



VKM Report 2019: 11

# Assessment of species listing proposals for CITES CoP18

**Scientific opinion of the Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food and  
Environment**

Scientific opinion of the Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food and Environment (VKM)  
15.03.2019

ISBN: 978-82-8259-327-4

ISSN: 2535-4019

Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food and Environment (VKM)

Po 4404 Nydalen

N – 0403 Oslo

Norway

Phone: +47 21 62 28 00

Email: [vkm@vkm.no](mailto:vkm@vkm.no)

[vkm.no](http://vkm.no)

[vkm.no/english](http://vkm.no/english)

Cover photo: Public domain

Suggested citation: VKM, Eli. K Rueness, Maria G. Asmyhr, Hugo de Boer, Katrine Eldegard, Anders Endrestøl, Claudia Junge, Paolo Momigliano, Inger E. Måren, Martin Whiting (2019) Assessment of Species listing proposals for CITES CoP18. Opinion of the Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food and Environment, ISBN:978-82-8259-327-4, Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food and Environment (VKM), Oslo, Norway.

## **Assessment of species listing proposals for CITES CoP18**

Note that this report was finalised and submitted to the Norwegian Environment Agency on March 15, 2019. Any new data or information published after this date has not been included in the species assessments.

### **Authors of the opinion**

VKM has appointed a project group consisting of four members of the VKM Panel on Alien Organisms and Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), five external experts, and one project leader from the VKM secretariat to answer the request from the Norwegian Environment Agency. Members of the project group that contributed to the drafting of the opinion (in alphabetical order after chair of the project group):

Eli K. Rueness – Chair of the project group and member of the Panel on Alien Organisms and Trade in Endangered Species. Affiliation: 1) VKM; 2) University of Oslo

Maria G. Asmyhr – Member of the project group and project leader in the VKM secretariat. Affiliation: VKM

Hugo de Boer – Member of the project group and member of the Panel on Alien Organisms and Trade in Endangered Species. Affiliation: 1) VKM; 2) Natural History Museum

Katrine Eldegard – Member of the project group and member of the Panel on Alien Organisms and Trade in Endangered Species. Affiliation: 1) VKM; 2) Norwegian University of Life Sciences

Anders Endrestøl – Member of the project group. Affiliation: Norwegian Institute for Nature Research

Claudia Junge – Member of the project group. Affiliation: Institute of Marine Research

Paolo Momigliano – Member of the project group. Affiliation: University of Helsinki

Inger E. Måren – Member of the project group and member of the Panel on Alien Organisms and Trade in Endangered Species. Affiliation: 1) VKM; 2) University of Bergen

Martin Whiting – Member of the project group. Affiliation: Macquarie University

### **Competence of VKM experts**

Persons working for VKM, either as appointed members of the Committee or as external experts, do this by virtue of their scientific expertise, not as representatives for their employers or third party interests. The Civil Services Act instructions on legal competence apply for all work prepared by VKM.

# Table of Contents

<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Sammendrag på norsk .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Abbreviations and/or glossary .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Background as provided by the Norwegian Environment Agency .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Terms of reference as provided by the Norwegian Environment Agency .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2 Literature/sources of information.....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 The proposals to amend the appendices .....	13
2.2 Literature review.....	13
2.3 Relevant databases/websites for trade data .....	13
<b>3 Species assessments .....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 Assessment of CoP18 proposals .....	19
<b>4 Uncertainties.....</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>5 Data gaps .....</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>6 References .....</b>	<b>152</b>

# Summary

**Key words:** CITES, Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of wild fauna and flora, CoP18, Non-Detriment Findings, VKM; Norwegian Scientific Committee for food and environment, Norwegian Environment Agency.

**Introduction:** International trade in endangered species is regulated through the CITES Convention (The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora). The aim of the Convention is to prevent trade across borders leading to over-exploitation of species. Currently 183 countries (Parties) are bound by the Convention and more than 35,000 species are protected at various levels by CITES (Appendices I, II, III).

CITES Conference of the Parties (CoP) happens triennially. Prior to these meetings, the Parties may propose amendment to CITES Appendices I and II. Such amendment could be to include new species, transfer a species from one Appendix to the other, or the removal of species from the Appendices. The proposals to amend the Appendices include a status summary for the species/group of species in question. Prior to the CoP, each Party will then assess the proposals before voting at the meeting. A 2/3 majority is required to change a species listing.

The Norwegian Environment Agency assigned VKM to review the list of proposals for amendments to Appendix I and II submitted ahead of the eighteenth meeting of the CoP (CoP18), which will be held in Geneva, 17-28 August 2019.

**Method:** VKM has put forward a project group comprising participants from the panel on Alien organisms and trade in endangered species (CITES), VKM's secretariat, and relevant external experts. The project group has reviewed the information given in each proposal and searched for additional data to assess the impact of legal and illegal trade.

**Results and discussion:** VKM has assessed proposals for the following groups: mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, terrestrial invertebrates, elasmobranchs, echinoderms and plants. For each proposal, summary information and assessment of the possible impact of trade is presented in a species fact-sheet.

**Conclusions** The species fact sheets constitute the scientific basis for a national public hearing of the listing proposals prior to the CoP18.

# Sammendrag på norsk

**Innledning:** CITES konvensjonen er en internasjonal avtale som overvåker og regulerer handel med ville arter av dyr og planter for å forhindre at deres overlevelse trues. Konvensjonen trådte i kraft i 1975 og inkluderer per 2019, 183 medlemsland (parter) som har ratifisert avtalen og dermed reglene som er vedtatt gjennom CITES.

CITES har partsmøter (Conference of the Parties- CoP) hvert tredje år, og i forkant av disse møtene kan medlemslandene fremme forslag om endringer til to av CITES' lister over arter som reguleres (Appendix I og II). Dette kan innebære å inkludere nye arter til listene, å flytte arter mellom listene eller å fjerne arter fra Appendix II. Slike forslag omfatter en statusrapport for den aktuelle arten. Partene vurderer kunnskapsgrunnlaget i søknadene før møtet der det stemmes over forslagene. Det kreves 2/3 flertall for å gjennomføre en listeendring.

I forbindelse med partsmøtet som skal holdes i Genève i perioden 17-28 august, 2019, har Miljødirektoratet gitt VKM i oppdrag å vurdere kunnskapsgrunnlaget for de listeforslagene som skal behandles på møtet.

**Metode:** VKM har utnevnt en prosjektgruppe bestående av medlemmer fra faggruppen for fremmede organismer og handel med truede arter (CITES), VKMs sekretariat samt eksterne eksperter på de artsgruppene som skal vurderes. VKM har gjennomgått tilgjengelig informasjon om de aktuelle artenes biologi, populasjonsstruktur, størrelse og -trender, utbredelsesstatus, bevaringsbehov, bevaringstiltak og handels status (lovlig og ulovlig), og har på grunnlag av denne informasjonen vurdert hvorvidt handel kan påvirke artenes overlevelse.

**Resultat og diskusjon:** VKM har vurdert 57 listeforslag for de følgende taksonomiske gruppene: pattedyr, fugler, reptiler, amfibier, terrestriske invertebrater, haier og skater, pigghuder og planter. Bakgrunnsinformasjon og evaluering av den mulige effekten av handel er oppsummert i et artsevalueringsark (species fact sheet) per CoP-søknad.

**Konklusjon:** Vurderingene fra VKM danner det vitenskapelige grunnlaget for en nasjonal høring i forkant av CoP18.

# Abbreviations and/or glossary

## Abbreviations

CITES: The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

CoP: Conference of the Parties.

IUCN: International Union for the Conservation of Nature.

NDF: Non-detriment finding.

NGO: Non-governmental organization.

TRAFFIC: the wildlife trade monitoring network.

UNEP: United Nations Environment Programme.

UNEP-WCMC: UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre.

## Glossary

**CITES Appendices:** Appendix I includes species threatened with extinction. Trade in specimens of these species is permitted only in exceptional circumstances. Appendix II includes species not necessarily threatened with extinction, but in which trade must be controlled in order to avoid utilization incompatible with their survival. Appendix III contains species that are protected in at least one country, which has asked other CITES Parties for assistance in controlling the trade. In contrast to Appendix I and II, each Party is entitled to make unilateral amendments to Appendix III

**Non-detriment finding:** A conclusion by a Scientific Authority that the export of specimens of a particular species will not impact negatively on the survival of that species in the wild. The NDF is required before an export or import permit may be issued for a specimen of an Appendix-I species and before an export permit may be granted for a specimen of an Appendix-II species. Factors regarding biology, management and sustainability of trade are evaluated and the scientific reviews as to whether or not trade endangers a species are the NDFs (Res. Conf.16.7).

**Range State:** Any nation that exercises jurisdiction over any part of a range which a particular species, taxon or biotope inhabits.

**Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17):** The latest revision of the Resolution underlying listing of species in the CITES Appendices. The Parties have agreed upon this Resolution that

comprises the criteria for amendment of the Appendices I and II. The criteria are formulated in the following Annexes: Annex 1 (Appendix I), Annex 2a and 2b (Appendix II), special cases are described in Annex 3, precautionary measures are given in Annex 4, definitions, explanations and guidelines are found in Annex 5 while Annex 6 defines the format for proposals to amend the Appendices.



# Background as provided by the Norwegian Environment Agency

The 18th Conference of Parties to CITES will take place in Colombo\*, Sri Lanka from 23. May to 3. June 2019. The CoP will address 57 species listing proposals and potential changes to the Appendices as tabled by the Parties. The Appendices at present contain 36.000 species. These proposals will have to adhere to Resolution 9.24 (Rev CoP17). The requested assessment produced by VKM will form the scientific basis for a national hearing of the proposals prior to the CoP itself.

\*CoP in Colombo was postponed, and CoP18 will be held in Geneva, 17-28 August 2019.

# Terms of reference as provided by the Norwegian Environment Agency

## **Terms of reference – Assessment new proposals for Appendix I and II of CITES**

The Norwegian Environment Agency requests the VKM to undertake an assessment according to Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) of all the 57 listing proposals, cf. <https://cites.org/eng/cop/18/prop/index.php> The assessment should follow the format of Annex 1, and should be approximately two pages per proposal. Some proposals contain more than one species and therefore expansion of the number of pages may be necessary. For proposals presented in Spanish only, the assessment should be based on existing information available from use of the literature list and additional available literature information.

The CITES listing criteria as stated in Resolution 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) will be the basis for the assessment of the proposals by the Parties, cf. <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/document/E-Res-09-24-R17.pdf> Based on this the evaluation of the knowledge basis will be critical. The agency also refer to the fact that there will be additional analysis of the proposals by relevant organizations, such as FAO and the CITES Secretariat. We also refer to the fact that there is information on previous accepted or dismissed proposals on the CITES web pages (<https://cites.org>). We also refer to available information at <http://speciesplus.net>, <http://trade.cites.org> and potential evaluations done by other organizations such as IUCN-TRAFFIC (<http://www.traffic.org>) and others.

## **Species of particular interest**

The agency point to the fact that the following species probably will arouse more interest among the parties and therefore the debate on these may be demanding:

Changes to annotation #15 for listed species from the genus *Dalbergia* og *Guibourtia*

De-listing of *Dalbergia sissoo* from Appendix II

New species for Appendix II: *Cedrela* spp., *Giraffa camelopardalis*, *Glaucostegus* spp., *Handroanthus* spp. + *Tabebuia* spp. + *Roseodendron* spp., *Holothuria fuscogilva* + *Holothuria nobilis* + *Holothuria whitmaei*, *Isurus oxyrinchus* + *Isurus paucus*, *Mammuthus primigenus* og *Rhinidae* spp.

# 1 Introduction

International wildlife trade is estimated to be worth billions of dollars annually and to include hundreds of millions of plant and animal specimens. The trade ranges from whole individuals, dead or alive, to all kinds of products manufactured of plant and animal tissues. Even though many wildlife species in trade are not endangered, international cooperation is essential to safeguard these resources for the future.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) is a global agreement between governments with the purpose to ensure that international trade with wild animals and plants is not a threat to their survival. Currently more than 35,000 species are protected at various levels by the Convention.

The idea behind CITES was first coined in 1963 at an IUCN meeting. The text of the Convention (<https://cites.org/eng/disc/text.php>) was agreed upon by representatives of 80 countries in 1973 and set to work in 1975. Today 183 countries, or Parties, have joined and are thereby bound by the Convention. The Parties have to adopt their domestic legislation to ensure that CITES is implemented. All import, export, re-export and introduction of species covered by CITES has to be authorized through a licensing system controlled by national Management Authorities. Parties that do not satisfactorily enact the legislations may be suspended from commercial trade with CITES-listed species until the national laws have been strengthened (<https://cites.org/eng/legislation>).

The supreme decision making body of CITES is the CoP, where all the Parties are represented. The Parties have agreed upon a resolution with a set of criteria for listing of species in the CITES Appendices (I-III), the Resolution Conf. 9.24., that contains a set of biological and trade criteria to categorize species by the degree of protection needed. All assessments related to listing of species in Appendices I and II have to be done in accordance to the criteria outlined in the latest revision i.e. Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). The Parties can propose amendments to Appendix I and II prior to the CoP, while amendments to Appendix III can be made unilaterally. Import and export of CITES` listed species requires that documentation has been obtained and a permit issued from the appropriate Management Authorities. Appendix I species are endangered and trade will be permitted only exceptionally and never for primarily commercial purposes. Permits are required from both the exporting and importing countries. For Appendix II species, only permits for export (re-export) are required. However, an export permit for species listed in Appendices I or II will only be granted if it has been established that trade is not going to be detrimental to the survival of the species through a NDFanalysis, cf. CITES Resolution Conf. 16.7. Trade quotas, if allowed, are then regulated accordingly.

VKM has assessed the 57 proposals for amendment of the CITES Appendices, cf. Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) submitted to the eighteenth meeting of the CoP (CoP18). The list of propoals can be found here: <https://cites.org/eng/cop/18/prop/index.php>

The list of proposals includes mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, invertebrates, plants, elasmobranchs and echinoderms (see table 3-1 for further information on the proposals). VKM's assignment has been to prepare objective, science-based assessments of the proposed amendments to the Appendices. This involves reviewing each proposal against the criteria listed in CITES Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), and to conclude on whether or not trade is likely to be detrimental to the species/group of species in question. The species assessments are provided as fact sheets (chapter 3 of this report), which constitute the scientific basis for a national hearing prior to the CoP.

## 2 Literature/sources of information

### 2.1 The proposals to amend the appendices

Each of the proposals VKM has evaluated was submitted by one or more of the Parties and suggests amendment of Appendix I and/or Appendix II. The proposals follow a standard format given by Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) Annex 6, and should provide to the CoP adequate information, of satisfactory quality and in sufficient detail for judgement against the criteria established for the proposed action. The proposals should for instance describe the species characteristics, status and trends of the populations and their habitats, threats and the levels of utilization and trade. Information about any national and international conservation actions and management strategies should also be specified.

### 2.2 Literature review

VKM has evaluated the biological information presented in each proposal and its agreement with other sources of data, such as that found on the IUCN RedList site (<http://www.iucnredlist.org>) or in recent scientific literature. Specifically, literature that provided contrasting results to those conveyed by proponents was sought. For species not previously assessed by the IUCN only primary literature was available and the amount of information available was sometimes limited. This is reflected in the pertinent fact sheets.

### 2.3 Relevant databases/websites for trade data

All registered trade with CITES-listed species is being archived and is searchable at the CITES Trade Database (<http://trade.cites.org/>). For species protected by CITES, or other multilateral environmental agreements, records of trade can also be found at SPECIES+ (<http://speciesplus.net/>). This database also includes information about the history of CITES Appendix listings, quotas and suspensions. Previous CoP proposals to amend the Appendices, Animals and Plants Committee documents relating to the CITES Review of Significant Trade Process, Non-Detriment Findings (NDFs) and Agenda and Summary of Conclusions of meetings of the EU CITES Scientific Review Group are also archived and searchable at this website. The wildlife trade monitoring network, TRAFFIC, is a global NGO working on trade in wild animals and plants in the context of both biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. They collect, investigate and broadcast information on trends and patterns of wildlife trade, including illegal trade and reports published on their webpage (<http://www.traffic.org>) were used as a sources of information where appropriate. For a few of the species that have not previously been CITES-listed or proposed for CITES-listing, none of these resources provided information and additional reports and indications of trade had to be sought for (as stated in the relevant fact sheets). Typically, a sudden increase in prices of a wildlife products may indicate that the supply is becoming less compared to the demand, which again could reflect a decline of the source population. In other cases,

searching databases such as Ebay (<http://www.ebay.com/>) and trade related websites for exchange in specimens or derivative products would indicate an illegal or non-registered market.

### 3 Species assessments

Table 3-1 Species or groups of species assessed in this report.

Species name	Common name	Norwegian name	CoP18 proposal number
<i>Achillides chikae hermeli</i>	Peacock swallowtail		47
<i>Adansonia grandidieri</i>	Grandidiers baobab	Madagaskar baobabtre	56
<i>Aloe ferox</i>	Bitter aloe		55
<i>Aonyx cinereus</i>	Asian small-clawed otter		6
<i>Balearica pavonina</i>	Black-crowned trane	Svarkronetrane	19
<i>Calotes nigrilabris</i> and <i>Calotes pethiyagodai</i>	Black-lipped lizard, Pethiyagod as crestless lizard		23
<i>Capra falconeri heptneri</i> (population of Tajikistan)	Markhor	Skruegeit	1
<i>Cedrela</i> spp.	Cedars		57
<i>Ceratophora</i> spp.	Horned lizards		24
<i>Ceratotherium simum simum</i> (population of Eswatini)	Southern white rhinoceros	Stumpnesehorn	9
<i>Ceratotherium simum simum</i> (population of Namibia)	Southern white rhinoceros	Stumpnesehorn	8
<i>Cophotis ceylanica</i> and <i>Cophotis dumbara</i>	Pygmy lizards		25
<i>Crocodylus acutus</i> (population of Mexico)	American crocodile	Amerikansk krokodille	22
<i>Ctenosaura</i> spp.	Spiny-tail iguanas		31
<i>Cuora bourreti</i>	Bourret's Box turtle		33
<i>Cuora picturata</i>	Vietnamese box turtle		34

Species name	Common name	Norwegian name	CoP18 proposal number
<i>Dalbergia</i> spp., <i>Guibourtia demeusei</i> , <i>Guibourtia pellegriniana</i> , <i>Guibourtia tessmannii</i>	Rosewoods, Palisanders and Bubingas		52
<i>Dalbergia sissoo</i>	North Indian rosewood		51
<i>Dasyornis broadbenti litoralis</i>	Lesser rufous bristlebird		20
<i>Dasyornis longirostris</i>	Long-billed bristlebird	Vestbørstefugl	21
<i>Echinotriton chinhaiensis</i> and <i>Echinotriton maxiquadratus</i>	Chinhai spiny newt, Mountain spiny crocodile newt		39
<i>Gekko gekko</i>	Tokay gecko	Tokay	28
<i>Geochelone elegans</i>	Indian star tortoise	Stjerneskilpadde	36
<i>Giraffa camelopardalis</i>	Giraffe	Sjiraff	5
<i>Glaucostegus</i> spp.	Guitarfish spp.	Gitarfisk	43
<i>Gonatodes daudini</i>	Grenadines clawed Gecko		29
<i>Goniurosaurus</i> spp. (populations of China and Viet Nam)	Leopard geckos		27
<i>Handroanthus</i> spp., <i>Tabebuia</i> spp. and <i>Roseodendron</i> spp.	Trumpet trees		49*
<i>Holothuria (Microthele) fuscogilva</i> , <i>Holothuria (Microthele) nobilis</i> , <i>Holothuria (Microthele) whitmaei</i>	Sea cucumber		45
<i>Hyalinobatrachium</i> spp., <i>Centrolene</i> spp., <i>Cochranella</i> spp., and <i>Sachatamia</i> spp.	Glassfrogs	Glassfrosk	38
<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i> and <i>Isurus paucus</i>	Short-finned and long-finned Mako sharks	Makrellhai	42



Species name	Common name	Norwegian name	CoP18 proposal number
<i>Leporillus conditor</i>	Greater stick-nest rat		14
<i>Loxodonta africana</i> (populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe) (amend Annotation 2)	African elephant	Afrikansk savanneelefant	11
<i>Loxodonta africana</i> (populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe) (Appendix II to I)	African elephant	Afrikansk savanneelefant	12
<i>Loxodonta africana</i> (population of Zambia)	African elephant	Afrikans savanneelefant	10
<i>Lutrogale perspicillata</i>	Smooth-coated otter	Korthåret oter	7
<i>Lyriocephalus scutatus</i>	Hump-snout lizard/ Lyreshead lizard		26
<i>Malacochersus tornieri</i>	Pancake tortoise	Pannekakeskilpadde	37
<i>Mammuthus primigenius</i>	Woolly mammoth	Ullhåret mammutt	13
<i>Mauremys annamensis</i>	Vietnamese pond turtle		35
<i>Paramesotriton</i> spp.	Asian warty newts		40
<i>Parides burchellanus</i>	Swallowtail butterfly		48
<i>Paroedura androyensis</i>	Grandidier's Madagascar Ground Gecko		30
<i>Pericopsis elata</i>	African rosewood	Krokrodua	53
<i>Poecilotheria</i> spp.	Ornamental spiders		46
<i>Pseudocerastes urarachnoides</i>	Spider-tailed horned viper		32
<i>Pseudomys fieldi praeconis</i>	Shark bay mouse		15

Species name	Common name	Norwegian name	CoP18 proposal number
<i>Pterocarpus tinctorius</i>	African padauk, mukula		54
<i>Rhinidae</i> spp.	Wedgefish		44
<i>Saiga tatarica</i>	Saiga antelope	Saigaantilope	2
<i>Syrmaticus reevesii</i>	Reeves's pheasant	Kongefasan	18
<i>Tylototriton</i> spp.	Crocodile or knobby newts		41
<i>Vicugna vicugna</i> (population of the Province of Salta)	Vicuna	Vikunja	3
<i>Vicugna vicugna</i> (population of Chile)	Vicuna	Vikunja	4
<i>Widdringtonia whytei</i>	Mulanje cedar		50
<i>Xeromys myoides</i>	Water mouse		16
<i>Zyzomys pedunculatus</i>	Central rock rat		17

\*Proposal 49 was withdrawn before the meeting

## 3.1 Assessment of CoP18 proposals

CoP18 Prop. 47

### 1. Review of listing proposal under CITES

The European Union and the Philippines propose to include the species *Achillides chikae hermeli* in Appendix I in accordance with the following: *Achillides chikae hermeli* closely resembles *Papilio chikae* (proposed to be renamed as *Achillides chikae chikae*), and therefore meets criterion A in Annex 2 b of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) for an Appendix II listing. However, inclusion in Appendix I is proposed in order to avoid split-listing of subspecies in accordance with Annex 3 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), and in line with paragraph 2(b) of Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP17) on Standard Nomenclature.

**Species name:** *Achillides chikae hermeli* (Nuyda, 1992). Common name: Mindoro Peacock Swallowtail. Scientific synonyms: *Papilio chikae hermeli*, *Papilio hermeli*. The relationship between *Achillides chikae chikae* and *Achillides chikae hermeli* is very close (Treadaway and Schröder, 2012).

**Distribution:** *Achillides chikae hermeli* is a swallowtail butterfly endemic to the island of Mindoro in the west central Philippine, i.e. Mount Halcon and Mount Baco (Nuyda, 1992; Danielsen and Treadaway, 2004; Treadaway and Schröder, 2012).

**Population trend:** Populations are characterized as “probably stable” by Danielsen and Treadaway (2004). Treadaway and Schröder (2012) reported the species to be to be “very rare”.

**Habitat status:** *Achillides chikae hermeli* inhabits montane forest at altitudes above 1800 m a.s.l. (Nuyda, 1992). The remaining forests of Mt. Halcon are under threat of further decline over the next few years because of timber poaching, charcoal production, conversion of forestlands into other land uses, slash and burn farming, small scale mining, and other destructive and unsustainable resources use practices (Gatumbato, 2012). Threats to Mt Iglit-Baco National Park include cattle ranching, upland farming and firewood gathering, which have led to rapid deforestation both inside and outside the park (BirdLife International, 2019).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** The taxon *Achillides chikae hermeli* (or *Papilio hermeli*) is not available on CITES trade database, Species+, or TRAFFIC.

### 2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions

*A. c. hermeli* has not been assessed by IUCN. The nominate species *Papilio chikae* (*A. c. chikae*) is listed as endangered (EN) (Collins and Morris, 1985; Gimenez Dixon, 1996).

### 3. Evaluation of trade data

The nominate species *Papilio chikae* (*A. c. chikae*) is regarded as a “highly prized species” with “a high demand, particularly from Japanese collectors” by Collins and Morris (1985). A female specimen on a West German dealer's list in 1983 was offered for the equivalent of about \$150 (Collins and Morris, 1985). According to Collins and Morris (1985) the market in *Papilio chikae* had decreased, with still a great need for restraint in collecting. The taxon *Achillides chikae hermeli* (or *Papilio hermeli*) is not available on CITES trade database, Species+, or TRAFFIC. It is a scientifically relatively new species, which could explain the lack of data on this species. Framed and pinned specimen named “*Papilio hermeli*” are available online (e-bay etc). Several examples are given in CITES (2019). Discussions online suggest that individuals are in fact *Papilio chikae* offered under the false name “*hermeli*”, as *P. chikae* is on the CITES list while *A. c. hermeli* is not.

#### **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

All swallowtail butterflies in the Philippines are protected under the Wildlife Resources Conservation and Protection Act of 2001, and any collection and trade must be managed through a permitting system (Republic of the Philippines, 2001).

Since 1994, the Philippines has prohibited the export for commercial purposes of wild-caught specimens of terrestrial fauna. Only specimens bred in captivity by breeders authorized and registered by the CITES Management Authority (the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)) may be exported (CITES, 2010).

The nominate species *P. chikae* (*A. c. chikae*) has been included in CITES Appendix I since 1987.

#### **5. Recommendations**

*Achillides chikae* er en sommerfugl i gruppen svaletjerter som er endemisk til den filipinske øyen Mindoro. Den er svært lik en annen art/underart *P. chikae* (*A. c. chikae*) som er ettertraktet blant samlere. Det er vanskelig for tollere å skille disse og det er derfor fare for at handel kan være en trussel mot overlevelsen av *A. chikae* om den ikke reguleres. Den foreslåtte listingen er i tråd med Annex 2b, criterion A om look-alikes og av og Annex 3 angående split-listing i følge of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

#### **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

BirdLife International (2019) Important Bird Areas factsheet: Iglit - Baco Mountains. Downloaded from <http://www.birdlife.org> on 07/02/2019.

CITES, 2010. Notif. No. 2010/038. Available online at:

<https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/notif/2010/E038.pdf>

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 47 (*Achillides chikae hermeli*). Available online at:

[https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Achillides-chikae-hermeli.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Achillides-chikae-hermeli.pdf)

Collins N.M., Morris M.G. (1985) Threatened Swallowtail Butterflies of the World. The IUCN Red Data Book. IUCN, Gland and Cambridge.

Danielsen, F., Treadaway, C.G. (2004) Priority conservation areas for butterflies (Lepidoptera: Rhopalocera) in the Philippine islands. *Animal Conservation* 7: 79–92.

Gatumbato, E.A. (2012) Mount Halcon Conservation and Management Plan (2012–2022). 115 pp.

Gimenez Dixon, M. 1996 *Papilio chikae*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 1996: e.T15986A5341006. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.1996.RLTS.T15986A5341006.en>.  
 Nuyda, J.S. (1992) A new Papilionid butterfly from Mindoro Island, Philippines (Lepidoptera: Papilionidae). *Butterflies* 3: 34–35.  
 Republic of the Philippines (2001) Wildlife Resources Conservation and Protection Act. (Republic Act No. 9147).  
 Treadaway, C.G., Schröder, H.G. (2012) Revised checklist of the butterflies of the Philippine Islands (Lepidoptera: Rhopalocera). *Nachrichten des Entomologischen Vereins Apollo*, Supplement: 64.

CoP18 Prop. 56

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Switzerland proposes to amend the annotation “#16 Seeds, fruits, oils and living plants” to the listing of *Adansonia grandidieri* in Appendix II by deleting reference to live plants, so as to read: #16 Seeds, fruits and oils. The listing and annotation *Adansonia grandidieri* (CoP17. Prop. 58) was accepted by consensus at the 17th Conference of the Parties. CoP17. Prop. 58 was submitted by Madagascar, and proposed to include in Appendix II the species *Adansonia grandidieri* with an annotation (Annotation #16): Seeds, fruits, oils and living plants. The purpose of the present proposal is to correct the text of the annotation, which is in error in that it explicitly includes live plants. The inclusion in such an annotation of ‘live plants’ is contrary to the Convention for the following reasons: 1) In accordance with Article I, paragraph (b), plants, whether alive or dead, are always subject to the provisions of the Convention; 2) The explicit reference to “living plants” included the text of Annotation #16 is redundant and potentially misleading, as suggests that for other plant taxa listed in Appendices II and III with an annotation # followed by a number, live plants are not so covered; 3) Live and dead plants may not be considered as parts or derivatives and, therefore, may not be subject to an annotation # followed by a number (cf §7 of the Interpretation of the current Appendices I, II and III); and 4) The word ‘also’ in the first sentence of §7 of the Interpretation clearly indicates that live and dead plants are always covered by the provisions of the Convention.

**Species name:** *Adansonia grandidieri* Baill. (1893). Common name: Baobab. Norsk navn: baobabtre, apebrødtre.

**Distribution:** *Adansonia grandidieri* is endemic to the island of Madagascar. It is one of nine species in the Boobab genus *Adansonia*, and one of six endemic to Madagascar. *Adansonia grandidieri* has a very restricted or localized range, limited to two sectors of South-Western Madagascar (Baum, 1996, 1995a, 1995b; Leong Pock Tsy et al., 2013; Razanameharizaka, 2009): The Morondava sector (Bekonazy, Andranomena, Marofandilia on the road that leads to Belo sur Tsiribihina, Antonga); and the Morombe sector (between the Mangoky river and Lake Ihotry, Befandriana Sud and Andavadaoka).

**Population trend:** According to the latest IUCN Red List assessment (Ravaomanalina and Razafimanahaka, 2016), the population of *Adansonia grandidieri* is estimated to be 1,000,000 mature individuals, but the population trend is decreasing, and it is assessed as endangered. An aging of the population can be observed; the number of adult trees larger than 70 cm is high whereas young trees between 10 and 70 cm in diameter are becoming ever more rare (Ranjevasoa, 2003). The extinction or the increasing rarity of dispersing animals may be reducing the success of seed dispersion (CITES CoP17 Prop. 58, 2016).

**Habitat status:** The habitat of *Adansonia grandidieri* is threatened by its conversion into agricultural land and by “slash-and-burn” agriculture or “hatsake”, a traditional practice used for a very long time in western Madagascar (CITES CoP17 Prop. 58, 2016). IUCN listed threats include housing and urban areas, commercial and industrial areas, annual and perennial non-timber crops, livestock farming and ranching, gathering terrestrial plants, logging and wood harvesting, and fire and fire suppression (Ravaomanalina and Razafimanahaka, 2016).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** The primary uses of *Adansonia grandidieri* are its fruit, seeds and bark. The fruit is considered to have the best taste among all baobab fruits, and has for a long time been prized for its juice (Baum, 1995b). The seeds have gained popularity in recent years and are exploited commercially with an annual demand of around 4,000 kg (CITES CoP17 Prop. 58, 2016). The bark, 0.5-4 cm in thickness (Ravaomanalina, 2011), is used in traditional medicine.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

The 2016 IUCN Red List Assessment of *Adansonia grandidieri* assesses the species as endangered with a decreasing population (Ravaomanalina and Razafimanahaka, 2016). The species has a very low regeneration rate and a very long generation time (three generations is estimated to be 1,050 to 3,000 years). Combining the rapid past, current and projected rate of deforestation in Madagascar with the low regeneration rate, the long generation time and the intensive threats of utilization and habitat destruction, the species is assessed as endangered. The principal threats to the population of *Adansonia grandidieri* are: 1) massive harvesting and exploitation of its fruit and seeds; 2) complete felling of trees for harvesting of the bark; 3) ongoing modification and destruction of its natural habitat due to “slash-and-burn” agriculture, the hunt for cultivable ground and pasture for cattle. The intensity and frequency of the harvesting of the fruit and seeds are endangering the natural regeneration of the species and are causing germination problems. The local population gathers the fruit before it has fallen to prevent animals from eating it, which creates a serious problem for regeneration because there are now practically no seeds reaching the ground to ensure germination (Wickens, 2008). The intensive exploitation of the fibres of the bark is leading to a reduction in density and to an aging of the population, as a result of the frequent felling of trees. This exploitation could result in the species becoming extinct. The future decline of the species has been calculated at 80% (Ranjevasoa, 2003).

### 3.Evaluation of trade data

Since its Appendix II listing at the CoP17, there have been three reported exports recorded in the CITES Trade Database, all in 2017 (MG to FR, 11 dried plants; MG to GB, 0.53 gram specimens; MG to TR, 50 kg for cosmetics).

### 4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states

Patrut et al. (2018) report that the majority of the oldest and largest African baobabs (*A. digitata* L.) have died over the past 12 years and rule out that these deaths were caused by an epidemic, and shows also that there has been a rapid increase in the apparently natural deaths of many other mature baobabs. The authors suspect that the demise of monumental baobabs may be associated at least in part with significant modifications of climate conditions that affect southern Africa in particular. This is an additional threat to *Adansonia grandidieri*.

### 5.Recommendations

Søkeren ønsker å korrigere teksten i annotasjon "#16 Seeds, fruits, oils and living plants" til listingen *Adansonia grandidieri* i Appendiks II, den foreslåtte tkesten er: "#16 Seeds, fruits and oils". Det forventes at denne rettelsen vil redusere sannsynligheten for misforståelser i tolkningen av gjeldene annotasjon.

### 6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)

- Baum, D.A. (1996) The ecology and conservation of the baobabs of Madagascar, in: Ganzhorn, J.U., Sorg, J.P. (Eds.), Ecology and Economy of a Tropical Dry Forest in Madagascar, Primate Report. pp. 311–327.
- Baum, D.A. (1995a) A systematic revision of *Adansonia* (Bombacaceae). Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden 440–471.
- Baum, D.A. (1995b) The comparative pollination and floral biology of baobabs (*Adansonia*-Bombacaceae). Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden 322–348.
- CITES, 2016. CoP17 Prop. 58 (*Adansonia grandidieri*). Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/prop/060216/E-CoP17-Prop-58.pdf>
- Leong Pock Tsy, J.-M., Lumaret, R., Flaven-Noguier, E., Sauve, M., Dubois, M.-P., Danthu, P., (2013) Nuclear microsatellite variation in Malagasy baobabs (*Adansonia*, Bombacoideae, Malvaceae) reveals past hybridization and introgression. Annals of botany 112: 1759–1773.
- Patrut, A., Woodborne, S., Patrut, R.T., Rakosy, L., Lowy, D.A., Hall, G., Karl, F. (2018) The demise of the largest and oldest African baobabs. Nature plants 4: 423.
- Ranjevasoa, B.N. 2003. Etudes de quelques espèces menacées (*Adansonia grandidieri* Baill., *A. rubrostipa* Jumm. and Perrier, *A. za Baill.*, *Hazomalania voyronii* Capuron) de la forêt classée de Kirindy Nord en vue de leur conservation (Mémoire de DEA). Faculté des Sciences. Université d'Antananarivo, Antananarivo.
- Ravaomanalina, B.H., 2011. Anatomie et dynamique de croissance des espèces d'*Adansonia* (baobab) de Madagascar (PhD Thesis). Université Antananarivo, Antananarivo.

Ravaomanalina, H., Razafimanahaka, J., 2016. *Adansonia grandidieri* [WWW Document]. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-2.RLTS.T30388A64007143.en>. (accessed 3.4.19).

Razanameharizaka, J.H.N., 2009. Régénération, démographie, physiologie de la graine et des plantules du genre *Adansonia* à Madagascar (PhD Thesis). Thèse de doctorat, option Physiologie végétale, Université d'Antananarivo

Wickens, G.E., 2008. The baobabs: pachycauls of Africa, Madagascar and Australia. Springer Science and Business Media.

CoP18 Prop. 55

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

The Republic of South Africa proposes to amend the listing of *Aloe ferox* in Appendix II, by amending Annotation #4 with the underlined text: "All parts and derivatives, except: finished products of *Aloe ferox* packaged and ready for retail trade". The proposal is in line with agreements and recommendations contained in the resolution on the Use of annotations in Appendices I and II (Resolution Conf. 11.21 (Rev. CoP17)).

**Species name:** *Aloe ferox* Mill. Common name: Bitter aloë, Cape aloë, Lucid aloë, Tap aloë. Synonyms: *Aloe candelabrum* A.Berger, *Aloe galpinii* Baker, *Aloe horrida* Haw., *Aloe muricata* Haw., *Aloe perfoliata* Thunb., *Aloe pseudo-ferox* Salm-Dyck, *Aloe subferox* Spreng., *Aloe supralaevis* Haw., *Pachidendron ferox* (Mill.) Haw., *Pachidendron pseudo-ferox* (Salm-Dyck) Haw., *Pachidendron supralaeve* (Haw.) Haw.

**Distribution:** *Aloe ferox* has a restricted distribution within South Africa extending from the Western Cape Province, intermittently throughout the Eastern Cape, and up into south-eastern Free State (Smith et al., 2016). The species also occurs in southern Lesotho (Smith et al., 2016).

**Population trend:** Currently classified as a Least Concern (LC) species on the national Red List of South African Plants (Raimondo et al., 2012) as well as on the Lesotho Plants List (2002). Estimated population size is in excess of 100 000 individuals (Donaldson, 2003).

**Habitat status:** *Aloe ferox* grows under a wide range of climatic conditions in a broad range of habitats, including fynbos, grassland, Karoo vegetation and valley bushveld, typically on rocky hillslopes up to 1000 masl or across flat open areas and in extremely dry areas of the Karoo (Anjarwalla et al., 2013; Newton and Vaughan, 1996; Van Wyk and Van Wyk, 2013; Van Wyk and Smith, 1996; DEA, 2014).. It is able to establish healthy populations within disturbed areas and is considered a pioneer plant that is amongst the first to emerge when livestock are removed from heavily overgrazed land. Higher densities in some areas of the Eastern Cape is attributed to a historical decline of large herbivores



such as elephants, rhinoceroses and kudu. However, the recent establishment of game farms in both the Eastern and Western Cape is considered a problem for the species' persistence. There has been a previous loss of habitat to crop cultivation and urban development/human settlement, particularly in the western parts of the species range.

