearica regulorum</i></b> (grey crowned crane): Vulnerable (IUCN 2011); SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC classify the species as Urgent Concern in Rwanda, Uganda, and Tanzania; and that the Secretariat be directed to bring to the attention of SC, evidence of illegal trade in all three countries. In <b>Rwanda</b> and <b>Uganda</b>, trade is considered to be significant with some</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>trade (without permits) recorded at borders. In Uganda, the removal of cranes from the wild is considered to likely be unsustainable. In <b>Tanzania</b>, with a potential decline of 75% over 25 years, 182 wild specimens were exported in 2006-2010. Specimens may be transported to the Middle East by private plane without customs or border checks; it is reported that specimens can be bought outside the quota system through “special arrangements” with wildlife officers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Mantella aurantiaca</i></b> (golden frog): Critically Endangered (IUCN 2011); While no quota was established for 2005, 2006 or 2007, export quotas were subsequently published in 2009 (2500), 2010 (550), and 2011 (550). The species was eliminated from the Review at AC23 because a zero quota had been established; it was reinserted as a species of priority concern at AC25. In 2010 (the last year for which data are available) the quota was exceeded more than four times; it is estimated that up to 100% more individuals are collected from the wild than are actually exported due to high mortality during transport and at exporters’ facilities. SSN <u>urges</u> AC to classify the species as Urgent Concern and, again, recommend that a zero quota be established immediately. A NDF cannot be made when according to IUCN the population is declining and over-exploitation is one of the major threats. Easily confused with <i>M. mylotympanum</i> (Critically Endangered (IUCN 2011)) and <i>M. crocea</i> (Endangered (IUCN 2011)), both for which AC recommended a zero quota; no mechanisms in place that can prevent laundering of these species as <i>M. aurantiaca</i>. Madagascar reports that its population estimate and subsequent quotas for the species are based on work by Rabemananjara <i>et al.</i> (2008); yet this same study states that “without long-term and more detailed studies on population structure and dynamics of these frogs, our data are insufficient to quantitatively assess strategies for sustainable harvesting of these species.” Exports totaled 29,469 specimens from 2000-2009.</li> <li>• <b><i>Huso huso</i></b> (beluga sturgeon): Critically Endangered (IUCN 2011); SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC classify Iran, Kazakhstan, and the Russian Federation as Urgent Concern until such time that these Parties confirm that zero export and catch quotas are in place for the species. SSN <u>urges</u> AC to agree that the species be reinserted into the Review of Significant Trade if trade commences.</li> <li>• <b><i>Hippocampus spp.</i></b> (seahorses): SSN <u>is concerned</u> that the majority of trade in <i>Hippocampus spp.</i> (dead specimens and medicinals) is not reported. Vincent <i>et al.</i> (2011) estimate that traditional (Chinese) medicine consumes 95% of <i>Hippocampus spp.</i> in trade, yet imports recorded by China appear low. Illegal trade, reported in China, India, the</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam, is significant and is thought to involve tonnes of dried specimens annually. SSN <u>strongly urges</u> AC to recommend that the CoP adopt a decision requiring that a report be undertaken on illegal and/or unreported trade in <i>Hippocampus spp.</i>, and that the SC develop recommendations to address such trade. Regarding <b>China</b>, SSN <u>is concerned</u> that no information is provided on the origin of exported medicinals. SSN <u>urges</u> AC to classify the taxon as Urgent Concern in <b>Thailand</b> for the three species in response to high levels of trade in dried specimens (18,223 kg of <i>H. kelloggi</i> (Kellog's seahorse) from 2004 – 2009; 1,916 kg <i>H. kuda</i> (common seahorse) from 2004–2009; 18,351 kg of <i>H. spinosissimus</i> (hedgehog seahorse) from 2004–2009) and little information on population status. SSN notes that <i>Hippocampus kelloggi</i> is classified as data deficient (IUCN 2011); <i>H. kuda</i> as Vulnerable (IUCN 2011); and, <i>H. spinosissimus</i> as Vulnerable (IUCN 2011).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Pandinus imperator</i></b> (emperor scorpion): highly vulnerable to over-collecting for the pet trade as a result of its life history strategy, i.e. highly social animals with small brood sizes, lengthy gestation periods, high age at sexual maturity, high level parental care, and generally low reproductive output. SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC follow the recommendations of UNEP and classify the species as Urgent Concern in Benin, Ghana, and Togo and Possible Concern in Guinea. No information is available on status of the species. Regarding <b>Benin</b>, 76,700 live, ranched specimens were reported imported from Benin between 2000 and 2010; claims of ranching and captive-breeding are questionable according to a study cited in the UNEP report. Regarding <b>Ghana</b>, 766,244 wild and 2,800 ranched specimens were reported imported from Ghana from 2000 to 2010. Regarding <b>Togo</b>, 187,137 ranched and 145,976 wild-sourced specimens reported; importer-reported trade was over four times the level of export reported by Togo. Regarding <b>Guinea</b>, 400 and 410 individuals were exported in 2001 and 2008, respectively; Guinea did not provide annual reports for 2007 or 2009.</li> <li>• <b><i>Tridacna spp.</i></b> (giant clams): As slow-growing, highly visible organisms usually found in easily accessible shallow waters, <i>Tridacna spp.</i> are considered to be very vulnerable to overharvesting. IUCN status of all species was most recently assessed in 1996 and needs updating. In some areas of Solomon Islands, heavy exploitation was considered to have led to near extinction of Tridacnidae. SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC classify the five species as Urgent Concern in order to address the trade of wild specimens, including whether shells traded under source codes C</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS																							
		<p>and F meet the requirements for these codes. SSN also <u>recommends</u> that <b>Solomon Islands</b> be requested to confirm that the trade and export of wild specimens is prohibited, as reported. Import records from 2000-2009 show the following clams originating from Solomon Islands:</p> <p><b><i>Tridacna crocea</i></b> (saffron-coloured clam) (Lower Risk/least concern (IUCN 2011)) 15,270 wild, 14,731 captive-bred, and 5,722 captive-born live animals; 353 shells. <b><i>Tridacna derasa</i></b> (southern giant clam) (Vulnerable (IUCN 2011)) 24,528 wild, 8,729 captive-bred, 2,316 captive-born live animals; 317 wild, 203 captive-bred, and 4,400 captive-born shells. <b><i>Tridacna gigas</i></b> (giant clam) (Vulnerable (IUCN 2011)) 46 wild, 708 captive-bred, and 217 captive-born live animals; 1,752 wild, 5 captive-bred, and 20 captive-born shells. <b><i>Tridacna maxima</i></b> (small giant clam) (Lower Risk/least concern (IUCN 2011)) 5,578 wild, 3,626 captive-bred, 589 captive-born live animals; 100 wild and 21 captive-bred shells. <b><i>Tridacna squamosa</i></b> (fluted giant clam) (Lower Risk/Least Concern (IUCN 2011)) 2,312 wild, 2,804 captive-bred, and 1,572 captive-born live animals; 1,519 wild and 15 captive-bred shells.</p>																							