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** *Aloe ferox* is currently one of South Africa's commercially most intensively traded wild harvested plants. The *A. ferox* industry provides significant socio-economic benefits to many rural South Africans who derive an income from harvesting its leaves. The majority of material (95%) used in commercial *A. ferox* products is wild-harvested in South Africa, and the bulk of this material is exported. There are records of the species in the CITES trade database from 1981 to 2017 and it is traded domestically as well.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

The genus *Aloe* has been listed CITES Appendix II listed from 1975. Later amendments have seen specific species transferred to Appendix I and others excluded. *A. ferox* has always been CITES Appendix II listed (Species+). The species is listed as a Least Concern (LC) species on the national Red List of South African Plants (Raimondo et al., 2012) as well as on the Lesotho Plants List (2002).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

There are records of the species in the CITES trade database from 1981 to 2017. Harvesting for commercial production is concentrated within a number of key districts in the Eastern and Western Cape Provinces (Newton and Vaughan, 1996; Melin, 2009).

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

The South African National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act 10 of 2004 (NEMBA) provides for the management and conservation of biological diversity within South Africa. Any commercial activity involving the use/export of *A. ferox* resources requires a BABS permit (valid for five years). The National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act No 57 of 2003 (NEMPAA) provides for the establishment of protected areas that promote the conservation of ecologically viable areas representative of South Africa's biological diversity. *Aloe ferox* occurs within areas protected under this Act.

## **5.Recommendations**

Det er kjent eller kan antas at regulering av handel med arten er påkrevd for å sikre at høsting av ville spesimen av arten ikke reduserer den naturlige populasjonen til et nivå hvor videre overlevelse er truet av handel eller andre faktorer. Mesteparten (95%) av materialet høstes fra naturlige bestander i Sør-Afrika og brukes i kommersielle produkter av *A. ferox*. Artens rødliste status er Least Concern og den er en pionerart i degraderte habitat. Ved å endre annotasjonen slik at ferdige produkter unntas CITES regulering vil lette administrativt arbeid for forvaltningen i eksport/import land, men vil også mest sannsynlig øke volumet av handel. Overvåkning av de ville bestandene er derfor nødvendig for sikre at endringen ikke har ødeleggende effekter på land sikt.

## **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Anjarwalla, P., Mwaura L., Oforo D. A., Jamnadas R., Stevenson P., Smith P. (2013) Pesticidal Insect Leaflet Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research: *Aloe ferox* Mill. ISBN 978-92- 9059-340-9.

Department of Environmental Affairs. (2014) Resource Assessment for *Aloe ferox* in South Africa. Republic of South Africa.

Donaldson, J. (2003) Proposed revision of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (CoP12 Com. I.3): Criteria for listing on Appendix I and Appendix II.

Melin, A. (2009). A bitter pill to swallow: a case study of the trade and harvest of *Aloe ferox* in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. MSc Dissertation. Imperial College London, UK.

Newton, D. J., Vaughan, H. (1996) South Africa's *Aloe ferox* plant, parts and derivatives industry. South Africa: TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa.

Raimondo, D., Vlok, J.H., van Wyk, B.E., van Jaarsveld, E., Victor, J.E. (2012) *Aloe ferox* Mill. National Assessment: Red List of South African Plants version 2013.

Smith, G.F., Klopper, R.R. Crouch, N.R., Figueiredo, E. (2016) Reinstatement of *Aloe candelabrum* A.Berger (Asphodelaceae: Aloioideae), a tree-like aloe of KwaZulu-Natal province, South Africa. *Bradleya* 34: 59-69.

Van Wyk, B.E., Smith, G. (1996) Guide to the Aloes of South Africa. Briza Publications, Pretoria, South Africa.

Van Wyk, B., Van Wyk, P. (2013) Field guide to trees of southern Africa. Struik Nature: Cape Town, South Africa.

CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 55 (*Aloe ferox*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Aloe-ferox.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Aloe-ferox.pdf)

## CoP18 Prop. 6

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

India, (supported by Nepal and the Philippines) proposes to transfer the small-clawed otter (*Aonyx cinereus*) from Appendix II to Appendix I. According to the proponent the species has had a marked decline in population size and thus meets the criteria of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16), Annex 1 Paragraph C. and qualifies for listing on CITES Appendix I.

**Species name:** *Aonyx cinereus* (Illiger, 1815), *Lutra cinerea* Illiger, 1815, *Amblonyx cinereus* (Illiger, 1815). Common names: Asian small-clawed otter, Oriental small-clawed otter, small-clawed otter, Asian short-clawed otter.

**Distribution:** The Asian small-clawed otter is found in Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, India (Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Arunachal Pradesh, West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh, Assam, Kerala), Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Philippines, Singapore, Taiwan, Province of China, Thailand and Viet Nam.

**Population trend:** Decreasing. No reliable population estimate of the Asian small-clawed otter exists (IUCN, 2015).

**Habitat status:** *A. cinereus* is semi-aquatic and found in various habitats providing prey and shelter, such as coastal wetlands and mountain streams. It also inhabits human modified habitats such as rice fields and coffee/tea plantations. In many parts of Asia, the habitats have been reduced due to aquaculture and other human development and activities (Wright et al. 2015).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:**

The Asian small-clawed otter is hunted for its fur and there is extensive trade of live animals from captive breeding for zoos and the pet market. Otters are also used in traditional medicines in Southeast Asia.

**2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*A. cinereus* is listed as Vulnerable on the IUCN Red List (2015). It has been listed in CITES Appendix II since 1977 and in the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations Annex B since 1997.

**3.Evaluation of trade data**

Analysis of illegal trade for the years 1980-2015 documented confiscation of 5,881 individuals. The majority were hunted for their fur and it is difficult to identify at the species level between four Asian otter species (Gomez et al. 2017). *A. cinereus* is the one among these species that has become most popular as a pet. Illegal trade of wild caught juvenile individuals to Japan (where otter cafes and pet otters have gained popularity in recent years) has been documented and the threat posed by poaching is assumed to still be very significant in many parts of India, and South East Asia. In 2016 and 2017, at least 39, mostly juvenile small-clawed otters were seized in five incidents, all destined for Japan (Kitade and Naruse, 2018). Hybrids between *A. cinereus* and the smooth-coated Otter (*Lutrogale perspicillata*, see CoP18 proposal 36) have been observed in captivity (Gomez et al. 2017).

**4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

The Government of India banned the export of all wild-taken specimens for commercial purposes in 2018 (CITES Notif. No. 2018/031). According to Gomez et al. (2017) *A. cinereus* is not protected in Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia and Nepal (CITES, 2019).

**5.Recommendations**

*A. cinereus* er en semi-akvatisk art som lever i et område der menneskelig aktivitet fører til at tilgjengelig, egnet habitat er minkende. Antallet individer er nedadgående og arten tilfredstiller som sådan kravet til listing i CITES Appendix I i følge Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Etterspørsel etter pels har lenge ført til ulovlig jakt på *A. cinereus* og tre andre arter av asiatiske otere. I tillegg er *A. cinereus* i de seneste årene blitt svært populær i

kjæledyrhandel og den ulovlige handelen av viltfangede dyr er omfattende. Handel kan være en trussel for denne artens overlevelse.

## 6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 4 (*Aonyx cinereus*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Aonyx-cinereusxx.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Aonyx-cinereusxx.pdf).

Gomez, L., Leupen, B., Theng, M., Fernandez, K., Savage, M. (2017). Illegal Otter Trade: An Analysis of Seizures in Selected Asian Countries (1980-2015). *TRAFFIC Report*.

Kitade, T., Naruse, Y. (2018) Otter alert. A rapid assessment of illegal trade and booming demand in Japan. *TRAFFIC Report*.

Wright, L., de Silva, P., Chan, B., Reza Lubis, I. 2015. *Aonyx cinereus*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2015: e.T44166A21939068.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2015-2.RLTS.T44166A21939068.en>.

CoP18 Prop. 19

## 1. Review of listing proposal under CITES

Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I of black-crowned crane *Balearica pavonina* in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), Annex 1, Paragraph C); A marked decline in the population size in the wild has been i) observed as ongoing, and ii) inferred or projected on the basis of levels or patterns of exploitation, and a decrease in area of habitat, is proposed by Senegal and Burkina Faso.

**Species name:** *Balearica pavonina* (Linnaeus, 1758). Common name: Black-crowned crane. Two subspecies are recognized (Archibald et al., 2019): *B. p. pavonina* (Linnaeus, 1758) – scattered populations in sub-Saharan West Africa from Senegambia to L Chad. and *B. p. ceciliae* Mitchell, 1904 – sub-Saharan Africa from Chad to Sudan, South Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and N Kenya, especially in basin of upper R Nile. Other common names: Northern Crowned-crane, West African Crowned-crane (*pavonina*), Sudan Crowned-crane (*ceciliae*). Norwegian name: Svartkronetrane.

**Distribution:** Afrotropical. Year-round resident in: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Sudan, Togo. Vagrant in: Uganda, Zaire (Archibald et al., 2019).

**Population trend:** Decreasing (BirdLife International, 2016). Based on data from *B. p. pavonina* populations alone, the species is estimated to have declined between 0-25% from 1985-2004. Given the uncertainty around these estimates, IUCN provisionally estimate a worst-case decline of 30-49% over 45 years (three generations), though the true figure may be higher depending on the status of *B. p. ceciliae* (Archibald et al., 2019; BirdLife International, 2016).

**Habitat status:** Increasingly fragmented. Habitat loss and degradation are significant threats, occurring through drought, wetland drainage and conversion for agriculture, overgrazing, fire, agricultural and industrial pollution, industrial construction and dam

construction (flooding wetlands upstream and desiccating those downstream) (Archibald et al., 2019 and references therein). Warfare and political instability affects nations across the range of the species, in particular in South Sudan (Williams et al., 2003).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Hunting and trade are of concern in several range States, with considerable demand for birds in North Africa, the Middle East, Europe and China (Archibald et al., 2019 and references therein). For example, surveys of two towns in the Inner Niger Delta of Mali, in 2001, found that 55 people had 129 cranes in captivity. Further, over the period 1998–2000, 165 birds were traded, with 70 being exported to other countries; average purchase price from a hunter was €24, but the selling price was between €55 and €159 (Kone et al., 2007). In 1994 alone, 1840 individuals were exported from Tanzania (where the species does not occur naturally), mostly to the Netherlands (Beilfuss et al., 2007). There is extensive capture and sale of live birds, some destined for legal international markets (over 7,000 birds since 1985, UNEP-WCMC CITES Trade Database, January 2005, cited in Birdlife International, 2016).

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*B. pavonina* is categorized as Vulnerable (VU) on the IUCN Red List (Birdlife International, 2016), and has been listed on CITES Appendix II since 1985. The species is listed in Appendix B in the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations.

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

The proponents provide solid documentation of legal and illegal trade from 1986 to present. In addition, a search in the <https://trade.cites.org/> database carried out 2019/03/08 (years 2008-2018), returned ca. 954 specimens (using the largest number when export and import figures did not match), nearly all were live birds. Of the ca. 950 live birds, 531 specimens were taken from the wild, 30 had no information on source, and the rest were mainly captive birds. For wild-sourced (531) and unknown (30), the reported purposes were breed (90), zoo (95), personal (50), scientific (4) and commercial (308), or not reported (14). Four wild-sourced live birds were exported from Pakistan (not a range country) to Sri Lanka, with country of origin not reported. Two wild-sourced live birds were exported from Russia (not a range country) to Belarus in 2014, with Sudan as country of origin. Breeding success of *B. pavonina* is very low and captive birds are generally short-lived and prone to diseases and injury (Kone et al., 2007), increasing the demand for new birds captured from wild populations. In addition to capture and sale of live birds, considerable hunting pressures exist (Birdlife International, 2016, and references therein), and parts of dead *B. pavonina* are used in traditional healing (Williams et al., 2003).

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

*B. pavonina* is protected by law in most range States (Archibald et al., 2019). Listing under Appendix I has been pursued in the past (R. Beilfuss in litt., 2004 cited in Birdlife International, 2016), and recently CITES has suspended trade in this species in Sudan, South Sudan and Guinea (<https://speciesplus.net>).

## 5.Recommendations

Det er godt dokumentert at både lovlig og ulovlig handel med svartkronetranen har hatt en negativ effekt på bestandsstørrelsen til villlevende populasjoner. Uttak av ville fugler for domestisering og handel har vært en medvirkende årsak til bestandsreduksjonen. Arten oppfyller dermed kravene beskrevet i Annex 1, Paragraph C) Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Handel kan sette denne arten i fare for utryddelse.

## 6.References

- Archibald, G.W., Meine, C.D., Kirwan, G.M., Garcia, E.F.J. (2019). Black Crowned-crane (*Balearica pavonina*). In: del Hoyo, J. et al., editors, Handbook of the Birds of the World Alive. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona. (retrieved from <https://www.hbw.com/node/53551> on 21 February 2019).
- Beilfuss, R.D., Dodman, T., Urban, E.K. (2007) The status of cranes in Africa in 2005. Ostrich 78: 175-184.
- BirdLife International, 2016. *Balearica pavonina*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T22692039A93334339. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-3.RLTS.T22692039A93334339.en>. Downloaded on 21 February 2019.
- Kone, B., Fofana, B., Beilfuss, R. Dodman, T. (2007) The impact of capture, domestication and trade on Black Crowned Cranes in the Inner Niger Delta, Mali. Ostrich 78: 195-203.
- Williams, E.T.C., Beilfuss, R.D., Dodman, T. (2003). Status survey and conservation action plan for the Black Crowned Crane *Balearica pavonina*. Wetlands International, Dakar.

CoP18 Prop. 23

## 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

Sri Lanka is proposing that *Calotes nigrilabris* and *Calotes pethiyagodai* be included in Appendix I in accordance with Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev CoP17) because *Calotes nigrilabris* meets Annex 1, criterion A (i), (v) as well as criterion B (i), (iii), (iv) and C (i), while *Calotes pethiyagodai* meets Annex 1, criterion A (i), (v) and criterion B (iii), (iv).

**Species name:** *Calotes nigrilabris* Peters, 1860. Common name: Black-cheek lizard.

Synonyms:

*Calotes (Bronchocele) nigrilabris* Peters 1860: 183

*Calotes rouxii* Blyth (not of Duméril and Bibron; fide Smith 1935)

*Calotes nigrilabris* — Boulenger 1885

*Calotes nigrilabris* — Smith 1935

*Calotes nigrilabris* — Manthey and Schuster 1999

*Calotes nigrilabris* — Somaweera and Somaweera 2009

*Calotes pethiyagodai* Amarasinghe, Karunarathna, Hallermann, 2014. Common names: Pethiyagoda's Crestless Lizard, Sinhala (local) name: Pethiyagodagē Nosilu Katussa, Tamil (local) name: Pethiyagodavin Oonan.

Synonyms: *Calotes pethiyagodai* Amarasinghe, Karunarathna, Hallermann, in Amarasinghe et al. 2014.

**Distribution:** *Calotes nigrilabris* is endemic to Sri Lanka and is found in south-central Sri Lanka including Nuwara, Eliya, Hakgala, Horton Plains, Peak Wilderness (Sripadha/Samanala Kanda), in the Central Province (Somaweera and Somaweera, 2009). *Calotes pethiyagodai* is endemic to Sri Lanka, being found in the Knuckles massif (Uetz et al., 2019). Specifically, Riverstone (1200 m elevation), Dotalugala (~1500 m elevation), Gammaduwa (~900 m elevation), Kobonilagala (1400 m elevation), Rangala (1400 m elevation), Cobet's Gap (1000 m elevation) and Thangappuwa near Cobet's Gap (1000 m elevation) (Amarasinghe et al., 2014).

**Population trend:** Minimal data with the exception of a study by Erdelen (1988) that is too old to give much of an impression of current populations of *C. nigrilabris*. However, populations are likely to be declining in response to rapidly shrinking and fragmenting habitat. For example, populations of *C. nigrilabris* are mostly mountain-top isolates (Bahir and Surasinghe, 2005) and are highly fragmented (MOE, 2012). Amarasinghe et al. (2009) suggest that populations are in decline.

*Calotes pethiyagodai* was only described in 2014 and was described by the authors as "extremely rare" and they suggest that this species get immediate conservation attention (Amarasinghe et al. 2014). The loss and degradation of habitat in the past few decades would strongly suggest that populations are declining.

**Habitat status:** *Calotes nigrilabris* is found in montane and submontane cloud forests above 1,400 m elevation in the central highlands (Amarasinghe et al., 2011). *Calotes nigrilabris* also occurs in grasslands around Nuwara Eliya, Hakgala and the Horton Plains (Kirigalpotta, ~2200 m; Amarasinghe et al., 2011). This makes *C. nigrilabris* the only *Calotes* species to occur in high altitude (tropical) open grasslands (Bahir and Surasinghe 2005). Although it is arboreal, *C. nigrilabris* is frequently found in low shrubs and ferns near the ground (Somaweera and Somaweera, 2009). Habitat for *C. nigrilabris* is described as effectively mountain-top isolates by Bahir and Surasinghe (2005).

*Calotes pethiyagodai* are restricted to an area of occupancy < 25 km<sup>2</sup> and an extent of occurrences < 180 km<sup>2</sup> within the Knuckles massif (Amarasinghe et al. 2014). It appears to be more common in ecotone than forested habitat and many trees of moderate height (~8 m) occur here (Amarasinghe et al. 2014).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Since 1993 it has been illegal to collect and trade any species of *Calotes* (or lizards) in Sri Lanka. Individuals of both species have been traded abroad (mostly by Russian, German and UK traders, but also the USA, Spain and Italy), confirming that animals have been smuggled out of the country (Altherr 2014; Auliya et al., 2016). It is thought that gravid females are targeted in order to have animals that were 'bred in captivity' and also because of the obvious benefits of increasing the numbers of animals collected. Any animals actually bred in captivity are from animals

illegally collected. Although *C. pethiyagodai* was only described in 2014, it has already appeared for sale in the UK and US on dealer web sites (CITES, 2019). Current levels of trade do not appear to be high.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

Neither species has been assessed by the IUCN Red List. *Calotes nigrilabris* is classified as Endangered in the National Red List of Sri Lanka (MOE 2012). *C. pethiyagosdai* is only recently described (2014) and not yet listed in the National Red List of Sri Lanka. Both species are protected under umbrella legislation protecting all Sri Lankan reptiles from capture, hunting and trade/export (Parliament of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka 2009).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

Illegal trade occurs mostly in Europe, where *C. nigrilabris* is worth between 100-250 Euros per animal although they are worth substantially more in the US where a pair has fetched \$1000 (CITES, 2019). Current trade levels are not high, but also difficult to evaluate and could become a problem in the near future if demand for these animals increases. Traders take advantage of the fact that *Calotes* outside of the range state (Sri Lanka) can be legally traded. They also claim animals are captive bred to give them an air of legitimacy, although the original breeding stock were illegally collected (and/or gravid females collected illegally) (CITES, 2019)

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

*Calotes nigrilabris* is thought to be at risk from pesticide use and habitat destruction (Amarasinghe et al., 2011). A number of threats to *C. pethiyagodai* have been identified for habitat loss and fragmentation in the Knuckles region (citations in Amarasinghe et al., 2014) including Chena cultivations, illegal timber harvest, encroachments, man-made fire, soil erosion, garbage dumping, habitat destruction, unplanned constructions, rock collection, illegal gem mining, and land-fills. The use of pesticides in surrounding cardamom cultivations is an additional threat (Bahir and Surasinghe 2005). Other factors include road kills in the Riverside area and specimens that have been found dead for unknown reasons (Amarasinghe et al., 2009 in Amarasinghe et al. 2011). Both species have low reproductive output (Krvavac, 2015 cited in CITES, 2019).

## **5.Recommendations**

De to praktøgleartene *C. pethiyagodai*, som ble beskrevet i 2014, og *Calotes nigrilabris* er begge utsatt for signifikant reduksjon i utbredelse, habitat ødeleggelse og fragmentering og de har begrenset utbredelse. Det er lite informasjon om bestandsstørrelse og trender, men *C. pethiyagodai* regnes som svært sjelden av lokale forskere som jobber med *Calotes*-gruppen. Begge artene er nylig registrert å være en del av hobbydyrmarkedet i Europa, selv om det er ulovlig å fange dem på Sri Lanka. Basert på at begge arter har svært begrenset og fragmentert utbredelse, lavt reproduksjonspotensiale og trues av ulovlig handel virker listeforslaget å være i tråd med de oppgitte kriteriene i Anneks 1, Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Uregulert handel vil kunne være ødelggende for disse artenes videre overlevelse.



## 6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)

- Altherr, S (2014): Stolen Wildlife – Why the EU needs to tackle smuggling of nationally protected species. Report by Pro Wildlife, Munich, Germany, 32 pp.
- Auliya, M. et al. (2016): Trade in live reptiles, its impact on wild populations, and the role of the European market. *Biological Conservation* 204:113-119.
- Amarasinghe, A.A.T., Karunarathna, D.M.S.S., Gabadage, D.E. (2009) Current status of *Calotes liocephalus* Günther, 1872 (Reptilia: Agamidae) of Sri Lanka. *Journal of Threatened Taxa* 1: 553–557.
- Suranjan Karunarathna, D.M.S., Pradeep, W.A.A.D.G., Peabotuwage, I., De Silva, M.C. (2009) First report on the Ovipositional behavior of *Calotes nigrilabris* Peters, 1860 (Reptilia: Sauria: Agamidae) from the Central massif of Sri Lanka. *Russian Journal of Herpetology* 18:111-118.
- Amarasinghe A.A.T., Tiedemann F., Karunarathna D.M.S. (2011) *Calotes nigrilabris* Peters, 1860 (Reptilia: Agamidae: Draconinae): a threatened highland agamid lizard in Sri Lanka. *Amphibian and Reptile Conservation* 5:90-100(e32).
- Amarasinghe, A.A.T., Suranjan Karunarathna, D.M.S., Hallermann, J., Fujinuma, J., Grillitsch, H., and Campbell, P.D. (2014). A new species of the genus *Calotes* (Squamata: Agamidae) from high elevations of the Knuckles Massif of Sri Lanka. *Zootaxa* 3785: 59-78.
- Bahir, M.M., Surasinghe, T.D. (2005). A conservation assessment of the agamid lizards of Sri Lanka. *The Raffles Bulletin of Zoology (Supplement)* 12:407-412.
- CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 23 (*Calotes nigrilabris* and *Calotes pethiyagodai*). Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/010319/E-CoP18-Prop-23.pdf>
- Krvavac, M. (2015): in litt to Altherr, Pro Wildlife, dated 29th June (Cited in CITES, 2019).
- MOE (2012): The National Red List 2012 of Sri Lanka: Conservation Status of the Fauna and Flora. Ministry of Environment, Colombo, Sri Lanka. viii + 476 pp.
- Somaweera, R. and Somaweera, N. (2009). Lizards of Sri Lanka: a colour guide with field keys. Chimaira, Frankfurt, 304 pp.
- Uetz, P., Freed, P. and Hošek, J. (eds.), 2019. The Reptile Database, <http://www.reptile-database.org>, accessed [11 March 2019].

CoP18 Prop. 1

## 1. Review of listing proposal under CITES

The republic of Tajikistan (that joined CITES in 2016) proposes to transfer its population of Heptner's, *Capra falconeri heptneri*, from Appendix I to Appendix II. They claim this down-listing to be in accordance with a precautionary measure specified in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16).

**Species name:** *Capra falconeri* (Wagner, 1839). Synonym: *Aegoceros falconeri* Wagner, 1839. Common names: Markhor, Heptner's markhor, Bukhara markhor, Tajik markhor. Norwegian name: Skruegeit. *Capra falconeri heptneri* is one of three subspecies of *Capra falconeri* recognized by IUCN.

**Distribution:** The markhor inhabits Afghanistan, India (Jammu-Kashmir), Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

**Population trend:** Increasing. The population size was estimated to 5,754 mature individuals (IUCN 2015). In a survey of the population in Tajikistan conducted by IUCN Species Survival Commission Caprinae Specialist Group (SSC/CSG) in 2017, altogether 1,901 individuals were observed, of which 844 were identified as mature animals and 81 as males over 8 years old (IUCN SSC/CSG 2017). In a 2012 survey 1,018 individuals were counted (Michel et al. 2015), indicating population growth. However, IUCN SSC/CSG stated that overestimation due to repeated counts cannot entirely be excluded. They therefore advise against rushed management decisions that could pose a great danger for a threatened species like the Heptner's markhor (IUCN SSC/CSG 2017).

**Habitat status:** *C. falconeri* lives in mountainous terrain elevated between 600 and 3,600 m above sea level. There is continuous decline in area, extent and quality of its habitat (IUCN, 2015).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Some legal trophy hunting occurs and some illegal hunting is known to take place (CITES, 2019). The markhor is also poached for meat in Tajikistan (IUCN, 2015).

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*C. falconeri* is listed as Near Threatened on the IUCN Red List (2015). The species has been listed in CITES appendix II from 1975 and was up-listed to appendix I in 1992. *C. falconeri* has been listed in Annex B of the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations and since 1997.

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

IUCN SSC/CSG (2017) recommends trophy quota for Tajikistan on altogether 9 males over 8 years of age. The quota is divided on 3 of 6 surveyed areas. For the remaining three conservancies no hunting was recommended. It should be noted that 4 exports of *C. falconeri* trophies from Tajikistan to the US, recorded in the CITES trade database for 2017 are not included in paragraph 6.2 on legal trade in the listing proposal. (cf. CITES, 2019 page 7). The EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) had a positive opinion on the import of Markhor trophies from well-managed conservancies in Tajikistan in 2014 (EU SRG 2014). However, several concerns were raised about events/observations in 2016 and 2017 (EU SRG 2017). EU SRG recommends following the guidelines and quota proposed in IUCN SSC/CSG (2017). EU confiscation of 11 hunting trophies of Tajik origin in 2017 (EU SRG 2017) shows that illegal hunting occurs.

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

The markhor is listed in the Red Book of Tajikistan and thus legally protected (CITES, 2019).

## **5.Recommendations**

Bestanden av skruegeit er i ferd med å ta seg opp etter å ha vært dramatisk redusert på grunn av ukontrollert jakt. De kvotene som anbefales imidlertid svært små og vil kunne opprettholdes under nåværende CITES listing i Appendix I. Det er dokumenterte tilfeller av ulovlig internasjonal handel med jakttrofeer med opprinnelse i Tajikistan så sent som 2017. En nedlisting av den tajikiske beattnden av skruegeit vil også innebære å splitte arten mellom Appendix I og Appendix II som bør unngås i følge Annex 3 av Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Handel kan være en trussel mot overlevelsen av denne arten.

#### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 1 (*Capra falconeri heptneri*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Capra-falconeri-heptneri.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Capra-falconeri-heptneri.pdf).

EU SRG 79/4/8 a) (2017) Markhor (*Capra falconeri heptneri*) in Tajikistan: EU's contribution to maintain conservation successes of the past.

IUCN SSC/CSG (2017) - IUCN Species Survival Commission Caprinae Specialist Group - Tino Broghammer, Clemens Herche, Sandro Lovari .

Survey of populations of Heptner's markhor *Capra falconeri heptneri* in Tajikistan: 13th February – 6th March 2017.

Michel S., Rosen Michel,T. 2015. *Capra falconeri* (errata version published in 2016). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2015: e.T3787A97218336.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2015-4.RLTS.T3787A82028427.en>.

Michel, S., Rosen, Michel T., Saidov, A., Karimov, K., Alidodov, M., Kholmatov, I. (2015). Population status of Heptner's markhor *Capra falconeri heptneri* in Tajikistan: Challenges for conservation. *Oryx* 49: 506 - 513.

Cop18 Prop. 57

#### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Ecuador and Brazil propose to amend the CITES listing of *Cedrela* spp. *Cedrela odorata*, *C. fissilis* and *C. lilloi* are currently CITES Appendix III listed. The proponents propose to include *Cedrela odorata* in Appendix II of CITES, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 (a) of Article II of the Convention and paragraph B of Annex a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), and to include all other species of the *Cedrela* genus in Appendix II of CITES for reasons of similarity in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 (a) of Article II of the Convention and paragraph A of Annex 2 b of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

**Species name:** *Cedrela odorata* L. (1759). Common name: Cedar

**Distribution:** *Cedrela* is a genus of trees in the Meliaceae family. Within this genus, the most important commercial species and the most studied is *Cedrela odorata*. *Cedrela* constitutes 17 species and has a wide distribution that extends from the 24°North in Mexico to the 27°South in Argentina. Most species are restricted to deciduous forests, but but also grows in montane forests of the Andes, and two species are widely distributed in lowland rainforests (Pennington and Muellner, 2010; Lombardi et al., 2014). *C. odorata* is found in

Mexico, Central America, the Great and Lesser Antilles, in South America along the Pacific in Colombia and Ecuador, and throughout the Amazon basin and on the central coast and eastern Brazil, Paraguay and northern Argentina (Pennington and Muellner, 2010). In Colombia it is widely distributed throughout all the lowland and Andean piedmont regions (Cárdenas et al., 2015).

**Population trend:** The size of the populations of all species of *Cedrela* is unknown throughout its natural distribution; however, there is some data in different countries. In Peru, the population of *Cedrela* is 1.1 million trees (Pérez, 2011). *C. odorata* occurs at densities of up to 1.15 individuals/ha (Pérez, 2011) with a commercial population of trees between 261,159 and 300,743 individuals. The 2017 IUCN Red List Assessment of *Cedrela odorata* assesses the species as Vulnerable (Mark and Rivers, 2017). Sixteen out of the 17 *Cedrela* species are threatened (Mark and Rivers, 2017; Pennington and Muellner, 2010). Overexploitation and illegal logging, especially of the best individuals, is one of the most important causes for changes in the structure of populations.

**Habitat status:** Selective logging, land use change, habitat degradation, burning and other anthropogenic factors have contributed to the loss of forest cover, resulting in very fragmented populations (Rivera et al., 2013). The loss of habitat due to land use change directly affects endemic species (Mexico: *C. dugesii*, *C. discolor*, *C. oaxacensis*, El Salvador: *C. monroensis*, Peru: *C. longipetiolulata*, *C. molinensis*, *C. weberbaueri*) or species with restricted distribution ranges.

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** The countries with the largest exports are Bolivia, Brazil, Peru and Mexico. The number of exporting countries varies from year to year, ranging from 2 to 12. From 2010 to 2017, 87 243 m<sup>3</sup> of wood were exported (logs, plywood, sawn wood, wood and veneers), where 99% corresponds to the species *Cedrela odorata* (CITES Trade Database). This accounts for 53% of the wood marketed globally for the *Cedrela* genus. 47% of the wood trade of the *Cedrela* genus includes 62,462 m<sup>3</sup> from plants that are artificially propagated. Additionally, 12,975 m<sup>3</sup> of pre-convention specimen wood and 290 m<sup>3</sup> of unknown source.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

In Ecuador, cedar wood is mainly used to make fine furniture, doors, windows, counter frames, decorative plates, turned pieces, handicrafts, canoes, musical instruments and domestic instruments in general (Aguirre et al., 2015; Ecuador Forestal, 2012; FAO, 2018).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

There are records of the species' in the CITES trade database.

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

It is argued that *C. odorata* meets the criteria for inclusion in CITES Appendix II, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 (a) of Article II of the Convention and paragraph B of Annex 2 to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). In addition, it is proposed

that all other species of the genus *Cedrela* be included in CITES Appendix II for reasons of similarity, in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2 (b), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) Annex 2 b, paragraph A.

### **5.Recommendations**

De største truslene mot *Cedrela* spp. er overutnyttelse og habitatsødeleggelse, og til en viss grad forekomsten av *Hypsipyla grandella* (Lepidoptera, Pyralidae) som angriper skuddene. Hvis det ikke er bærekraftig styring og regulering av handel, kan bestandene av disse artene ikke gjenopprettes raskt nok og risikoen for utryddelse øker. Handel forventes derfor å påvirke bestander av disse artene negativt i deres naturlige habitater.

### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Aguirre, Z., Loja, A., Solano, C., y Aguirre, N. 2015. Especies forestales más aprovechadas en la región sur del Ecuador. 127p.

Cárdenas, L. D., Castaño, A. N., Sua, T. S., Quintero B. L. et. al. 2015. Planes de Manejo para la Conservación de Abarco, Caoba, Cedro, Palorosa, y Canelo de los Andaquies. Bogotá, Colombia: Instituto Amazónico de Investigaciones Científicas – SINCHI.

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 57 (*Cedrela* spp.). Available online at: <https://cites.org/eng/cop/18/prop/index.php>

CITES, 2007. CoP14 Proposal 33 (*Cedrela odorata*). Available online at: <https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/14/prop/E14-P33.pdf>

Ecuador Forestal (15 de agosto de 2012). Ecuador Forestal: Fichas técnicas de especies forestales, Ficha técnica N° 5 Cedro.

Lombardi, I., Garnica, C., Carranza, J., Barrena, Ortiz, H., Gamarra, J., Ponce, B. 2014. Evaluación de la Recuperación de las Poblaciones de Cedro y Caoba en el Perú. Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina. Lima, Perú.

Mark, J., Rivers, M.C. 2017. *Cedrela odorata*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2017: e.T32292A68080590.

Pennington, T. D., Muellner, A. N. (2010) A monograph of *Cedrela* (Meliaceae). dh books. England.

Pérez Contreras, O. 2011. Estudio de Mercado de *Cedrela odorata* en Bolivia, Brasil y Perú. Organización Internacional de Maderas Tropicales.

CoP18 Prop.24

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Sri Lanka is proposing to list all members of the genus *Ceratophora* as CITES Appendix I. All *Ceratophora* are endemic to Sri Lanka. Of the five species, three are classified as Critically Endangered in Sri Lanka's national Red List, while two are listed as Endangered. Sri Lanka protects all five species and does not allow exports for commercial purposes. This designation of CITES Appendix 1 is in accordance with Article II paragraph 1 of the Convention, satisfying Criteria A i), ii) and v) as well as B i), iii) and iv) of Annex 1 of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev CoP17).

### **Species names:**

*Ceratophora aspera* Günther, 1864. Common name: Sri Lanka Horned Agama, Hornagame, Spitznase.

Synonyms:

*Ceratophora aspera* Günther 1864

*Ceratophora aspera* — Ferguson 1877

*Ceratophora aspera* — Boulenger 1885

*Ceratophora aspera* — Smith 1935

*Ceratophora aspera* — Taylor 1953

*Ceratophora aspera* — Manthey and Schuster 1999

*Ceratophora aspera* — Somaweera and Somaweera 2009

*Ceratophora erdeleni* Pethiyagoda and Manamendra-Arachchi, 1998

Synonyms:

*Ceratophora erdeleni* Pethiyagoda and Manamendra-Arachchi, 1998

*Ceratophora erdeleni* — Janzen et al. 2007

*Ceratophora karu* Pethiyagoda and Manamendra-Arachchi, 1998

Synonyms:

*Ceratophora karu* Pethiyagoda and Manamendra-Arachchi, 1998

*Ceratophora karu* — Janzen et al. 2007

*Ceratophora stoddartii* GRAY, 1834. Common names: Mountain Horned Agama, Rhino-horned lizard, Stachelnase, Hornagame.

Synonyms:

*Ceratophora stoddartii* GRAY 1834

*Ceratophora Stoddartii* — Duméril and Bibron 1837

*Ceratophora Hoddartii* — Kelaart 1854: 138

*Ceratophora stoddartii* — Ferguson 1877

*Ceratophora stoddartii* — Boulenger 1885

*Ceratophora stoddarti* — Smith 1935

*Ceratophora stoddarti* — Taylor 1953

*Ceratophora stoddartii* — Manthey and Schuster 1999

*Ceratophora stoddertii* [sic] — Barts and Wilms 2003

*Ceratophora tennentii* Günther, 1861. Common name: Rhinoceros agama

Synonyms:

*Ceratophora tennentii* Günther 1861: 281

*Ceratophora tennentii* — Ferguson 1877: 13

*Ceratophora tennentii* — Boulenger 1885: 278

*Ceratophora tennenti* — Smith 1935: 153

*Ceratophora tennentii* — Taylor 1953: 1560

*Ceratophora tennentii* — Manthey and Schuster 1999: 40

*Ceratophora tennentii* — Pianka and Vitt 2003

**Distribution:** All five species have restricted distributions in south or central Sri Lanka (Somaweera and Somaweera, 2009; Uetz et al., 2019). Two species are particularly restricted. *C. karu* and *C. erdeleni* are found in areas < 10 km<sup>2</sup>.

**Population trends:** There is very little data on population trends but any ongoing habitat loss will reduce populations of all *Ceratophora* spp. For example, tea plantations have supplanted montane cloud forest and greatly reduced the range of the once 'widely' distributed *C. stoddartii* (Pethiyagoda and Manamendra-Arachchi, 1998). Likewise, *C. aspera* is severely fragmented because of habitat loss (Somaweera and de Silva, 2010) and any further habitat loss will reduce existing populations.

**Habitat status:** Agriculture represents a major threat through forest clearing and land transformation. *C. aspera* is a lowland species largely restricted to undisturbed and fragmented, moist lowland and sub-montane dipterocarp forests (Somaweera and de Silva 2010). The remaining species are all found in montane rain forest 760 - 2200 m above sea level, with high humidity and lower temperatures (Bartelt and Janzen 2007 in CoP18). Sri Lanka's forest has been reduced from 80% to <16% in the past 130 years. Forests in the wet zone and central hill range are becoming increasingly fragmented. In the case of *C. aspera*, *C. tennentii*, according to the IUCN there is a continuing decline of mature individuals probably in response to the continuing decline in area, extent and/or quality of habitat (Somaweera and de Silva 2010; World Conservation Monitoring Centre 1996). Of greatest concern for two species (*C. karu* and *C. erdeleni*) is that they occupy an area < 10 km<sup>2</sup> (Bahir and Surasinghe, 2005).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Since 1993 it has been illegal to collect and trade any species of *Ceratophora* in Sri Lanka. However, it appears that individuals of every species have been traded abroad (typically in Europe), confirming that animals have been smuggled out of the country. Post 2010, numerous *Ceratophora* began showing up on dealer web sites and some have made it to the US market (Altherr 2014 in CoP18; Auliya et al., 2016). Any future significant peak in trade may suggest renewed smuggling of animals and should be monitored.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*C. aspera* is listed as Vulnerable on the IUCN Red List (Somaweera and de Silva, 2010), and was last assessed in 2009.

*C. tennentii* is listed as Endangered on the IUCN Red List (World Conservation Monitoring Centre 1996), but was last assessed in 1996.