<p>12.3</p>	<p>Selection of species for review following CoP15</p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 12.3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that 24 animal taxa were selected for the Review at AC25, including: <b><i>Macaca fascicularis</i></b> (crab-eating macaque), <b><i>Psittacus erithacus</i></b> (grey parrot), four <b><i>Chamaeleo spp.</i></b> (chameleons), two <b><i>Kinyongia spp.</i></b> (chameleons), <b><i>Ptyas mucosus</i></b> (oriental ratsnake), <b><i>Naja sputatrix</i></b> (Javan spitting cobra), <b><i>Python reticulatus</i></b> (reticulated python), <b><i>Podocnemis unifilis</i></b> (yellow-spotted Amazon river turtle), <b><i>Kinixys homeana</i></b> (Home's hinge-back tortoise), four <b><i>Hippocampus spp.</i></b> (seahorses), <b><i>Mantella bernhardi</i></b> (Bernhard's mantella) and six coral species.</li> <li>Provides a table identifying whether or not affected range States responded to the request from the Secretariat regarding possible problems with the implementation of CITES Article IV for these species.</li> <li>Invites AC to review responses from range States (not provided) and eliminate the species from the Review if it is satisfied that CITES Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a), is correctly implemented.</li> <li>States that the Secretariat will proceed with compiling information on species not eliminated from the Review.</li> </ul>																							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC maintain all of the species in the Review, subject to consideration of the responses from range States.</li> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC request the Secretariat to make range States' responses available sufficiently in advance of the meeting so that participants can study them and consult relevant experts.</li> <li><b><i>Macaca fascicularis</i></b>: SSN <u>urges</u> AC to consider AC26 Doc. Inf. 3, which provides information on threats relevant to, the making of NDFs, and the misuse of source codes for this species.</li> <li><b><i>Psittacus erithacus</i></b>: SSN <u>notes</u> that the Secretariat refers to the submission of a response from Tanzania and a lack of response from Togo when these Parties are not range States and that the species is extinct in Kenya. SSN <u>notes</u> that of the countries under review, exports and source codes include:</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="1241 1105 1940 1341"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Central Africa Republic</td> <td>2090 C 810 W</td> <td>850 C</td> <td>2730 C 2 W</td> <td>2790 C 7 W</td> <td>650 C 2 W</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Equatorial Guinea</td> <td>272 W</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nigeria</td> <td>400 C</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: UNEP-WCMC CITES Trade Database</p>		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Central Africa Republic	2090 C 810 W	850 C	2730 C 2 W	2790 C 7 W	650 C 2 W	Equatorial Guinea	272 W	0	2	0	0	Nigeria	400 C	0	0	0	0
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009																				
Central Africa Republic	2090 C 810 W	850 C	2730 C 2 W	2790 C 7 W	650 C 2 W																				
Equatorial Guinea	272 W	0	2	0	0																				
Nigeria	400 C	0	0	0	0																				

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mantella bernhardi</b>: SSN <u>recommends</u> that the species be retained in the Review. Madagascar did not respond to the request for information from the Secretariat and maintains a quota of 150 specimens (2011). The species was eliminated from the Review at AC23 because a zero quota had been established; it was reinserted as a species of priority concern at AC25, after Madagascar had set an export quota for this Endangered (IUCN 2011) species with a very restricted distribution. In addition, AC recommended that this species be included in a long-term standardized monitoring programme.</li> </ul>
<b>13. Periodic review of animal species included in the CITES Appendices</b>			
<b>13.1</b>	<p>Overview of species under review</p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 13.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 14.8 on <i>Periodic review of the Appendices, inter alia</i>, directs the Secretariat to maintain a list of species previously reviewed by AC, including dates of the review and links to the appropriate documents.</li> <li>• Provides the list of animal species selected for review between CoP13 and CoP15 (Annexes 1 and 2).</li> <li>• Invites AC to note the information presented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC note the document.</li> </ul>
<b>13.2</b>	<p>Species selected for review from CoP13 (2004) to CoP15 (2010)</p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 13.2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a list of 51 taxa for which no volunteer has been identified to conduct the review.</li> <li>• Notes that Notification to the Parties No. 2011/038 invited volunteers to complete outstanding reviews of animal species selected for the period 2004-2010.</li> <li>• Invites AC Chair to provide additional comments on input received from volunteers in response to Notification No. 2011/038.</li> <li>• Invites AC to decide on steps to take with the remaining species including whether the reviews should be kept or terminated.</li> <li>• Annex includes a review of <b>Andrias davidianus</b> (Chinese giant salamander) by China.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Regarding the list of species for Review:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> AC to recommend that those taxa for which no one has volunteered to complete the review within three AC or PC meetings after their inclusion in the review be eliminated from the review.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Regarding the Review of <i>Andrias davidianus</i>:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC agree with the recommendation that the species be maintained in Appendix I. This Critically Endangered (IUCN 2011) species continues to meet the listing requirements for Appendix I as it has experienced a drastic population decline, estimated to be more than 80% over the last three generations, due to over-exploitation and, as the world's largest amphibian, is in demand for collections.</li> </ul>
	<p>13.2.1 Galliformes – Report of the working group</p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 13.2.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepared by the Alternative Representative of North America with support of AC Chair.</li> <li>• Notes that an intersessional Periodic Review Working Group was created to help facilitate the review of the remaining 16 species of Galliformes.</li> <li>• Reports that no Parties volunteered to undertake the reviews for these species.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>appreciates</u> the report compiled by the World Pheasant Association, and <u>notes</u> that it demonstrates that NGOs with expertise in taxa to be reviewed are capable of assembling and presenting useful data from published and unpublished sources in a rapid, professional and useful manner. Calling on such NGOs for assistance may be the best way to expedite the progress of the review.</li> <li>• SSN <u>notes</u>, however, that when such (or any) data are used as guidance</li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a summary document (Annex) on status and trade of these species prepared by World Pheasant Association.</li> </ul>	for the placement of a species on the CITES Appendices, this should be done in accordance with the Precautionary Principle and in compliance with the requirements of RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP15).
13.3	Species selected for review from CoP15 (2010) to CoP17 (2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not available at the time this document was prepared.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>
<b>14. Criteria for the inclusion of species in Appendices I and II (Decision 15.29) – Report of the working group</b>  <b>AC26 Doc. 14</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by the Chair of the Working Group on Criteria for the Inclusion of Species in the Appendices.</li> <li>Decision 15.29 directs AC to: develop guidance on the application of criterion Annex 2 a) B) and the introductory text to Annex 2 a) of RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) on <i>Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II</i> to commercially exploited aquatic species proposed for inclusion on Appendix II; recommend the best way to incorporate the guidance for use when applying RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) to commercially exploited aquatic species, without affecting the application of RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) to other taxa; and, submit its conclusions and recommendations to SC62.</li> <li>Provides a report from the Working Group Chair that, <i>inter alia</i>, notes that input provided to date is divided into three areas of consideration when evaluating the level of risk posed by take for international trade and the relative “value” of a CITES Appendix II listing: biology of the species, population/distribution, and management in place. Reports that the Chair is waiting for responses to a series of questions posed under these areas of consideration.</li> <li>Invites AC to note the report of the Working Group Chair, and any oral updates on progress since the submission of this report.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>welcomes</u> information that the Working Group will meet during AC26 and <u>recommends</u> that AC note the report and any updates received.</li> </ul>
<b>15. Sturgeons and paddlefish</b>			
15.1	Secretariat's report  <b>AC26 Doc. 15.1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) on <i>Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish</i> directs the Secretariat to provide at each AC meeting a written report on activities related to these topics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC note this report.</li> <li>Given the precarious status of wild sturgeon species, SSN <u>believes</u> it is important that AC be informed if any quotas are established for shared stocks. If RC12.7 (Rev. CoP14) is amended, SSN <u>recommends</u> the</li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports that, regarding quotas from 1 March 2011 to 29 February 2012 and 1 March 2012 to 29 February 2013, the Secretariat did not receive the required information from any range State except Ukraine and so it has published zero export quotas for all shared stocks in compliance with subparagraph a) v) of RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP14)</li> <li>• States that the Secretariat received no pertinent intelligence relating to illegal trade in caviar and, that “Crime, corruption and a lack of political will have perhaps created bigger obstacles to sturgeon recovery than any physical obstructions which prevent fish accessing their traditional spawning grounds.”</li> <li>• Invites AC to note the report.</li> <li>• Notes that SC61 agreed to propose that CoP16 delete the SC reporting requirement and suggests that AC may wish to propose the deletion of AC reporting requirement.</li> </ul>	<p>following:  <del>DIRECTS the Secretariat to provide at each meeting of report to the Animals Committee a written report, including references to relevant documents, on its activities related to the conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish if any export quotas for caviar or meat of Acipenseriformes species are established;</del></p>
15.2	<p>Evaluation of sturgeon stock assessment and Total Allowable Catch (TAC) determination methodology – Reports from Caspian Sea range States</p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 15.2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) on <i>Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish, inter alia</i>, directs AC to carry out, on a 3-year cycle, an evaluation of the assessment and monitoring methodologies used for stocks of Acipenseriformes and provide its recommendations on actions to be taken to the SC.</li> <li>• Reports that no range States have responded to Notification to the Parties No. 2011/049 regarding progress made in improving existing sturgeon stock assessment and total allowable catch determination methodology.</li> <li>• Reports that AC has now completed its evaluation of the assessment and the monitoring methodologies used for stocks of Acipenseriformes in the Caspian.</li> <li>• Taking account of its experience in implementing the monitoring of progress, 3-year cycle evaluations and reporting to SC, invites AC to consider the usefulness of these instructions and the possible need to amend RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP14).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC note the document and consider what action to take regarding amendments to RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP14), keeping in mind that quotas for the species may be established some time in the future.</li> </ul>
15.3	<p>Review of Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP14) on <i>Conservation of and</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment.</li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p><i>trade in sturgeons and paddlefish</i> regarding caviar labelling, product sources and species identification – Report of the working group</p> <p><b>No document</b></p>		
<p><b>16. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP15) on Conservation and management of sharks (Class Chondrichthyes)</b></p>			
<p><b>16.1</b></p>	<p>Report of the working group</p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 16.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepared by the Chair of AC Shark Working Group.</li> <li>• RC 12.6 (Rev. CoP15) on <i>Conservation and management of sharks (Class Chondrichthyes)</i> directs AC to examine information from range States on trade and other relevant information, and report its analysis and progress on shark and ray activities to the CoP. Responses from the Parties are provided in the Annex.</li> <li>• States that, if information is available at AC26, the Secretariat will provide reports on a July 2010 FAO and CITES Workshop to review the application and effectiveness of international regulatory measures for the conservation and sustainable use of elasmobranchs, and FAO's global review of the implementation of the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks).</li> <li>• Notes that AC25 requested the Secretariat to report on its collaboration with the Convention of Migratory Species on shark issues, and on developments related to the inclusion of standards found in the CITES toolkit on e-permitting with the World Customs Organization data model particularly with regard to reporting trade in sharks at the species level and reporting on product codes used for trade in sharks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>is extremely disappointed</u> with the lack of progress on these issues since AC25, and notes with concern that the results of the FAO and CITES workshop still are not available almost two years after the workshop took place.