The remaining species have not been assessed other than for the Sri Lanka national Red Data list in which all species are listed. In 2012 *C. aspera* was classified as Endangered while *C. tennentii* was reclassified as Critically Endangered in the national Red List (Wickramasinghe 2012). (They were formerly classified as Vulnerable (*C. aspera*) and

Endangered (*C. tennentii*) (Bahir and Surasinghe 2005)). *C. karu* and *C. erdeleni* are both Critically Endangered while *C. stoddartii* is Endangered (MOE, 2012).

### **3.Evaluation of trade data**

There are no records of the species in the CITES trade database.

### **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

The species was subject to Periodic Review of the Appendices, and the Animals Committee, at its 30<sup>th</sup> meeting (Geneva, 2018) concluded with the following: The Committee determined that in accordance with subparagraphs 2 g) and h) of Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP17) the six species reviewed by Australia meet the criteria in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) for transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II as outlined in CITES, 2018. The Committee asked the Secretariat to invite Australia to submit these proposals to the Conference of the Parties at its 18th meeting.

### **5.Recommendations**

Alle artene i slekten *Ceratophora* er endemiske til Sri Lanka. Tre av dem er vurdert til Kritisk truet og to til Truet av IUCN. Artene er spesialiserte med svært begrensede utbredelsesområder og tilfredstiller derfor flere av kravene beskrevet i Anneks 1 of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev CoP17). Det er ingen lovlig internasjonal handel, men det finnes et ulovlig marked blant samlere. All handel kan bidra til å sette disse artene i ytterligere fare for utryddelse.

### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

- Auliya, M. (2003): Hot trade in cool creatures: A review of the live reptile trade in the European Union in the 1990s with a focus on Germany. TRAFFIC Europe, Brussels, Belgium.
- Bahir, M., Surasinghe, T. (2005): A conservation assessment of the Sri Lankan agamidae (Reptilia:Sauria). Raffles Bulletin Zoology 12: 407–412.
- MOE 2012. The National Red List 2012 of Sri Lanka: Conservation Status of the Fauna and Flora. Ministry of Environment, Colombo, Sri Lanka. viii + 476 pp.
- Pethiyagoda, R., Manamendra-Arachchi, K. (1998). A revision of the endemic Sri Lankan agamid lizard genus *Ceratophora* Gray, 1835, with description of two new species. J. Journal of South Asian Natural History 3: 1-50.
- Somaweera, R., de Silva, A. 2010. *Ceratophora aspera*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2010: e.T170383A6773297. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2010-4.RLTS.T170383A6773297.en>.
- Uetz, P., Freed, P., Hošek, J. (eds.), 2019. The Reptile Database, <http://www.reptile-database.org>, accessed [11 March 2019].
- World Conservation Monitoring Centre 1996. *Ceratophora tennentii*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 1996: e.T4178A10537517. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.1996.RLTS.T4178A10537517.en>.

CoP18 Prop. 9

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**



Namibia proposes to transfer the population of *Ceratotherium simum simum* of Namibia from Appendix I to Appendix II with the following annotation: For the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in: a) live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations; and b) hunting trophies. All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly. Namibia claims that its white rhino population no longer fulfil the criteria for an Appendix I listing (CITES, 2019). Trophy hunting of white rhinos already occurs in Namibia but the Appendix I listing prevents it from being for commercial purposes.

**Species name:** *Ceratotherium simum simum* (Burchell 1718). Common name: Southern white rhinoceros. Norsk navn: stumpnesehorn.

**Distribution:** The largest population of *C. simum simum* occurs in South Africa (about 15,625), with smaller reintroduced populations (total of 2,349 animals) in Botswana, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Mosabique, Eswatini, Uganda, Zambia, and Kenya, all of which originated from the South African population (African Rhino Specialist Group, 2018). Namibia's white rhino population is the second largest population of the species, and is currently estimated at 1037 individuals (CITES, 2019).

**Population trend:** The population is increasing, according to the latest IUCN Red List assessment (Emslie, 2011). The white rhinoceros in Namibia has grown from initial 16 individuals in 1975, to 1037 individuals in 2018, with a growth rate of 6.7% per annum from 2002 to 2018. This number includes a large number of imports from South Africa, permits to import 508 animals from south Africa have been issued over the past 10 years (CITES, 2019). The privately owned population comprises 780 animals in around 70 populations and state owned population comprises 267 animals in 3 protected areas (CITES, 2019).

**Habitat status:** Unclear whether the habitat is fragmented or not. The potential range for southern white rhinoceros in Namibia is restricted by rainfall, as the species is not known to occur in areas with less than 200mm of annual rainfall (CITES, 2019). Southern white rhinos in Namibia occur on private land and in protected areas. It is estimated that Namibia has sufficient habitat to carry as many as 14000 white rhinoceros in the potential range for white rhinos in Namibia (CITES, 2019).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Trophy hunting of southern white rhinos takes place in South Africa and Namibia only (Emslie et al., 2016). Between 2008 and 2018, a total of 57 white rhinoceros were hunted (CITES, 2019; CITES Trade Database). The records from the CITES Trade Database between 2008 and 2018 are mainly importer reported (40), whereas only two were actually reported by the exporter (Namibia). Illegal trade in rhino horns is a significant international issue.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*C. simum simum* is listed as Near Threatened on the IUCN Red list of Threatened Species (Emslie, 2011). The reason for this listing, and not the use of the Least Concern category, is the continued and escalating poaching in recent years and the high illegal demand for horn (Emslie, 2011; Emslie et al., 2016). The entire family Rhinocerotidae was included in Appendix I of CITES in 1977. The South African population of the *C. simum simum* was transferred to Appendix II in 1994 under the following annotation: " for the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations and hunting trophies. All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I, and trade in them shall be regulated accordingly." In 2004, Eswatini's (Swaziland) population was transferred to Appendix II under the same annotation. The EU Wildlife Trade Regulations has included the species in Annex A since 01.06.1997, whereas the populations of South Africa and Eswatini are listed in Annex B, with the same annotation as for the CITES listing.

### **3.Evaluation of trade data**

Poaching and illegal trade are the major threats to southern white rhinos, and the number of poached rhinos was in 2015 the highest since 2008, with poaching in 2015 representing 5.3 % of white rhino numbers (Emslie et al., 2016). These numbers are approaching the average continental growth rate of rhinos recorded between 1995 and 2007 (Emslie et al., 2016). South Africa holds the largest rhino population, but 88% of the poaching between 2010 and 2015 was in South Africa. In Kruger national park, which holds the largest rhino population, there is severe poaching and the species is most likely in decline in this park (Emslie et al., 2016 and references herein). Emslie et al. (2016) reports a poaching rate of 0.3% between 2008 and 2012 in Namibia. Between 2013 and 2015 this rate increased to 3.3% and has since then continued to increase (CITES, 2019). These figures represent minimum numbers, as some carcasses may go undetected (Emslie et al., 2016). Trophy hunting of southern white rhinos takes place in South Africa and Namibia, with a restricted offtake of 0,34% of the population in these two countries (Emslie et al., 2016). Legal trophy hunting has not been detrimental to rhino recovery but the abuse of trophy hunting in South Africa emerged as a serious issue in 2006. Pseudo hunting, where rhinos are hunted to acquire horns for illegal trade purposes still occurs on a regular basis, despite several measures to come to terms with it (e.g. by not accepting trophy hunting applications from hunter of certain nationalities) (CITES, 2019).

### **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states**

The IUCN published in 2016 a briefing paper on trophy hunting, describing how well managed hunting can contribute to conservation (IUCN, 2016). Trophy hunting of rhinos (both black and white) in South Africa and Namibia is presented as a positive (i.e sustainable and contributing to species conservation) case study.

### **5.Recommendations**

Den Namibiske bestanden av stumpnesehorn er den nest største bestanden av denne arten, den er ikke i nedgang og har heller ikke begrenset utbredelsesområde. Bestanden antas derfor å ikke oppfylle kriteriene for listing i Appendiks I. Den foreslåtte overføringen av denne populasjonen til Appendiks II virker å være i tråd med Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev.

CoP17) Annex 4, føre var tiltak A.2.iii, i og med at handel skal begrenses til levende dyr og jakttrofeer. Kontroll og forvaltningstiltak er grundig beskrevet i forslaget, for eksempel hvordan man skal forhindre at stumpnesehorn deler som er anskaffet på lovlig vis skal ikke til det illegale markedet. Basert på de overnevnte faktorer så virker det usannsynlig at denne type handel vil være ødeleggende for denne artens overlevelse.

## **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Emslie, R. H., Miliken, T., Talukdar, B., Ellis, S., Adcock, K., Knight, M. H. (2016) African and Asian Rhinoceroses – Status, Conservation and Trade. A report from the IUCN Species Survival Commission African and Asian Rhino Specialist Groups and Traffic to the CITES Secretariat pursuant to Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP15). CoP17 Doc. 68

Emslie, R. 2012. *Ceratotherium simum*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2012: e.T4185A16980466. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2012.RLTS.T4185A16980466.en>.

IUCN, 2016. Informing decisions on trophy hunting: A briefing Paper regarding the issues to be taken into account when considering restriction of imports of hunting trophies.

Available online at: [https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/iucn\\_sept\\_briefing\\_paper\\_-\\_informingdecisionstrophyhunting.pdf](https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/iucn_sept_briefing_paper_-_informingdecisionstrophyhunting.pdf)

CITES, 2019. CoP18 proposal 9 (*Ceratotherium simum simum*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Ceratotherium-simum-simum-Namibia.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Ceratotherium-simum-simum-Namibia.pdf)

CoP18 Prop. 8

## **1. Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Eswatini (formerly Swaziland) propose to remove the existing annotation on the Appendix II listing of the country's southern white rhino population, in order to enable regulated legal trade in Eswatini's white rhinos, including their horns and derivatives. More specifically, Eswatini wishes to sell from existing stock 330 kg of rhino horn to licenced retailers in the Far East and also up to 20 kg p.a., including harvested horn, to those retailers. The horn will be harvested in a non-lethal way.

**Species name:** *Ceratotherium simum simum* Burchell 1918. Common name: Southern white rhinoceros. Norsk navn: stumpnesehorn.

**Distribution:** The largest population of *C. simum simum* is in South Africa (about 15,625 individuals), with smaller reintroduced populations (total of 2,349 individuals) in Botswana, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Mosabique, Eswatini, Uganda, Zambia, and Kenya, all of which originated from the South African population (African Rhino Specialist Group, 2018). Eswatini's southern rhinos are currently located in the Hlane Royal National Park and the Mkhaya Game Reserve (CITES, 2019).

**Population trend:** The population is increasing, according to the latest IUCN Red List assessment (Emslie, 2011). In Eswatini, 66 southern white rhinos occur in two existing rhino parks, and there is a potential to increase the population to approximately 160 individuals (CITES, 2019).

**Habitat status:** Fragmented. The majority of Africa's southern white rhino populations occur in South Africa, where they are reported to be fragmented but widespread (UNEP-WCMC, 2014). Populations occur in both state owned and private protected areas, with 23% of the South African white rhino population is kept on private game farms (UNEP-WCMC, 2014). In Eswatini there are plans to expand the rhino population to a third wildlife sanctuary, the Mlilwane Wildlife Sanctuary (CITES, 2019).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** There is no legal trade in rhino horns, parts and derivatives in Eswatini (CITES, 2019). Between 2010 and 2018, 10 records of southern white rhinos or rhino products can be found in the CITES Trade Database, where the majority are either for Law enforcement/juridical/forensic purposes (source code L) and reintroduction (source code N). The illegal trade in rhino horns is a significant international issue.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*C. simum simum* is listed as Near Threatened on the IUCN Red list of Threatened Species (Emslie, 2011). The reason for this listing, and not the use of the Least Concern category, is due to the continued and escalating poaching in recent years and the high demand for illegally sourced rhino horn (Emslie, 2011; Emslie et al., 2016). The entire family Rhinocerotidae was included in Appendix I of CITES in 1977. The South African population of the *C. simum simum* was transferred to Appendix II in 1994 under the following annotation: " for the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations and hunting trophies. All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I, and trade in them shall be regulated accordingly." In 2004, Eswatini's (Swaziland) population was transferred to Appendix II under the same annotation. The species is listed in Annex A under the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations (since 01.06.1997), whereas the populations of South Africa and Eswatini are listed on Appendix B, with the same annotation as for the CITES listing.

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

Poaching and illegal trade are the major threats to southern white rhinos, and the number of poached rhinos was in 2015 the highest since 2008, with poaching in 2015 representing 5.3 % of white rhino numbers (Emslie et al., 2016). These numbers are approaching the average continental growth rate of rhinos recorded between 1995 and 2007 (Emslie et al., 2016). South Africa holds the largest rhino population, but 88% of the poaching between 2010 and 2015 was in South Africa. In Kruger national park, which holds the largest rhino population, there is severe poaching and the species is most likely in decline in this park (Emslie et al., 2016 and references therein). Eswatini, despite being located in the middle of South Africa, has only had three documented poaching incidences in the last 26 years, two in 2011 and 1 in 2014 (CITES, 2019). Trophy hunting is conducted in both South Africa and Namibia, with a restricted offtake of 0,34% (Emslie et al., 2016). Legal trophy hunting has not been detrimental to rhino recovery but the abuse of trophy hunting in South Africa emerged as a serious issue in 2006 (Emslie et al., 2016). Pseudo hunting,

where rhinos are hunted to acquire horns for illegal trade purposes still occurs on a regular basis, despite several measures to come to terms with it (e.g. by not accepting trophy hunting applications from hunter of certain nationalities) (CITES, 2019).

#### **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states**

Eswatini proposed to remove the existing Appendix II annotation for its southern white rhino population at CoP17, but this proposal that was rejected (CITES, 2016; Species+).

#### **5. Recommendations**

Det er ikke registrert mange tilfeller av krypskyting av stumpnesehorn i Eswatini, til tross for landets beliggenhet midt i Sør Afrika, som er svært hardt rammet av krypskyting. Dette tyder på at den lille stumpnesehornbestanden i Eswatini (kun 66 individer) er godt forvaltet, og sett i isolasjon så er det usannsynlig at regulert handel med horn og hornprodukter vil være ødeleggende for Eswatini-populasjonen. Krypskyting og ulovlig handel med nesehorn horn er imidlertid et transnasjonalt problem som påvirker den totale bestanden av denne arten negativt. Det er derfor sannsynlig at slik handel vil kunne være ødeleggende for denne artens videre overlevelse.

#### **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES, 2019. CoP18 proposal 9 (*Ceratotherium simum simum*) Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Ceratotherium-simum-simum-Eswatini.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Ceratotherium-simum-simum-Eswatini.pdf)

CITES, 2016. CoP18 proposal 8 (*Ceratotherium simum simum*) Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/prop/060216/E-CoP17-Prop-07.pdf>

Emslie, R. H., Miliken, T., Talukdar, B., Ellis, S., Adcock, K., Knight, M. H. (2016) African and Asian Rhinoceroses – Status, Conservation and Trade. A report from the IUCN Species Survival Commission African and Asian Rhino Specialist Groups and Traffic to the CITES Secretariat pursuant to Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP15). CoP17 Doc. 68

Emslie, R. 2012. *Ceratotherium simum*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2012: e.T4185A16980466. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2012.RLTS.T4185A16980466.en>.

United Nations Environment Program/World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) (2014) Review of trophy hunting in selected species. UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge.

CoP18 Prop. 25

#### **1. Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Sri Lanka is proposing that *Cophotis ceylanica* and *Cophotis dumbara* be added to Appendix I, in accordance with Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev CoP17) because *C. ceylanica* meets Annex 1, criterion B (i), (iii) and (iv), while *Cophotis dumbara* meets Annex 1, criterion A (i) and (v) as well as criterion B (i), (iii) and (iv) (CoP18).

**Species name:** *Cophotis ceylanica* (Peters 1861). Common names: Ceylon Deaf Agama, Ceylonische Taubagame, Baumagame.

Synonyms:

*Cophotis ceylanica* Peters 1861

*Cophotis ceylanica* — Ferguson 1877

*Cophotis ceylanica* — Boulenger 188  
*Cophotis ceylanica* — Smith 1935  
*Cophotis ceylanica* — Manthey and Schuster 1999  
*Cophotis ceylanica* [sic] — Barts and Wilms 2003

*Cophotis dumbara* (Samarawickrama, Ranawana, Rajapaksha, Ananjeva, Orlov, Ranasinghe and Samarawickrama, 2006). Common names: Dumbara Agama, Dumbara-Agame.

Synonyms:

*Cophotis dumbara* Samarawickrama, Ranawana, Rajapaksha, Ananjeva, Orlov, Ranasinghe and Samarawickrama 2006

*Cophotis dumbarae* Manamendra-Arachchi et al. 2006

**Distribution:** *Cophotis ceylanica* is endemic to Sri Lanka and is found in south-central Sri Lanka including Nuwara, Eliya, Hakgala, Horton Plains, Pattipola, Peak Wilderness (Sripadha/Samanala Kanda), Ambeweda, and Piiduruthalagala (Somaweera and Somaweera, 2009).

*Cophotis dumbara* is endemic to Sri Lanka, being found in the Knuckles Range. Localities include Dothalugala Man and Biosphere Reserve, Tangappuwa area, Riverston Estate, Kobonilagala, Gammaduwa and Rangala (Somaweera and Somaweera, 2009).

**Population trend:** In 1992, two populations (Hakgala and Nuwara Eliya) of *C. ceylanica* experienced major die-offs as a result of high temperatures and drought, when hundreds of individuals were found dead over a period of a few days (de Silva, 2001, 2006). A gradual increase in temperatures and drop in rainfall has been a trend over the past century (de Silva, 2001). In 1998, populations of both species were thought to have been reduced by more than 50% over the previous decade (CAMP 1998). de Silva noted that over 15 years of visiting the Knuckles Range he has noticed a drop in the numbers of *Cophotis* and on one trip he saw no lizards (*Cophotis*). *Cophotis dumbara* is particularly poorly known and rarely seen in the wild (Samarawickrama et al., 2009). Overall, we have little data on populations in the wild.

**Habitat status:** Fragmented and greatly reduced in both species (Samarawickrama et al., 2009). Large areas of montane cloud forest has been destroyed by either timber harvesting and/or because they were replaced with cardamom and tea plantations (Bahir and Surasinghe, 2005). The habitat has also been significantly altered through removal of the understory, changing the microclimate and also making animals more vulnerable to predation (Samarawickrama et al., 2006).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Since 1993 it has been illegal to collect and trade any species of *Cophotis* in Sri Lanka. However, it appears that individuals of both species have been traded abroad (mostly by German and French traders, but also the

USA, Czech Republic, Malaysia, Switzerland, Russia and United Kingdom), confirming that animals have been smuggled out of the country (Altherr 2014; Auliya et al., 2016). Since about 2013, *Cophotis* have begun showing up on dealer web sites. In the case of *C. dumbara*, most trade has been since May 2015. Overall, the current level of trade is relatively low, but this could change, especially if the market value and interest in these species increases. Any future significant peak in trade may suggest renewed smuggling of animals and should be monitored.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*C. ceylanica*: Endangered in Sri Lanka's National Red List (MOE 2012; Wickramasinghe 2012), but unassessed by the IUCN Red List.

*C. dumbara*: IUCN Red List and National Red List of Sri Lanka both classify as Critically Endangered (Samarawickrama et al., 2009; MOE 2012; Wickramasinghe, 2012).

Sri Lanka protects all its lizards from capture, hunting and trade/export (Parliament of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, 2009).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

Illegal trade occurs in Europe in particular and animals are worth 250-600 Euros or up to 1,500 Euros for a breeding pair. Current trade levels are not high, but also difficult to evaluate and could become a problem in the near future if demand for these animals increases. Traders are currently taking advantage of the fact that *Cophotis* outside of the range state (Sri Lanka) can be legally traded.

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

Both species occur in fragmented habitat that is restricted, and sometimes of reduced quality. They are also slow moving and likely to be susceptible to collection. In areas where cardamom is commercially harvested, it would be easy for local workers to collect them as they encountered them. These are very poorly understood species that are rarely encountered and considered highly vulnerable to extinction by Sri Lankan authorities.

## **5.Recommendations**

Pygmeøglene *C. ceylanica* og *C. dumbara* har gjennomgått en significant reduksjon og fragmentering av habitat, de har svært begrenset utbredelse (*C. ceylanica* finnes kun på noen få fjelltopper), og de er begge listet som utryddingstuet på den nasjonale rødlisten. Begge artene er virker å svært sjeldne, da man sjelden støter på dem, og bestandene har vært i kraftig nedgang over tid. Artene smugles ut av Sri Lanka, og er nå attraktive på hobbydyrmarkedet hvor de selges for høy pris (se 3). All handel vil mest sannsynlig være ødeliggende for disse artens videre overlevelse.

## **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Altherr, S (2014): Stolen Wildlife – Why the EU needs to tackle smuggling of nationally protected species. Report by Pro Wildlife, Munich, Germany, 32 pp.

Auliya, M. et al. (2016): Trade in live reptiles, its impact on wild populations, and the role of the European market. Biological Conservation 204:113-119.

de Silva, A. (2001). The Herpetofauna of Sri Lanka: An historical overview, current status with checklists. Published by ARROS.

Samarawickrama, V., Ranawana, K., Rajapaksha, D., Ananjeva, N.B., Orlov, N.L., Ranasinghe, J.M.A.S., Samarawickrama, V., Manamendra-Arachchi, K., de Silva, A. Amarasinghe, T. (2009). *Cophotis dumbara*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2009: e.T169677A6666297. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2009-2.RLTS.T169677A6666297.en>.

MOE (2012): The National Red List 2012 of Sri Lanka: Conservation Status of the Fauna and Flora. Ministry of Environment, Colombo, Sri Lanka. viii + 476 pp.

Somaweera, R. and Somaweera, N. (2009). Lizards of Sri Lanka: a colour guide with field keys. Chimaira, Frankfurt, 304 pp.

CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 25 (*Cophotis ceylanica* and *Cophotis dumbara*). Available online at:

<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/010319/E-CoP18-Prop-25.pdf>

## CoP18 Prop. 22

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

Mexico proposes to transfer the Mexican populations of American crocodile (*Crocodylus acutus*) from Appendix I to Appendix II. The proponent claims that the populations do not meet the biological criteria for inclusion in Appendix I, according to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

**Species name:** Scientific name: *Crocodylus acutus* (Cuvier, 1807). Synonym: *Crocodilus acutus* Cuvier, 1807. Common name: American crocodile. Norwegian name: Amerikansk krokodille.

**Distribution:** The American Crocodile is the most widely distributed of the New World crocodiles and is found in Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, the United States of America (Florida) and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. In Mexico it is found on both the Pacific slope and the Yucatan Peninsula. The proponent presents a new estimate of the Mexican distribution area of approximately 199,765 km<sup>2</sup> (CITES, 2019).

**Population trend:** Increasing (Ponce-Campos et al., 2012).

**Habitat status:** Not fragmented (Ponce-Campos et al., 2012).

### Describe known/suspected level of trade:

Captive breeding farms are registered by CITES in Cuba, Honduras and Colombia (Ponce-Campos et al., 2012). In 2018, 1,716 skins were exported from Colombia for commercial purposes. In 2017 Colombo reported 5,000 skin exports while altogether 2,902 were reported by importing countries. All of these were exported under source code D (i.e. Appendix-I animals bred in captivity: <https://trade.cites.org>). Exports from Mexico since 2000 have been mainly for scientific purposes.



## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*C. acutus* is listed as Vulnerable in the IUCN Red List (2012). It has been listed in CITES Appendix I since 1981 (it was on Appendix II since 1975), with exception of the population in Cuba (2005) and the population of the Integrated Management District of Mangroves of the Bay of Cispata, Tinajones, La Balsa and Surrounding Areas, Department of Córdoba, Colombia (2017) that are listed in Appendix II. Similarly all populations except those mentioned above (that has been listed in Annex B since 2005 and 2017 respectively) have been listed in the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations Annex A since 1997.

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

American crocodiles were overexploited for their skin in Mexico from around 1870, but protection measures were initiated in the 1970s and the population has recovered substantially (Thorbjarnarson *et al.* 2006). The discrepancies between reported imports and exports in the CITES trade database are substantial and in 2017 100 skins destined to the USA from Colombia were listed with source code I, i.e. confiscated or seized specimens.

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

Mexico's Crocodilians Specialists Group (GEC-Mexico) was founded in 2010 and is preparing a Monitoring Program of American Crocodile (*Crocodylus acutus*) for status and trends of the main wild populations of the species in the entire area of its distribution in Mexico. *C. acutis* found in 47 protected areas that represent almost 10% of its total distribution range in the country (CITES, 2019).

## **5.Recommendations**

Den Amerikanske krokodillens bestander i Meksiko har tatt seg opp etter at beskyttende tiltak ble iverksatt på 1970-tallet. Arten oppfyller derfor ikke lenger de biologiske kriteriene beskrevet i Annex I av Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Siden det allerede finnes andre bestander av arten som er nedlistet fra Appendix I til II vil nedlisting av den Meksikanske bestanden være uproblematisk med henhold til split-listing, jf. Anneks 3 av resolusjonen. Under streng regulering vil noe handel med Amerikansk krokodille fra Meksiko kunne foregå uten å sette arten i fare for utryddelse.

## **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 22 (*Crocodylus acutus*) (population of Mexico). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Crocodylus%20acutus-Mexico.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Crocodylus%20acutus-Mexico.pdf).

Ponce-Campos, P., Thorbjarnarson, J., Velasco, A. IUCN SSC Crocodile Specialist Group; 2012 *Crocodylus acutus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2012: e.T5659A3043244. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2012.RLTS.T5659A3043244.en>.

Thorbjarnarson, J., Mazzotti, F., Sanderson, E., Buitrago, F., Lazcano, M., Minkowski, K., Muñiz, M., Ponce, P., Sigler, L., Soberon, R., Trelancia, A.M., Velasco, A. (2006) Regional habitat conservation priorities for the American Crocodile. *Biological Conservation* 128: 25-36.

**Note, there is no supporting CoP18 document for review. These comments must therefore be taken in light of that, and are greatly limited. Also, a significant number of IUCN Red Data List assessments are out of date (e.g. 5+ accounts by G. Köhler in 2004).**

### **1. Review of listing proposal under CITES**

El Salvador and Mexico are proposing to list *Ctenosaura* spp. (Spiny-tailed iguanas) in Appendix II.

#### **Species name:**

Source: Uetz et al. (2019)

*Ctenosaura acanthura* (SHAW, 1802)

*Ctenosaura bakeri* STEJNEGER, 1901

*Ctenosaura clarki* BAILEY, 1928

*Ctenosaura conspicuosa* DICKERSON, 1919

*Ctenosaura flavidorsalis* KÖHLER and KLEMMER, 1994

*Ctenosaura hemilopha* (COPE, 1863)

*Ctenosaura macrolopha* SMITH, 1972

*Ctenosaura melanosterna* BUCKLEY and AXTELL, 1997

*Ctenosaura nolascensis* SMITH, 1972

*Ctenosaura oaxacana* KÖHLER and HASBUN, 2001

*Ctenosaura oedirhina* DE QUEIROZ, 1987

*Ctenosaura palearis* STEJNEGER, 1899

*Ctenosaura pectinata* (WIEGMANN, 1834)

*Ctenosaura quinquecarinata* (GRAY, 1842)

*Ctenosaura similis* (GRAY, 1831)

The following is a list of taxa from the IUCN SSC Iguana Specialist Group

*Ctenosaura acanthura*

Veracruz Spiny-tailed Iguanas

*Ctenosaura alfredschmidtii*

Campeche Spiny-tailed Iguanas

*Ctenosaura bakeri*

Útila Spiny-tailed Iguanas

*Ctenosaura clarki*

Balsas Spiny-tailed Iguanas

*Ctenosaura conspicuosa*

San Esteban Spiny-tailed Iguanas

*Ctenosaura defensor*

Yucatán Spiny-tailed Iguanas

*Ctenosaura flavidorsalis*

Yellow-backed Spiny-tailed Iguanas

*Ctenosaura hemilopha*

Baja California Spiny-tailed Iguanas

*Ctenosaura macrolopha*  
 Sonoran Spiny-tailed Iguanas  
*Ctenosaura melanosterna*  
 Black-chested Spiny-tailed Iguanas  
*Ctenosaura nolascentis*  
 Nolasco Spiny-tailed Iguanas  
*Ctenosaura oaxacana*  
 Oaxaca Spiny-tailed Iguanas  
*Ctenosaura oedirhina*  
 Roatán Spiny-tailed Iguanas  
*Ctenosaura palearis*  
 Motagua Spiny-tailed Iguanas  
*Ctenosaura pectinata*  
 Guerreran Spiny-tailed Iguanas  
*Ctenosaura praeocularis*  
 Southern Honduran Spiny-tailed Iguanas  
*Ctenosaura quinquecarinata*  
 Five-keeled Spiny-tailed Iguanas  
*Ctenosaura similis similis*  
 Common Spiny-tailed Iguanas  
*Ctenosaura similis multipunctata*  
 Providence Spiny-tailed Iguanas

**Distribution:** Mexico and Central America, including off-shore islands. Some islands are very small, for example *C. nolascentis* occurs on an island (San Pedro Nolasco) that is only 3 km<sup>2</sup>.

**Population trend:** The IUCN Red List lists the following species of *Ctenosaura* as having declining populations: *C. bakeri*, *C. palearis*, *C. melanosterna*, *C. oedirhina*, *C. flavidorsalis*, *C. oaxacana*, *C. quinquecarinata*. Of the remaining species evaluated by the IUCN Red List, two species have stable populations (*C. nolascentis*, *C. similis*), while four species have populations that are unknown with respect to population size (*C. clarki*, *C. praeocularis*, *C. defensor*, *C. alfredschmidt*). **However, some of these assessments are in dire need of updating.**

**Habitat status:** Many species are experiencing reduction in extent of habitat (e.g. *C. bakeri*, *C. palearis*, *C. clarkia*, *C. melanosterna*, *C. oedirhina*, *C. quinquecarinata* and others). In many species primary threat to is habitat destruction and fragmentation.

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:**

The trade in iguanas is not well documented but appears to have dropped off in the US while Europe appears to have a different market and greater interest in a variety of Ctenosaurs (e.g. Stephen et al., year unknown). The local trade in iguanas for meat and

eggs has been quite heavy for many species and has contributed to the decline of many populations.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

With respect to the IUCN Red List, two species are critically Endangered, five species are Endangered, three species are Vulnerable, and one species is Near Threatened.

The Nolasco Spiny-tailed Iguana (*Ctenosaura nolasensis*) is listed as Vulnerable by the IUCN Red List (Reynoso and Pasachnik, 2012).

Utila Spiny-tailed Iguana (*Ctenosaura bakeri*) is listed as Critically Endangered by the IUCN Red List (Maryon et al., 2018).

Motagua Spiny-tailed Iguana (*Ctenosaura palearis*) is listed as Endangered by the IUCN Red List (Ariano-Sánchez and Pasachnik, 2011).

Balsas Spiny-tailed Iguana (*Ctenosaura clarki*) is listed as Vulnerable by the IUCN Red List (Köhler, 2004).

Black-chested Spiny-tailed Iguana (*Ctenosaura melanosterna*) is listed as Endangered by the IUCN Red List (Pasachnik et al. 2012).

Roatán Spiny-tailed Iguana (*Ctenosaura oedirhina*) is listed as Endangered by the IUCN Red List (Pasachnik et al. 2015).

Yellow-backed Spiny-tailed Iguana (*Ctenosaura flavidorsalis*) is listed as Endangered by the IUCN Red List (Köhler, 2004).

Oaxaca Spiny-tailed Iguana (*Ctenosaura oaxacana*) is listed as Critically Endangered by the IUCN Red List (Köhler, 2004).

Five-keeled Spiny-tailed Iguana (*Ctenosaura quinquecariniata*) is listed as Endangered by the IUCN Red List (Köhler, 2004).

Yucatán Spiny-tailed Iguana (*Ctenosaura defensor*) is listed as Vulnerable by the IUCN Red List (Köhler, 2004).

Campeche Spiny-tailed Iguana (*Ctenosaura alfredschmidti*) is listed as Near Threatened by the IUCN Red List (Köhler, 2004).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

*C. bakeri* is locally hunted and traded as food, including eggs. Of concern is the targeting of gravid females for food consumption. Hunting was banned by government of Honduras in 1993, but not well enforced. This population is in decline (Maryon et al., 2012).

*Ctenosaura palearis* is intensively hunted and also illegally traded outside of Guatemala. Over-hunting/harvest has caused some populations to go extinct (Ariano-Sánchez and Pasachnik, 2011). *C. melanosterna* is illegally traded. Many of the species experience local hunting.

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

*C. nolasensis* has experienced severe weather and climate change resulting in habitat shifts, drought, extreme temperature, and hurricanes. Eggs and hatchlings are particularly susceptible to high temperatures. The island of San Pedro Nolasco also harbours alien rats, which likely have an adverse effect on rats. Sometimes in pet trade, has a very restricted range (Reynoso and Pasachnik, 2012).

*C. bakeri* has a highly restricted distribution, limited to an island of area 41 km<sup>2</sup>.  
*C. oedirhina* is hunted for food and the pet trade, which is having a significant effect on the populations (Pasachnik et al., 2015).

### **5.Recommendations**

Det foreligger ikke noe dokument for dette listeforslaget og vurderingen er derfor utelukkende basert på IUCN vurderinger (som i mange tilfeller trenger en oppdatering). Iguanartene i slekten *Ctenosaura* finnes i områder der det har vært betydelig habitatødeleggelse og fragmentering. Noen av artene er bare å finne på små øyer og disse er spesielt sårbare for høsting og endringer i habitatkvalitet (for eksempel som følge av global oppvarming). Lokal høsting har hatt en signifikant negativ innvirkning på mange bestander. Handel forekommer, men det er vanskelig å finne dokumentasjon og dermed kunne konkludere angående hvor stor ødeleggelse handelen kan påføre disse artene.

### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

- Ariano-Sánchez, D., Pasachnik, S. 2011. *Ctenosaura palearis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2011: e.T44192A10860487. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2011-1.RLTS.T44192A10860487.en>.
- Köhler, G. 2004. *Ctenosaura clarki*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2004: e.T44194A10861033. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T44194A10861033.en>.
- Köhler, G. 2004. *Ctenosaura flavidorsalis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2004: e.T44188A10858777. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T44188A10858777.en>.
- Maryon, D., Ardon, D., Martinez, A., Clayson, S., Pasachnik, S.A. 2018. *Ctenosaura bakeri*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018: e.T44181A125203850. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-1.RLTS.T44181A125203850.en>.
- Pasachnik, S., Montgomery, C.E., Henningheim, E. 2012. *Ctenosaura melanosterna*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2012: e.T44189A14857036. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2012-1.RLTS.T44189A14857036.en>.
- Pasachnik, S., Ariano-Sánchez, D., Burgess, J., Montgomery, C.E., Köhler, G. 2015. *Ctenosaura oedirhina*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2015: e.T44191A73610844. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2015-1.RLTS.T44191A73610844.en>.
- Reynoso, V.H. and Pasachnik, S. 2012. *Ctenosaura nolascensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2012: e.T174477A1414514. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2012-1.RLTS.T174477A1414514.en>.
- Stephen, C., Pasaschnich, S., Reuter, A., Mosig, P., Ruyle, L., Fitzgerald. Date unknown. Survey of status, trade and exploitation of Central American Iguanas.
- Köhler, G. 2004. *Ctenosaura oaxacana*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2004: e.T44190A10859692. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T44190A10859692.en>.
- Köhler, G. 2004. *Ctenosaura quinquecarinata*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2004: e.T44193A10860862. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T44193A10860862.en>.
- Köhler, G. 2004. *Ctenosaura defensor*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2004: e.T44182A10857610. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T44182A10857610.en>.

Köhler, G. 2004. *Ctenosaura alfredschmidti*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2004: e.T44180A10856950.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T44180A10856950.en>.  
Uetz, P., Freed, P., Hošek, J. (eds.), 2019. The Reptile Database, <http://www.reptile-database.org>, accessed [11 March 2019].

CoP18 Prop. 33

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Vietnam proposes to transfer *Cuora bourreti* from Appendix II to Appendix I, in accordance with Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev.CoP17), Annex 1, criteria A v) (intrinsic vulnerability) and C i) (past and ongoing severe decline due to exploitation).

**Species name:** *Cuora bourreti*, Obst and Reimann, 1994. Common name: Bourret's Box Turtle. Scientific synonyms: *Cuora galbinifrons bourreti*, Obst and Reimann, 1994; *Cistoclemmys galbinifrons bourreti* (Obst and Reimann, 1994); *Cistoclemmys bourreti* (Obst and Reimann, 1994). *C. bourreti* was traditionally considered a subspecies of *Cuora galbinifrons* however, more recent research has treated *bourreti* as a full species, including the nomenclature standard reference for the *Cuora galbinifrons* group adopted at CoP17, (Spinks et al., 2012 cited in CITES, 2019), which recognizes *Cuora bourreti* as full valid species for CITES purposes.

**Distribution:** *C. bourreti* occurs in the hill forests of central Viet Nam and in adjoining the Savannakhet Province of Lao PDR (McCormack and Stuart, 2016).

**Population trend:** Decreasing, according to the IUCN (McCormack and Stuart, 2016). No population size data are available for this species, but encounter rates during a survey in Lao were very low (1 turtle observation per 3 months; Stuart and Timmins, 2000 cited in McCormack and Stuart, 2016) and interviews of local people from throughout the species range indicate very low densities of *C. bourreti* (McCormack and Stuart, 2016).

**Habitat status:** Declining. *C. bourreti* inhabits upland, moist, closed-canopy evergreen forest, usually between 300 and 700 m altitude (McCormack and Stuart, 2016 and references herein). Forest habitat in which this species is dependent on is in decline, both in regard to quality and range (CITES, 2019).

### **Describe known/suspected level of trade:**

Searching for *C. bourreti* in the CITES Trade Database for the years between 2010 and 2018 resulted in no records at all. However, searching for *C. galbinifrons* between years 1999 and 2013 resulted in 3372 exporter reported live animals reported to be captive bred and traded for commercial purposes (purpose code T) (CITES Trade Database, CITES, 2019). The CITES trade database does not specify subspecies so it is not possible to indicate how many of these specimens were actually *C. bourreti*. The species appears to be very common in Asian markets, and in numbers that are significantly higher than what

is reported to the CITES Trade Database (McCormack and Stuart, 2016 and references therein).