</li> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> AC to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Direct the Secretariat, in the event that the workshop report is not available at the present meeting, to ensure that the report be made available to the Working Group no later than 30 June 2012.</li> <li>■ Direct the Working Group to prepare its report on progress on shark and ray activities including its analysis of the country reports, workshop results and other relevant information so that it can be approved electronically by AC and submitted in time for the 4 October 2012 CoP16 document deadline.</li> <li>■ Direct the working group to identify major shark fishing and trading countries that did not provide reports and communicate with them directly, requesting that they submit a report in time for inclusion in AC report to CoP16.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SSN <u>is concerned</u> about the recent dramatic increase in trade in giant manta (<i>Manta birostris</i>) and reef manta (<i>Manta alfredi</i>). The global catch of devil rays (including mantas) reported to the FAO increased from 900 tonnes (t) to over 3,300t from 2000 to 2007. SSN <u>urges</u> AC to request data on the international trade in manta ray gill rakers from Parties that import or export manta ray products.</li> </ul>



ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Invites AC to note the document and to examine the information provided by range States on trade and other available relevant data and information as a result of Notifications 2010/027 and 2011/049, together with the final report on the CITES/FAO workshop, if it is available, in order to report their analyses at CoP16.</li> </ul>	
16.2	Reports from Parties  <b>AC26 Doc. 16.2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RC 12.6 (Rev. CoP15) on <i>Conservation and management of sharks (Class Chondrichthyes)</i> directs AC to examine information from range States on trade and other relevant information, and report its analysis and progress on shark and ray activities to the CoP. Responses from the Parties are provided in the Annex.</li> <li>Notes that Notification to the Parties No. 2011/049 requested that Parties:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit a list of shark species that they believe require additional action to enhance their conservation; and</li> <li>Advise whether they have domestic measures regulating: a) the fishing, retention or landing of shark or ray species; or b) the import or export of shark parts and products (fins, meat, skin, organs, etc.).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Provides reports (Annex) from Australia, Canada, India, Israel, Japan, Maldives, the Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, the United States of America and the European Union.</li> <li>Invites AC to take note of the document and examine the information provided by the Parties with a view to reporting its analyses to CoP16.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN is extremely disappointed with the lack of response from many shark fishing nations. SSN urges AC to direct the Working Group to identify major shark fishing and trading countries that did not provide reports and communicate with them directly, requesting that they submit reports in time for inclusion in AC report to CoP16.</li> <li>SSN recommends that AC, in its report to CoP16,:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provide the list of species (see below) that Parties believe require additional action for their conservation;</li> <li>recommend that range States with concerns for shark conservation submit proposals to CoP16 for listing warranted species in the Appendices; and</li> <li>provide a list of the major shark fishing and trading countries, and identify which have yet to file a report with AC and which have yet to adopt National Plans of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (NPOA-Sharks).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>List of species that Parties believe require additional action for their conservation: Order Rhinobatiformes (guitarfishes, shovelnose rays), Family Carcharhinidae (requiem sharks), Family Mobulidae (devil rays), Family Potamotrygonidae (freshwater stingrays), Family Pristidae (sawfishes), <i>Alopias</i> spp. (thresher sharks), <i>Centrophorus</i> spp. (gulper sharks), <i>Sphyrna</i> spp. (hammerhead sharks), <i>Alopias superciliosus</i> (bigeye thresher), <i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i> (silky shark), <i>Carcharhinus leucas</i> (bull shark), <i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i> (oceanic whitetip shark), <i>Carcharhinus obscurus</i> (dusky shark), <i>Carcharhinus plumbeus</i> (sandbar shark), <i>Galeocerdo cuvier</i> (tiger shark), <i>Galeorhinus galeus</i> (tope shark), <i>Glaucostegus granulatus</i> (sharpnose guitarfish), <i>Glaucostegus halavi</i> (Halavi guitarfish), <i>Glaucostegus thouin</i> (clubnose guitarfish), <i>Glaucostegus typus</i> (common shovelnose ray, giant shovelnose ray), <i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i> (shortfin mako), <i>Isurus paucus</i> (longfin mako), <i>Lamna nasus</i> (porbeagle), <i>Manta birostris</i> (manta ray), <i>Mobula japonica</i> (spinetail devil ray, spinetail mobula), <i>Odontaspis ferox</i> (deepwater nurse shark), <i>Prionace glauca</i> (blue shark), <i>Sphyrna lewini</i> (scalloped hammerhead), <i>Sphyrna mokarran</i> (great hammerhead), <i>Sphyrna zygaena</i> (smooth hammerhead), <i>Squalus acanthias</i> (spiny dogfish), and <i>Triakis semifasciata</i> (leopard shark).</p>
17. Snake trade and conservation management (Decision 15.76) – Report of the working group		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment.</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><b>No document</b></p> <p><b>18. Tortoises and freshwater turtles (Decision 15.79)</b></p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 18</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision 15.79 directs AC to review the IUCN/SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group study of progress on conservation of and trade in CITES-listed tortoises and freshwater turtles in Asia and to make recommendations to the SC and/or CoP16.</li> <li>Provides an update on the work of the SC regarding the recommendations made by AC25.</li> <li>Invites AC to act upon recommendations from AC25 that: a) AC should engage consultants to undertake a study to provide guidance for Parties to make NDFs for tortoises and freshwater turtles and report on progress at AC26 and CoP16; b) AC26 shall review the results of the North American Turtle Trade Workshop (September 2010), and the Asian Turtle Conservation Workshop (February 2011), and additional information, and make recommendations to amend the CITES Appendices with regard to turtle species.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>urges</u> AC and Parties to provide support for a study to provide guidance for Parties to make NDFs for tortoises and freshwater turtles and <u>welcomes</u> the opportunity to participate in the review of outcomes of the workshops.</li> </ul>
<p><b>19. Sea cucumbers [Decision 14.100 (Rev. CoP15)] – Report of the working group</b></p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 19</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by the Co-Chair of the Intersessional Working Group on Sea Cucumbers.</li> <li>Decision 14.100 (Rev. CoP15) directs AC to evaluate the outcomes of the 2007 FAO Workshop on Sustainable Use and Management of Sea Cucumber Fisheries, and recommend appropriate follow-up actions to CoP16.</li> <li>Provides a report of the Group (Annex) noting that it made no clear progress due to delay in publication of one of the FAO reports.</li> <li>Invites AC to evaluate the outcomes of the FAO workshop and the FAO publications and, recommend appropriate follow-up actions to report at CoP16.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC direct the Working Group to meet at AC26 and develop recommendations based on the available documents, rather than wait for them all to be published.</li> <li>SSN <u>urges</u> AC to instruct the Working Group to invite observers to participate.</li> <li>SSN <u>is concerned</u> that, almost five years after the 2007 FAO sea cucumber workshop was held, all of the outcomes have not yet been published.</li> </ul>
<p><b>20. Nomenclatural matters</b></p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 20</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared by the AC Specialist on Zoological Nomenclature.</li> <li>States that that there is no need to add a footnote to PRIMATES spp. or <i>Hominidae</i> spp. indicating that <i>Homo sapiens</i> is not covered by the higher taxon listing as humans are not “wild fauna and flora”.</li> <li>Recalls AC25 nomenclature decisions involving</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC take note of the report and adopt the recommendations contained in this document with one exception, see below.</li> <li>SSN <u>is concerned</u> that the recommendation regarding <b><i>Agalychnis</i> spp.</b>, which would limit the current listing of the genus <i>Agalychnis</i> spp. to the complex of five species considered in the original proposal, would exclude any species within that complex that may be discovered in</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p><i>Crocodylus johnsoni</i>, the genus <i>Uromastyx</i>, <i>Varanidae</i>, and <i>Gongylophis conicus</i>, and an amendment to RC 12.11 on <i>Standard nomenclature</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Notes that online databases cannot directly serve as a formal nomenclature standard reference for CITES-listed species as they are frequently changed, so the nomenclature specialist has compiled extracts that can be adopted by CITES.</li> <li>● Provides an update from the Secretariat on activities related to the harmonization of nomenclature with other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements.</li> <li>● Notes that the frog species <i>Epipedobates machalilla</i> had been transferred from the genus <i>Colostethus</i> to <i>Epipedobates</i> and it was unclear whether this species was then covered or not by the listing of <i>Epipedobates</i> spp. on Appendix II.</li> <li>● Recommends that AC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Consider a WCMC report on new (fauna) species and other taxonomic changes relating to species listed in the EC wildlife trade regulations (Annex 1); and, a report on taxa identified as candidates to be listed under the name of a higher taxon without altering the scope of the original CITES listing as outlined in Decision 15.63 (Annex 5).</li> <li>■ Decide whether to adopt an extract of the online database “Amphibian Species of the World, an online Reference”, version 5.5 of 2011 (Annex 2), as a new nomenclatural standard reference for amphibians in combination with the publication of Brown et al. (2011), noting resulting changes (Annex 3) including a change in the Appendices from “<i>Agalychnis</i> spp.” to the listing of the five single tree frog species <i>Agalychnis annae</i>, <i>A. callidryas</i>, <i>A. moreletii</i>, <i>A. saltator</i>, and <i>A. spurrelli</i>.</li> <li>■ Consider using the extract from the Eschmeyer &amp; Fricke online catalogue “Taxonomic Checklist of CITES listed Fish species” (Annex 4) as nomenclatural standard reference for all fish species except for <i>Hippocampus</i>, for which separate references will be mentioned.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>future. This narrows the scope of the original listing by genus, under which any such species would have automatically been included in Appendix II. SSN therefore recommends either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. rejecting the recommendation, but amending the current reference annotation to read: “Includes only the species <i>A. annae</i>, <i>A. callidryas</i>, <i>A. moreletii</i>, <i>A. saltator</i> and <i>A. spurrelli</i>, which were originally listed as <i>Agalychnis</i> spp. before taxonomic revisions broadened the scope of the genus. Should any new species be discovered that would have been classified in <i>Agalychnis</i> as it was understood at the time of the original listing, it will automatically be included in Appendix II”; or</li> <li>b. accepting the recommendation, but with a reference annotation to all listed species as follows: “These species were originally listed as <i>Agalychnis</i> spp. before taxonomic revisions broadened the scope of the genus. Should any new species be discovered that would have been classified in <i>Agalychnis</i> as it was understood at the time of the original listing, it will automatically be included in Appendix II”.</li> </ol> <p>In addition, SSN <u>requests</u> AC to examine whether other species, formerly belonging to a different genus but now included in <i>Agalychnis</i>, would qualify for a listing in CITES Appendix II on their own and whether a listing proposal for these species should be prepared.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Regarding <i>Epipedobates machalilla</i>, SSN <u>notes</u> that AC26 Doc. 27.3 indicates that Ecuador will prepare a proposal to list the species in Appendix II for CoP16.</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Recommend to CoP16 to adopt the publications currently used by WCMC as reference for the CITES Species Database and the Checklist of CITES Species (see Annex 6) as interim nomenclature reference for CITES listed corals, and to ask the Secretariat to publish a notification to seek funds to compile a taxonomic checklist for CITES listed coral species.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>21. Identification of CITES-listed corals in trade [Decision 15.64 b)] – Report of the working group</b></p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 21</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Prepared by the Co-Chairs of the AC Working Group on Identification of CITES-listed corals in trade.</li> <li>● Decision 15.64 b) directs AC to 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 provide the updated list to the Secretariat for dissemination.</li> <li>● Notes that the Working Group has discussed decision rules or criteria by which the list of corals whose identification to genus level is acceptable might be modified and has begun to consider suggestions for revision to the list.</li> <li>● Reports that it is expected that a provisional revised list should be available for consideration at AC26 for which further deliberations by the Working Group might be required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC note the report.</li> </ul>