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

The species is listed as Critically Endangered A2bd+4bd, ver. 3.1 on the Red List of Threatened species (McCormack and Stuart, 2016). The reason for this listing is that trade collapse and field surveys indicate the species to be rare, with an estimated population collapse of over 90% over the past 60 years. The decline is predicted to continue (McCormack and Stuart, 2016). Population decline is caused by intensive exploitation for the pet/farming/aquaculture trade (McCormack and Stuart, 2016). It is further important to note that the species has been listed as Critically Endangered since 2000, but for the previous Red List assessments, *C. bourreti* was included as a sub species of *Cuora galbinifrons*. *C. bourreti* has been included in the list of 25 species of tortoises and freshwater turtles at highest risk of extinction since 2011 (Turtle Conservation Coalition, 2011, 2018; CITES, 2019). *C. bourreti* was first listed in CITES Appendix II as a subspecies of *C. galbinifrons* at CoP11 (in 2000). A zero quota commercial trade for wild-caught individuals was adopted at CoP16 (in 2013). At CoP17, *C. bourreti* was recognised as a full separate species and this was adopted as a part of the revision of Res. Conf. 12.11 (<https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/document/E-Res-12-11-R17.pdf>). The species has been listed on Annex B of the EU Trade Wildlife Trade Regulations since 2000, again, first as a subspecies of *C. galbinifrons* and finally as *C. bourreti* (Species+).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

The species is kept in modest numbers in captivity and is considered difficult to breed (CITES, 2019). In a survey of trade in Hong Kong markets alone between 2000 and 2003, Cheung and Dugdeon (2006) recoded over 15,000 *C. galbinifrons* (including *C. bourreti*), which is significantly lower than the 905 specimens reported as exported in the CITES database for the same time period (Cheung and Dugdeon, 2006, cited in McCormack and Stuart, 2016; CITES Trade Database). This discrepancy suggests significant illegal trade levels. Commercial turtle farms in East Asia are considered the primary purchasers of wild-collected turtles, and contribute to the decline of the species rather than facilitating its recovery (CITES, 2019).

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

*C. bourreti* is a slow growing species with low fecundity (CITES, 2019).

*Cuora bourreti* is legally protected from exploitation in both range countries Lao PDR and Viet Nam, but enforcement may be insufficient (CITES, 2019). *C. galbinifrons* (including subspecies *C. picturata* and *C.bourreti*) was selected for Review of Significant Trade soon after its inclusion in CITES Appendix II at CoP11 (2000), resulting in suspension of trade from Lao and Vietnam in 2009. The suspension was later withdrawn as there was no commercial trade in this species from any of the two countries (CITES, 2017; 2018). A proposal to list *C. galbinifrons* (including subspecies *C. picturata* and *C.bourreti*) on Appendix I was submitted to CoP16 (CITES, 2013a) but was defeated by proposal 32 which placed a zero quota on trade in *C. galbinifrons* (CITES, 2013b)

At CoP16, *C. galbinifrons* was selected for Periodic Review of the Appendices and the Animals Committee agreed with the recommendation in the Periodic Review Document to transfer *C. galbinifrons* (including subspecies *C. picturata* and *C. bourreti*) to Appendix I (CITES, 2015, 2016).

### 5.Recommendations

*C. bourreti* er en kritisk truet skilpaddeart som vokser sakte og har lavt reproduksjonspotensiale, samtidig som den er under stort press fra internasjonal handel, både lovlig og ulovlig. Basert på disse faktorene virker en opplisting til Appendix I å være i tråd med Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) kriterium A v) (iboende sårbarhet) and C i) (Sterk og kontinuerlig nedgang som følge av overhøsting). All handel vil kunne være ødeleggende for denne artens videre overlevelse.

### 6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)

Cheung, S.M. and Dudgeon, D. (2006) Quantifying the Asian turtle crisis: market surveys in southern China, 2000-2003. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 16: 751-770.

McCormack, T. and Stuart, B. 2016. *Cuora bourreti*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T163447A115303472. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-1.RLTS.T163447A1009344.en>

CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 33 (*Cuora bourreti*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Cuora-bourreti.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Cuora-bourreti.pdf)

CITES, 2018. SC70 Doc.29.2. Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/70/E-SC70-29-02.pdf>

CITES, 2017, SC62 Doc. 27.2 Available online at: <https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/62/E62-27-02.pdf>

CITES, 2013a. CoP16, Proposal 33 (*C. galbinifrons*). Available online at: <https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/16/prop/E-CoP16-Prop-33.pdf>

CITES, 2013b. CoP16, Proposal 32. Available online at: <https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/16/prop/E-CoP16-Prop-32.pdf>

CITES, 2015: AC28 Sum 2 (Rev.1). Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/28/ExSum/E-AC28-ExSum-02-Rev.1.pdf>

CITES, 2016. CoP17 Doc.73. Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/WorkingDocs/E-CoP17-73.pdf>

Spinks, P.Q., Thomson, R.C., Zhang, Y.P., Che, J., Wu, Y., Shaffer, H.B. (2012) Species boundaries and phylogenetic relationships in the critically endangered Asian box turtle genus *Cuora*. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 63: 656–667. doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2012.02.014

Turtle Conservation Coalition (2011). *Turtles in Trouble: The World's 25+ Most Endangered Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles—2010*. Lunenburg, MA: IUCN/SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group, Turtle Conservation Fund, Turtle Survival Alliance, Turtle Conservancy, Chelonian Research Foundation, Conservation International, Wildlife Conservation Society, and San Diego Global Zoo.



Turtle Conservation Coalition (2018). Turtles in Trouble: The World's 25+ Most Endangered Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles — 2018. [Stanford, C.B., Rhodin, A.G.J., van Dijk, P.P., Horne, B.D., Blanck, T., Goode, E.V., Hudson, R., Mittermeier, R.A., Currylow, A., Eisemberg, C., Frankel, M., Georges, A., Gibbons, P.M., Juvik, J.O., Kuchling, G., Luiselli, L., Shi, H., Singh, S., and Walde, A. (Eds.)]. Ojai, CA: IUCN SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group, Turtle Conservancy, Turtle Survival Alliance, Turtle Conservation Fund, Chelonian Research Foundation, Conservation International, Wildlife Conservation Society, and Global Wildlife Conservation, 80 pp.

CoP18 Prop.34

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Vietnam proposes to transfer of *Cuora picturata* from Appendix II to Appendix I, in accordance with Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), under criteria A i) and A v) (small population in decline, intrinsic vulnerability), B iii) and B iv) (restricted area of distribution, declining population, intrinsic vulnerability) and C i) (past and ongoing severe decline due to exploitation) in Annex 1.

**Species name:** *Cuora picturata* Lehr, Fritz and Obst, 1998. Common name: Southern Vietnam Box Turtle. Together with *C. bourreti*, the species was originally described and recognized as a subspecies of *Cuora galbinifrons* (e.g., Fritz and Havas, 2007, cited in CITES, 2019), but recent taxonomic studies have treated it as a full species, *Cuora picturata* (CITES, 2019 and references herein).

**Distribution:** The species is endemic to Viet Nam. *C. picturata* inhabits rain forests at elevations between 300 and 600 m, on the Lan Bian Plateau in southern central Vietnam (McCormack et al., 2016).

**Population trend:** Decreasing according to the IUCN (McCormack et al., 2016). While the number of individuals of this species remains unknown (estimated to be between 3,000 and 10,000 individuals at best), various surveys (including with trained survey dogs) revealed very low densities of turtles (McCormack et al., 2016 and references herein).

**Habitat status:** Difficult to say for certain, as the only literature with any habitat details are based on the locations of nine animals in three surveyed localities (Ly *et al.*, 2011; Blanck *et al.*, 2016, cited in McCormack et al., 2016). However, forest in these locations are being destroyed by logging and conversion into farmland (Turtle Conservation Coalition, 2018).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** The primary threat to *C. picturata* is collection for trade. The species is in high demand in the international pet trade and previously in the Asian consumption trade (CITES, 2019).

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*C. picturata* is listed as Critically Endangered A2bd+4bd, ver. 3.1 on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, as it has a restricted occurrence and is intensively collected for human consumption, pet and farming/aquaculture trades (McCormack et al., 2016). The species has been listed as Critically Endangered since 2000, as a subspecies of *C. galbinifrons*. *C. picturata* has been included in the list of 50 species of tortoises and freshwater turtles at highest risk of extinction since 2011 (Turtle Conservation Coalition, 2011, 2018; CITES, 2019). *C. picturata* was first listed in CITES Appendix II as a subspecies of *C. galbinifrons* at CoP11 (in 2000). A zero quota commercial trade for wild-caught individuals was adopted at CoP16 (in 2013). At CoP17, *C. bourreti* was recognised as full separate species and this was adopted as a part of the revision of Res. Conf 12.11 (<https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/document/E-Res-12-11-R17.pdf>) (Species+). The species has been listed on Annex B of the EU Trade Wildlife Trade Regulations since 2000, again, first as a subspecies of *C. galbinifrons* and finally as *C. bourreti* (Species+).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

Given that the species previously was considered a sub-species of *Cuora galbinifrons* (until 2013), and subsequently a zero quota for wild-caught specimens traded for commercial purposes was adopted there are no records in the CITES trade database on international trade in *C. picturata*). However, searching for *C. galbinifrons* between years 1999 and 2013 resulted in 3372 exporter reported live animals reported to be captive bred and traded for commercial purposes (purpose code T) (Species+, CITES, 2019). The CITES trade database does not specify subspecies so it is not possible to indicate how many of these specimens were actually *C. picturata*. *C. picturata* is maintained in small numbers in captivity by hobbyists and institutions in Asia, Europe, North America and elsewhere, but is regarded as difficult, sensitive species to breed in captivity (Struijk, 2010 in CITES 2019). As for with *C.bouretti*, there is a concern that the East Asian turtle farms are creating a specific demand for *C. picturata* collected from the wild (Shi et al., 2007 in CITES, 2019). *C. galbinifrons* specimen are commonly registered in illegal seizures of turtles in China, Viet Nam and Hong Kong, however, due to difficulties separating the two species, as well as the only recent taxonomic split, it is unclear if there were specimens of *C. picturata* among the seized turtles (CITES, 2019).

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

*C. picturata* is protected from commercial exploitation under local legislation in Viet Nam, however there is no management or population-monitoring program in place for *C. picturata* (CITES, 2019). *C. galbinifrons* (including subspecies *C. picturata* and *C.bouretti*) was selected for Review of Significant Trade soon after its inclusion in CITES Appendix II at CoP11 (2000), resulting in suspension of trade from Lao and Vietnam in 2009. The suspension was later withdrawn as there was no commercial trade in this species from any of the two countries (CITES, 2017; 2018).

A proposal to list *C. galbinifrons* (including subspecies *C. picturata* and *C. bourreti*) on Appendix I was submitted to CoP16 (CITES, 2013a) but was defeated by proposal 32 which placed a zero quota on trade in *C. galbinifrons* (CITES, 2013b)

At CoP16, *C. galbinifrons* was selected for Periodic Review of the Appendices and the Animals Committee agreed with the recommendation in the Periodic Review Document to transfer *C. galbinifrons* (including subspecies *C. picturata* and *C. bourreti*) to Appendix I (CITES, 2015, 2016).

## **5.Recommendations**

*C. picturata* er en kristisk truet art som vokser sakte og med begrenset reproduksjonspotensiale, samtidig som den er under stort press fra internasjonal handel. Nedgangen i populasjonen skyldes hovedsakelig overhøsting. Basert på disse faktorene vil den foreslåtte opplistingen til Appendix I være i tråd med Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). All handel vil kunne være ødeleggende for denne artens videre overlevelse.

## **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Blanck, T., Braun, S. McCormack, T., Ha, H.V., Thang, N.T., Luc, N.V. and Le, M. 2016 in press. Auf der Suche nach der scheuen Schönheit und den Höhlenschildkröten. Marginata 47.

CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 34 (*Cuora picturata*). Available online at:

[https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Cuora-picturata.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Cuora-picturata.pdf)

CITES, 2018: SC70 Doc.29.2. Available online at:

<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/70/E-SC70-29-02.pdf>

CITES, 2017: SC62 Doc. 27.2 Available online at:

<https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/62/E62-27-02.pdf>

CITES, 2013a. *C. galbinifrons*, CoP16, Proposal 33. Available online at:

<https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/16/prop/E-CoP16-Prop-33.pdf>

CITES, 2013b. CoP16, Proposal 32. Available online at:

<https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/16/prop/E-CoP16-Prop-32.pdf>

CITES, 2015: AC28 Sum 2 (Rev.1). Available online at:

<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/28/ExSum/E-AC28-ExSum-02-Rev.1.pdf>

CITES, 2016. CoP17 Doc.73. Available online at:

<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/WorkingDocs/E-CoP17-73.pdf>

Fritz, U., Havaš, P. (2007) Checklist of Chelonians of the World. Vertebrate Zoology 57 (2): 149-368.

Ly, T., Hoang, H.D., Stuart, B.L. (2011) Market turtle mystery solved in Vietnam. Biological Conservation 144: 1767-1771.

McCormack, T., Stuart, B. and Blanck, T. 2016. *Cuora picturata* (errata version published in 2017). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T163463A115303820.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-1.RLTS.T163463A1010522.en>.

Turtle Conservation Coalition (2011). Turtles in Trouble: The World's 25+ Most Endangered Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles—2010. Lunenburg, MA: IUCN/SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group, Turtle Conservation Fund, Turtle Survival Alliance,

Turtle Conservancy, Chelonian Research Foundation, Conservation International, Wildlife Conservation Society, and San Diego Global Zoo.

Turtle Conservation Coalition (2018). Turtles in Trouble: The World's 25+ Most Endangered Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles 2018. [Stanford, C.B., Rhodin, A.G.J., van Dijk, P.P., Horne, B.D., Blanck, T., Goode, E.V., Hudson, R., Mittermeier, R.A., Currylow, A., Eisemberg, C., Frankel, M., Georges, A., Gibbons, P.M., Juvik, J.O., Kuchling, G., Luiselli, L., Shi, H., Singh, S., and Walde, A. (Eds.)]. Ojai, CA: IUCN SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group, Turtle Conservancy, Turtle Survival Alliance, Turtle Conservation Fund, Chelonian Research Foundation

CoP18 Prop. 52

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

#### **This is a proposal for an annotation amendment and is independent from a species status assessment**

The EU and Canada propose to amend CITES Appendix Interpretation annotation #15 to Leguminosae, applying specifically to all *Dalbergia* species (except *Dalbergia nigra*, which is listed in Appendix I) and three *Guibourtia* species. The amendment concerns parts and derivatives exempted from the CITES Appendix II listing. The purpose of the present proposal is to facilitate interpretation of the annotation. The current annotation, adopted at CoP17 and in force from 2 January 2017, is as follows: "All parts and derivatives are included, except: a) Leaves, flowers, pollen, fruits, and seeds; b) Non-commercial exports of a maximum total weight of 10 kg per shipment; c) Parts and derivatives of *Dalbergia cochinchinensis*, which are covered by Annotation # 4; d) Parts and derivatives of *Dalbergia* spp. originating and exported from Mexico, which are covered by Annotation # 6." The amended text would be: "All parts and derivatives, except: a) Leaves, flowers, pollen, fruits, and seeds; b) Finished products to a maximum weight of wood of the listed species of 500g per item; c) Finished musical instruments, finished musical instrument parts and finished musical instrument accessories; d) Parts and derivatives of *Dalbergia cochinchinensis*, which are covered by Annotation #4; e) Parts and derivatives of *Dalbergia* spp. originating and exported from Mexico, which are covered by Annotation #6." Removal of the words "are included" removes redundancy and gives consistency with other annotations. Rephrasing of paragraph b resolves the issue of determination of whether material is commercial or non-commercial, and the determination of what defines a shipment. The rephrased paragraph b refers to finished products and caps the weight per item to 500 grams, which make it practical to assess for management and enforcement. The added paragraph c adds an exemption for musical instruments, parts and accessories, and this paragraph is intended to address the consensus view that the regulation of these items imparts little conservation value while increasing greatly the permit and compliance burdens.

**Species name:** All *Dalbergia* L.f. (1782) species, except *Dalbergia nigra* (Vell.) Benth. which is Appendix I listed, as well as three *Guibourtia* J.J.Bennett (1857) species

(*Guibourtia demeusei* (Harms) J. Leonard, *Guibourtia pellegriniana* Leonard and *Guibourtia tessmannii* (Harms) J. Leonard). Common name: Rosewood. Norsk navn: rosentre, palisander.

For information about distribution, population trends, habitat status, and trade see CoP17 Prop. 55 (CITES, 2016a), CoP17 Prop. 56 (CITES, 2016b), CoP17 Prop. 53 (CITES, 2016c) and CoP17 Prop. 54 (CITES, 2016d).

## **2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

For information about biological status and conservation status, see CoP17 Prop. 55 (CITES, 2016a), CoP17 Prop. 56 (CITES, 2016b), CoP17 Prop. 53 (CITES, 2016c) and CoP17 Prop. 54 (CITES, 2016d).

## **3. Evaluation of trade data**

The CITES Appendix II listing with current annotation was adopted at the CoP17 and came into force on 2 January 2017. The CITES Trade Database (CITES Trade Database 2019) has 4672 records for *Dalbergia* and 660 for *Guibourtia* since 2017.

## **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states**

Not relevant, but cf. see CoP17 Prop. 55 (CITES, 2016a), CoP17 Prop. 56 (CITES, 2016b), CoP17 Prop. 53 (CITES, 2016c) and CoP17 Prop. 54 (CITES, 2016d).

## **5. Recommendations**

Den foreslåtte endringen av annotasjon #15 vil være oppklarende for CITES-listingen av *Dalbergia* ved at man unngår å skille mellom kommersiell og ikke-kommersiell eksport. Vekten på forsendelser unntatt plikt om tillatleser er redusert fra 10 kg til 500 g. Det gjøres et unntak for alle musikkinstrumenter, deler og tilbehør til disse. Dette vil forenkle arbeidet for forvaltningen, uten å ha betydelig effekt på bevaring av artene.

## **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES, 2016a. CoP17 Prop. 55. Include the genus *Dalbergia* in CITES Appendix II with exception to the species included in Appendix I. Available online at:  
<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/prop/060216/E-CoP17-Prop-55.pdf>  
CITES, 2016b. CoP17 Prop. 56. Include *Guibourtia tessmannii*, *Guibourtia pellegriniana* and *Guibourtia demeusei* in Appendix II. Available online at:  
<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/prop/060216/E-CoP17-Prop-56.pdf>  
CITES, 2016c. CoP17 Prop. 53. Amend the annotation to the listings of *Dalbergia cochinchinensis*. Available online at:  
<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/prop/060216/E-CoP17-Prop-53.pdf>  
CITES, 2016d. CoP17 Prop. 54. Include 13 timber species of genus *Dalbergia* (native to Mexico and Central America) in Appendix II. Available online at:  
<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/prop/060216/E-CoP17-Prop-54.pdf>  
CITES Trade Database (2019). Assessed March 6, 2019. Available online at:  
<https://trade.cites.org/>

CoP18 Prop. 51

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

India, with co-proponents Bhutan, Bangladesh and Nepal, proposes delisting of *Dalbergia sissoo*, from CITES Appendix II, by arguing that the regulation of trade in the species is not necessary to avoid it becoming eligible for inclusion in Appendix I in the near future and the harvest of specimens from the wild is not reducing the wild population to a level at which its survival might be threatened. *D. sissoo* is one of the most useful timber species of India, and primarily used in the making of handicraft items, furniture, veneer, plywood, and several other tools and artifices. The leaves of *D. sissoo* are used as medicine, fodder, whereas the wood is also used as fuel wood, especially in villages of India.

**Species name:** *Dalbergia sissoo* (Roxb. ex DC.) Common name: Indian rosewood, Himalaya raintree, Indian Dalbergia, Penny leaf tree, Sisso. Synonyms: *Amerimnon sissoo* (Roxb. ex DC.) Kuntze

**Distribution:** *Dalbergia sissoo* is a fast-growing, hardy deciduous rosewood tree native to the Indian Subcontinent and Southern Iran. The species is native to Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, South Africa and also widely introduced especially in Africa and Asia but also in the United States of America, and Virgin Islands of the USA.

**Population trend:** The population is expanding on the sub-Indian continent. The species has very fast growth rate and capacity to become naturalized outside of its native range, it is even invasive in some parts of the world.

**Habitat status:** *D. sissoo* is adapted to a wide range of ecological habitats. The species naturally grows in porous soils containing sand, pebbles and boulders and found gregariously in riverbeds on alluvial soil, shingle boulders, along water channels occupying 500–900 m elevation belt but exceptionally ascending to 1500 m with 4–45°C mean annual temperature, 500–4500 mm mean annual rainfall. The habitat is not diminishing.

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** *D. sissoo* is one of the most widely utilised plantation tree species on the Indian subcontinent (Hossain and Martin, 2013). The impacts of both harvest and trade are low as harvest and trade do not pose threats to the existing wild population of *D. sissoo* in India. Due to its extensive availability on cultivation/ plantation, the illegal trade of the species from its wild population is rarely reported at present. The Government of India has banned the export for commercial purposes of all wild-taken specimens of species included in Appendices I, II and III, except cultivated varieties of plant species included in Appendices I and II accompanied by a CITES Comparable Certificate issued by the competent authorities of India. Wood and wood products in the form of logs, timber, stumps, roots, bark, chips, powder, flakes, dust and charcoal produced from wild-sourced *D. sissoo* and *D. latifolia* are not exempt (CITES Notif. No. 2018/031). For further information about distribution, population trends, habitat status, and trade, see CoP17 #15 (Species+).

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

For information about distribution, population trends, habitat status, and trade, see CoP17 #15 (Species+).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

The CITES Appendix II listing with current annotation was adopted at the CoP17 and came into force in January 2017. It is listed in the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations Annex B (2017). The CITES Trade Database has 4672 records for *Dalbergia* spp. since 2017.

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

Not relevant, but cf. see CoP17 #15 (Species+).

## **5.Recommendations**

Den foreslåtte endringen av annotasjon #15 vil være oppklarende for CITES-listingen av *Dalbergia* ved at man unngår å skille mellom kommersiell og ikke-kommersiell eksport. Vekten på forsendelser unntatt plikt om tillatleser er redusert fra 10 kg til 500 g. Det gjøres et unntak for alle musikkinstrumenter, deler og tilbehør til disse. Dette vil forenkle arbeidet for forvaltningen, uten å ha betydelig effekt på bevaring av artene.

## **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 51 (*Dalbergia sissoo*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Dalbergia-sissoo.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Dalbergia-sissoo.pdf)

CoP18 Prop. 20

## **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Transfer of Western rufous bristlebird *Dasyornis broadbenti litoralis* from CITES Appendix I to CITES Appendix II, in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev CoP17) Annex 4 measures A.1, A.2(a)(i), and the provisions regarding extinct species outlined in Annex 4D, is proposed by Australia.

**Species name:** *Dasyornis broadbenti* subsp. *litoralis* (Milligan, 1902). English name: Western rufous bristlebird, Norwegian name: not available.

**Distribution:** Coastal SW Western Australia

**Population trend:** Presumed extinct; last recorded in 1906–1908, not long after its initial discovery, with unconfirmed reports in 1940, 1977 and 1980 (Gregory, 2019). Appears in four occurrence datasets, all related to museum collections (GBIF, 2017).

**Habitat status:** *Dasyornis broadbenti litoralis* was restricted to a narrow strip of densely vegetated rounded sandhill habitat extending c. 75 km between Cape Naturaliste and Cape Leeuwin, in extreme SW Western Australia (Gregory, 2019).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:**

According to the proponent, no trade is recorded in the CITES Trade Database, and there is no known incidence of illegal trade in *D. longirostris*. This information from the proponent is supported by independent database and internet searches carried out in connection with this assessment.

**2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*Dasyornis broadbenti litoralis* has been listed on CITES Appendix I since 1975, and is listed in Appendix A in the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations.

The main species *Dasyornis broadbenti* (English: Rufous bristlebird, Norwegian: Sørbørstefugl) is categorized as LC (Least Concern), with a decreasing population trend (Birdlife International, 2016). The species is endemic to Australia and occurs in scrub, heathland and forest, and the populations are suspected to be in decline owing to habitat loss and degradation, disturbance, fires and drought. Two current subspecies: *D. b. broadbenti* and *D. b. caryochrous*, the latter listed in Australia as "Vulnerable".

**3.Evaluation of trade data**

No trade was recorded in the CITES Trade Database in a search in the <https://trade.cites.org/> database carried out 2019/03/09 for the period 1975-2018, neither for *Dasyornis broadbenti litoralis* or for main species *Dasyornis broadbenti*. Furthermore, no indication of illegal trade were found in independent searches carried out in connection with this assessment. See also comments above "known/suspected levels of trade".

**4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

See above

**5.Recommendations**

Populasjonene av *Dasyornis broadbenti litoralis* er antatt å være utdødd, og handel er dermed ikke en faktor som virker inn på populasjonsstørrelsen. Populasjonene av *D. b. broadbenti* and *D. b. caryochrous* er i nedgang, men handel er ikke en faktor som virker inn på populasjonsstørrelsen for disse underartene. Handel vil derfor sannsynligvis ikke påvirke populasjonen dersom *D. b. litoralis* blir gjenoppdaget.

**6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

BirdLife International, 2016. *Dasyornis broadbenti*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T22704510A93973139. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-3.RLTS.T22704510A93973139.en>. Downloaded on 10 March 2019.

GBIF Secretariat, 2017. *Dasyornis broadbenti* subsp. *litoralis* (Milligan, 1902). GBIF Backbone Taxonomy. Checklist dataset <https://doi.org/10.15468/39omei> accessed via GBIF.org on 2019-03-10.

Gregory, P. (2019) Rufous Bristlebird (*Dasyornis broadbenti*). In: del Hoyo et al., editors, Handbook of the Birds of the World Alive. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona. (retrieved from <https://www.hbw.com/node/62334> on 10 March 2019).



### 1. Review of listing proposal under CITES

Transfer of Western bristlebird *Dasyornis longirostris* from CITES Appendix I to CITES Appendix II, in accordance with provisions of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev CoP17), Annex 4 precautionary measures A1 and A2a(i), is proposed by Australia.

**Species name:** *Dasyornis longirostris*, Gould, 1841. English name: Western bristlebird, Norwegian name: Vestbørstefugl.

**Distribution:** Endemic to Western Australia. Coastal SW Australia between Two Peoples Bay and Waychinicup, and in Fitzgerald River National Park. Small translocated population near Walpole (W of Albany) may now be extinct (Gregory, 2019).

**Population trend:** Categorized as decreasing by the IUCN (BirdLife International, 2018).

**Habitat status:** Fragmented. The species is terrestrial and sedentary with a preference for dense, closed coastal heathland (Gregory, 2019). This species has a very small range, and a small population which is undergoing a decline, owing mainly to the effects of wildfires. Large lightning-induced fires in 2005 and 2006 severely reduced the population, and ongoing habitat degradation from fires is likely (BirdLife International, 2016).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** According to the proponent, no trade is recorded in the CITES Trade Database and the species is not traded domestically, and there is no known incidence of illegal trade in *D. longirostris*. Illegal trade is not considered to have been a factor in the decline of this species. This information from the proponent is supported by independent database and internet searches carried out in connection with this assessment.

### 2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions

*D. longirostris* is categorized as Endangered (EN) on the IUCN Red List (Birdlife International, 2016), and has been listed on CITES Appendix I since 1975. The species is listed in Appendix A in the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations. *D. longirostris* is particularly vulnerable to habitat destruction and alteration. Wildfire is the principal threat, particularly large-scale wildfires, the incidence and extent of which have been increasing in recent years, despite increased skills, capacity and effort to stop them (Birdlife International, 2016; Gregory, 2019 and references therein).

### 3. Evaluation of trade data

No trade was recorded in the CITES Trade Database in a search carried out 2019/03/09 in the <https://trade.cites.org/> database for the period 1975-2018. Furthermore, no indication of illegal trade were found in independent searches carried out in connection with this assessment. See also comments above "known/suspected levels of trade".

### 4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.

See above

### 5. Recommendations

Populasjonene av *D. longirostris* er sterkt truet og i nedgang, men handel er ikke en faktor som virker inn på populasjonsstørrelsen.

#### **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

BirdLife International, 2016. *Dasyornis longirostris*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T22704502A93972474. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-3.RLTS.T22704502A93972474.en>. Downloaded on 09 March 2019.

Gregory, P. (2019) Western Bristlebird (*Dasyornis longirostris*). In: del Hoyo, J. et al, editors, Handbook of the Birds of the World Alive. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona. (retrieved from <https://www.hbw.com/node/62333> on 9 March 2019).

CoP18 Prop. 39

#### **1. Review of listing proposal under CITES**

China proposes to include two newt species, *Echinotriton chinhaiensis* and *Echinotriton maxiquadratus*, in Appendix II. The proponent claims this to be in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a) and satisfying Criterion B in Annex 2a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) implying that the regulation of trade is necessary to ensure the survival of these species.

**Species name:** Scientific name: *Echinotriton chinhaiensis* (Chang, 1932). Common names: Chinese Spiny Newts, Chinhai spiny crocodile newt, and Scientific name: *Echinotriton maxiquadratus* Hou, Wu, Yang, Zheng, Yuan, and Li, 2014. Common name: Mountain spiny crocodile newts.

**Distribution:** The two species of newts are found in low hills in coastal areas and subalpine regions in the east and southeast mainland China. The locality of the newly discovered *E. maxiquadratus* has remained undisclosed for the protection of the species (CITES, 2019).

**Population trend:** *E. chinhaiensis*, decreasing (IUCN, 2004). According to the proponent *E. chinhaiensis* and *E. maxiquadratus* are the most endangered amphibians in China (CITES, 2019).

**Habitat status:** Both species are found in densely populated areas where they are threatened by habitat loss (CITES, 2019; AmphibiaWeb, 2019)

#### **Describe known/suspected level of trade:**

No legal trade exists (CITES, 2019). However, over-collection of individuals has been identified as a potential threat for both *E. chinhaiensis* (IUCN, 2004) and *E. maxiquadratus* (Hou et al., 2014).

#### **2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*E. chinhaiensis* has been assessed as Critically Endangered at the IUCN Red List (2004). *E. maxiquadratus*' recommended status is Critically Endangered (AmphibiaWeb, 2019).

### 3.Evaluation of trade data

According to the proponent there is a marked for *E. chinhaiensis* in the USA and EU and a few records of illegal trade exists (CITES, 2019).

### 4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.

*E. chinhaiensis* has been listed as the second class in the List of Wildlife under Special State Protection since 1989.

### 5.Recommendations

Begge disse salamanderartene er endemiske til Kina og har små utbredelsesområder. *E. chinhaiensis* er vurdert til Kritisk truet av IUCN (2004). *E. maxiquadratus* som først ble beskrevet i 2014 er foreslått som Kritisk truet av amfibiespesialister (AmphibiaWeb. 2019). Søkeren hevder at artene kvalifiserer for listing i CITES Appendix II og at handel kan utgjøre en trussel mot deres overlevelse hvis den ikke reguleres. Disse artene oppfyller allerede kravene til listing i CITES Appendix I i følge kriteriene som er beskrevet I Anneks 1 av Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Handel kan true overlevelsen av disse artene.

### 6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)

AmphibiaWeb. 2019. < <https://amphibiaweb.org/species/8273> > University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA. Accessed 6 Mar 2019.

Hou, M., Wu, Y., Yang, K., Zheng, S., Yuan, Z., Li, P. (2014). "A missing geographic link in the distribution of the genus *Echinotriton* (Caudata: Salamandridae) with description of a new species from southern China." Zootaxa 3895: 89-102.

Xie Feng, Gu Huiqing 2004. *Echinotriton chinhaiensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2004: e.T59447A11942842.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T59447A11942842.en>.

CoP18 Prop. 28

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

The European Union, India, Philippines and the United States of America are proposing to include *Gekko gecko* in Appendix II, in accordance with Article II, Paragraph 2 (a) of the Convention and satisfying Criterion B of Annex 2 a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

**Species name:** There are two subspecies: *Gekko gecko gecko* (Linnaeus, 1758) and *Gekko gecko azhari* Mertens 1955. Common names: Tokay Gecko, Tuctoo, Tokeh-tokeh, Tokeh. There is also evidence that a species complex exists, and additional taxa may be described in the future (e.g. see Kongbuntad et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2014).

Synonyms:

*Lacerta Gecko* LINNAEUS 1758: 205

*Gekko verticillatus* LAURENTI 1768 (fide TAYLOR 1963)

*Gekko teres* LAURENTI 1768

*Lacerta Geko* MÜLLER 1774: 98 (nomen illegitimum)

*Gekko aculeatus* HOUTTUYN 1782 (non *Gekko aculeatus* SPIX 1825)  
*Gekko perlatus* HOUTTUYN 1782  
*Stellio maculatus* SCHNEIDER 1792 (fide RÖSLER et al. 2018)  
*Gekko guttatus* DAUDIN 1802  
*Gekko verus* MERREM 1820: 42  
*Gekko annulatus* KUHL 1820: 132  
*Platydictylus guttatus* — DUMÉRIL and BIBRON 1836: 328  
*Gekko tenuis* [HALLOWELL 1857]  
*Gekko indicus* [GIRARD 1858]  
*Gymnodactylus tenuis* HALLOWELL 1856 — BOULENGER 1885: 22  
*Gekko guttatus* — STOLICZKA 1870: 160  
*Platydictylus guttatus* — BRÜHL 1886  
*Gekko verticillatus* [sic] — BOULENGER 1885: 183  
*Gekko verticillatus* [sic] — BOULENGER 1894: 82  
*Gekko gekko* — BARBOUR 1912  
*Gekko verticillatus* — DE ROOIJ 1915: 56  
*Gekko gekko* — TAYLOR 1922  
*Gekko gekko* — TAYLOR 1963: 799  
*Gekko gekko* — KLUGE 1993  
*Gekko gekko* — RÖSLER 1995: 120  
*Gekko gekko* — MANTHEY and GROSSMANN 1997: 231  
*Gekko gekko* — COX et al. 1998: 82  
*Gekko gekko* — ZIEGLER 2002: 165  
*Gekko df. gekko* — JESTRZEMSKI et al. 2013  
*Gekko gekko* azhari MERTENS 1955  
*Gekko gekko* azhari — MAHONY et al. 2009

**Distribution:** *G. gekko* is found in Bangladesh (ssp *azhari*); remaining distribution refers to *Gekko gekko gekko*: India (Assam, Mizoram, Tripura, etc.), Nepal, Bhutan, Myanmar (= Burma), Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, Malaysia, S China (incl. Hong Kong, Guangxi, Taiwan), Philippines (Palawan, Calamian Islands, Panay, Luzon, Mindoro, Bohol, Masbate, Cebu, Camiguin Sur, Misamis Oriental, Sibuyan), Indonesia (Borneo, Sumatra, Bali, Java, Sulawesi, Lombok, Flores, Timor, Aru, Komodo), Sulu Archipelago, Timor-Leste. There are multiple introductions: USA (introduced to Florida and Hawaii [fide McKeown]), introduced to Martinique (Caribbean) and Brazil (single report from Santa Catarina).

**Population trend:** TRAFFIC reports declining populations in Indonesia, Thailand, Java and parts of mainland China (Caillabet, 2013). IUCN red list has not assessed this species.

**Habitat status:** Generally does well in human-altered landscapes. Natural habitat is fragmented in areas; generally a widely distributed species.

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Populations from Indonesia, Thailand and Java are being heavily collected for the traditional medicine (TM) trade. To quote a TRAFFIC report "The international trade in Tokay Geckos for TM is colossal." In 2009 it was purported to cure HIV/AIDS in southeast Asia and particularly Malaysia and this drove the trade for a period, but after peaking in 2010/11, it began to decline. Geckos traded for medicinal purposes in Malaysia originate in Thailand, as well as in Lao PDR and Myanmar. In these areas, they are transported overland to Malaysia, after harvest from the wild. Tokay geckos are also reported to be collected from the Philippines. Most dealers in Malaysia are close to the Thai border. The majority of consumers are Singaporeans and Malaysians. It is also in the pet trade in Malaysia, North America and Europe. Using customs import data, TRAFFIC report that since 2004, Taiwan has imported ~15 000 000 Tokay Geckos, of which ca. 71% were imported from Thailand and the balance mostly from Indonesia. TRAFFIC reports that the trade in Thailand is legal but unregulated, the trade in from Java appears to be illegal. There is also very heavy consumption of Tokay geckos for TM in Hong Kong, China and Viet Nam. In 2011, a shipment of 1,200 000 dried geckos destined for Hong Kong and originating in Indonesia, were confiscated. Likewise, there have been many instances of intercepted shipments documented by TRAFFIC (Caillabet, 2013).

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

The species is not currently listed on the IUCN red list and therefore, there are no details of trade in the IUCN database. However, there is a detailed report prepared by TRAFFIC (Caillabet, 2013) that examines the trade in southeast Asia and more specifically, the trade for use in TM. This report documents significant use for traditional medicine.

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

There are no records of the species in the CITES trade database. However, there is data in a report from TRAFFIC (some details above). The TRAFFIC report gives many instances of intercepted shipments of large numbers of geckos that don't need to be repeated here. What is clear, is that large numbers of wild-caught animals are being 'laundered' into shipments of legally bred captive animals. The captive breeding program does not give good financial returns and the numbers of animals that are being reported as having been captive bred are far in excess of what existing facilities are capable of producing.

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

There appears to be a significant amount misinformation with respect to the reporting of captive breeding (i.e. false claims of breeding; Caillabet, 2013). This needs to be better assessed, as does the impact of collecting from wild populations and the resilience of these populations. The supply of captive-bred animals is unlikely to be sufficient to sustain the levels of wild harvest. Population studies of wild populations are needed, particularly in areas of intense collection such as Thailand. More data on habitat requirements are also needed.

## **5.Recommendations**

Gecko gecko er under stort press fra internasjonal handel og dette er årsaken til nedgang i bestandene deler av Bangladesh, Kina, Indonesia og Thailand. Listeforslaget virker derfor i tråd med kriterium B, Anneks 2 a, Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Uregulert handel vil mest sannsynlig kunne være ødeleggende for artens videre overlevelse.

**6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Caillabet, O.S. (2013). The Trade in Tokay Geckos *Gekko gecko* in South-East Asia: with a case study on Novel Medicinal Claims in Peninsular Malaysia. TRAFFIC, Petaling Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia ISBN 978-983-3393-36-7.

Kongbuntad, W., C. Tantrawatpan, W. Pilap, K. Jongsomchai, T. Chanaboon, P. Laotongsan, T.N. Petney, W. Saijuntha. (2016) Genetic diversity of the red-spotted tokay gecko (*Gekko gecko* Linnaeus, 1758) (Squamata: Gekkonidae) in Southeast Asia determined with multilocus enzyme electrophoresis. Journal of Asia-Pacific Biodiversity 9: 63-68, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.japb.2015.11.004>.

Zhang, Y., Chen, C., Li, L., Zhao, C., Chen, W., Huang, Y. (2014) Insights from ecological niche modeling on the taxonomic distinction and niche differentiation between the blackspotted and red-spotted tokay geckoes (*Gekko gecko*). Ecology and Evolution 4(17): 3383–3394.