<p><b>22. Progress report on the Identification Manual</b></p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 22</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provides an update on the use of the CITES Wiki Identification Manual.</li> <li>● Reports that the Secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ is seeking partners to make improvements to the Wiki, including providing links from keys to species pages; and having separate sections for products, parts and derivatives.</li> <li>■ is planning to provide direct links to trade data from pages of the manual, the species database, and other on-line identification resources.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Invites Parties, organizations and experts to contribute.</li> <li>● Invites AC to note this report.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC note this report.</li> <li>● SSN <u>is concerned</u> that use of the Manual remains difficult for non-experts, that searches by range State and higher taxa are not possible, and that there is no option to print pages or save them as documents or PDF files. SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC direct the Secretariat to explore ways to make these improvements to the Manual, and report to SC62.</li> <li>● SSN <u>remains concerned</u> that many Parties may not have regular, reliable access to the Internet and urges AC to recommend that the Secretariat ensure that paper copies of the identification manual are available and distributed in sufficient number in developing countries where availability of computers and the Internet is problematic.</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><b>23. Relationship between wildlife trade and wildlife diseases</b></p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 23</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports that the Secretariat was invited by the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) to become a Core Affiliate of the Scientific Task Force on Wildlife and Ecosystem Health (STFWEH) convened with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)</li> <li>• Provides the terms of reference of the STFWEH (Annex).</li> <li>• Notes that CITES Resolutions address disease issues in relation to release of seized specimens and preparation of proposals to amend the Appendices. Specific mention of disease is not included in text regarding formulation of NDFs contained RC 10.3 on <i>Designation and role of the Scientific Authorities</i></li> <li>• States that wildlife diseases have three main linkages to CITES implementation: “a) international trade in wild animals and their products can spread wildlife diseases; b) the effects of wildlife diseases can influence CITES decisions, such as the inclusion of species in the Appendices or the making of NDFs; and c) trade restrictions taken for sanitary reasons can impact programmes and projects designed to ensure the sustainable use of wildlife.”</li> <li>• Invites AC to: a) discuss the relationship between international wildlife trade and wildlife diseases in the context of the implementation of CITES; and b) provide advice to SC62 on the significance of this issue, including a recommendation about the nature of the relationship between CITES and the STFWEH.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> AC to ensure that, as a scientific body, it has a formal role in CITES participation within the STFWEH should the invitation be approved.</li> <li>• SSN <u>disagrees</u> with part of the Secretariat’s assessment of linkages of wildlife disease with CITES implementation. In particular, we note that CITES has no role in promoting or protecting trade, particularly in response to disease concerns, nor do CITES permits in any way serve as a green label for “sustainable” trade. In addition, the example used by the Secretariat (restrictions on wild bird imports) is that of a stricter domestic measure adopted for sanitary reasons in conformity with Article XIV. Evaluating such restrictions is outside the mandate of CITES.</li> <li>• SSN <u>considers</u> the main linkage between wildlife disease and CITES is that international trade in wild animals and their parts and products spreads diseases to fauna, flora, and people.</li> <li>• AC <u>may wish to consider</u> addressing disease considerations in relation to: the handling and inspection of wildlife shipments; the introduction of disease via wildlife shipments (import <i>and</i> export); the benefits of wildlife quarantine to stopping the spread of disease; the requirement in CITES Article III for the importing country of a live specimen to be satisfied that the proposed recipient is ‘suitably equipped’ to house and care for it before issuing an import permit; the requirement (Articles III, IV, V and VII) for live specimens to be “prepared and shipped so as to minimize the risk of injury, damage to health or cruel treatment”; the importance of the establishment and funding of facilities for confiscated live specimens; the making of NDFs (via the intersessional Working Group on Non-detriment Findings); and promoting increased communication and information sharing between health agencies and CITES authorities at the national level.</li> </ul>
<p><b>24. Report of the Chair for the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</b></p> <p><b>No document</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>25. Review of objections to the registration of operations that breed Appendix-I animal species in captivity for commercial purposes</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notification to the Parties No. 2011/045 of 11 October 2011 published four applications (Annexes 1-4) from Philippines to register Birds International, Inc. as a breeder of <i>Cacatua moluccensis</i> (Moluccan cockatoo), and subspecies (<i>C. sulphurea abbotti</i>, <i>C. s.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>urges</u> AC to recommend that the SC reject these applications, noting that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <i>Cacatua sulphurea</i> is classified as Critically Endangered (IUCN 2011) primarily as a result of unsustainable trapping for the cage bird trade; <i>Cacatua moluccensis</i> is classified as Vulnerable (IUCN 2011) and is</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
AC26 Doc. 25		<p><i>citrinocristata</i> and <i>C. s. sulphurea</i>) of <i>Cacatua sulphurea</i> (lesser sulphur-crested cockatoo) in the <i>CITES Register of operations that breed Appendix-I animal species in captivity for commercial purposes</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports that Indonesia (range State) objects to the registration, questioning the legality of the founder stock, referring to the lack of records of legal exports, citing continuing illegal trade, and noting that the Philippines still has not responded to a draft action plan for the species prepared by Indonesia as part of a memorandum of understanding on Indonesian <i>Cacatua</i> species signed by the two countries.</li> <li>• RC12.10 (Rev. CoP15) on <i>Registration of operations that breed Appendix-I animal species in captivity for commercial purposes</i> states that if any Party objects to the registration, AC should review the objection and comment within 60 days. The Secretariat shall forward the comments made by AC to the Parties concerned and allow a further 30 days for resolution of the identified problem(s).</li> </ul>	<p>threatened by trapping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Parties have repeatedly raised objections to registration of this facility and applications were rejected at CoP14 and CoP15.</li> <li>■ As at CoP14 and CoP15, no documentation is provided that proves legality of founder stock. For <i>C. moluccensis</i>, existing documentation is limited to one import permit for the general term “parrots” and another permit for 20 peacocks. For <i>C. sulphurea</i> the pre-convention certificates demonstrate imports for the years 1978-1980. However, in its objection Indonesia stresses that there were no records of legal exports from Indonesia for <i>C. sulphurea</i> and for <i>C. moluccensis</i> during this time period.</li> <li>■ Parrots continue to be smuggled from Indonesia to the Philippines for the pet trade.</li> <li>■ Philippines exports these species for commercial purposes despite not being included in the register. Exports from 2005 to 2009 include 10 <i>C. moluccensis</i> and 62 <i>C. sulphurea</i>.</li> </ul>
26. Proposals to amend the Appendices		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 11.1 (Rev. CoP15) on Establishment of Committees, (Annex 2), instructs AC, <i>inter alia</i>, to provide scientific advice and guidance on all matters relevant to international trade in animal and plant species included in the Appendices, which may include proposals to amend the Appendices.</li> </ul>	
26.1	<p>Draft proposal to transfer <i>Trichechus senegalensis</i> from Appendix II to Appendix I</p> <p>AC26 Doc. 26.1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepared by Senegal with the support of Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania and Sierra Leone.</li> <li>• Provides, for advice of AC, a draft proposal to transfer <i>Trichechus senegalensis</i> (West African manatee) from Appendix II to Appendix I (Annex containing draft proposal in French only).</li> <li>• <b>Regarding <i>T. senegalensis</i>:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Distribution:</b> occurs in coastal marine waters, brackish estuaries, and adjacent rivers of western Africa (21 range States).</li> <li>■ <b>Population:</b> Vulnerable (IUCN 2011); estimated at fewer than 10,000 individuals; field observations indicate a population decline, especially in areas where manatee meat and other products are traded</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN <u>congratulates</u> Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Senegal and Sierra Leone on the preparation and submission of this proposal.</li> <li>• Manatees are vulnerable to overexploitation due to their life history characteristics including late sexual maturity and low reproductive rates with females reaching sexual maturity at 4-5 years in age, giving birth to one calf at a time, with 3 to 5 years between births.</li> <li>• IUCN (2011) states that there is “high probability that a 30% or greater reduction in population size will result within a 90 year three generation period.”</li> <li>• Illegal international trade is growing and demand for manatee products and derivatives is projected to continue growing as human populations grow.</li> <li>• The species meets the criteria for listing on Appendix I in RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP15): the species is in international trade; the wild population is small</li> </ul>

ISSUE		PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>(Sierra Leone, Chad, Ivory Coast, Cameroon, Nigeria, Gulf of Guinea).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Threats:</b> exploitation for meat, skin, bones, and oil for food and traditional medicine; incidental takes in fishing nets; poor enforcement of protective laws; poaching and illegal trade; habitat loss and habitat degradation. Guinea and Sierra Leone report recent increases in poaching and trade in manatee meat; in Sierra Leone more than 350 manatees were killed by commercial poachers between 2007 and 2010.</li> <li>■ <b>Trade:</b> Between 2000 and 2010, 28 live animals, 1 body, 30 skins/skin pieces, 118 specimens, 17 bones, 19 bone carvings and bone pieces, 1 skull and 150 ml of oil were traded internationally (UNEP-WCMC CITES Trade Database, 2012). All range States prohibit trade but poor law enforcement leads to significant illegal trade in parts and products, especially between Guinea, Sierra Leone and Ivory Coast, between Chad, Cameroon and Nigeria and from Senegal to the Gulf of Guinea. In Sierra Leone, authorities refer to the emergence of an organized “manatee mafia”. Illegal trade is reported to be so lucrative that it is unlikely to stop in the near future.</li> </ul>	<p>(&lt; 10,000) and there has been a projected decline in the number of individuals by &gt;30% over the next three generations and an observed decline in the number of individuals (Annex 1, A); there has been an observed decline in the area and quality of habitat (Annex 1, A (i)); and the species is highly vulnerable to intrinsic (e.g. life history) and extrinsic (e.g. habitat destruction) factors (Annex 1, A(v)). Furthermore, it has been projected that the wild population will experience a marked decline in size (&gt;30% in three generations) (Annex 1, C ii) on the basis of a decrease in area and quality of habitat, levels of exploitation, and high vulnerability to intrinsic and extrinsic factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC support the proposal and recommend to CoP16 that the proposal be adopted.</li> </ul>