<http://reptile-database.reptarium.cz/>

### 1. Review of listing proposal under CITES

Bangladesh, India, Senegal and Sri Lanka are proposing that *Geochelone elegans* (Indian Star Tortoise) be transferred from CITES Appendix II to Appendix I in accordance with Article II, paragraph 1, of the Convention. They propose that *Geochelone elegans* meets the biological criteria found in paragraphs C i) and ii) of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16), Annex 1.

**Species name:** *Geochelone elegans* (Schoepff, 1795). Common name: Indian Star Tortoise, German: Indische Sternschildkröte, French: Tortue étoilée de l'Inde,

Synonyms: *Testudo elegans* Schoepff 1795

*Testudo stellata* SCHWEIGGER 1812

*Testudo actinoides* BELL 1828

*Testudo actinodes* [sic] — GRAY 1831

*Testudo actinodes* — DUMÉRIL and BIBRON 1835: 66

*Testudo megalopus* BLYTH 1853

*Testudo actinodes* — DUMÉRIL and BIBRON 1854: 220

*Testudo actinodes* — SOWERBY 1872

*Testudo elegans* — MURRAY 1886: 6

? *Testudo stellata* — BOULENGER 1887: 407

*Geochelone elegans* — PRITCHARD 1967

*Geochelone elegans* — DAS 1996: 39

*Geochelone elegans* — MCCORD and JOSEPH-OUNI 2004

*Geochelone elegans* — LE et al. 2006

**Distribution:** Pakistan, India (ranging from Orissa in east to Sind and Kutch in the west, southwards to tip of the peninsula, Gujarat, Kerala, Tamil Nadu), Sri Lanka, and some offshore islands (Uetz et al., 2019).

**Population trend:** According to the IUCN, the current population is declining, as is the numbers of mature individuals (D'Cruze et al., 2016). A declining population is more likely when an organism has a low reproductive rate and is slow to mature. This life history strategy, combined with high rates of collection from the wild and habitat destruction, negatively affect population growth (D'Cruze et al., 2016). In the absence of field data, the current high levels of trade and confiscations add weight to the notion that populations are generally declining.

**Habitat status:** Substantial tortoise habitat has been cleared. For example, tortoises used to be common in Deccan thorn scrub forests—a xeric shrubland ecoregion that extended across vast areas in multiple states in India and also, northern Sri Lanka. In excess of 90% of this habitat has been cleared or degraded (WWF, 2018). Scrubland has been cleared from vast areas within the tortoises' range in an effort to plant orchards and use the land for cash crop agriculture (de Silva, 2015 in CITES, 2019; D'Cruze et al., 2016). These effects will become increasingly challenging as human populations increase.

For example, the population of India is increasing by 1%/year and is set to overtake China as the most populated country in the world (United Nations, 2017).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** *Geochelone elegans* is heavily traded and one of the most popular chelonians in the pet trade. For example, > 70K tortoises were traded by 37 non-range states during 2000-2015 (CITES, 2019). A big issue is that many of the animals are claimed to have been captive bred but there is no data on the country of origin of the breeding stock in 91% of instances (CITES, 2019). For example, countries responsible for substantial trade such as Slovenia and Ukraine have not legally imported *G. elegans*. The largest non-range country to export *G. elegans* is Jordan, responsible for 75% ( $n = 30,923$ ) of exports but with little to no documentation documenting the origin of these animals. In addition to the very problematic 'legal' trade, there is considerable illegal trade too (documented below).

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*Geochelone elegans* is listed as Vulnerable by the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (D'Cruze et al., 2016). Prior to this (in 2000) it was listed as Least Concern. Also, *G. elegans* has been included on Appendix II of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) (UNEP-WCMC 2011) since 1975. India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka have adopted stricter measures than CITES (e.g. Schedule IV of the Wildlife (Protection) Act 1972) makes it illegal to possess and commercially trade *G. elegans* from either within or from India (Sekhar, 2004 in CITES, 2019). Likewise, *G. elegans* is protected under the Sri Lanka Fauna and Flora Ordinance (1993). Pakistan added further protection by including *G. elegans* along with other chelonian Pakistani species in Schedule II (Protected Animals) of the Sindh Wildlife Protection Ordinance 1972. Within the European Union, *G. elegans* is provided with high levels of protection by being listed in Annex A of the EU Council Regulation 338/97. It is also listed in CITES Appendix II, because it is in the genus *Geochelone*.

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

There is a substantial illegal trade in *G. elegans* and it is thought to be the most commonly traded chelonian—it represents about 11% of intercepted chelonians illegally traded (van Dijk, pers. comms. 2016 in CITES, 2019). Over a 15 year period (2000-2015) 34,080 *G. elegans* were confiscated by customs and wildlife agencies during 118 incidents (CITES, 2017). More recently, 8,825 individual live specimens were seized during 2016 and 2018, with a value of approximately \$3.5 million. Thailand also trades heavily in *G. elegans* and large numbers of animals have been intercepted. Thailand has potentially been used to clear animals of dubious origin that were exported from other countries. Extremely large volumes of tortoises have been illegally collected from relatively small areas. For example, at least 55,000 tortoises were collected from just one location consisting of 16 villages in the state of Andhra Pradesh in India over just one year

D'Cruze et al., (2015). This is significantly higher than estimates for numbers poached across the entire range in a single year (10,000–20,000; Sekhar et al., 2004 in CITES,



2019). There are substantial records in the CITES database on trade in *G. elegans*. Although many of the records are for relatively low numbers of animals, there are numerous cases of large numbers of animals being traded.

#### **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

Tortoises such as *G. elegans* have a life history consistent with slow growth rates, late maturity (10 years) and relatively low reproductive rates. They therefore cannot rapidly recover from over-harvesting. This may be especially true when their natural habitat is increasingly restricted. Furthermore, they do not breed in captivity readily. Importantly, this species is highly desirable in the pet trade and large numbers will continue to be collected to fuel this market unless appropriate regulations are in place.

#### **5. Recommendations**

*Geochelone elegans* er en skilpaddeart som til tross for stort utbredelsesområde har gjennomgått en betydelig reduksjon i antall og utstrekning. Hovedårsaken til bestandsnedgangen er høsting i forbindelse med hobbydyrhandelen. Det er mye ulovlig handel utenfor utbredelseslandene med individer med ukjent opphav. Artens livshistorie (lav reproduksjonsrate) gjør at de er spesielt sårbare for bestandreduksjon. Listeforslaget er derfor i tråd med kriteriene C i) and ii), Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16), Anneks. Handel er en trussel for artens overlevelse.

#### **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES, 2019. CP18 Proposal 36 (*Geochelone elegans*). Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/060319/E-CoP18-Prop-36.pdf>

D'Cruze, N., Choudhury, B.C. and Mookerjee, A. 2016. *Geochelone elegans* (errata version published in 2017). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T39430A115173155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-1.RLTS.T39430A2926441.en>.

De silva, A. (2015) Brush-mover: a new threat to the star tortoise (*Geochelone elegans*) in Sri Lanka. *Wildlanka* 3: 200–203.

Sekhar, A.C., Gurunathan, N., Anandhan, G. (2004) Star tortoise: A victim of the exotic pet trade. *Tigerpaper* 31:4–6.

Uetz, P., Freed, P. and Hošek, J. (eds.), 2019. The Reptile Database, <http://www.reptile-database.org>, accessed [11 March 2019].

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. 2017. World Population Prospects: The 2017 revision, key findings and advance Tables. Working Paper No. ESA/P/WP/248.

UNEP-WCMC CITES Trade Database. 2018. <http://www.unep-wcmc-apps.org/citestrade/trade.cfm>.

<http://reptile-database.reptarium.cz/>

### 1. Review of listing proposal under CITES

Listing of *Giraffa camelopardalis* on CITES Appendix II is proposed by Republic of Chad, Senegal, Niger, Mali, Kenya. According to the proponents this is in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2 (a) and the species also meets Criterion B of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), Annex 2a, and the precautionary measures found in Annex 4, implying that the regulation of trade is necessary to ensure the survival of the species.

**Species name:** Scientific name: *Giraffa camelopardalis* (Linnaeus, 1758). Synonym: *Cervus camelopardalis* Linnaeus, 1758. Common name: Giraffe. Norwegian name: Sjiraff. The IUCN giraffe and okapi specialist group recognizes one species and nine subspecies (Muller et al., 2016). However, genetic analyses (Fennessy et al. 2016) indicate a division into four distinct giraffe species instead of one, a finding that highlights the need for targeted conservation efforts. The proposal addresses all giraffes as one species.

**Distribution:** Giraffes are distributed throughout sub-Saharan Africa across the following 19 African range States: Angola, Botswana, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

**Population trend:** Decreasing (IUCN, 2018). The estimated population size in 2016 was 97,562, of which 68,293 mature individuals (Muller 2018). In 1985 the number was 150,000. With a generation time of 10 years this equals a population decline of 36-40% over three generations (Muller et al. 2018). According to the IUCN Giraffe and Okapi Specialist Group (<http://www.giraffidsq.org/giraffe/>) populations in East Africa are generally decreasing, populations in southern Africa are generally increasing. In West Africa, the single population is increasing, but in Central Africa, the population is decreasing.

**Habitat status:** Not severely fragmented (IUCN, 2018). Giraffes have experienced continuing habitat loss and fragmentation as a result of the expansion of human activities into their habitats.

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** As the giraffe is not currently listed in the CITES Appendices no data exist in the CITES trade database. However, giraffes are hunted both legally and illegally for sport and for their skins, other parts and products. Some illegal hunting for meat occurs at national levels.

### 2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions

The giraffe is listed as Vulnerable on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (2018). In 2017 the giraffe was listed on Appendix II of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS).

**3.Evaluation of trade data:** Giraffes are hunted both legally and illegally for sport and for their parts and products. The U.S. Law Enforcement Management Information System (LEMIS) trade database have recorded 39,516 giraffe specimens (giraffes, dead or alive, and their parts and derivatives) that were imported to the U.S. over ten years (2206-2015). A 2017 petition from the Center for Biological Diversity, Humane Society International, The Humane Society of the United States, International Fund for Animal Welfare and Natural Resources Defense Council presents substantial scientific and commercial information indicating that the giraffe is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range

([http://www.hsi.org/assets/pdfs/giraffe\\_esa\\_petition\\_2017.pdf](http://www.hsi.org/assets/pdfs/giraffe_esa_petition_2017.pdf)).

Giraffe products for sale on-line, also for the European market, can easily be found.

**4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

Kenya, Niger and Uganda have national giraffe conservation strategies. No measures are in place to control the movement of giraffes across international borders (CITES, 2019).

**5.Recommendations**

Sjiraff er en art som er i nedgang både fordi tilgjengelig egnet habitat avtar, og fordi arten jaktes lovlig og ulovlig. Til tross for at noen deler av bestanden er i vekst er sjiraffen regnet som Sårbar av IUCN fordi antallet individer har sunket mye i løpet av de siste tre generasjonene. Register over import til USA og tilgjengeligheten av produkter på nett viser at den internasjonale handelen er omfattende. I tråd med Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) bør handel med sjiraff reguleres for å ikke være til trussel mot artens overlevelse.

**6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 24 (*Giraffa camelopardalis*). Available online at:

[https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Giraffa-camelopardalis.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Giraffa-camelopardalis.pdf).

Fennessy, J., T. Bidon, F. Reuss, V. Kumar, P. Elkan, M. A. Milsson, M. Vamberger, U. Fritz, Janke, A. (2016). Multi-locus analyses reveal four giraffe species instead of one. *Current Biology* 26: 2543-2549.

Muller, Z., Bercovitch, F., Brand, R., Brown, D., Brown, M., Bolger, D., Carter, K., Deacon, F., Doherty, J.B., Fennessy, J., Fennessy, S., Hussein, A.A., Lee, D., Marais, A., Strauss, M., Tutchings, A., Wube, T. 2018. *Giraffa camelopardalis* (amended version of 2016 assessment). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018: e.T9194A136266699.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-3.RLTS.T9194A136266699.en>.

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

Senegal, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chad, Comoros, Cote d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Gabon, Gambia, Liberia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Monaco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Palau, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, and Togo propose the inclusion of blackchin guitarfish (*Glaucostegus cemiculus*) and sharpnose guitarfish (*Glaucostegus granulatus*) in Appendix II in accordance with Article II paragraph 2(a) of the Convention and satisfying Criterion A and B in Annex 2a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). The same countries propose inclusion of all species of the family Glaucostegidae in Appendix II in accordance with Article II paragraph 2(b) of the Convention and satisfying Criterion A in Annex 2b of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

**Species name:** *Glaucostegus cemiculus* (Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1817). Common name: blackchin guitarfish. Synonyms: *Rhinobatos cemiculus* (Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1817), *Rhinobatos congolensis* (Giltay, 1928), *Rhinobatos rarus* (Garman, 1908).  
Species name: *Glaucostegus granulatus* (Cuvier, 1829). Common name: sharpnose guitarfish, granulated guitarfish. Synonyms: *Rhinobatus granulatus* (Cuvier, 1829), *Rhinobatus acutus* (Garman, 1908)

**Distribution:** *Glaucostegus cemiculus*: East-Atlantic, Portugal to Angola, including the Mediterranean Sea (Last et al., 2016). *Glaucostegus granulatus*: Indo-West Pacific, Arabian Sea and Persian Gulf to Thailand and Viet Nam (Last et al., 2016). Possibly occurring as far east as the Philippines (Compagno et al., 2005).

**Population trend:** Both *Glaucostegus cemiculus* (Notarbartolo di Sciara et al., 2016) and *Glaucostegus granulatus* (Marshall and Last, 2016) have declining population trends globally (see also Moore et al., 2017). Once common in the Mediterranean, *Glaucostegus cemiculus* disappeared from many landing sites (Psomadakis et al., 2009; Notarbartolo di Sciara et al., 2016). It was still commonly caught in the Gulf of Gabes in the early 2000s (Basusta et al. 2005). About 95% of individuals caught in Mauritania are below size-at-maturity (Diop and Dossa, 2011), data on population trends in many countries are missing but it assumed *Glaucostegus cemiculus* populations are declining given strong fishing pressures.

In the Arabian Sea and adjacent waters *Glaucostegus granulatus* populations have declined of 50-80% within 4 decades (Jabado et al., 2017). All Glaucostegidae listed by the IUCN Red List have decreasing population trends (with the exception of *Glaucostegus thouin*, for which population trends are unknown).

**Habitat status:** *Glaucostegus cemiculus* lives on soft-bottoms in coastal, shallow (< 100m) waters of tropical and warm-temperate waters of the Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean. *Glaucostegus granulatus* lives on soft-bottoms in shallow (< 120m) coastal waters to the mid-continental shelf in the Indo-West Pacific. The majority of their

habitat is located in coastal waters of developing/least developed countries, where there is widespread loss of mangrove, seagrass and coral reef habitat. Habitats are exposed to expanding, intensive and largely unregulated fisheries (Moore et al, 2017). Nursery and breeding grounds are particularly at risk. Coastal development is a major threats to *Galucostegidae* (Jabado et al. 2018).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** *Glaucostegidae* fins fetch very high prices (Vannuccini, 1999), and are manly exported to Asian markets. *Glaucostegus cemiculus* fins in West Africa fetch prices up to 100 Euro per kg (Notarbartolo di Sciara et al., 2016). *Glaucostegidae* fins have been found in Hong Kong, and in processing centres of Bangladesh (from which they are most likely exported to other Asian countries, Haque et al., 2018)

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*Glaucostegus cemiculus* is listed as Endangered (A4bd) ver. 3.1 on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (Notarbartolo di Sciara et al., 2016). *Glaucostegus granulatus* is listed as Vulnerable (A2bd+3d+4d) (Marshall and Last, 2016). Both assessments are over 10 years old and need update. All *Glaucostegidae* listed in the IUCN Red List are classified as Vulnerable or Endangered, with the exception of one data deficient species. *Glaucostegus cemiculus* was listed in Annex II of the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean of the Barcelona Convention in 2012, hence landings are illegal in signatory states. K-selected life history, large size, high fin price and a distribution mostly encompassing countries with unregulated or unsustainable fisheries make *Glaucostegidae* one of the elasmobranch taxa with the highest risk of extinction (Moore et al, 2017).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

International trade is mostly limited to fin products, meat products are consumed mainly on local markets. There is no international management of trading of *Glaucostegidae*, with the exception of the Mediterranean, therefore it can be assumed that international trade of their fin products is legal, with the exception of animals caught or traded in infringement of local laws.

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

There is no binding regulation on international trade, with the exception of Barcelona Convention's signatories states, where landing and trading of *Glaucostegus cemiculus* is forbidden as well as trawling with 3 miles of the coast (which could have the effect of protecting most of the species habitat in those countries). It is unclear how well this is enforced. Cabo Verde, Gambia, Guinea and Sierra Leone have shark finning bans which could bring some protection to *Glaucostegus cemiculus*, though fishing is still largely unregulated. Senegal has size limits. Several states have National Shark Action Plans and have restrictions on fishing. *Glaucostegus cemiculus* is protected in Israel, as all shark and ray species. There is no specific management of *Glaucostegus granulatus* in range states. Saudi Arabia banned shark fishing (though the ban is largely unenforced) and the UAE bans shark fin exports.

## 5.Recommendations

Finner fra de to artene av gitarfisk *Glaucostegus cemiculus* og *Glaucostegus granulatus*, og resten av familien Glaucostegidae er høyt priset og svært etterspurt på det internasjonale haifinnemarkedet. De artene som er listet på den globale rødlisten er enten sårbare eller utryddingstruede, og det er vanskelig med morfologisk artsbestemmelse av både hele spesimen og finner. Listeforslaget virker derfor å oppfylle kriteriene A og B i Anneks 2a, og kriterium A, Anneks 2b, Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Uregulert handel vil kunne være ødeleggende for artenes videre overlevelse.

## 6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)

- Basusta N., Keskin C, Serena F., Seret B. (2006) The Proceedings of the Workshop on Mediterranean Cartilaginous Fish with Emphasis on Southern and Eastern Mediterranean. Istanbul: Turkish Marine Research Foundation, Publication No. 23
- Compagno, L. J. V., Last, P. R., Stevens, J. D., Alava, M. N. R. (2005). Checklist of Philippine Chondrichthyes. CSIRO Marine Research ,Hobart, Tasmania
- Jabado, R. W., Kyne, P.M., Pollom, R.A., Ebert, D.A., Simpfendorfer, C.A., Ralph, G.M., Dulvy, N.K. 2017. The conservation status of sharks, rays, and chimaeras in the Arabian sea and adjacent waters. Environment Agency—Abu Dhabi, UAE and IUCN Species Survival Commission Shark Specialist Group. Vancouver, Canada. 236pp.
- Diop, M., Dossa, J. (2011) 30 Years of shark fishing in West Africa. Corlet/ Condé-sur-Noireau (France): Fondation internationale du Bassin d'Arguin, Regional Marine and Coastal Conservation Programme for West Africa, and the Sub-Regional Fishing Commission.
- Haque, A. B., Biswas, A. R., Latifa, G. A. (2018). Observations of shark and ray products in the processing centres of Bangladesh, trade in CITES species and conservation needs. TRAFFIC Bulletin Vol. 30 No 1. Pp 6-14.
- Jabado, R.W. (2018). The fate of the most threatened order of elasmobranchs: shark-like batoids (Rhinopristiformes) in the Arabian Sea and adjacent waters. Fish Research 204: 448-457.
- Last, P., Naylor, G., Séret, B., White, W., de Carvalho, M., Stehmann, M. (2016) Rays of the World CSIRO publishing, Clayton South, Victoria, Australia.
- Marshall, A.D., Last, P.R. (2016). *Glaucostegus granulatus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T60166A104009186
- Mohanraj, G., Rajapackiam, S., Mohan, S., Batcha, H., Gomathy, S. (2009). Status of elasmobranchs fishery in Chennai, India. Asian Fisheries Science 22(2): 607–615.
- Moore A.B. (2017) Are guitarfishes the next sawfishes? Extinction risk and an urgent call for conservation action. Endangered Species Research 34:75-88.
- Notarbartolo di Sciara, G., Bradai, M.N., Morey, G., Brahim, K., Camara L., Litvinov, F., Dulvy, N. Doumbouya, F., Ducrocq, M., Heenan, A., Sidi, N. (2016). *Glaucostegus cemiculus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T63132A104009894.
- Psomadakis, P.N., Maio, N., Vacchi, M. (2009) The chondrichthyan biodiversity in the Gulf of Naples (SW Italy, Tyrrhenian Sea): An historical overview. Cybium 33: 199-209
- Vannuccini S. (1999) Shark utilization, marketing and trade Food and Agriculture Org. Rome, 463 pp.

### 1. Review of listing proposal under CITES

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines proposes to include the Grenadines clawed gecko (*Gonatodes daudini*) in Appendix I. According to the proponent, it fulfils Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev CoP17) Annex I criterion B and C. as it is found in only one location and is in marked decline.

**Species name:** Scientific name: *Gonatodes daudini* Powell and Henderson, 2005.  
Common name: Grenadine's clawed gecko, Union Island gecko.

**Distribution:** *G. daudini* is only found on Union Island, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. The area of occupancy, based on the amount of suitable habitat considered capable of supporting this species on the island, is 0.523 km<sup>2</sup> (Powell and Henderson, 2011).

**Population trend:** Stable (Powell and Henderson, 2011). In a transect study conducted in 2018 9,957 individuals were counted (CITES, 2019).

**Habitat status:** Declining in extent and quality (Powell and Henderson, 2011).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** The species was discovered in 2005 and has since then been attractive in international pet trade. There is no legal trade.

### 2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions

The Grenadine's clawed gecko is listed as Critically Endangered on the IUCN Red List (Powell and Henderson, 2011).

### 3. Evaluation of trade data

Over-harvesting for commercial purposes is considered the main threat to the species' survival (CITES, 2019). Evidence of illegal international on-line trade can easily be found. It is unknown whether or not it is possible to breed the species in captivity.

### 4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.

A conservation action plan was developed in 2016 by the government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, together with Flora and Fauna International and stakeholders (CITES, 2019).

### 5. Recommendations

Denne gekkoarten finnes kun på Union Island som er en del av Saint Vincent og Grenadinene der man kjenner til en lokalitet med areal på ca 0,5 km<sup>2</sup>. Den er vurdert som Kritisk truet av IUCN og oppfyller flere av kriteriene beskrevet i Anneks 1 av Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev CoP17). Etter at arten ble beskrevet i 2005 har den blitt attraktiv blant reptilsamlere og finnes i internasjonal handel, til tross for at all eksport er ulovlig. Handel kan være en trussel for overlevelsen til denne arten.

## 6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 26 (*Gonatodes daudini*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Gonatodes-daudini.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Gonatodes-daudini.pdf).

Powell, R., Henderson, R.W. 2011. *Gonatodes daudini* (errata version published in 2017). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2011: e.T194258A115333400. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2011-2.RLTS.T194258A8889057.en>.

CoP18 Prop. 27

### 1. Review of listing proposal under CITES

The People's Republic of China and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam (supported by the European Union) propose to include 13 species of the genus *Goniurosaurus* in Appendix II. They claim this to be in accordance with Article II 2(a) of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev CoP17), implying that the regulation of trade is necessary to ensure the survival of these species.

**Species name:** The following 13 species of the genus *Goniurosaurus*: *G. araneus* Grismer, Viets and Boyle, 1999 *G. bawanglingensis* Grismer, Shi, Orlov and Anajeva, 2002, *G. catbaensis* Ziegler, Nguyen, Schmitz, Stenke, Rösler, 2008 (Common name: Cat Ba tiger gecko), *G. huuliensis* Orlov, Ryabov, Nguyen, Nguyen and Ho, 2008, *G. kadoorieorum* Yang and Chan, 2015, *G. kwangsiensis* Yang and Chan, 2015, *G. liboensis* Wang, Yang and Grismer, 2013, *G. luii* Grismer, Viets and Boyle, 1999, *G. hainanensis* Barbour, 1908, *G. lichtenfelderi* (Mocquard, 1897; Common name: Lichtenfelder's Gecko), *G. zhoui* Zhou, Wang, Chen and Liang, 2018, *G. yingdeensis* Wang, Yang and Cui, 2010 and *G. zhelongi* Wang, Jin, Li and Grismer, 2014. Common names: Tiger geckos, leopard geckos, cave geckos. The genus *Goniurosaurus* currently comprises 19 species, however, 6 species from endemic to Japan are excluded from the proposal.

**Distribution:** The 13 species included in the proposal are found in China and Viet Nam. The genus contains a high level of local endemism, and many species are recorded from a single locality, mountain range or Archipelago only (CITES, 2019).

**Population trend:** *G. catbaensis*, unknown (IUCN, 2016), *G. huuliensis*, unknown (IUCN, 2018a). *G. lichtenfelderi*, decreasing (IUCN, 2018b).

**Habitat status:** In China and Viet Nam, tiger geckos inhabit either granitic or limestone rock in old forest. Overall, the habitat of *Goniurosaurus ssp* is assumed to decrease and degrade due human activities (CITES, 2019).

#### Describe known/suspected level of trade:

Tiger geckos have spectacular patterns and have been popular in the pet market since the 1990s (CITES, 2019). Currently almost all members of the genus *Goniurosaurus* are popular in the international pet trade (Yang and Chan, 2015)



## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*G. catbaensis* is listed as Endangered on the IUCN Red List (2016). *G. huuliensis* is listed as Critically Endangered on the IUCN Red List (2018). *G. lichtenfelderi* is listed as Critically Endangered on the IUCN Red List (2018). In May 2018, at the IUCN Red List Workshop for Chinese Lizard Species held at Chong Qing China, nine species of *Goniurosaurus* were evaluated: *G. zhelongi* was classified as Critically Endangered, *G. bawanglingensis*, *G. liboensis*, *G. kadoorieorum*, *G. kwangsiensis*, *G. luii* and *G. yingdeensis* were classified as Endangered, *G. hainanensis* as Vulnerable, and *G. zhoui* was Data Deficient.

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

*G. catbaensis* occurs in European pet trade marked (Nguyen et al. 2016). *G. lichtenfelderi* has been recorded in the pet trade, both internationally and domestically in Viet Nam (Nguyen, 2018b). According to the proponents some national trade of *Goniurosaurus* spp. for traditional medicine and as pets takes place in both China and Viet Nam in addition to extensive international trade where rare species can achieve high prices (CITES, 2019). In the proposal it is stated that according to the LEMIS database of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, a total of 16,714 specimens of *Goniurosaurus* spp. have been imported into the USA between 1999 and 2018. The proposal is inconsistent regarding the origin of these specimens, on page 9 it says that 5,086 of the animals were allegedly bred in captivity while on page 11 it says that all 16,714 were bred in captivity.

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

Several *Goniurosaurus* species occur inside protected areas where collection is forbidden (CITES, 2019).

## **5.Recommendations**

De 13 gekkoartertene i slekten *Goniurosaurus* er endemiske til enten Kina eller Viet Nam og begrenset til små utbredelsesområder. Mange av gekkoartene er oppdaget nylig og kun tre av dem er blitt vurdert av IUCN, av disse er 2 Kritisk true og en Truet. Ved en IUCN Red List Workshop i 2018 ble ytterligere en art klassifisert som Kritisk truet og seks som Truet. Alle artene er attraktive i kjæledyrmarkedet der særlig sjeldne arter kan oppnå høye priser. Søkerene hevder at artene kvalifiserer for listing i CITES Appendix II og at handel kan utgjøre en trussel mot deres overlevelse hvis den ikke reguleres. Flere av disse artene oppfyller allerede kravene til listing i CITES Appendix I i følge kriteriene som er beskrevet i Annex 1 av Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Handel kan true overlevelsen av disse artene.

## **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 27 (*Goniurosaurus* spp). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Goniurosaurus-sppxx.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Goniurosaurus-sppxx.pdf).  
Nguyen, T.Q., Ngo, H., van Schingen, M., Ziegler, T. 2016. *Goniurosaurus catbaensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T18917684A18917688. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-2.RLTS.T18917684A18917688.en>.

Nguyen, T.Q. 2018a. *Goniurosaurus huuliensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018: e.T18917702A18917704. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-2.RLTS.T18917702A18917704.en>.

Nguyen, T.Q. 2018b. *Goniurosaurus lichtenfelderi*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018: e.T18917735A18917741. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-2.RLTS.T18917735A18917741.en>.

Yang, J.-H., Chan, B.P.L. (2015) Two new species of the genus *Goniurosaurus* (Squamata: Sauria: Eublepharidae) from southern China. Zootaxa 3980: 67-80.

CoP18 Prop. 49 – proposal withdrawn before the meeting

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

Brazil and Ecuador propose to include the taxon *Handroanthus* spp. in Appendix II, in accordance with paragraph 2 (a) of Article II of the Convention and criterion B of Annex 2a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), and taxa *Tabebuia* spp. and *Roseodendron* spp. in Appendix II in accordance with paragraph 2 (b) of Article II of the Convention, and criterion B of Annex 2b of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP 17), and include in Appendix II with the following annotation: # 6 Logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets and plywood.

**Species name:** The genus *Handroanthus* includes 30 species, the genus *Tabebuia* 73 species and the genus *Roseodendron* 3 species, all belonging to the Bignoniaceae family. Common name: trumpet trees, in Spanish: tahuari, apache, lapacho, primavera, amapola, maculís, palo de rosa, rosa morada, cortez, cortez negro, guayacán amarillo, cortés amarillo, corteza amarilla, roble, and in Portuguese: palo de arco, ipê.

**Distribution:** *Handroanthus* spp., *Tabebuia* spp. and *Roseodendron* spp. are distributed from North America; the south of the USA, to Argentina and Chile, including the Caribbean (WCSP, 2018, Grandtner and Chevrette, 2013, Grose et al., 2007).

**Population trend:** In Venezuela, *Handroanthus serratifolius* (*Tabebuia serratifolia*) is decreasing as a result of the popular demand for wood for the manufacture of handicrafts (León, 2009). In Brazil, ipé crops declined or disappeared in most of the former timber frontiers in the eastern Amazon, while extending to new timber frontiers in the central and southwestern region (Schulze et al., 2008). All populations of *Handroanthus impetiginis* (*T. impetiginosa*) and *H. serratifolius* (*T. serratifolia*) in northeastern Brazil showed drastic population declines (Schulze et al., 2008). In Ecuador, in vitro cultures are used to recover the endangered species' of *Handroanthus* (Indacochea et al., 2018). Populations of *H. chrysanthus* and *H. billbergii*, have been recovered mainly by management actions (Rivas et al., 2015). In Michoacán Mexico, natural populations of *T. rosea* have decreased considerably due to anthropogenic factors; deforestation for human settlements combined with obtaining wood, contributing to the reduction of their habitat (Muñoz et al., 2016). In Yucatan Mexico, *T. rosea* is very exploited (CONABIO, 2018).

**Habitat status:** Timber extraction and habitat destruction due to agricultural expansion, livestock grazing and the expansion of human settlements have severely affected the habitats of these forest species in a negative way. Brazil is experiencing rapid deforestation; the average annual rate was 0.4% for the period 2000-2010 and 0.2% for 2010-15 (Wellesley, 2014). Deforestation is driven mainly by the demand for agricultural land; and recent analyses suggest that between 68-90% of forest conversion between 2000 and 2012 was illegal (Wellesley, 2014).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Noncompliance with concession limits remains predominant in Latin America and there are many opportunities to surreptitiously increase profits with illegally harvested timber from areas outside of a licensed nominal concession (Richardson and Peres, 2016). Exploitation of *Handroanthus* spp. (the "new broadleaf mahogany") may lead this species to extinction (Brancalion et al., 2018). These species' are some of the most vulnerable to logging in Amazonian forests due to their low natural densities and low growth rates. For example, in Brazil, the wood production of *H. serratifolius* in 2017 was 150% higher than that observed in 2012. There are too many species included in this listing to present species specific data here from the Cites trade database (CITES trade database).

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

The IUCN red list contains 15 species of *Tabebuia* and *Handroanthus* in some risk category (IUCN, 2018). In Argentina, *Handroanthus lapacho* (= *T. lapacho*) is considered threatened (Prado, 1998) and as a minor concern *H. impetiginosus* (= *T. impetiginosa*) (WCMC 1998). In Bolivia, *Handroanthus chrysotrichus* (= *T. chrysotrica*) (MHN, 2010) and endangered *Handroanthus lapacho* (= *T. lapacho*) are in critical danger (MMAA, 2012). In Brazil, *H. arianae*, *H. riocensis*, *H. spongiosus* and *T. cassinoidis* are endangered and, as a minor concern, *H. albus*, *H. catarinensis*, *H. heptaphylus* and *T. obtusifolia* (CNCFlora, 2018). In Colombia, *T. palustris* and *T. striata* are considered threatened (Duke, 2010, Mitre, 1998). In Costa Rica, *H. guayacan* (= *T. guayacan*) and *T. palustris* are considered threatened (Jimenez, 2012, Duke, 2010) and minor concern *H. impetiginosus* (= *T. impetiginosa*) (WCMC, 1998). In Cuba there are 4 species of *Tabebuia* in critical danger of extinction, 2 in danger of extinction, 12 threatened and 13 of minor concern (González et al., 2016). In Haiti, *T. conferta* is in danger (IUCN, 2018). In Jamaica, *T. platyantha* is almost threatened (WCMC, 1998). In Mexico, *H. impetiginosus* (= *T. impetiginosa*) and *H. chrysanthus* (= *T. chrysantha*) are classified as threatened (DOF, 2018). In Panama, *T. palustris* and *T. striata* are considered threatened (Duke, 2010, Mitre, 1998). In Peru, *H. impetiginosus* is classified as endangered and *H. serratifolius* as threatened (MAR, 2016). In the Dominican Republic, they are in danger of extinction: *T. bullata*, *T. crispiflora*, *T. domingensis*, *T. maxoni*, *T. obovata*, *T. ophiolitica*, *T. paniculata*, *T. ricardii*, *T. vinosa* and *T. zanonii* (MMARN, 2011). In Venezuela *H. serratifolius* (= *T. serratifolia*) is threatened (León, 2009). A recent study on the risk of extinction of 80 arboreal species concluded that seven species deserve special attention because they are highly threatened throughout their distribution in South America, among which is *Handroanthus*

pulcherrimus (Van Zonneveld 2018), a species that is not even considered by IUCN's red list.

### **3.Evaluation of trade data**

There are records of these species in the CITES trade database. Due to the great similarity between the woods of the different Ipes, the species' are marketed under the same common name. In Brazil, from 2010 to 2016, 20 species of *Handroanthus/Tabebuia* spp. have been marketed with similar common names (ipé, ipê yellow, ipé purple, ipeúva, pau-darco) of which ipé alone corresponds to the majority (Ibama, 2016). This could have a negative impact on the less abundant populations of some of these species.

### **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

N/A

### **5.Recommendations**

De største truslene mot arter som tilhører disse tre slektene, er habitatødeleggelse og overhøsting. En ytterligere komplikasjon for god forvaltning er mangelen på kunnskap og klare morfologiske skilletekk mellom disse beslektede artene. Oppføring av disse tre slektene på CITES Appendiks II kan potensielt redusere den ekstensive overutnyttelsen av de mest ønskede taxa, bidra til å bevare taxaene som allerede er på IUCNs Rødliste, og støtte bærekraftig hogst i både naturlig og plantet skog. Lovlig og/eller ulovlig handel forventes å være skadelig for overlevelsen av mange av disse artene.

### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Brancalion, P.H., de Almeida, D.R., Vidal, E., Molin, P.G., Sontag, V.E., Souza, S.E., Schulze, M.D. (2018) Fake legal logging in the Brazilian Amazon. *Science advances*: 4(8)

CONABIO, 2018. *Tabebuia rosea*  
[http://www.conabio.gob.mx/conocimiento/info\\_especies/arboles/doctos/11-bigno7m.pdf](http://www.conabio.gob.mx/conocimiento/info_especies/arboles/doctos/11-bigno7m.pdf)

Grose, S.O., Olmstead, R.G. (2007a) Evolution of a charismatic neotropical tree: Molecular phylogeny of *Tabebuia* s.l. and allied genera (Bignoniaceae). *Systematic Botany* 32(3): 650-659.

Grose, S.O., Olmstead, R.G. (2007b) Taxonomic revisions in the polyphyletic genus *Tabebuia* s.l. (Bignoniaceae). *Systematic Botany* 32(3): 660-670.

Grandtner, M.M., Chevrette, J., 2013. Dictionary of trees, volume 2: South America: Nomenclature, taxonomy and ecology. Academic Press.

IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2018-1. [www.iucnredlist.org](http://www.iucnredlist.org)

Leon, W. 2009. Anatomía de la madera y clave de identificación para especies forestales vedadas en Venezuela. *Revista Forestal Venezolana*, Año XLIII, 53(1) 51-62.

Muñoz-Flores, H.J., Castillo-Quiroz, D., Castillo-Reyes, F., Sáenz-Reyes, J.T., Avila-Flores, D., Rueda-Sánchez, A., 2016. Potential Areas for Commercial Timber Plantations of *Tabebuia rosea* (Bertol.) DC. in Michoacan, Mexico. *Open Journal of Forestry*, 7(01), 48.

Rivas, G.V., Mendoza, Z.A., González, A.G., Gonzalez, E.B., Mendoza, N.A., Paredes, D., 2015. Pasado, Presente Y Futuro De Los "Guayacanes" *Handroanthus Chrysanthus* (Jacq.) So Grose Y *Handroanthus Billbergii* (Bureau and K. Schum.) So Grose, De Los Bosques Secos De Loja, Ecuador. *Arnaldia* 22(1): 85-104.

Schulze, M. et al. (2008) Evaluating ipê (Tabebuia, Bignoniaceae) logging in Amazonia: Sustainable management or catalyst for forest degradation? *Biological Conservation* 141(8): 2071–2085.

van Zonneveld M., Thomas E., Castañeda-Álvarez N.P. et al. 2018. Tree genetic resources at risk in South America: A spatial threat assessment to prioritize populations for conservation. *Diversity and Distribution* 00:1–12.