26.2	<p>Draft proposal to include <i>Lamna nasus</i> in Appendix II</p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 26.2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Prepared by Germany.</li> <li>● Provides, for advice of AC, a draft proposal to include <i>Lamna nasus</i> (porbeagle shark) in Appendix II (Annex).</li> <li>● <b>Regarding <i>L. nasus</i>:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Distribution:</b> Coastal and oceanic species found worldwide in temperate and cold-temperate waters; centers of distribution in the North Atlantic and in a circumglobal band in the southern Atlantic, southern Indian, southern Pacific and Antarctic Oceans.</li> <li>■ <b>Population:</b> Vulnerable (IUCN 2011); Northeast Atlantic and Mediterranean subpopulations - Critically Endangered (IUCN 2011); Northwest Atlantic subpopulation - Endangered (IUCN 2011). 2009 assessments of North and South Atlantic stocks have shown historical declines to &lt;30% of baseline, and more recent rates of decline of &gt;50%; other southern hemisphere stocks caught in targeted fisheries and as</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SSN <u>congratulates</u> Germany for the preparation and submission of this proposal.</li> <li>● Low reproductive capacity and high commercial value of both mature and immature age classes makes this species highly vulnerable to over-exploitation and population depletion.</li> <li>● Falls into the lowest productivity category of the most vulnerable species as defined by FAO; marked population decline meets CITES and FAO guidelines for listing of commercially-exploited aquatic species.</li> <li>● The FAO Ad Hoc Panel convened prior to CoP15 concluded that this species meets the criteria for inclusion in Appendix II; this proposal was adopted in CoP15 Committee I with a vote of 86 in favor, 42 opposed, and 8 abstentions. However, in the Plenary session, a proposal was made to re-open the discussion. This was adopted by a very narrow margin. Germany’s vote not to reopen the discussion was not recorded. If it had been, the discussion would not have been reopened and the listing proposal would have been adopted. On the second vote, Plenary rejected the listing proposal, with 84 in favor, 46 opposed, and 10 abstentions.</li> </ul>

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>bycatch also declining; estimated generation time at least 18 years in the North Atlantic and 26 years in the southern Oceans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Threats: Main threat is unsustainable fisheries (target and bycatch) driven by high market value of meat and fins; target fisheries in North Atlantic unsustainable for decades, with annual landings falling from thousands of tonnes to a few hundred in less than 50 years; southern stocks much smaller, slower-growing and longer-lived than northern stocks, making them more vulnerable to overfishing; without sustainable management southern hemisphere stocks likely to experience declines similar to those of northern hemisphere stocks.</li> <li>■ Trade: Meat traded internationally at high prices, both fresh and frozen; fins valuable and prevalent in the international fin trade; other products traded internationally include leather and liver oil, and probably cartilage and other parts. Trade records are generally not species-specific; international trade levels, patterns and trends are largely unknown.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Listing on Appendix II will ensure that international trade is sustainably managed and accurately recorded, in accordance with the FAO's IPOA-Sharks.</li> <li>● The species meets the criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 2a, paragraphs A and B and Annex 2b, paragraph A): marked decline due to over-exploitation and that CITES regulation is needed to avoid qualifying for Appendix I in the near future.</li> <li>● SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC support the proposal and recommend to CoP16 that the proposal be adopted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>26.3</b></p>	<p>Draft proposal to delete <i>Campephilus imperialis</i> from the Appendices</p> <p><b>AC26 Doc. 26.3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Prepared by Mexico.</li> <li>● Seeks the advice of AC on an evaluation of <i>Campephilus imperialis</i> (imperial woodpecker) (Annex) and proposes to delete the species, currently listed in Appendix I, from the Appendices at CoP16.</li> </ul> <p><b>Regarding <i>C. imperialis</i>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Distribution: was formerly distributed throughout the Sierra Madre Occidental of Mexico.</li> <li>■ Population: Critically Endangered (Possibly extinct) (IUCN 2011); has not been recorded with certainty since 1956, and extensive habitat destruction and fragmentation combined with hunting may well have driven the species to extinction.</li> <li>■ Threats: Chief threats are the combined and interconnected impacts of hunting and habitat loss.</li> <li>■ Trade: Four specimens re-exported to Mexico from the USA in 2006 for scientific purposes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SSN <u>notes</u> that this species has not been reported since 1956 and may be extinct. However, Birdlife International states (IUCN 2011) that "it cannot yet be presumed to be Extinct as the degree to which individuals can utilise sub-optimal regenerating forest is unknown, and it remains possible that some individuals survive. Any remaining population is likely to be tiny, and for these reasons it is treated as Critically Endangered (Possibly Extinct)." Birdlife also notes that the species, the largest woodpecker in the world, was heavily hunted "for fun, food and supposed medicinal purposes".</li> <li>● Under these circumstances, SSN <u>recommends</u> that the species be retained on the Appendices as a precautionary measure.</li> </ul>



ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTIONS	SSN RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><b>27. Reports on the actions taken by regional representatives and additional information from Parties, relevant to regional cooperation and the work of the Animals Committee</b></p> <p><b>AC26 Docs. 27.1 – 27.6</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The regional reports for Central and South America and the Caribbean, Europe, North America, and Oceania were available at the time this document was prepared.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN <u>recommends</u> that AC note these reports.</li> </ul>
<p><b>28. Time and venue of the 27th meeting of the Animals Committee</b></p> <p><b>No document</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>29. Any other business</b></p> <p><b>No document</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>30. Closing Remarks</b></p> <p><b>No document</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment.</li> </ul>

**REFERENCES:**

IUCN 2011. *IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2011.2*. <<http://www.iucnredlist.org>>. Downloaded on 25 February 2012.

Rabemananjara, F., Bora, P., Razafindrabe, T., Randriamitso, E., Ravoahangimalala Ramilijaona, O., Rasoamanponona Raminosoa, N., Rakotondravony, D., Vieites, D. R., and Vences, M. 2008a. Rapid assessments of population sizes in ten species of Malagasy poison frogs, genus *Mantella*. *Monografie del Museo Regionale di Scienze Naturali di Torino*, XLV: 253-264.

Vincent, A., Foster, S., and Koldewey, H. 2011. Conservation and management of seahorses and other Syngnathidae. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 78 (6): 1681-1724.

Brown, J. L., Twomey, E., Amézquita, A., Barbosa De Souza, M., Caldwell, L. P., Lötters, S., Von May, R., Melo-Sampaio, P. R., Mejía-Vargas, D., Perez-Peña, P., Pepper, M., Poelman, E. H., Sanchez-Rodriguez, M. & Summers, K. 2011. A taxonomic revision of the Neotropical poison frog genus *Ranitomeya* (Amphibia: Dendrobatidae). – *Zootaxa* 3083: 1-120.



**SPECIES SURVIVAL NETWORK**

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