CoP18 Prop.45

### 1. Review of listing proposal under CITES

The European Union, The United States of America, Kenya, Senegal and the Seychelles propose to include the following three species belonging to the subgenus *Holothuria* (*Microthele*):

*Holothuria (Microthele) fuscogilva* (hereafter *H. fuscogilva*), *Holothuria (Microthele) nobilis* (hereafter *H. nobilis*) and *Holothuria (Microthele) whitmaei* (hereafter *H. whitmaei*) in Appendix II, in accordance with Article II paragraph 2 (a) of the Convention and satisfying Criteria A and B in Annex 2a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

**Species name:** *Holothuria (Microthele) fuscogilva* Cherbonnier, 1980, *Holothuria (Microthele) nobilis* (Selenka, 1867), *Holothuria (Microthele) whitmaei* Bell, 1887. Common names: Teatfish, sea cucumber. Norsk navn: Sjøpølse

Scientific synonyms: *Holothuria fuscogilva* (Cherbonnier, 1980); *Microthele nobilis* (Selenka, 1867) *Mülleria nobilis* Selenka, 1867; *Holothuria (Bohadschia) whitmaei* Bell, 1887 *Holothuria mammiifera* Saville-Kent, 1890 *Muelleria maculata* (Brandt, 1835)

**Taxonomy:** *Holothuria (Microthele) fuscogilva* was considered the same species as *Holothuria (Microthele) nobilis* until 1980 (Cherbonnier).

The Pacific Ocean population of *Holothuria (Microthele) whitmaei* was separated from the Indian population of *Holothuria (Microthele) nobilis* in 2004.

*Holothuria (Microthele) nobilis* taxa seems to be considered as a group of species where *Holothuria* sp. “pentard” is a form that is currently being described. This species, locally named ‘pentard or flower teatfish’, is important for the Seychelles’ exploitation (CITES, 2019)

**Distribution:** *H. fuscogilva* is present in the Red Sea, Indian Ocean, and Pacific Ocean. *H. nobilis* is present in the Indian Ocean and Red Sea, and *H. whitmaei* is present in the Pacific Ocean. *Holothuria (Microthele) sp. “pentard”* is present in the Indian Ocean (CITES, 2019).

#### Population trend:

*H. fuscogilva*: Decreasing (Conand et al., 2013a).

*H. nobilis*: Unspecified (Conand et al., 2013b).

*H. whitmaei*: Unspecified (Conand et al., 2013c).

**Habitat status:** Increasingly fragmented. Teatfish occur in reef ecosystems, mainly at low depth in coral reef and seagrasses (CITES, 2019). There is some variation in preferred habitat type between species (CITES, 2019). Three quarters of the world's coral reefs are threatened, with productivity being lost due to factors such as overfishing and destructive fishing (i.e by the use of explosives and cyanide), sediment pollution, nutrient and pesticides and climate change (Tanzer et al., 2015; WWF, 2016, cited in CITES, 2019).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:**

Described in CITES (2019) and supported by the results of a Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (global review of sea cucumber trade by Toral-Granda et al., 2008), sea cucumbers are under intense fishing pressure in many parts of the world, and that there is a significant trade in sea cucumber products. In particular beche-de-mer (the product after gutting, cooking, salting and drying sea cucumbers) and supply for the international markets for luxury foods.

**2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

IUCN Red List status:

*H. fuscogilva*: Vulnerable A2bd, ver. 3.1 (Conand et al., 2013a).

*H. nobilis*: Endangered A2bd ver. 3.1 (Conand et al., 2013b)

*H. whitmaei*: Endangered A2bd ver. 3.1 (Conand et al., 2013c)

**3.Evaluation of trade data**

The global fishery for sea cucumbers has increased dramatically over the last 25 years (CITES, 2019), and the main threat to teatfish populations is overfishing. There are several examples of sea cucumber fishery collapses, and new species are placed on the market whilst the more valuable species are becoming more rare and difficult to find (Toral-Granda et al., 2008). The Asia and Pacific, where the species in this proposal occur, are the top producing regions, with combined catches in the order of 20,000 to 40,000 tonnes a year (Toral-Granda et al., 2008). Other regions also take out thousands of tonnes a year (CITES, 2019). There is also a significant illegal trade market in Holothuria species with poaching and exports in remote areas and international buyers who put pressure on local fishermen by offering high prices (CITES, 2019).

**4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

Teatfish have sexual reproduction, where mating strategy is to emit gametes freely into the sea, leading to external reproduction (CITES, 2019 and references herein). Therefore, the success of reproduction directly depends of the density of adults to ensure sufficient concentration of spermatozoa and oocytes. Currently only one species of teatfish is listed in the CITES Appendices; *Isostichopus fuscus* is listed in Appendix III (Species+, Conand et al., 2018). Based on the increasing exploitation of teatfish in tropical waters, Conand (2018) suggested to propose listing of the three species of the current proposal, as they share some characteristics: i)being commercially valuable, ii) easy to recognize, iii) are overfished. A draft version of the current proposal was submitted to the 30<sup>th</sup> meeting of

the Animals Committee in Geneva, 2018 (CITES, 2018), and the Committee noted document AC30 Doc. 30.1 and encouraged parties to submit their views to the proponent.

### **5.Recommendations**

De tre artene er listet som henholdsvis sårbar og utryddingstruet på den globale rødlisten. Sjøpølser er lette å samle, de er verdifulle og etterspurt på det internasjonale luksusmatmarkedet, samtidig som de innehar biologiske karaktertrekk som gjør dem ekstra sårbare for overhøsting (mer eller mindre immobile som voksne, tetthetsavhengig reproduksjon og dårlig rekrutteringsrate) noe som har resultert i lokal populasjonskollaps flere ganger. Den foreslåtte listingen virker dermed å være i tråd med Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), criteria A and B, Annex 2a. Uregulert handel vil kunne være ødeleggende for disse artenes overlevelse.

### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Conand, C., Purcell, S. and Gamboa, R. 2013a. *Holothuria fuscogilva*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013: e.T200715A2681354. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-1.RLTS.T200715A2681354.en>.

Conand, C., Purcell, S., Gamboa, R., Toral-Granda, T.-G. 2013b. *Holothuria nobilis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013: e.T180326A1615368. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-1.RLTS.T180326A1615368.en>.

Conand, C., Gamboa, R., Purcell, S., Toral-Granda, T.-G. 2013c. *Holothuria whitmaei*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013: e.T180440A1630988. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-1.RLTS.T180440A1630988.en>.

CITES, 2018. AC Doc. 30.1. Available online at:

<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/30/E-AC30-30-01.pdf>

Toral-Granda, V., Lovatelli, A., Vasconcellos, M. (eds). Sea cucumbers. A global review of fisheries and trade. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper. No. 516. Rome, FAO. 2008. 317p.

Conand, C. (2008) Population status, fisheries and trade of sea cucumbers in Africa and the Indian Ocean. In V. Toral-Granda, A. Lovatelli and M. Vasconcellos (eds). Sea cucumbers. A global review of fisheries and trade. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper. No. 516. Rome, FAO. pp. 143-193.

Conand, C. (2018). Tropical sea cucumber fisheries: Changes during the last decade. Marine Pollution Bulletin 133: 590–594

Tanzer, J., Phua, C., Jeffries, B., Lawrence, A., Gonzales, A., Gamblin, P. and Roxburgh, T. (2015). Living blue planet report. Gland, Switz.: WWF International.

World Wide Fund for Nature (2016). Rapport Planète Vivante 2016 : Risque et résilience dans l'Anthropocène.

**1. Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Costa Rica and El Salvador propose to list 104 species of the four genera *Hyalinobatrachium*, *Centrolene*, *Cochranella* and *Sachatamia* in Appendix II in accordance with Article II 2a and b of the Convention. Some of the wild populations of glass frogs (members of the family Centrolenidae) have restricted distributions and are experiencing marked population declines thus satisfying Annex 2a, paragraph A of Res. Conf 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). There is also evidence of commercialization of glass frogs over the last decade, thus they may also fulfil the criteria listed in Annex 2a, paragraph B of Res. Conf 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). In addition, several species meet the requirements of Article II, Paragraph 2b of the Convention, Annex 2b of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) because of the difficulties in separating between species of glass frogs (they are "look alikes"). The Annex of the proposal specify which species that fulfill which of the above-mentioned criteria (CITES, 2019).

**Genus name:** *Hyalinobatrachium*, *Centrolene*, *Cochranella* and *Sachatamia*.

The Annex of the proposal list the 104 species included in this proposal (CITES, 2019).

Common name: Glassfrogs. Norwegian name: Glassfrosker

**Distribution:** Members of Centrolenidae are a diverse group of frogs endemic to America. They occur from southern Mexico to Panama and through the Andes from Venezuela to Bolivia. Species are found in the Amazon and Orinoco River basins, the Guiana Shield Region, and the Atlantic forests of southeastern Brazil and northern Argentina (Cisneros-Heredia and McDiarmid, 2007)

**Population trend:** Population size data are scarce for glass frogs in general and most population trends are therefore unknown (CITES, 2019). For the few species (less than 50%) assessed by the IUCN, most have population status unknown, 30 are decreasing and 17 are stable (CITES, 2019; IUCN).

**Habitat status:** Most likely fragmented, but this will obviously vary among species. Central and South American forests are decreasing at significant rates, with the main cause of forest loss being the expansion of commercial agriculture (FAO, 2016 in CITES, 2019). As a consequence, the species of the current proposal have experienced a significant decline in all distribution ranges (CITES, 2019)

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** There are considerable levels of trade in species of all the proposed genera reported in the LEMIS database of the United States (CITES, 2019). Glass frogs are also traded over the internet (e.g. at <https://www.terrarium.com/>) and at European trade fairs for reptiles and amphibians (CITES, 2019).



## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

IUCN Red List status for:

*Hyalinobatrachium* spp.: Endangered (3), Vulnerable (2), Near Threatened (2), Least Concern (6), Data Deficient (1).

*Cochranella* spp.: Critically Endangered (5), Endangered (6), Vulnerable (14), Near Threatened (3), Least Concern (21), Data Deficient (26).

*Centrolene* spp.: Critically Endangered (3), Endangered (5), Vulnerable (6), Near Threatened (1), Least Concern (5), Data Deficient (16).

*Sachatamia* spp.: Endangered (3), Vulnerable (2), Near Threatened (2), Least Concern (6), Data Deficient (1).

None of the species are listed under CITES nor the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations (Species+)

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

From the LEMIS database there were records of a total of 2,138 individuals including a range of different species (determined to species level) imported between 2004 and 2016, and another 732 not identified to species level (CITES, 2009). The database Terraristik.com lists glass frogs for sale [https://www.terrarium.com/tb/list\\_classifieds.php](https://www.terrarium.com/tb/list_classifieds.php), including *Hyalinobatrachium fleischmanni* (Least Concern, Coloma et al., 2010) and *H. Valeroi* (Least Concern, Solis et al., 2008), *Sachatamia albomaculata* (Least Concern, Solis et al., 2010a) and *Cochranella granulosa* (Least Concern, Solis et al., 2010a). It is unclear from the adverts whether these frogs originate from captive breeding. A company in Ecuador, Wikiri is raising 12 species of frog, including species of glass frogs in order to sell them to try to save them from the black market and illegal collection (<https://www.nst.com.my/world/2017/07/258493/selling-us600-frogs-%E2%80%93-save-them-poachers>). For the species assessed by the IUCN, there is no mention of any of them being in use or trade nor being threatened by trade, even for the most recently assessed species (e.g. IUCN SSC Amphibian Specialist Group, 2018; IUCN population trends and status).

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

Captive breeding of glass frogs seem to occur among hobbyists, however it is unclear if stock animals are collected from the wild on a regular basis, as they are apparently difficult to find and collect (<http://www.reptilesmagazine.com/Wild-Amphibians/Glass-Frog-Basics/>). The main threat to glass frogs is habitat loss and fragmentation due to agriculture and livestock, as well as felling and timber extraction and mining (CITES, 2019 and references herein). In addition, both water pollution and Chytridiomycosis are major threats to glass frogs (CITES; 2019 and references herein).

## **5.Recommendations**

I Annex av listeforslaget listes alle artene, og klassifiseres etter hvilke konvensjonskriterier de oppfyller. I Annex I listes artene man ønsker å liste basert på kriteriene i Annex 2a, paragraf A, Res. Conf 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), altså nedadgående og begrenset utbredelse. Disse artene er alle på rødlisten, med begrenset utbredelse, og oppfyller de nevnte

kriteriene. Annex 2 lister de artene man ønsker å liste basert på Annex 2a, paragraf B, Res. Conf 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), altså arter som er i handel. Det er begrenset informasjon om hvilke arter som er i handel, men de fire artene som er spesifikt nevnt under punkt 4. er alle på denne listen. Annex 3 er de resterende artene som man ønsker å liste basert på Article II, Paragraph 2b av Konvensjonen, Annex 2b, Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev.CoP17), altså fordi de er «look-alikes» av de arter som er i handel. Det er svært vanskelig å skille mellom arter av glass frosk (Cisneros-Heredia and McDiarmid, 2007), og basert på dette oppfylles de overnevnte kriteriene for listing. Gitt at gruppen er svært like morfologisk sett og de er truet av habitat ødeleggelse, sykdom og forurensing, er det sannsynlig å tro at uregulert samling og handel vil være ødeleggende for disse artene.

## **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Cisneros-Heredia, D.F., McDiarmid, R.W. (2007) Revision of the characters of Centrolenidae (Amphibia: Anura: *Athesphatanura*) with comments in its taxonomy and the description of new taxa of glassfrogs. Zootaxa 1572: 1 - 82.

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Prop 38 (Hyalibatrachium-spp\_Centrolene-spp\_Cochranella-spp\_Sachatamia-spp). Available online at (in Spanish only):

[https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/S-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Hyalibatrachium-spp\\_Centrolene-spp\\_Cochranella-spp\\_Sachatamia-spp.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/S-CoP18-Prop_draft-Hyalibatrachium-spp_Centrolene-spp_Cochranella-spp_Sachatamia-spp.pdf)

Coloma, L.A., Ron, S.R., Wild, E., Cisneros-Heredia, D., Solís, F., Ibáñez, R., Santos-Barrera, G. and Kubicki, B. 2010. *Hyalinobatrachium fleischmanni*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2010: e.T55014A11238651. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2010-2.RLTS.T55014A11238651.en>.

FAO. 2016. State of the World's Forests 2016. Forests and agriculture: land-use challenges and opportunities. Rome.

IUCN SSC Amphibian Specialist Group 2018. *Centrolene hesperium*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2018: e.T54917A89198000. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-2.RLTS.T54917A89198000.en>

### **IUCN population trends and status:**

*Hyalinobatrachium*:

<https://www.iucnredlist.org/search?taxonomies=120210andsearchType=species>

Centrolene:

<https://www.iucnredlist.org/search?taxonomies=111475andsearchType=species>

Cochranella:

<https://www.iucnredlist.org/search?query=CochranellaandsearchType=species>

*Sachatamia*:

<https://www.iucnredlist.org/search?query=SachatamiaandsearchType=species>

Solís, F., Ibáñez, R., Chaves, G., Savage, J., Bolaños, F., Kubicki, B., Jaramillo, C., Fuenmayor, Q., Coloma, L.A., Ron, S.R., Cisneros-Heredia, D., Bolívar, W., Almendáriz, A. 2008. *Hyalinobatrachium valerioi*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: e.T55036A11243874. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T55036A11243874.en>

Solís, F., Ibáñez, R., Chaves, G., Savage, J., Jaramillo, C., Fuenmayor, Q., Castro, F., Grant, T., Wild, E., Kubicki, B., Sunyer, J. 2010a. *Sachatamia albomaculata*. *The IUCN Red*

*List of Threatened Species* 2010:

e.T54944A11230494. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2010-2.RLTS.T54944A11230494.en>.

Solís, F., Ibáñez, R., Jaramillo, C., Chaves, G., Savage, J., Cruz, G., Wilson, L.D., Köhler, G., Kubicki, B., Sunyer, J. 2010b. *Cochranella granulosa*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2010: e.T54964A11232691. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2010-2.RLTS.T54964A11232691.en>.

CoP18 Prop. 42

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Mexico proposes to include the shortfin mako, *Isurus oxyrinchus* in Appendix II in accordance with Article II paragraph 2 (a) of the Convention and satisfying Criterion B in Annex 2a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17); and *Isurus paucus* (longfin mako), in accordance with Article II paragraph 2 (b) of the Convention and satisfying Criterion A in Annex 2b of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP 17).

**Species name:** *Isurus oxyrinchus* (Rafinesque 1810). Common names: Shortfin mako; Norwegian name: Makrellhai, makohai. Scientific synonyms: *Isurus spallanzanii* (Rafinesque, 1810), *Squalus* (Lamna) *cepedii* (Lesson, 1830), *Lamna oxyrhina* (Cuvier y Valenciennes, in Agassiz, 1838), *Oxyrhina gomphodon* (Müller y Henle, 1839), *Lamna punctata* (Storer, 1839), *Isuropsis dekayi* (Gill, 1862), *Carcharias tigris* (Atwood, 1865), *Lamna guentheri* (Murray, 1884), *Lamna huidobrii* (Philippi, 1887), *Isurus Mako* (Whitley, 1929), *Isurus bideni* (Phillipps, 1932), *Isurus glaucus* (Müller y Henle, 1839), *Isurus tigris africanus* (Smith, 1957). **Similar species to *Isurus oxyrinchus*:** *Isurus paucus* (Guitart, 1966), Marrajo carite, Mako aletas largas. Common name of *I. paucus*: longfin mako

**Distribution:** The shortfin mako is circumglobally distributed in temperate and tropical ocean waters (Campana et al., 2005). Current extremes of their distribution include 20-50° between Australia and Chile, and almost 60° Southeast of New Zealand (Cailliet et al., 2009). The longfin mako is also circumglobally distributed but with narrower longitudes compared to the shortfin mako, with few records from Australasia (Froese and Pauly, 2019).

**Population trend:** *I. oxyrinchus*, decreasing (IUCN, 2004). *I. paucus*, decreasing (IUCN, 2006). For *I. oxyrinchus*, N Atlantic: historical decrease of 39% and projected decrease (next 10 years): 60%; S Atlantic: uncertain; Mediterranean: a decrease of >80% in the last three generations; N Pacific: historical decrease of 16.4%; S Pacific: uncertain; Indian Ocean: historical decrease of 26% and %; projected decrease (next 10 years): 41.6%. (Byrne et al., 2017; Cailliet et al., 2009; CITES, 2019; Heist et al., 1996; ICCAT, 2017; ICES WGEF, 2018; Rice et al., 2015; Schrey and Heist, 2002; Walls and Soldo, 2016)

**Habitat status:** *I. oxyrinchus* not fragmented (IUCN, 2004). *I. paucus* is considered severely fragmented (IUCN, 2006). Hazen et al. (2013) predicted a decline of up to 25% by 2100 in the central habitat of the shortfin mako in the Eastern North Pacific.

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:**

Shortfin mako is one of the most common species in the global fin trade, thus, fishery exploitation is a major source of mortality, and the potential look-alike longfin mako, populations, which, because of their life-history characteristics, have a high risk of overexploitation (Cortés et al. 2010). Shortfin mako is one of the most valuable shark species for its high-quality meat; being normally retained (Campana et al., 2005). The meat is utilized fresh, frozen, smoked and dried-salted for human consumption; the oil is extracted for vitamins; the fins used for shark-fin soup; the hides are processed into leather and the jaws and teeth are used for ornaments (Compagno 2001). It is a frequent bycatch species in pelagic long-line fisheries targeting tuna and billfish, and in other high seas tuna fisheries. It is also an important coastal recreational species (Cailliet et al. 2009), with relatively large quantities reported from both sides of the N Atlantic from sport fisheries to the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, ICCAT (ICES WGEF 2018). Legal trade: In 2010-2016, the Atlantic contributed 50% of the total catches (45,956 tons), the Pacific 34% (31,838 tons) the Indian Ocean 15% (14,043 tons) and the Mediterranean <1% (152 tons), according to FAO's global catch production statistics. Mako meat is nationally and internationally sold (e.g. Dent and Clarke 2015). Independent fishery estimates of the annual number of shortfin mako fins marketed globally by Clarke et al. (2006) reported approximately between 500,000 and 750,000 individuals used per year. According to Clarke (2004), shark fins are obtained worldwide through market channels concentrated in a small number of Asian shopping centers. There are reports of Japanese companies producing 240 tonnes / year of frozen Mako fillets for export to Italy and Spain (Dent and Clarke, 2015).

Illegal trade/finning: Catch data are considered underestimates, and the extent of finning in high seas fisheries is unclear. There have been major discrepancies between reported landings in databases from ICCAT, FAO and EuroStat. The ICCAT Secretariat is currently working on the validation of this database and the associated data mining task (ICES WGEF 2018). TRAFFIC reported that the shortfin mako is one of the species that are subject to IUU trade in the Mediterranean (Lack and Sant, 2008), whereby the level in other regions of the species distribution is unclear.

**2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

Both the shortfin and the longfin makos are listed as Vulnerable by IUCN (2004, 2006). Productivity estimates from the N Atlantic are lower than those from the S Atlantic (ICCAT 2017). Conservation status: Although it is difficult to accurately assess the conservation status of this shark because it is migratory and caught in numerous poorly monitored fisheries worldwide, it is reasonable to assume that decreases may be occurring in those areas for which there is limited or no data (Cailliet et al. 2009). *I. oxyrinchus* is listed as critically endangered in the Mediterranean (Walls and Soldo, 2016)

CMS: Appendix II; Appendix I in Migratory Shark MoU; COSEWIC: In 2006, the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada designated the Atlantic population of the shortfin mako as threatened (DFO, 2006); ICCAT: The N Atlantic shortfin mako stock was assessed in 2017, and found that the northern stock was overfished and was undergoing overfishing; stock status results for the S Atlantic are considered highly uncertain (ICCAT 2017). In light of the 2017 scientific advice, ICCAT adopted strong measures to ensure the sustainability of this fishery. These tools allowed for a positive recovery forecast of the Atlantic population, whose situation will be reviewed by ICCAT's Scientific Committee in 2019.

### **3.Evaluation of trade data**

Data on legal trade are available through catch records collected by many countries and regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs). There is no trade record for shortfin or longfin mako in the CITES trade database as it is not listed. Catch data are considered underestimates, and the extent of finning in high seas fisheries is unclear. Finning has been banned by many major fishing nations (including the EU) and by all of the international RFMOs. The amount of legal trade is currently regulated through the allowed (by)catch in a fishery by countries and RFMOs. It is very difficult to disentangle the "trade" from the "fisheries bycatch" issue, as most shortfin makos are caught as a bycatch species in high value longline fisheries for e.g. tuna or swordfish, and are therefore, for the N Atlantic, assessed through ICCAT.

### **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

EC Regulation No. 1185/2003 (updated by EU Regulation No 605/2013) prohibits the removal of shark fins of these species, and subsequent discarding of the body. Management measures in specific countries can be consulted at <http://www.fao.org/ipoa-sharks/database-of-measures/es/>.

### **5.Recommendations**

Den kortfannede makrellhaien er en art som er mye i handel fordi kjøttet er etterspurt og høyt priset. Den er også en av de viktigste artene i det ulovlige internasjonale markedet for haifinner. Mye av kjøttet/finnene som selges stammer fra bifangst, men det foregår også fiske rettet mot makrellhaien. Den langfannede makrellhaien er morfologisk svært lik og påvirkes også av fisket (look-alike). Begge artene er vurdert som Sårbare på IUCN sin globale rødliste for truede artet og bestandene er i nedgang. Siden fiske/handel antas å være en betydelig årsak til mortalitet hos makrellhai og bidrar til reduserte bestander oppfyller disse artene kravene til listing i Appendix II av Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP 17). Uregulert handel kan være en trussel mot disse artenes overlevelse.

### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Byrne M.E. et al. (2017) Satellite telemetry reveals higher fishing mortality rates than previously estimated, suggesting overfishing of an apex marine predator. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 284:20170658.

Campana, S.E., Marks, L., and Joyce, W. (2005) The biology and fishery of shortfin mako sharks (*Isurus oxyrinchus*) in Atlantic Canadian waters. *Fisheries Research* 73: 341–352.

Cailliet, G.M., Cavanagh, R.D., Kulka, D.W., Stevens, J.D., Soldo, A., Clo, S., Macias, D., Baum, J., Kohin, S., Duarte, A., Holtzhausen, J.A., Acuña, E., Amorim, A., Domingo, A. 2009. *Isurus oxyrinchus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2009: e.T39341A10207466. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2009-2.RLTS.T39341A10207466.en>

CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 42 (*Isurus oxyrinchus*). Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/060319/E-CoP18-Prop-42.pdf>

Clarke, S. (2004) Understanding pressures on fishery resources through trade statistics: a pilot study of four products in the Chinese dried seafood market. *Fish and Fisheries* 5 (1): 53-74.

Clarke, S.C., J.E. Magnussen, D.L. Abercrombie et al. (2006) Identification of shark species composition and proportion in the Hong Kong shark fin market based on molecular genetics and trade records. *Conservation Biology* 20(1): 201-211.

Compagno, L.J.V. (2001) Sharks of the world. An annotated and illustrated catalogue of shark species known to date. Vol. 2. Bullhead, mackerel, and carpet sharks (Heterodontiformes, Lamniformes, and Orectolobiformes). FAO Species Catalogue for Fishery Purposes. No. 1, vol.2. Rome, FAO: 269 p.

Cortes, E., Arocha, F., Beerkircher et al. (2010) Ecological risk assessment of pelagic sharks caught in Atlantic pelagic longline fisheries. *Aquatic Living Resources* 23: 25-34.

Dent, F., Clarke, S. (2015) State of the global market for shark products. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper No. 590. Rome, FAO. 187 pp.

Froese, R., and Pauly, D. (Eds). (2019) FishBase. World Wide Web electronic publication. [www.fishbase.org](http://www.fishbase.org), (02/2019).

Hazen, E.L., Jorgensen, S., Rykaczewski, R.R. et al. (2013) Predicted habitat shifts of Pacific top predators in a changing climate. *Nature Climate Change*, 3(3): 234.

Heist, E.J., Musick, J.A., Graves, J.E. (1996) Genetic population structure of the shortfin Mako (*Isurus oxyrinchus*) inferred from restriction fragment length polymorphism analysis of mitochondrial DNA. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science* 53: 583-588.

ICCAT. (2017) Report of the 2017 ICCAT shortfin mako stock assessment meeting. Madrid, Spain. June 12–16, 2017. [www.iccat.int/Documents/SCRS/DetRep/SMA\\_SA\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.iccat.int/Documents/SCRS/DetRep/SMA_SA_ENG.pdf)

ICES WGEF. (2018) Report of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea's Working Group on Elasmobranch Fishes, 12-28 June 2018, Lisbon, Portugal. ICES CM 2018/ACOM:16. 1306pp.

Reardon, M.B., Gerber, L., Cavanagh, R.D. (2006) *Isurus paucus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2006: e.T60225A12328101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2006.RLTS.T60225A12328101.en>

Rice, J., Tremblay-Boyer, L., Scott, R. et al. (2015) Analysis of stock status and related indicators for key shark species of the Western Central Pacific Fisheries Commission. Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission. WCPFC-SC11-2015/EB-WP-04-Rev 1

Schrey, A., Heist, E. (2003) Microsatellite analysis of population structure in the shortfin mako (*Isurus oxyrinchus*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science* 60: 670-675.

Walls, R.H.L., Soldo, A. (2016) *Isurus oxyrinchus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T39341A16527941.

CoP18 Prop. 14

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Australia proposes to transfer *Leporillus conditor* from CITES Appendix I to II in accordance with the provisions of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), Annex 4 precautionary measures A1 and A2 a(i). The species was selected for Periodic Review of the Appendices at the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee. Australia undertook the review and presented the results at the 30<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee (CITES, 2018).

**Species name:** *Leporillus conditor* (Gould, 1848). Common name: Greater Stick-nest Rat, Wopilkara. Synonyms: *Mus conditor* Gould, 1848; *Leporillus jonesi* Thomas, 1912.

**Distribution:** *L. conditor* became extinct on mainland Australia in the 1930s, remaining only on the Franklin Islands (5.1 km<sup>2</sup>), South Australia (Copley, 1999). The species has been introduced to a number of sites in Western and South Australia and New South Wales (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016).

**Population trend:** Stable, with an estimated number of individuals of about 3000-4000 (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016).

**Habitat status:** Not fragmented (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** There are no known records of trade in this species in the CITES Trade Database and the species is not traded domestically (CITES, 2019).

### **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*L. conditor* has been listed on CITES Appendix I since 1975 and on Appendix A of EU Wildlife Trade Regulations since 1997 (Species+). The species is listed as Near Threatened ver. 3.1 on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016).

### **3.Evaluation of trade data**

There are no records of the species in the CITES Trade Database.

### **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

The species was subject to Periodic Review of the Appendices, and the Animals Committee, at its 30<sup>th</sup> meeting (Geneva, 2018) concluded with the following: The Committee determined that in accordance with subparagraphs 2 g) and h) of Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP17) the six species reviewed by Australia meet the criteria in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) for transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II as outlined

in CITES, 2018. The Committee asked the Secretariat to invite Australia to submit these proposals to the Conference of the Parties at its 18th meeting.

### **5.Recommendations**

*L. conditor* er hovedsakelig truet av predasjon fra katter og rever og det er ikke noe som tyder på at de noen gang har vært i handel, hverken lovlig eller ulovlig. Den foreslåtte nedlistingen er dermed i tråd med føre-vare kriteriene i Annex 4, A1, A2 a(i), Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Handel er ikke forventet å være ødeleggende for denne arten.

### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Burbidge, A.A., Manly, B.F.J. (2002) Mammal extinctions on Australian islands: causes and conservation implications. *Journal of Biogeography* 29: 465-474.

CITES 2018. *Leporillus conditor* - Report of Australia. AC30 Doc.29.2.3. Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/30/E-AC30-29-02-03.pdf>

CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 14 (*Leporillus conditor*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Leporillus-conditor.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Leporillus-conditor.pdf)

Copley, P. (1999) Natural histories of Australia's stick-nest rats, genus *Leporillus conditor* (Rodentia: Muridae). *Wildlife Research* 26: 513-599

Woinarski, J. and Burbidge, A.A. 2016. *Leporillus conditor*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T11634A22457522. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-2.RLTS.T11634A22457522.en>.

CoP18 Prop. 10

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Zambia proposes to transfer its elephant population from Appendix I to Appendix II subject to the annotation opening for commercial trade in registered raw ivory tusks, hide and leather goods, and non-commercial trade in hunting trophies. All other specimen shall be deemed to be specimen of Appendix I. The rationale for this proposal is that the Zambian elephant population no longer fulfil the criteria for an Appendix I listing. Zambia argues that the current population meets criteria A of Annex 2b of Res. Conf. 9.24, for an Appendix II listing. This is Zambia's third proposal towards down listing of its elephant population (CITES, 2010; CITES, 2002).

**Species name:** *Loxodonta Africana* (Blumenbach, 1797). Common name: African elephant. Norsk name: Afrikansk savanneelefant

**Distribution:** In Zambia, Populations of elephants may be found in the Luangwa Valley, the Lower Zambezi Valley, Sioma Ngwezi, the Nsumbu/Mweru Wa Ntipa, the Kafue National Park and adjacent areas, Sesheke/Senanga districts, Kasanka/Lavushi Manda areas and Chizera/West Lunga in the North Western Province (CITES, 2019)



**Population trend:** The estimated number of elephants in Zambia is 21,967 (95% +- 4,703) (Thouless et al., 2016). In the African Elephant Status Report of 2016, Thouless et al., 2016 also indicated that there may be an additional 214 to 314 or even more individuals in areas not systematically surveyed. These estimates are based on surveys of 62% of known/possible elephant range, and 38% of possible range is still unaccounted for (Thouless et al., 2016). According to Thouless et al. (2016), elephant numbers in Zambia have changed little since the last update (African Elephant Status Report, 2007), although there has been a significant reduction in numbers in the Sioma Ngwezi National Park. It is however important to note that since a range of different survey techniques are used, reliable estimation of population trends is difficult. The Zambezi population is part of the large population inhabiting the border areas of Botswana, Zimbabwe, Namibia and Zambia (Kavango Zambesi Transfrontier Conservation Area). This population holds nearly 75% of the southern African elephant population, but the status for this critically important population is currently not known (Thouless et al., 2016).

**Habitat status:** Not fragmented (CITES, 2019). Elephant range in Zambia comprise several sub-regions larger than 10,000 km<sup>2</sup> (CITES, 2019). Elephant sub-regions cover diverse landscapes, and includes National Parks, Game Management Parks, and some open areas (CITES, 2019).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Trophy hunting is legal in Zambia, with an annual quota of 80 individuals (160 tusks and other hunting trophy parts) (Thouless et al., 2016). Poaching and illegal trade in ivory is a major problem.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

All populations of *L. africana* are listed on Appendix I of CITES since 1989, with the exception of the populations of Botswana, Namibia, and Zimbabwe, which are included in Appendix II (since 1997) and South Africa (since 2000). The species is also listed in Annex A of the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations (since 1997), but with the populations of Botswana, Namibia, Zimbabwe and south Africa listed in Annex B. The African elephant is listed as Vulnerable (A2a ver 3.1) in the IUCN Red List (Blanc, 2008). It is anticipated that a draft assessment against the Red List criteria will be submitted to IUCN for review by October 2018 (African Elephant Specialist Group).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

Zambia has a legal quota for hunting trophies, and exports some wild caught hunting trophies annually (not exceeding their quota) (CITES Trade Database). The main problem is not the trophy hunting but poaching of elephants for ivory and illegal trade. Southern Africa (as the rest of Africa) is facing increasing poaching of elephants for ivory, and the Zambian population is among the more severely affected populations (Thouless et al., 2016). Zambia is a major source and conduit of Africa's illegal ivory (Wasser et al., 2018). In fact, the largest single ivory seizure since the ivory trade ban- 6.5 tonnes in Singapore in 2002 - was shown by DNA analyses to have originated almost entirely from Zambia (Wasser et al., 2018; 2007). Several other large seizures from Zambia have followed

(Wasser et al., 2018). Studies by Wasser et al. (e.g. Wasser et al. 2008; 2015) clearly demonstrate that the illegal ivory trade issue is a transnational issue in Africa, with advanced criminal gangs operating the transactions of ivory in and out of African countries and subsequently out of the continent.

#### **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

*L. Africana* is distributed across 37 range states in Africa, and there is substantial variation in the status of the species across its range. Southern, Eastern, Central and West Africa have 71%, 20%, 6% and 3% of the continental population respectively (SC69) Populations in different regions and countries face different challenges, including poaching for ivory, human-elephant conflict and habitat loss and fragmentation (Thouless et al., 2016). In 2016, the total continental population of *L. africana* was estimated to 415,428 ( $\pm$  20,111) elephants, with an additional 117,127 to 135,384 elephants in areas not systematically surveyed. This indicates a population decline of some 111,000 elephants over ten years (Thouless et al. 2016). Southern Africa hold the largest number of elephants on the continent, with an estimated 293,447 ( $\pm$  16,682) individuals (Thouless et al. 2016). This is 27,000 fewer than what was reported in the status report from 2007 (Thouless et al., 2016). Previous attempts by Zambia to down list its elephant population has been rejected (CITES, 2010; CITES, 2002).

#### **5. Recommendations**

Zambia ønsker å overføre sin elefantbestand fra Appendix I til Appendix II for blant annet kunne åpne for kommersielt salg av ubehandlet elfenben fra registrerte lager. Med unntak av den foreslåtte annotasjonen (se 1.) skal bestanden fortsatt behandles som Appendix I. Det argumenteres med at nedlisting vil være i henhold Annex 2b, kriterium A av Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), altså at spesimen av arten i handel ligner spesimen av en art listet i Appendix II. Listing av elefant er allerede splittet og det vil fortsette å være elefantbestander listet på både Appendix I og II. Det er dermed uklart om dette kriteriet kan brukes for denne arten - i så fall må alle populasjonene flyttes til Appendix II. Videre argumenteres det at den foreslåtte nedlistingen og annotasjonen oppfyller føre-var kriteriene (Precautionary measures, Annex 4) i Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Basert på data presentert under punkt 3 og 4, virker det usannsynlig at overføring av Zambias elefantpopulasjon til Appendix II for kommersielt salg av elfenben oppfyller føre-var kriteriene. Krypskyting er i oppgang i hele Afrika, også i Sør-Afrika. Det illegale markedet med elfenben drives av profesjonelle organiserte kriminelle gjenger med svært avanserte metoder, og jobber på tvers av landegrenser. På nåværende tidspunkt vil handel være ødeleggende for overlevelsen til denne arten.

#### **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Blanc, J. 2008. *Loxodonta africana*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: e.T12392A3339343. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T12392A3339343.en>.  
CITES, 2010. CoP15 Prop. 5. (*Loxodonta Africana*) Available online at: <https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/15/prop/E-15-Prop-05.pdf>  
CITES, 2002. CoP12 Pop9 (*Loxodonta Africana*) Available online at: <https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/12/prop/E12-P09.pdf>

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal X (*Loxodonta africana*) Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Loxodonta-africana-Zambia.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Loxodonta-africana-Zambia.pdf)

Thouless, C.R., Dublin, H.T., Blanc, J.J., Skinner, D.P., Daniel, T.E., Taylor, R.D., Maisels, F., Frederick H. L. and Bouché, P. (2016). African Elephant Status Report 2016: an update from the African Elephant Database. Occasional Paper Series of the IUCN Species Survival Commission, No. 60 IUCN / SSC Africa Elephant Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

Wasser et al. (2018). Elephants, Ivory and Trade. Science 327:1331-1332  
DOI:10.1126/science.1187811

Wasser, S., Mailand, C., Booth, R., Mutayoba, B., Kisamo, E., Clark, B., Stephens, M. (2007). Using DNA to track the origin of the largest ivory seizure since the 1989 trade ban. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science 104: 4228-4233.  
[www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0609714104](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0609714104)

## CoP18 Prop. 11

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe proposes to amend the Annotation for the Appendix II listing of the elephant populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe. The following amendments are suggested:

- iv) *raw ivory pursuant to the conditional sale of registered government-owned ivory stocks agreed at CoP12, which are 20,000 kg (Botswana), 10,000 kg (Namibia) and 30,000 kg (South Africa);*
- v) *in addition to the quantities agreed at CoP12, government-owned ivory from Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe registered by 31 January 2007 and verified by the Secretariat may be traded and despatched, with the ivory in paragraph (g) iv) above, in a single sale per destination under strict supervision of the Secretariat; the additional quantities specified in paragraph (g) v) above shall be traded only after the Standing Committee has agreed that the above conditions have been met; and*
- h) *no further proposals to allow trade in elephant ivory from populations already in Appendix II shall be submitted to the Conference of the Parties for the period from CoP14 and ending nine years from the date of the single sale of ivory that is to take place in accordance with provisions in paragraphs g) i), g) ii), g) iii), g) vi) and g) vii). In addition such further proposals shall be dealt with in accordance with Decisions 16.55 and 14.78 (Rev. CoP16).*

**Species name:** *Loxodonta africana* (Blumenbach, 1797). Common name: African elephant. Norsk name: Afrikansk savanneelefant

**Distribution:** There are currently 37 African range states with known and possible elephant populations, covering a range of over 3.1 million km<sup>2</sup> (CITES, 2017). Guinea Bissau and Somalia are still considered range states although the status of their

populations are uncertain. *L. africana* is not evenly distributed across its range, and populations in different regions and countries face very different challenges. Southern, Eastern, Central and Western Africa have 71%, 20%, 6% and 3% of the continental population respectively (CITES, 2017).

**Population trend:** Declining overall. In 2016, 37 African elephant range States were thought to hold 415,428 ( $\pm 20,111$ ) elephants, with an additional 117,127 to 135,384 elephants in areas not systematically surveyed. This is estimated to represent a decline of some 111,000 elephants over ten years (Thouless et al. 2016). Southern Africa holds the largest number of elephants on the continent, with an estimated 293,447 ( $\pm 16,682$ ) individuals (Thouless et al. 2016). This is 27,000 fewer than what was reported in the status report from 2007 (Thouless et al. 2016).

**Country specific estimates** (from Thouless et al., 2016)

Zimbabwe: 82,630 ( $\pm 8,589$ ) Declining

Botswana: 131,626 ( $\pm 12,508$ ) Population trend is unclear.

South Africa: 18,841 ( $\pm 0$ ) Increasing

Namibia: 21,967 ( $\pm 4,704$ ) Increasing

**Habitat status:** Will vary across range states. The African Elephant Status Report 2016 reports a steady loss of elephant range, although this may be caused by estimation biases (CITES, 2019).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:**

Three of the proposing countries all issue annual export quotas for trophy hunting, which are currently i) tusks as trophies from 90 animals (Namibia); ii) tusks as trophies from 150 animals (South Africa); iii) tusks as trophies from 500 animals (Zimbabwe). Poaching and illegal trade in ivory is a major problem across the species range.

**2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

All populations of *L. africana* have been listed on Appendix I of CITES since 1989, with the exception of populations later transferred to Appendix II from Botswana, Namibia, and Zimbabwe (since 1997) and South Africa (since 2000). The species is also listed in Annex A of the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations (since 1997), but with the populations of Botswana, Namibia, Zimbabwe and south Africa listed in Annex B. The African elephant is listed as Vulnerable (A2a ver 3.1) in the IUCN Red List (Blanc, 20081). The African Elephant Specialist Group's Red List Authority is currently updating the 2008 Red List assessment of the African elephant as part of IUCN's Global Mammal Assessment, which will be the most comprehensive examination of elephant population and range data across the continent to date.

**3.Evaluation of trade data**

See 4.

#### **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

CoP18 Doc. 69.2 (CITES, 2019b), which is the report on Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) report contains up to date information on illegal killing of elephants, based on information from 2003 through to 2017. It reports the proportion of illegally killed elephants recorded at 60 designated MIKE-sites in Africa, which together holds an estimated 30-40 % of the African elephant population (CITES, 2019b). The proportion of Illegally Killed Elephants (PIKE) is calculated as the number of illegally killed elephants found divided by the number of elephant carcasses encountered ([https://cites.org/eng/prog/mike/data\\_and\\_reports#MIKE](https://cites.org/eng/prog/mike/data_and_reports#MIKE) Data Analysis). PIKE is used as an indication of poaching trends and PIKE levels above 0.5 is considered a threshold above which elephant populations are very likely to be in net decline (CITES, 2019b). Southern Africa is the only region where the regional PIKE value is below 0.5, however the PIKE estimate for Southern Africa has increased from 0.41 in 2016 to 0.48 in 2017, thus approaching the 0.5 threshold for what is considered "sustainable" (CITES, 2019b). There has been an increase in PIKE levels at both Chobe National Park in Botswana and Kruger National Park in South Africa (CITES, 2019b).

Doc. 69.3 (Rev. 1) presents an analysis of illegal ivory trade based on data in the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS). Considerable quantities of ivory have entered the international trade from South Africa, but despite the recent increase in poaching in Kruger National Park, most of the ivory in a large shipment destined to Viet Nam is believed to have originated from outside South Africa. Seizure records show that small quantities of raw ivory from Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and Zimbabwe occasionally enter South Africa, thus there is some concern that consolidation of ivory from neighbouring countries for future illegal exports is a factor (CITES, 2019c). Studies by Wasser et al. (e.g. 2008; 2015; 2018) illustrate that the illegal ivory market is a transnational challenge, affecting the African elephant population as a whole (40, 000 elephants are estimated to be killed by poaching annually, Wasser et al., 2018).

#### **5. Recommendations**

Det er i Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) ikke gitt noen eksplisitte retningslinjer for hvordan man skal forholde seg til en søknad om endring eller sletting av en annotasjon for en Appendix II art. Det er vanskelig å vurdere de fire bestandene i søknaden under ett da de nasjonale utfordringene er ulike mellom landene. Derfor er det vanskelig å identifisere til hvilken grad de ulike landene oppfyller føre-var kriteriene Anneks 4, av overnevnte Resolusjon.

Men flere studier og analyser (se 4.) konkluderer med at den illegale handelen med elfenben drives av internasjonale nettverk som jobber på tvers av landegrenser. Den totale elefantbestanden er i nedgang (estimert til en nedgang på 111,000 elefanter de siste 10 år, Thouless et al., 2016). Basert på dette og på nåværende tidspunkt vil handel kunne være ødeleggende for artens videre overlevelse.

## 6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)

**CITES, 2017. SC69 Doc. 51.1:** Status of elephant populations, levels of illegal killing, and the trade in ivory: A report to the CITES Standing Committee. Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/69/E-SC69-51-01-A.pdf>

CITES, 2019. *Loxodonta Africana* CoP18 Proposal x. Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Loxodonta%20africana-annotation2.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Loxodonta%20africana-annotation2.pdf)

CITES 2019b. CoP18 Doc. 69.2. Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/doc/E-CoP18-069-02.pdf>

CITES, 2019c. CoP18 Doc. 69.3 (Rev.1). Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/doc/E-CoP18-069-03-R1.pdf>

CITES, 2018. SC70 Doc. 49.1: Report on the conservation status of the African and Asian elephants, trade in elephant specimens, the African Elephant Action Plan, and MIKE and ETIS. Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/70/E-SC70-49-01.pdf>

Wasser, S. K., Clark, W.J., Drori, O., Kisamo, E.S., Mailand, C., Mutayoba, B., Stephens, M. (2008) Combating the illegal trade in African Elephant Ivory with DNA Forensics. *Conservation Biology* 22 (4): 1065-1071.

Wasser, S.K., Brow, L., Mailand, C., Mondol, S., Clark, W., Laurie, C., Wir, B.S. (2015) Genetic assignment of large seizures of elephant ivory reveals Africa's major poaching hotspots. *Science* 349 (6243): 64-87. doi: 10.1126/science.aaa2457

Wasser et al. (2018) Elephants, Ivory and Trade. *Science* 327 (5971):1331-1332. DOI: 10.1126/science.1187811

### CoP18 Prop. 12

Note that information about the elephant populations in Prop. 12 is already presented in the assessment of proposal 11 above.

Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Kenya, Liberia, Niger, Nigeria, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic and Togo propose to list the **African elephant** (*Loxodonta africana*) populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe on CITES Appendix I. The proponents argue that the listing would be in accordance with Res. Conf. 9.24 Annex 1, C, in that there has been a marked decline in population size in the wild and Annex 3 "listing of a species in more than one Appendix should be avoided in general in view of the enforcement problems it creates". Furthermore, the opening paragraph of Annex 4, precautionary measures, is highlighted.

The total elephant population has showed a marked decline over the last decade (111, 000 elephants) (see assessment for Prop. 11). While Southern Africa is the stronghold for the African elephant population, the population had declined with approximately 27,000 individuals since the last status report was published in 2007 (see assessment for Prop.

11). There is high uncertainty regarding the population estimates in the African Elephant Status Report (Thouless et al., 2016, cited in Prop. 11), but the population trend for South Africa and Namibia is increasing. The Zimbabwe population has declined with approximately 10,000 individuals since the last status report in 2007. No trend is available for the Botswana population. While a decline of 10,000 individuals in the Zimbabwe population is significant, it is not enough to count as a marked decline in terms of the guidelines of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) (50% over the last 10 years or 3 generations, which for elephants is 75 years), since the population was reported to have been growing exponentially between 1990 and 2006 (<https://conservationaction.co.za/resources/reports/zimbabwe-national-elephant-management-plan-2015-2020/>).

Basert på overnevnte informasjon ser ikke elefantbestandene i Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe ut til å oppfylle kriteriene i Anneks 1, C, Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

CoP18 Prop. 7

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

India (supported by Bangladesh and Nepal) proposes to transfer the smooth-coated otter (*Lutrogale perspicillata*) from Appendix II to Appendix I. According to the proponents the species meets the criteria found in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16), Annex 1 as it is experiencing habitat loss and degradation, they also claim that it is detrimentally affected by persecution and international trade.

**Species name:** *Lutrogale perspicillata* (I. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1826). Synonym: *Lutra perspicillata* I. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1826. Common names: Smooth-coated otter, Indian smooth-coated otter. Norwegian name: Korthåret otter.

**Distribution:** The smooth-coated otter is found in a wide range of wetland habitats and is distributed throughout south Asia and southeast Asia, in the following range Sates: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Thailand and Viet Nam.

**Population trend:** Decreasing (IUCN, 2015). A reliable population estimate is not available (de Silva et al. 2015). There is a continuing decline of mature individuals.

**Habitat status:** The habitat is severely fragmented. The species is found in large rivers, lakes, peat swamp forests, coastal mangroves, estuaries and rice fields (de Silva et al. 2015).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:**

Asian river otters are primarily exploited either for their fur or as pets. Otters are further used in traditional Asian medicine.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*L. perspicillata* is listed as Vulnerable on the IUCN Red List (2015). It has been listed in CITES Appendix II since 1977 and the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations Annex B since 1997.

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

The legal trade restricted to a few live specimens for scientific or zoological purposes. Most of the demand for skins is from China. Analysis of illegal trade for the years 1980-2015 documented confiscation of 5,881 individuals. The majority were hunted for their fur and it is difficult to identify at the species level between four Asian otter species (Gomez et al. 2017). Investigations focusing on on-line otter trade and increasing seizures of live otters suggests that the demand for live, juvenile otters as pets is increasing (Gomez et al. 2016). The small-clawed otter, *Aonyx cinereus* appear (see CoP18 proposal 4) is the most popular pet, but *L. Perspicillata* is also found in the pet trade. Hybrids between the two species have also been observed in captivity (Gomez et al. 2016).

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

*L. perspicillata* is protected in the range States, except in Cambodia and Brunei Darussalam (CITES, 2019).

## **5.Recommendations**

Korthåret oter er en semi-akvatisk art som lever i et område der menneskelig aktivitet fører til at tilgjengelig, egnet habitat er minkende. Antallet individer er nedadgående og arten tilfredstiller som sådan kravet til listing i CITES Appendix I i følge Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Etterspørsel etter pels har lenge ført til ulovlig jakt på *L. perspicillata* og tre andre arter av asiatiske otere. Asiatiske otere er også i senere tid blitt svært populære i kjæledyrhandel og den ulovlige handelen av viltfangede dyr er omfattende. *A. cinereus* (se CoP18 søknad 4) er mest populær, men handelen påvirker også korthåret oter. Handel kan være en trussel for denne artens overlevelse.

## **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 36 (*Lutrogale-perspicillata*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Lutrogale-perspicillataxx.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Lutrogale-perspicillataxx.pdf).

Gomez, L., Leupen, B., Theng, M., Fernandez, K., Savage, M. (2017). Illegal Otter Trade: An Analysis of Seizures in Selected Asian Countries (1980-2015). TRAFFIC Report.

Kitade, T., Naruse, Y. (2018) Otter alert. A rapid assessment of illegal trade and booming demand in Japan. *TRAFFIC Report*.

de Silva, P., Khan, W.A., Kanchanasaka, B., Reza Lubis, I., Feeroz, M.M., Al-Sheikhly, O.F. 2015. *Lutrogale perspicillata*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2015: e.T12427A21934884. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2015-2.RLTS.T12427A21934884.en>.



**1. Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Sri Lanka proposes to include *Lyriocephalus scutatus* in Appendix I, in accordance with Article II Paragraph 1 of the Convention and Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev CoP17). According to the proponent the species has a restricted area of distribution and is characterized by a high vulnerability to intrinsic and extrinsic factors combined with observed and inferred decrease in both area and quality of its habitat.

**Species name:** Scientific name: *Lyriocephalus scutatus* (Linnaeus, 1758). Synonyms: *Lyriocephalus margaritaceus* Merrem, 1820 and *Lyriocephalus macgregorii* Gray, 1835. Common names: Hump snout lizard, hump-nosed Lizard and lyreshead lizard.

**Distribution:** The species is endemic to Sri Lanka where it has an extent of occurrence of less than 17,400 km<sup>2</sup>. However, according to Sri Lanka's Ministry of Environment (2012), the area of occurrence for *L. scutatus* is less than 5,000 km<sup>2</sup> (CITES, 2019). It is most commonly found in closed canopy sub-montane rainforest (Somaweera and de Silva 2010).

**Population trend:** Unknown (IUCN, 2010).

**Habitat status:** Fragmented (IUCN, 2010). Deforestation has decreased the available habitat for *L. scutatus* (Somaweera and de Silva, 2010).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Trade in *L. scutatus* has been strictly prohibited in Sri Lanka since 1993. Nevertheless, the species is likely to be collected from the wild for pet trade (Somaweera and de Silva, 2010).

**2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*L. scutatus* is listed as Near Threatened on the IUCN Red List (2010).

**3. Evaluation of trade data**

Despite the trade ban for *L. scutatus* smuggling and illegal trade of has continued in recent times (Altherr, 2014; Auliya et al. 2016). The proponent provided examples of on-line sale in Asia, Europe and the USA with prizes up to USD 5,500 for a pair (CITES, 2019).

**4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

*L. scutatus* is classified on Sri Lanka's Red List as Vulnerable. All Sri Lankan reptiles are protected under the national Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance legislation, which prohibits hunting, capturing and exporting. Ranching and breeding of reptile species is not permitted in Sri Lanka (CITES, 2019).

**5. Recommendations**

*L. scutatus* er en øgle som har et svært begrenset utbredelsesområde på Sri Lanka, området er fragmentert og av minkende omfang og kvalitet. Arten kvalifiserer dermed til flere av kriteriene beskrevet i Annex I av Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev.CoP17). Det er påvist at

internasjonal handel forekommer til tross for forbud mot innsamling av reptiler på Sri Lanka. Handel kan være en trussel mot denne artens overlevelse.

#### **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Altherr, S. (2014) Stolen Wildlife –Why the EU needs to tackle smuggling of nationally protected species. Pro Wildlife (ed.), Munich, Germany.

Auliya, M., Altherr, S., Ariano-Sanchez, D., Baard, E.H., Brown, C., Brown, R.M., Cantu, J.C., Gentile, G., Gildenhuys, P., Henningheim, E., Hintzmann, J., Kanari, K., Krvavac, M., Lettink, M., Lippert, J., Luiselli, L., Nilson, G., Nguyen, T.Q., Nijman, V., Parham, J.F., Pasachnik, S.A., Pedrono, M., Rauhaus, A., Rueda Córdova, D., Sanchez, M.E., Schepp, U., van Schingen, M., Schneeweiss, N., Segniagbeto, G.H., Somaweera, R., Sy E.Y., Türkozan, O., Vinke, S., Vinke, T., Vyas, R., Williamson, S., Ziegler, T. (2016) Trade in live reptiles, its impact on wild populations, and the role of the European market. Biological Conservation 204 (Part A): 103-119.

CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 37 (*Lyriocephalus scutatus*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Lyriocephalus-scutatus.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Lyriocephalus-scutatus.pdf).

Somaweera, R., de Silva, A. 2010. *Lyriocephalus scutatus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2010: e.T170409A6778615. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2010-4.RLTS.T170409A6778615.en>.

#### Cop18 Prop. 37

#### **1. Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Kenya (supported by the United States of America) proposes transfer of the pancake tortoise, *Malacochersus tornieri*, from Appendix II to Appendix I. According to the proponent the species satisfies Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), Annex 1 Criterion B. as the species has a restricted, fragmented and decreasing distribution area, and Criterion C. due to a marked decline in the population size.

**Species name:** *Malacochersus tornieri* (Siebenrock, 1903). Synonym: *Testudo tornieri* Siebenrock, 1903. Common names: Crevice tortoise, pancake tortoise, softshell tortoise, Tornier's tortoise. Norwegian name: Pannekakeskillpadde.

**Distribution:** *M. tornieri* is found in Kenya, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia where it is restricted to rock crevices in small rocky hills (kopjes) in dry savannah.

**Population trend:** Unspecified. There exist no population estimate and the species status was last assessed by IUCN in 1996. The population in Zambia has been confirmed only by one study where 68 individuals were observed (Chansa and Wagner, 2006).

**Habitat status:** Fragmented (CITES, 2019).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:**

The pancake tortoise is a popular pet, and the trade in captive bred live animals is extensive. Illegal trade is known to occur. The United Republic of Tanzania had a quota of 940 individuals in each 2016 and 2017 (Species+).

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*M. tornieri* is listed as Vulnerable by IUCN (1996). A draft for a new Red List assessment changing the status to Critically Endangered was finalized in 2018 (CITES, 2019). The Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group listed the pancake turtle among the 25+ most endangered turtle species in 2018 (TFTSG, 2018). The species has been listed in CITES Appendix II as part of the higher taxon listing of *Testudines* since 1975, and EU Wildlife Trade Regulations Annex A since 1997.

There are huge discrepancies between reported exports and imports in the CITES trade database (<http://trade.cites.org/>). The export from Zambia began the same year as the presence of the species in the country was first documented (Chansa and Wagner 2006). Since then thousands of individuals, allegedly bred in captivity, has been exported. A high number of exports have also been reported from non-range States. Given the low reproduction rate of the species (it reaches maturity at age 5-9 and produces 1-2 eggs annually) and lack of information on breeding facilities (CITES, 2019) there is reason to believe that wild caught animals are smuggled from range States. Pancake tortoises are sold on-line for prices around \$400 per individual. According to the proponent and references herein over-collection from the wild for international trade in live animals has been identified as the single most important threat to *M. tornieri* (CITES, 2019).

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

A majority of pancake Tortoise populations occur outside protected areas (CITES, 2019). Kenya and the United States of America proposed to transfer *M. tornieri* from Appendix II to I to CITES CoP11 (Prop 39), but the proposal was withdrawn. In 2018, CITES suspended the United Republic of Tanzania of trade of all exports, except specimens produced from ranching/captive-breeding operations for which an annual export quota has to be agreed between the Management Authority and the Secretariat (CITES Notif. No. 2018/006).

## **5.Recommendations**

Statusen til pannekakeskillpadden har ikke vært vurdert siden 1996, men siden den gangen har både utbredelsesarealet og bestandstørrelsen avtatt. Den ble regnet blant verdens 25+ mest truede skillpaddearter i 2018 og er vurdert som Kritisk truet av Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group. Arten oppfyller derfor flere av kriteriene beskrevet under Annex I av Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Skillpaddens lave foremeringsrate gjør den spesielt sårbar. Det er grunn til å tro at det foregår omfattende ulovlig handel med viltfangede individer. Handel kan være en trussel for overlevelsen til denne arten.

## **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Chansa, W., Wagner, P. (2006) On the status of *Malacochersus tornieri* (Siebenrock, 1903) in Zambia. Salamandra 42: 187-190.

CITES 2019. CoP18 proposal 38 (*Malacochersus tornieri*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Malacochersus-tornieri.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Malacochersus-tornieri.pdf).

Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group 1996. *Malacochersus tornieri*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 1996: e.T12696A3373951.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.1996.RLTS.T12696A3373951.en>. Downloaded on 26 February 2019.

TFTSG 2018. Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group 2018. Turtles in Trouble: The World's Top 25 Most Endangered Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles – 2018. [www.iucn-tftsg.org/turtles-in-trouble-2018/](http://www.iucn-tftsg.org/turtles-in-trouble-2018/).

## CoP18 Prop. 13

### 1. Review of listing proposal under CITES

Israel and Kenya propose to list the Woolly mammoth, *Mammuthus primigenius*, in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2 (b) of the Convention (the so-called "look-alike provision"). The purpose of this listing proposal is to prevent illegal trade in living elephants by preventing "laundering" or mislabelling of elephant ivory.

**Species name:** *Mammuthus primigenius* (Blumenbach, 1799). Common name: Woolly mammoth. Norsk navn: Ullhåret mammutt.

**Distribution:** The woolly mammoth is extinct.

**Population trend:** N/A

**Habitat status:** N/A

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** There may be as many as 10 million mammoth tusks in Siberia and elsewhere, and these are likely to become more and more available to people with global warming and melting permafrost (Aryal et al., 2018). Demand and use of mammoth ivory has been on the increase over the past few decades, as it has become more available (CITES, 2019). International trade in mammoth tusks is currently legal and is poorly documented (CITES, 2019).

### 2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions

N/A

### 3. Evaluation of trade data

The major exporter of mammoth ivory is Russia, and mammoth tusks are being imported to Hong Kong and onwards to China. There has been a significant increase in such imports, from less than 9 tonnes a year from 2000 to 2003, to an average of 31 tonnes per year from 2007 to 2013 (CITES, 2019). Wholesale prices of mammoth ivory tusks have increased with the increasing demand from China - for example in 2010, wholesale prices

of top grade mammoth ivory was USD 350/kg, whereas in 2014 it was USD 1900/kg (Vigne and Martin, 2014, cited in CITES, 2019).

Through a survey of the US ivory market, TRAFFIC revealed several cases of intentional mislabelling of illegal elephant tusks as mammoth tusks (Kramer et al., 2017). For example, in 2015, undercover NYDEC officers purchased a carving from a shop in Manhattan, and the salesperson claimed that it was made from mammoth tusks. Subsequent analyses revealed it to be elephant ivory, and when returning to the shop, officers found and seized elephant ivory products estimated to be worth 4.5 million USD (Kramer et al., 2017).

#### **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

Larger sections of raw wholly mammoth tusks are distinguishable from elephant ivory by their shape (twisted, not straight). Polished cross-sections of elephant and mammoth ivory display characteristic Schreger lines, which can be seen within the outside layer of the tusk.

The average angle of the Schreder-lines is generally different between the two species, and may be used to identify whether the tusks are from a mammoth or an elephant (Espinoza and Mann, 2017). Moreover, mammoth ivory will occasionally display intrusive brownish or blue-green coloured blemishes caused by the iron phosphate vivianite. Elephant ivory will not display vivianite discolouration in its natural state (Espinoza and Mann, 2017). However, sections of tusks, as well as worked mammoth ivory are difficult to differentiate from elephant ivory (CITES, 2019). Grade A mammoth ivory can easily be mixed up with elephant ivory, especially when carved into small items (CITES, 2019). At CoP17, Israel submitted a working document on trade in mammoth ivory, highlighting current issues in relation to the legal mammoth trade and its effect on elephant ivory trade and poaching and proposed a draft Resolution and Decisions related to this topic (CITES, 2016). Some of the comments from the CITES secretariat on the above-mentioned document included concerns on whether an extinct species could be covered by the scope of the Convention, and that the risk of mislabelling tusks was mainly an issue with carved items. It was also noted that very few data on the extent of mislabelling of elephant tusks as ivory was presented. The proposed Resolution was not adopted at CoP17 (CITES, 2016).

#### **5. Recommendations**

Listeforslaget som omhandler ullhåret mammut er det første av sitt slag, et forslag om å inkludere en utryddet art i CITES Appendiks II. Dette for å hindre at lovlig handel med støttenner fra mammut skal kunne bidra til den ulovlige handelen med støttenner fra elefant.

Israel mener at den foreslåtte listingen av mammut er i tråd med den såkalte look-alike paragafen - Anneks 2b, A og B, Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

Siden handel med støttenner fra mammut er lovlig i de aller fleste land så finnes det ikke så mye data på denne handelen. Det er hovedsakelig behandlet elfenben som kan merkes som fra mammut. Det er vanskelig å si hvor utbredt dette er, men TRAFFICs analyse av USAs nasjonale elfenbensmarked avslørte flere tilfeller av feilmerking. Ser man bort i fra

at arten er utryddet så er forslaget om å liste mammut i Appendiks II i tråd med overnevnte kriterier i Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), ved at spesimen av arten i handel er i en form som minner om spesimen av en art som er inkludert i Appendiks I eller II, og at de tilfeller det er snakk om import/eksport av behandlet (for eksempel laget til figurer) elfenben vil det kunne være vanskelig for de som skal kontrollere importen/eksporten å avgjøre hvilken art det er snakk om.

## **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Aryal, A., Morley, C. G., McLean, I. G. (2018) Conserving elephants depend on a total ban of ivory trade globally. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 27: 2767–2775.

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 13 (*Mammuthus primigenius*). Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/060319/E-CoP18-Prop-13.pdf>

CITES, 2016. CoP17 Doc. 17.38.

<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/WorkingDocs/E-CoP17-38.pdf>

Espinoza, E. O., Mann, M.-J. (2017). Identification Guide for Ivory and Ivory Substitutes; Updated Web-based Version. <https://www.fws.gov/lab/ivory.php>. Downloaded on 1 December 2018.

Kramer, R., Sawyer, R., Amato, S., LaFontaine, P. (2017)

The US elephant ivory market: A new baseline. TRAFFIC, Washington, DC.

Vigne, L., Martin, E. (2014). China Faces a Conservation Challenge: the Expanding Elephant and Mammoth Ivory Trade in Beijing and Shanghai. Publ. by Save the Elephants, The Aspinall Foundation. 92 pp.

Cop18 Prop. 35

## **1. Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Viet Nam proposes to transfer *Mauremys annamensis* from Appendix II to Appendix I, in accordance with Criteria A i), A ii), A v), B i), B iii), B iv), and C i) of Annex I of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17)

**Species name:** *Mauremys annamensis* (Siebenrock, 1903). Common names: Vietnamese Pond Turtle, Annam Pond Turtle. Scientific synonyms: *Cyclemys annamensis* Siebenrock, 1903 *Annamemys merklei* Bourret, 1939 *Annamemys annamensis* (Siebenrock, 1903)

**Distribution:** *M. annamensis* is endemic to Viet Nam and is known only from the lowland (less than 200 m above sea level) wetland of central Viet Nam (McCormack et al., 2014).

**Population trend:** *M. annamensis* historic and current population sizes are unknown and the species persist in the wild as a highly fragmented population with scattered single individuals remaining in a few wetlands (CITES, 2019; McCormack et al., 2014). Based on observations from local people, as well as frequent presence in trade seizures, the species was considered relatively common in the 1980s and 90s (CITES, 2019). However, reduction in observations within trade combined with habitat loss and continued hunting

pressure, indicate that the population has declined steeply and is in danger of being extirpated (Hendrie, 2000 cited in CITES, 2019).

**Habitat status:** Fragmented. The majority of the lowland habitat of *M. annamensis* has been converted to agriculture and urban areas, and the species is currently restricted to ponds and fragmented wetlands scattered among rice fields and along riparian corridors (McCormack et al., 2014).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:**

*M. annamensis* is traded for consumption in Asia and for the pet trade (CITES, 2019). Between 2000 and 2017, a record of 1581 exports of live animals, together with 33 specimens and 1.5 kg of specimens were recorded in the CITES Trade Database (CITES, 2019; verified in CITES Trade Database). There is also illegal trade in *M. annamensis*.

**2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

The species has been listed as Critically Endangered A1d+2d ver.2.3 on the Red List since 2000 (Asian Turtle Trade Working Group, 2000), with a more recent assessment confirming that this status is still valid (Turtle and Tortoises Working Group, 2014). *M. annamensis* is included among the world's 25 most endangered tortoises and freshwater turtles (Turtle Conservation Coalition, 2011; 2018). The species has been listed in Appendix II of CITES since 2003 and there has been a zero quota for wild specimen for commercial purposes since 2013 (Species+). The species is listed in Annex B of the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations (since 2003), and with a zero export quota for commercial trade (since 2013) (Species+).

**3.Evaluation of trade data**

Some aquaculture facilities are believed to acquire breeding stocks from the wild population, which is likely to fuel illegal collection and cross border trade (CITES, 2019). Direct exploitation of *M. annamensis* - historically for subsistence consumption and local medicinal purposes, and more recent for export and trade - is the main driver of species decline (CITES, 2019 and references therein).

**4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

A proposal to list *M. annamensis* on Appendix I was submitted to CoP16 (CITES, 2013a), but was rejected because an alternate proposal which retained *M. annamensis* on Appendix II, but with a zero export quota for commercial purposes, was approved instead (CITES, 2013b).

**5.Recommendations**

*M. annamensis* er en endemisk og kritisk truet skilpaddeart som er truet av overhøsting og stor etterspørsel i internasjonal handel. Det finnes ikke noe bestandsestimat, men lokale observasjoner og hvorvidt den er tilstede i handelsbeslag indikerer en nedadgående trend gjennom de siste ti år. Handel er allerede regulert gjennom en Appendix II listing med en 0 kvote for eksport, da all handel vil kunne være ødeleggende for artens overlevelse.

Forslaget om opplisting til Appendiks I virker å være i tråd med Kriteria A i), A ii), A v), B i), B iii), B iv), og C i), Anneks I av Res.Conf.9.24 (Rev.CoP17).

## **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Asian Turtle Trade Working Group 2000. *Mauremys annamensis* (errata version published in 2016). *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2000:

e.T12876A97370458. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2000.RLTS.T12876A3393755.en>.

CITES, 2013a. *Mauremys annamensis*, CoP16 Proposal 35, Available online at:

<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/16/prop/E-CoP16-Prop-35.pdf>

CITES, 2013b. *Mauremys annamensis*, CoP16 Proposal 32. Available online at:

<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/16/prop/E-CoP16-Prop-32.pdf>

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 35 (*Mauremys annamensis*). Available online at:

Turtle Conservation Coalition (2011). Turtles in Trouble: The World's 25+ Most Endangered Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles—2010. Lunenburg, MA: IUCN/SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group, Turtle Conservation Fund, Turtle Survival Alliance, Turtle Conservancy, Chelonian Research Foundation, Conservation International, Wildlife Conservation Society, and San Diego Global Zoo.

TFTSG 2018. Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group 2018. Turtles in Trouble: The World's Top 25 Most Endangered Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles – 2018. [www.iucn-tftsg.org/turtles-in-trouble-2018/](http://www.iucn-tftsg.org/turtles-in-trouble-2018/).

TTWG – Turtle Taxonomy Working Group [van Dijk, P.P., Iverson, J.B., Rhodin, A.G.J., Shaffer, H.B., and Bour, R.]. 2014. Turtles of the world, 7th edition: annotated checklist of taxonomy, synonymy, distribution with maps, and conservation status. In: Rhodin, A.G.J., Pritchard, P.C.H., van Dijk, P.P., Saumure, R.A., Buhlmann, K.A., Iverson, J.B., and Mittermeier, R.A. (Eds.). Conservation Biology of Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises: A Compilation Project of the IUCN/SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group. Chelonian Research Monographs 5(7):000.329–479

CoP18 Prop. 40

## **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Viet Nam and China propose to list all species of the genus *Paramesotriton* in Appendix II of CITES, with the exception of *P. hongkongensis* which was listed in CITES Appendix II at CoP17. According to the proponents, the proposed genus listing is in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2a of the Convention and criteria of Annex 2a criteria A and B, an Annex 2b, criterion A of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Due to morphological similarities between *P. hongkongensis* and most other *Paramesotriton* species, this proposal aims to list the whole group in Appendix II.

**Genus name:** *Paramesotriton* Chang, 1935. The proposal includes 13 species.

**Distribution:** The genus is endemic to China and Viet Nam and is distributed throughout mountain regions of Southeast China and North Viet Nam (CITES, 2019).



**Population trend:** Data on population size and trends are generally missing for this group, but most species are reported to have extremely small distribution ranges (e.g. a single stream or pool) (CITES, 2019). For the species listed on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, the trend is decreasing: *Paramesotriton caudopunctuatus* (Zhigang and Leu, 2004a), *P. deloustali* (IUCN SSC Amphibian Specialist Group, 2017), *P. fuzhongensis* (Ermi and Zhigang, 2004), *P. chinensis* (Huiging et al., 2004), *P. guangxiensis* (Zhigang et al., 2004b), *P. hongkongensis* (Lau and Chan, 2004) were all reported to be decreasing. It is however important to note that most of these assessments were conducted in 2004. Since then, major taxonomical revisions has taken place (e.g. *P. chinensis* has been split into 5 more species since the 2004 assessment) and thus these assessments need updating (CITES, 2019).

**Habitat status:** Fragmented. *Paramesotriton* spp. inhabit tropical or sub-tropical moist lowland or evergreen forests, with adults being mostly aquatic and small rocky streams, with low gradient and clear basins or deep pools. Juveniles are terrestrial and live in the near vicinities of these streams (Raffaëlli, 2013, cited in CITES, 2019). Logging is a major factor in habitat destruction and fragmentation of *Paramesotriton* habitat (CITES, 2019).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Collection for the pet trade is considered a threat to most Southeast Asian species of newts and it has been recommended to list all Southeast Asian newts in the CITES appendices in order to monitor trade (Rowley et al., 2016).

## 2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions

The species *Paramesotriton hongkongensis* has been included on CITES Appendix II at CoP17 (CITES, 2016). The whole genus *Paramesotriton* is listed in Annex D of EU Wildlife Trade Regulations (since 2009, Species+).

*Paramesotriton* is included in a list of 20 genera of salamanders present in the international pet trade that pose a risk of introducing *Batrachochytrium* salamandrivorans (Bsal) into North America (CITES, 2019).

## 3. Evaluation of trade data

According to the CITES trade database a total of 1,771 individuals identified as *P. chinensis* (62 %), *P. labiatus* (37 %) and *P. hongkongensis* (1 %) have been officially imported into the EU between 2009 and 2016 (2016 last entry) (CITES, 2019; CITES Trade Database). Of these, only 13% were reported as captive bred (all transactions originating in Singapore), and the remaining trade (87%) were from an unknown source and most likely involved wild caught animals (CITES, 2019). Finally, 16% were exported from non-range countries (CITES, 2019; CITES Trade Database). According to reports from the LEMIS database of the United States, 38,273 individuals of *Paramesotriton* spp. have been imported to the U.S in the period between 2000 and 2016, with 50% being wild-caught (CITES, 2019). Market surveys indicate that the amount of harvest in *Paramesotriton* is far higher than what is reported in trade statistics (CITES, 2019; Rowley et al., 2016).

There is also evidence of illegal trade occurring within each range country, between range countries and into the international market (CITES, 2019).

Moreover, species discrimination is challenging and the geographic region of the imported newts is mostly unknown (Rowley et al., 2016). Species are also misclassified on purpose, since rare and new species can be sold for a high price (Rowley et al., 2016).

Captive breeding occur in 13 institutions in Asia, the U.S and Europe, and also privately by different individuals (CITES, 2019). It is not clear how captive breeding is affecting the wild populations.

#### **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

The genus has recently undergone significant taxonomical updates (for example the case of *P. chinensis* described in 1.) and it is recommended that all literature prior to 2011 should be treated cautiously (CITES, 2019).

#### **5. Recommendations**

*Paramesotriton* slekten inneholder mest sannsynlig en rekke fortsatt ubeskrevne kryptiske arter, de fleste arter har svært begrenset utbredelse, er truet av habitat ødeleggelse og flere arter er også vanlige i internasjonal handel. Basert på dette oppfyller artene i slekten *Paramesotriton* kravene om listing i CITES Appendiks II (basert på kriteriene i Annex 2a, A og B, og Annex 2b, kriterium A av Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), ved at mange er i internasjonal handel og at de fleste ligner på *P. hongkongensis* som allerede er listet i Appendiks II. Uregulert handel vil kunne være ødeleggende for flere av disse artenes overlevelse.

#### **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES, 2016. CoP17 proposal 41 (*Paramesotriton hongkongensis*). Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/prop/060216/E-CoP17-Prop-41.pdf>

CITES 2019. CoP18 proposal 40 (*Paramesotriton* spp.). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Paramesotriton-sppxx.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Paramesotriton-sppxx.pdf)

Gu Huiqing, Geng Baorong, Yuan Zhigang 2004. *Paramesotriton chinensis*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2004: e.T59457A11945154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T59457A11945154.en>.

IUCN SSC Amphibian Specialist Group 2017. *Paramesotriton deloustali*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2017: e.T16129A113959728. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2017-2.RLTS.T16129A113959728.en>.

Rowley, J.J.L., Shepherd, C.R., Stuart, B.L., Nguyen, T.Q., Hoang, H.D., Cutajar, T.P. Wogan, G.O.U., Phimmachak, S. (2016)

Estimating the global trade in Southeast Asian newts. *Biological Conservation* 199:96-100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.05.001>

Raffaëlli, J. (2013) *Les Urodèles du monde*. Penclen: Édition

Michael Wai Neng Lau, Bosco Chan 2004. *Paramesotriton hongkongensis*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2004:

e.T59460A11945539. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T59460A11945539.e>  
n.  
Yuan Zhigang, Michael Wai Neng Lau 2004a. *Paramesotriton caudopunctatus*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2004:  
e.T59456A11945015. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T59456A11945015.e>  
n.  
Yuan Zhigang, Zhao Ermi, Lu Shunqing 2004b. *Paramesotriton guangxiensis*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2004:  
e.T59459A11945437. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T59459A11945437.e>  
n.  
Zhao Ermi, Yuan Zhigang 2004. *Paramesotriton fuzhongensis*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2004:  
e.T59458A11945297. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T59458A11945297.e>  
n.

CoP18 Prop. 48

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Brazil propose to include the species *Parides burchellanus* in Appendix I, in accordance with Article II, paragraph 1 of the Convention and satisfying Criteria A i,ii, v; B i,iii, iv and C ii of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

**Species name:** *Parides burchellanus* (Westwood, 1872). Common name: NA. Synonyms: *Papilio jaguaræ* Foetterle, 1902; *Papilio numa* Boisduval, 1836; *Parides socama* Schaus, 1902.

**Distribution:** According to Collins and Morris (1985, and references therein), *Parides burchellanus* is found in central Brazil from northern Goiás state to western São Paulo. The most recent specimens have come from the Rio Maranhão on the border of Goiás state and the Federal District of Brasília. The only localities p.t. are in the municipality of Planaltina, Distrito Federal and in several municipalities in Minas Gerais (Bedê et al., 2015 and references therein).

**Population trend:** According to Bedê et al. (2015) it seems possible that the number of mature individuals may be larger than 50, but that there is a lack in data to ascertain whether this population is in decline or suffer from extreme fluctuations. According to Beirão et al. (2012) populations exhibited marked fluctuations.

**Habitat status:** *Parides burchellanus* is endemic to the Cerrado (Brazilian savanna) domain in central Brazil, where it occurs only in riparian forests associated with narrow streams, especially in the sectors where the river is closed by the forest canopy (Collins and Morris, 1985; Beirão et al., 2012; Bedê et al., 2015). The main threat to its habitat is

conversion of Cerrado landscapes to agricultural land (Bedê et al., 2015). Colonies are subject to elimination by changes in water level (Collins and Morris, 1985).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** There are no known records of trade in this species in the CITES Trade Database and the species is not traded domestically.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*Parides burchellanus* is listed as endangered (EN) on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (Grice et al., 2018).

The species is classified as Critically Endangered (CR) according to the present Brazilian Red List of Threatened Species (ICMBio/MMA, 2018).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

Information about the taxon *Parides burchellanus* is not available in the CITES trade database, Species+, or TRAFFIC. It can be found for sale online, e.g. "theinsectcollector" (one female €950.00), e-bay (ranging from €795-2500 for single specimen). According to CITES (2019), the number of specimens found in sales portals has increased, especially in the last year.

## **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

There is no legal national device in Brazil specifically designed to protect *Parides burchellanus*. It is present in protected areas (Minas Gerais – Serra do Rola-Moça State Park).

## **5.Recommendations**

Svalestjertsommerfugler er populære blant samlere. *Parides burchellanus* er listet som truet på den globale rødlisten og tilfredstiller flere av kriteriene i Anneks I, Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Det er sannynslig at handel vil være skadelig for denne artens overlevelse.

## **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Bedê, L. C., Marini-Filho, O.J., Neto, F.C.C., Ribeiro, F., dos Reis, E.S., do Vale Beirão, M., Resende, F.O. (2015) *Parides burchellanus* (Westwood, 1872) (Lepidoptera, Papilionidae): New distribution records from southwestern Minas Gerais state, Brazil. Check List 11(3): 1663.

Beirão, M.V., Campos-Neto, F.C., Pimenta, I.A. and Freitas, A.V.L. (2012) Population biology and natural history of *Parides burchellanus* (Papilionidae: Papilioninae: Troidini), an endangered Brazilian butterfly. Annals of the Entomological Society of America 105: 36–43.

Collins N.M. and Morris M.G. (1985) Threatened Swallowtail Butterflies of the World. The IUCN Red Data Book. IUCN, gland and Cambridge.

CITES (2019) CoP18 Proposal 48 (*Parides burchellanus*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Parides-burchellanus.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Parides-burchellanus.pdf)

Grice, H., Freitas, A.V.L., Rosa, A., Marini-Filho, O., Silva, F., Mega, N., Mielke, O. and Casagrande, M. (2018). *Parides burchellanus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species

2018: e.T16240A122600436. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-2.RLTS.T16240A122600436.en>.  
ICMBio/MMA (2018) Livro Vermelho da Fauna Brasileira Ameaçada de Extinção. Vol. 7 Invertebrados. 1ª Edição. Brasília, DF.

CoP18 Prop. 30

### 1. Review of listing proposal under CITES

Madagascar and the European Union propose to include *Paroedura androyensis* in Appendix II, in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2 (a) of the Convention and satisfying criterion B in Annex 2a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), because it is collected in the wild to supply an increasing international pet trade.

**Species name:** *Paroedura androyensis* (Grandidier, 1867). Common name: Grandidier's Madagascar Ground Gecko.

**Distribution:** *P. androyensis* is endemic to Madagascar where it occurs in scattered locations on the southern part of the island (Rabibisoa et al., 2011).

**Population trend:** There is no available information on population size for this species (CITES, 2019), but the patchy distribution and declines in the extent of suitable habitat indicates that the population is both severely fragmented and declining (Rabibisoa et al., 2011).

**Habitat status:** Fragmented, and a continuing decline in area, extent and quality of suitable habitat (Rabibisoa et al., 2011).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** There is an increasing interest in having this species as a pet, and significant levels of trade in *P. androyensis* in the EU was identified through an internet survey of non-CITES listed reptiles in 2009 (UNEP-WCMC, 2009).

### 2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions

The species is listed as Vulnerable B1ab (iii) ver.3.1 on the IUCN Red list of Threatened species, due to a very small range of occurrence (17,970 km<sup>2</sup>), the population is severely fragmented, and there is a continuing decline in the quality and extent of its habitat (Rabibisoa et al., 2011).

### 3. Evaluation of trade data

The species is not listed in the CITES Appendices, thus there is no record of trade in the CITES Trade Database. The proponents present numbers on exports from Madagascar between 2013 and 2017, with international trade increasing to over 1000 specimens annually since 2015 and the total number of exports over this period was 6392 individuals (Table 1 in CITES, 2019). Some of the exports from Madagascar were reported as being

captive bred individuals, however no captive breeding facility for this species exist in Madagascar (CITES, 2019).

#### **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

The species is classified as a category III under Madagascar Law 2006-400 on the classification of wildlife species which means that hunting and capture is only allowed with a hunting licence within a specific hunting season (CITES, 2019). It is further listed in Appendix IV, which is a list of non-CITES species, where export of such species from Madagascar requires a less formal "leaving authorization" than a CITES permit (CITES; 2019).

#### **5.Recommendations**

Gekkoarten *P. androyensis* har økende popularitet på det internasjonale hobbydyr-markedet samtidig som den er listet som sårbar på rødlisten grunnet liten utbredelse, habitat i nedgang og fragmentert bestand. Det samlede trusselbildet er dermed alvorlig, og uttak av selv små antall individer vil kunne ha store og negative konsekvenser for artens videre overlevelse. Den foreslåtte listingen av *P. androyensis* er i tråd med Anneks 2a, kriterium B, av Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Uregulert handel vil kunne være ødeleggende for denne artens overlevelse.

#### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 30 (*Paroedura androyensis*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Paroedura-androyensis.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Paroedura-androyensis.pdf)

Rabibisoa, N., Rafanomezantsoa, J., Rakotondrazafy, N.A. 2011. *Paroedura androyensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2011: e.T172822A6924613. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2011-2.RLTS.T172822A6924613.en>.

UNEP-WCMC (2009) Review of non-CITES reptiles that are known or likely to be in international trade. A Report to the European Commission. UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge, UK.

CoP18 Prop. 53

#### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

##### **This is a proposal for an annotation amendment and is independent from a species status assessment**

The EU and Ivory Coast propose to amend the annotation to the listing of *Pericopsis elata* in Appendix II (currently #5), so as to read: "Logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, plywood, and transformed wood<sup>1</sup>." The listing and annotation of *Pericopsis elata* (CoP8. Prop. 93) was accepted by consensus at the 8th Conference of the Parties in 1992. Trade in *Pericopsis elata* has been subject to the CITES Review of Significant Trade regularly, and is one of the most highly valued tropical timbers on the market (EUR 800-1000 per m<sup>3</sup> in 2012) and faces ongoing demand in trade. The purpose of the present proposal is to amend the annotation. This is a response to a review of data from the CITES Trade Database and concerns raised by EU Member States, that wood with very superficial

modifications and without any added value, is imported without CITES permits, as these would constitute either plywood or transformed wood exempt from the *Pericopsis elata* annotation for only "Logs, sawn wood, and veneer sheets." This is a case that demonstrates how a loophole is used to circumvent the CITES system.

**Species name:** *Pericopsis elata* (Harms) Meeuwen (Knaap-van Meeuwen, 1962).

Common name: African Teak, Afrormosia. Norsk navn: n.a.

**Distribution:** *Pericopsis elata* is native and extant in Cameroon; Central African Republic; Congo; The Democratic Republic of the Congo; Côte d'Ivoire; Ghana; Nigeria.

**Population trend:** The latest review showed that the species meets a high volume trade threshold for globally threatened species (2011- 2015) and demonstrated a sharp increase in trade in 2015. In the 2003 Significant Trade Review of *Pericopsis elata*, it was noted that significant stocks remain in Cameroon, Congo and DRC where the forests are more extensive and logging of this species has been more recent (CITES 2003, PC14 Doc. 9.2.2. A3, p 1). The species is CITES trade suspended in Côte d'Ivoire from 7 September 2012 (CITES 2016, SC66 Doc. 31.2, p. 16; CITES 2017, PC23 Doc. 15.1, p.5). According to the latest IUCN Red List assessment (African Regional Workshop, 1998), the species is Endangered. The factors that control its population dynamics are however imperfectly known (Bourland et al., 2012).

**Habitat status:** The habitat of *Pericopsis elata* is threatened by its conversion into agricultural land and by legal and illegal logging of the species and others (CITES 2003, PC14 Doc. 9.2.2. A3, p. 79-80).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Since 1948 trade in the timber has soared. Levels of exploitation have been unsustainable in all countries and the species' habitat has declined. Regeneration is insufficient to replace lost subpopulations (African Regional Workshop, 1998). The species has one of the most highly valued tropical timbers on the market (EUR 800-1000 per m<sup>3</sup> in 2012) and faces ongoing demand in trade. The EU has always been one of the big importers of timber from this species (CITES 2019, CoP18 Prop 44). Trade in *Pericopsis elata* has been subject to the CITES Review of Significant Trade regularly. The latest review showed that the species meets a high volume trade threshold for globally threatened species (2011- 2015) and demonstrated a sharp increase in trade in 2015 (CITES 2019, CoP18 Prop 44). Only Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Republic of Congo, export on a commercial level (CITES 2019, CoP18 Prop 44).

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

This is a proposal for an annotation amendment and is independent from a species status assessment. However, it should be noted that the 1998 IUCN Red List Assessment of *Pericopsis elata* is flagged as in need of updating (IUCN, 2019). Ongoing trade without

permits from Côte d'Ivoire, which has been trade suspended since 2012 (CITES (2016) SC66 Doc. 31.2, p. 16), might be allude to wider illegal export in the range states.

### **3.Evaluation of trade data**

Cameroon, Congo and the Democratic Republic of the Congo have yearly export quotas within CITES going back to 2003 (Species+, 2019).

### **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states**

The EU Scientific Review Group is positive to trade from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, but only from concessions with approved management inventories (SRG 84 Soc); assesses no significant trade from Congo (SRG 84 Soc); positive to trade from Cameroon (SRG 84 Soc); has no opinion on trade from Central African Republic (SRG 39 Soc) and negative to trade from Côte d'Ivoire (SRG 64 Soc).

### **5.Recommendations**

Forslaget fra EU og Elfenbenskysten om å tilpasse annotasjonen for listningen av *Pericopsis elata* i Appendix II (nå Annotation #5) til: "Logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, plywood, and transformed wood." er basert på erfaringer og observasjoner av at det manøvreres rundt CITES systemet gjennom å markere at tremateriale er modifisert så blir det tolket som unntatt CITES listingen og Annotation #5. Dette er en sak som viser et smutthull i CITES systemet og det skal korrigeres.

Annotation #5 gjelder for ni taxa i CITES-Appendiksene. Annotation #6 er ganske lik men angir "Logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets and plywood". Forslaget vil resultere i en ny Annotasjon fordi ingen bruker den foreslåtte ordlyden. Det skal vurderes om dette smutthullet påvirker andre taxa med Annotations #5 og #6, og om disse to annotasjonene skal omformuleres til "Logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, plywood, and transformed wood." og gjelde for alle taxa med disse annotasjonene.

### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

African Regional Workshop (Conservation and Sustainable Management of Trees, Zimbabwe, July 1996) (1998) *Pericopsis elata*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 1998: e.T33191A9759606. Available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.1998.RLTS.T33191A9759606.en>. Downloaded on 07 March 2019.

Bourland, N., Kouadio, Y.L., Lejeune, P., Sonké, B., Philippart, J., Daïnou, K., Fétéké, F., Doucet, J.-L. (2012) Ecology of *Pericopsis elata* (Fabaceae), an endangered timber species in southeastern Cameroon. *Biotropica* 44: 840-847.

CITES, 2003. PC14 Doc. 9.2.2. Annex 3. Available online at:

<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/14/E-PC14-09-02-02-A3.pdf>

CITES (2016) SC66 Doc. 31.2. Available online at:

<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/66/E-SC66-31-02.pdf>

CITES (2017) PC23 Doc. 15.1. Available online at:

<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/23/E-PC23-15-01.pdf>

CITES (2019) CoP18 Prop. 44. Amendment of the annotation to the listing of *Pericopsis elata* in Appendix II. Available online at:



[https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Pericopsis-elata.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Pericopsis-elata.pdf)

IUCN (2019). *Pericopsis elata*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species: e.T33191A9759606. Available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.1998.RLTS.T33191A9759606.en>.

Knaap-van Meeuwen, M.S. (1962) Reduction of Afrormosia to Pericopsis (Papilionaceae). Bulletin du Jardin Botanique de l'État à Bruxelles 32(2): 216.

CITES (2016) CoP17 Prop. 58. Include Adansonia grandidieri in Appendix II only for seeds, fruits, oil and live plants and annotate the listing to this effect. Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/prop/060216/E-CoP17-Prop-58.pdf>

Species+ (2019) Pericopsis elata. Available online at: [https://speciesplus.net/#/taxon\\_concepts/18339/legal](https://speciesplus.net/#/taxon_concepts/18339/legal)

EU SRG (2018) SRG 84 Soc. Available online at: [https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/a/c7c37ae4-139b-47dd-a4eb-8a2a5dafa6fa/84\\_Summary\\_SRG.pdf](https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/a/c7c37ae4-139b-47dd-a4eb-8a2a5dafa6fa/84_Summary_SRG.pdf)

## CoP18 Prop. 46

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

Sri Lanka and the United States of America propose inclusion of all species of arboreal and ornamental tarantula in the genus *Poecilotheria* in Appendix II. The proposed inclusion is in accordance with Article II paragraph 2(a) of the Convention, satisfying Criterion B, Annex 2(a) of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16).

#### **Species name:** *Poecilotheria* Simon, 1885

This proposal includes all the following 15 species in the genus *Poecilotheria* (synonyms; common English names).

*P. chaojii* Mirza, Sanap and Bhosale, 2014 (None; None)

*P. fasciata* (Latreille, 1804) (*Mygale fasciata*, *Avicularia fasciata*, *Theraphosa fasciata*, *Scurria fasciata*, *Lasiodora fasciata*; Sri Lankan ornamental tarantula)

*P. formosa* Pocock, 1899 (*Poecilotheria nallamalaiensis*; Salem ornamental tarantula)

*P. hanumavilasumica* Smith, 2004 (None; Rameswaram ornamental tarantula)

*P. metallica* Pocock, 1899 (None; Gooty ornamental tarantula)

*P. miranda* Pocock, 1900 (None; None)

*P. ornata* Pocock, 1899 (None; Fringed ornamental tarantula)

*P. rajaei* Nanayakkara et al. 2012 (None; None)

*P. regalis* Pocock, 1899 (*Ornithoctonus gadgili*, *Poecilotheria gadgili*; Indian ornamental tarantula)

*P. rufilata* Pocock, 1899 (None; Red slate ornamental tarantula)

*P. smithi* Kirk, 1996 (*Poecilotheria bara*, *Poecilotheria pococki*; Yellow-backed ornamental tarantula)

*P. striata* Pocock, 1895 (None; Mysore ornamental tarantula)

*P. subfusca* Pocock, 1895 (*Scurria fasciata*, *Poecilotheria uniformis*, *Poecilotheria bara*; Ivory-billed ornamental tarantula)

*P. tigrinawesseli* Smith, 2006 (None; Wessel's tiger ornamental tarantula)  
*P. vittata* Pocock, 1895 (*Poecilotheria pedersenii*; Ghost ornamental tarantula)

**Distribution:** Eight species are endemic to India, five are endemic to Sri Lanka, and two species can be found in both countries (World Spider Catalog, 2019).

**Population trend:**

Out of the 15 species, population trends are listed for the following eight species in the IUCN Red List:

*P. formosa*: Unknown  
*P. hanumavilasumica*: Decreasing  
*P. metallica*: Decreasing  
*P. miranda*: Decreasing  
*P. regalis*: Decreasing  
*P. rufilata*: Decreasing  
*P. striata*: Decreasing  
*P. tigrinawesseli*: Unknown

**Habitat status:** All the species in the genus is completely arboreal. Habitat loss and degradation are major threats for the species assessed by the IUCN.

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:**

Information about the taxon *Poecilotheria* is not found in the CITES Trade Database, Species+ or TRAFFIC.

**2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

Out of the 15 species, the following eight species are evaluated for the IUCN Red List with the following category, year and criteria:

*P. formosa*: Endangered EN, 2008, B1ab(i,ii,iii)+2ab(i,ii,iii)  
*P. hanumavilasumica*: Critically Endangered CR, 2008, B1ab(ii,iii,iv,v)+2ab(ii,iii,iv,v)  
*P. metallica*: Critically Endangered CR, 2008, B1ab(iii)  
*P. miranda*: Endangered EN, 2008, B1ab(iii)  
*P. regalis*: Least Concern LC, 2008  
*P. rufilata*: Endangered EN, 2008, B1ab(ii,iii)  
*P. striata*: Vulnerable VU, 2008, B1ab(ii,iii)+2ab(ii,iii)  
*P. tigrinawesseli*: Data Deficient DD, 2008

**3.Evaluation of trade data**

For the species listed in the IUCN red list, all of them have "trade" mentioned as a threat to the populations:

*P. formosa*: "Given the habitat threats and restricted distribution, collection for international pet trade from the few remaining populations is an additional pressure on the extant populations" (Molur et al., 2008a).

*P. hanumavilasumica*: "Although not found extensively in pet trade, a few adult males and females along with subadults and juveniles were taken out of the country" (Siliwal et al., 2008a).

*P. metallica*: "An additional threat to the species is collection by international pet traders, which could have an impact on the population. An incident of smuggling was recorded in 2002 when two Europeans took a few specimens out of the country and advertised them for sale on the internet. There are also reports available of other such incidents since then" (Molur et al., 2008b).

*P. miranda*: "Collection for international pet trade in addition to the other threats is of concern for this species" (Siliwal et al., 2008b).

*P. regalis*: "Habitat loss and degradation are major threats, and collections for pet trade and persecution are additional threats to the species" (Molur et al., 2008c).

*P. rufilata*: "Pet traders collect this spider from forested areas near Trivandrum" (Siliwal et al., 2008c).

*P. striata*: "Habitat loss and degradation along with collection for international pet trade are major threats" (Siliwal et al., 2008d).

*P. tigrinawesseli*: "Although the author provides information on the distribution and status (as not endangered), it is to be treated with caution as the species was collected by members of the international pet trade and the species is named after a well-known tarantula trader" (Siliwal et al., 2008e).

Tarantulas in general are highly valued on the trade market, both dead and alive (des Bois, 2014).

Some trade information regarding the USA is given in USFW (2018):

*P. fasciata*, *P. ornata*, and *P. vittata* (it does not currently collect information on *P. smithi* or *P. subfusca*). Four hundred individuals of these species were legally imported into, or exported or reexported from, the United States during 2007–2012; 298 were imported into, and 106 were exported or re-exported from, the United States. Mainly captive-bred but some also wild-caught. U.S. trade data represents imports and exports declared between 2006 and 2017 are given in CITES (2017).

The species can be bought online (eg. e-bay and Spiderworld.eu; where at least 12 of the 15 species can be bought ranging from 5-100 EUR, both mounted or alive).

#### **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

In addition to the species listed in the IUCN redlist (see 2 above), *P. ornata* (EN), *P. smithi* (CR), *P. subfusca* (EN) and *P. vittata* (EN) are listed in the National Red List of Sri Lanka (category in brackets).

Sri Lanka prohibits the commercial collection and exportation of all *Poecilotheria* species, under the Sri Lanka Flora and Fauna Protection (Amendment) Act, No. 22 of 2009. India's Wildlife Protection Act does not list any of the species of this genus.

The five tarantula species from Sri Lanka: *Poecilotheria fasciata*, *P. ornata*, *P. smithi*, *P. subfusca*, and *P. vittata* are added to the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFW, 2018) (prohibitions on certain activities including import, export, take, commercial activity, interstate commerce, and foreign commerce.)

#### **5. Recommendations**

Over halvparten av *Poecilotheria* artene er listet på den internasjonale rødlisten med synkende bestander og tap av habitat som en stor trussel. I tillegg nevnes handel som en trussel for de rødlistede artene. Det er sannsynlig at handel vil kunne være ødeleggende for *Poecilotheria* artenes videre overlevelse. Listeforslaget er i tråd med Anneks 2a, kriterium B of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) og Anneks 2b, kriterium A of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), grunnet taksonomiske uklarheter og utfordringer med morfologisk identifikasjon av voksne og da særlig juvenile individer.

## **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

- CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 46 (*Poecilotheria* spp.). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Poecilotheria-spp.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Poecilotheria-spp.pdf)
- des Bois, R. 2014. Tarantula-Mania. On the Trail: Information and analysis bulletin on animal poaching and smuggling 5: 129-131.
- Molur, S., Siliwal, M. and Daniel, B.A. (2008a) *Poecilotheria formosa*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: e.T63561A12691712.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T63561A12691712.en>.
- Molur, S., Daniel, B.A. and Siliwal, M. (2008b) *Poecilotheria metallica*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: e.T63563A12681959.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T63563A12681959.en>.
- Molur, S., Daniel, B.A. and Siliwal, M. (2008c) *Poecilotheria regalis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: e.T63566A12682744.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T63566A12682744.en>.
- Siliwal, M., Molur, S. and Daniel, B.A. (2008a) *Poecilotheria hanumavilasumica*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: e.T63562A12681695.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T63562A12681695.en>.
- Siliwal, M., Molur, S. and Daniel, B.A. (2008b) *Poecilotheria miranda*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: e.T63564A12682467.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T63564A12682467.en>.
- Siliwal, M., Molur, S. and Daniel, B.A. (2008c) *Poecilotheria rufilata*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: e.T63567A12683035.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T63567A12683035.en>.
- Siliwal, M., Molur, S. and Daniel, B.A. (2008d) *Poecilotheria striata*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: e.T63568A12691945.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T63568A12691945.en>.
- Siliwal, M., Molur, S. and Daniel, B.A. (2008e) *Poecilotheria tigrinawesseli*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: e.T63569A12692174.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T63569A12692174.en>.
- World Spider Catalog (2019) World Spider Catalog, version 20.0. Genus *Poecilotheria* Simon, 1885. National History Museum Bern.  
<https://wsc.nmbe.ch/genus/3413/Poecilotheria>
- USFW (2018) Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Five *Poecilotheria* Tarantula Species from Sri Lanka. Federal register 83 (147): 36755-36773.

**1. Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Iran proposes to include the newly described (in 2006) species *Pseudocerastes urarachnoides* to CITES Appendix II, in accordance with Res. Conf .9.24 (Rev. CoP17), Annex 2a, criteria A and B. The rationale for the proposed listing is that the species is a recently described snake species with unique morphological characteristics, very little is known about its biology, and there is already indications of it being collected for the international pet trade. Note that the proponent writes criteria Res. Conf .9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex I, criteria A and B. This must be a typo as Annex I solely is for inclusion in Appendix I, and criteria A and B, Annex 2a are described in the proposal.

**Species name:** *Pseudocerastes urarachnoides* (Bostanchi, Anderson, Kami and Papenfuss 2006). Common names: Spider-tailed False-horned Viper, Iranian spider-tailed viper.

**Distribution:** *P. urarachnoides* is known from a few localities in the Zagros Mountains of western Iran (Bostanchi et al., 2006 in Anderson and Papenfuss, 2009). The species is most likely more widely distributed in the Zagros mountains, and is likely to be present in adjacent areas of Iraq (Fathinia et al., 2009, cited in Anderson and Papenfuss, 2009)

**Population trend:** The species is listed as Data Deficient by the IUCN (Anderson and Papenfuss, 2009) and there are no data on population trends. It is however considered to be rare (CITES, 2019).

**Habitat status:** Very little is known about the habitat trends of *P. urarachnoides* (CITES, 2019).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** There is evidence that the species has been collected and smuggled out of Iran to Germany, and that several specimen are kept in captivity (CITES, 2019).

**2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*P. urarachnoides* is listed as Data Deficient ver. 3.1 in the Red List of Threatened Species, since it has only recently been described and there is very little information on its extent of occurrence, status, threats and ecological requirements (Anderson and Papenfuss, 2009).

**3. Evaluation of trade data**

In the IUCN assessment of 2009 it was stated that "it is an unusual snake and is potentially threatened by future over-collection for the international pet trade" (Anderson and Papenfuss, 2009). The CITES proposal presents evidence that the species has been collected from the wild and transported to Germany, and that there are specimen in captivity in Europe (CITES, 2019; delMarmol et al., 2016). There are two more described species in the genus *Pseudocerastes*: The Persian horned viper (*P. persicus*), and Field's

horned viper (*P. fieldi*) (delMarmol et al., 2016). Both of these species are collected for pet trade (Amr et al., 2012; Ananjeva et al., 2010; deMarmol et al., 2016).

#### **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

There is no formal conservation action plan in place for this species, but there are plans to develop one as soon as more information is gathered (CITES, 2019). The Iranian Department of Environment (DOE) has prohibited any collection of this species and has included it on the protected wildlife list as "Nationally Endangered", which is the highest conservation status (CITES, 2019).

#### **5.Recommendations**

Det er svært lite informasjon tilgjengelig for *Pseudocerastes urarachnoides*. Likevel, basert på at det foregår handel med de to andre artene i slekten, at denne arten har et unikt utseende som kan gjøre den attraktiv blant samlere, indikasjoner på at den allerede er i handel og føre var prinsippet, er det sannsynlig at uregulert handel vil kunne være ødeleggende for denne arten.

#### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

- Amr, Z.S.S., Al Johany, A.M.H., Baha El Din, S., Disi, A.M., Nilson, G., Werner, Y.L. 2012. *Pseudocerastes fieldi*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2012: e.T164564A1058258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2012.RLTS.T164564A1058258.en>.
- Ananjeva, N., Nilson, G., Anderson, S.C., Andrén, C., Tok, V., Ugurtas, I., Sevinç, M., Böhme, W. and Crochet, P.- A. 2010. *Pseudocerastes persicus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2010: e.T164640A5914734. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2010-4.RLTS.T164640A5914734.en>
- Bostanchi, H., Anderson, S.C., Kami, H.G., Papenfuss, T.J. (2006) A new species of *Pseudocerastes* with elaborate tail ornamentation from western Iran (*Squamata: Viperidae*). Proceedings of the California Academy of Sciences 57(14): 443-450.
- CITES, 2019. CoP18 proposal X (*Pseudocerastes urarachnoides*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Pseudocerastes-urarachnoides.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Pseudocerastes-urarachnoides.pdf)
- delMarmol, G.M., Mozaffari, G., Gállego, J. (2016). *Pseudocerastes urarachnoides*: The ambush predator. Boletín de la Asociación Herpetológica Española 27: 34-42
- Fathinia, B., Anderson, S.C., Rastegar-Pouyani, N., Jahani, H. and Mohamadi, H. 2009. Notes on the natural history of *Pseudocerastes urarachnoides* (Squamata: Viperidae). Russian Journal of Herpetology 16(2): 134-138.
- Steven C. Anderson, Theodore Papenfuss 2009. *Pseudocerastes urarachnoides*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2009: e.T164664A5916336. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2009.RLTS.T164664A5916336.en>.

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

Australia proposes to transfer *Pseudomys fieldi praeconis* from CITES Appendix I to II in accordance with the provisions of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), Annex 4 precautionary measures A1 and A2 a(i). The species was selected for Periodic Review of the Appendices at the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee. Australia undertook the review and presented the results at the 30<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee (Geneva, 2018). Australia also proposes to amend the name *Pseudomys fieldi praeconis* to *Pseudomys fieldi* (Waite, 1896), in compliance with standard nomenclature.

**Species name:** *Pseudomys fieldi praeconis* or *Pseudomys fieldi* (Waite, 1896). Note that *P. fieldi* was only known from a single specimen from Alice Springs in the Northern Territory, whereas *P. praeconis* was associated with the population on Bernier Island, Western Australia. Both were listed as separate species in 1977, but 15 years later the two names were synonymized, with *P. fieldi* taking priority over *P. praeconis*.  
Common name: Djoongari, Shark Bay Mouse.

**Distribution:** The species current distribution is Bernier, Faure Islands and North West Island, Western Australia (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016). In addition, the species has recently been reintroduced to a mainland island at Lorna Glen, Western Australia and this population is being monitored (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016).

**Population trend:** Stable (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016), however The Shark Bay Mammal Recovery Team has noted that this species is difficult to monitor, thus resulting in large errors associated with population trends and size estimates for this species.

**Habitat status:** *P. fieldi* occur at three small islands, and although very limited, the habitat in use by *P. fieldi* is relatively secure (CITES; 2019).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** There are no known records of trade in this species in the Cites Trade Database and the species is not traded domestically (CITES, 2019).

### 2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions

*P. fieldi* has been listed on CITES Appendix I since 1977 and on the EU trade Regulations Appendix A since 1997. The species is listed as Vulnerable D2 ver.3.1 on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016). Moreover, the species is listed as Vulnerable under several national legislations, including the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

### 3.Evaluation of trade data

There is no trade record concerning this species in the CITES Trade Database.

### 4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.

The species was subject to Periodic Review of the Appendices, and the Animals Committee, at its 30<sup>th</sup> meeting (Geneva, 2018) concluded with the following: The Committee determined that in accordance with subparagraphs 2 g) and h) of Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP17) the six species reviewed by Australia meet the criteria in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) for transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II as outlined in documents AC30 Doc. 29.2.1 to 29.2.6 (CITES, 2018). The Committee asked the Secretariat to invite Australia to submit these proposals to the Conference of the Parties at its 18th meeting.

### 5.Recommendations

*Pseudomys fieldi* forvaltes under nasjonale og regionale lover, og er ikke i handel. Den foreslåtte nedlistingen av *Pseudomys fieldi* er i tråd med Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), Annex 4 føre-var tiltak A1 and A2 a(i). Det er ikke noe som tyder på at handel vil være ødeleggende for denne artens overlevelse,

### 6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)

CITES, 2018. AC30 Doc. 29.2.4. *Pseudomys Fieldi* - report of Australia. Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/30/E-AC30-29-02-04.pdf>

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 32 (*Pseudomys fieldi praeconis*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Pseudomys-fieldi-praeconis.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Pseudomys-fieldi-praeconis.pdf)

Woinarski, J. and Burbidge, A.A. 2016. *Pseudomys fieldi*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T18549A22398445. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-2.RLTS.T18549A22398445.en>.

CoP18 Prop. 54

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

#### **This is a proposal for an annotation amendment and is independent from a species status assessment**

Malawi proposes to list the species *Pterocarpus tinctorius* in CITES Appendix II without annotation specifying the types of specimens to be included, in order to include all readily recognizable parts and derivatives in accordance with Resolution Conf. 11.21 (Rev. CoP17). *Pterocarpus tinctorius* is a rosewood species native to east and southern Africa, and the past few years have seen a dramatic increase in harvest and export linked to Asian demand. Lower availability as well as trade restrictions in *Dalbergia* species have caused a shift in demand to alternate species as replacements, particularly within the *Pterocarpus* genus (CITES, 2019; CoP18 Prop. 54, p. 2). The proponents infer that regulation of trade in the species is necessary to avoid it becoming eligible for inclusion in Appendix I in the near future.

**Species name:** *Pterocarpus tinctorius* Welw. (1858). Common name: African Padouk.

**Distribution:** *P. tinctorius* is found across Africa's broad belt of miombo woodland, a 2.7 million km<sup>2</sup> area of tropical seasonal forest and dry forests in Angola, Democratic Republic



of Congo, Burundi, Tanzania, Malawi, Mozambique, and Zambia (Campbell et al., 1996; Barstow, 2018).

**Population trend:** According to the latest IUCN Red List assessment (Barstow, 2018), the population of *P. tinctorius* is estimated to be decreasing, but is assessed as Least Concern.

**Habitat status:** *P. tinctorius* is found in a range of habitats, including wooded savanna, dry evergreen thickets, riparian moist forests, and miombo woodland where it can form part of *Acacia* and *Brachystegia* woodland associations (Barstow 2018; Munishi et al 2010). The species thrives in poor and rocky soils, and grows between approximately 50 and 1800m ASL (Barstow 2018; Phiri et al 2015).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** The primary threat to *Pterocarpus tinctorius* is overharvesting, including both legal and widespread illegal extraction, for the international trade (CITES, 2019, CoP18 Prop. 54, p. 4). *P. tinctorius* has achieved market demand due to its lookalike characteristics, and an early boom in *P. tinctorius* from 2010 was reportedly due to its being used as a false rosewood substituted for *Pterocarpus santalinus* (red sandalwood) on the Chinese market (CIFOR, 2017). Greenpeace estimates that as much as 15,000 tonnes of the wood are sold each month from just the four biggest mukula markets (Kuo 2017). In Tanzania, one of the few countries where species-specific official data is available, export permits for *P. tinctorius* increased almost 7 times between 2012 and 2014 alone (831.4 to 5,578.4 thousand cubic meters), according to Tanzania Forest Service data (TRAFFIC 2016).

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

The 2018 IUCN Red List Assessment assesses the species as being of Least Concern, but adds that the *P. tinctorius* population “is considered to be in decline as a result of the harvesting of the species for its timber...currently in high demand in local markest and it is predicted that in the future its international demand could increase as other *Pterocarpus* timber species become rare or protected.” (Barstow 2018). The previously cited CIFOR (2017) study of the mukula value chain in Zambia found that 84% of community cutters had entered the business since 2012. An alarming 68% of these cutters observed depletion of population stocks in the field, and a full 95% of key informants in the same study agreed with this assessment and anticipated the species “going extinct”. This species is slow-growing and not considered to be under sustainable management throughout its range, with the exception of certain protected areas (Phiri et al 2015).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

The species is not CITES listed, and is IUCN Red List assessed as being of Least Concern. Range state governments struggle with governance over this species (CITES, 2019, CoP18 Prop. 54, p. 5). Massive increase in the trade of this species during the last ten years is reported (TRAFFIC 2016), and it is suggested that this trade has accelerated due to lower

availability as well as trade restrictions of *Dalbergia* species that in turn have caused a shift in demand to alternate species as replacements (CITES, 2019, CoP18 Prop. 54, p. 2).

#### **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states**

The majority of trade in *Pterocarpus tinctorius* is export to China. As with other timber species, the mukula trade is connected to illegal trade in endangered animal parts. In late 2016, Chinese customs officials seized a 2.9-tonne shipment of pangolin scales hidden in a container of mukula timber (Sharman 2016). In Namibia, the Chinese national identified as owner of the key exports logistics company for Angolan and Zambian clients has also been repeatedly linked to traffic in rhino horn and animal skins (ibid). CITES Appendix II listing might not reduce illegal trade, but it is likely to create awareness of the scale and threat of this trade.

#### **5. Recommendations**

Malawi foreslår at inkludere *Pterocarpus tinctorius* på CITES Appendix II. Etterspørselen av arten har økt de siste årene. Dette ser ut til å være knyttet til økt sjeldenhet av mer høyt ønskede *Dalbergia* arter, samt CITES Appendix II listning av *Dalbergia* spp. i 2017. Det nåværende handelsnivået er uholdbart og listning vil trolig øke reguleringen av handel.

## 6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)

- Barstow, M. (2018) *Pterocarpus tinctorius*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018: e.T62027862A62027864. Downloaded on 23 July 2018. Available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-1.RLTS.T62027862A62027864.en>.
- Campbell, B. Frost, P., Byron, N. (1996) Miombo woodlands and their use: overview and key issues. Pages 1-10 in B. Campbell, editor. The Miombo in Transition: Woodlands and Welfare in Africa. CFIOR, Bogor.
- CIFOR (2017) Domestic markets, cross-border trade and the role of the informal sector in Cote d'Ivoire, Cameroon and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. (Activities A4.1.1 and A4.1.2). PD 700/13 Rev.2 (I) Development of intra-African trade and further processing in tropical timber and timber products - phase I stage 1. ITTO.
- CITES, 2019. CoP18 Prop. 54. List the species *Pterocarpus tinctorius* in CITES Appendix II. Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/010319/E-CoP18-Prop-54.pdf>
- Kuo, L. (2017) China's demand for rosewood furniture is decimating a rare, slow-growing species of African tree. Quartz Africa. Available online at: <https://qz.com/africa/1009008/chinas-demand-for-rosewood-furniture-is-decimating-africas-mukula-trees/>
- Munishi, P.K.T., Mringi, S., Shirima, D.D., Linda, S.K. (2010) The role of the Miombo Woodlands of the Southern Highlands of Tanzania as carbon sinks. Journal of Ecology and the Natural Environment 2: 261-269.
- Phiri, D., Zulu, D., Lwali, C., Imakando, C. (2015) Focusing on the future of *Pterocarpus chrysotrix* (Mukula) in Zambia: A Brief Review of its Ecology, Distribution and Current Threats. International Journal of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 3(6): 218-221.
- TRAFFIC (2016). Report on *Pterocarpus tinctorius* in Tanzania. Cited in CITES CoP18 Prop. 54. List the species *Pterocarpus tinctorius* in CITES Appendix II. Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/010319/E-CoP18-Prop-54.pdf>

CoP18 Prop. 44

## 1. Review of listing proposal under CITES

Sri Lanka, with the European Union and many more, propose inclusion of Giant Guitarfish (*Rhynchobatus djiddensis*) and Bottlenose Wedgefish (*Rhynchobatus australiae*) in Appendix II in accordance with Article II paragraph 2(a) of the Convention and satisfying Criterion A and B in Annex 2a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). The same states propose inclusion of all species of the family Rhinidae in Appendix II in accordance with Article II paragraph 2(b) of the Convention and satisfying Criterion A in Annex 2b of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17)

**Species name:** *Rhynchobatus australiae* (Whitley, 1939). Common name: Bottlenose Wedgefish, white-spotted guitarfish, white-spotted wedgefish. Synonyms: *Rhynchobatus djiddensis australiae* (Whitley, 1939). *Rhynchobatus djiddensis* (Forsskal, 1775). Common

name: Giant Guitarfish, Whitespotted Wedgefish. Synonyms: *Raja djiddensis* (Forsskål, 1775), *Rhinobatus djiddensis* (Forsskål, 1775)

**Distribution:** *Rhynchobatus australiae*: Eastern Indian Ocean and the Western Central Pacific: Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines and Australia (Western Australia, the Northern Territories and Queensland) (Compagno and Last 1999; Giles et al., 2016). Giles et al. (2016) reported *Rhynchobatus australiae* from India, Last et al. (2016) suggest its distribution extends to the Eastern African coast, the Red Sea and the Arabian Sea. *Rhynchobatus djiddensis*: Western Indian Ocean, from the Eastern Cape Province (South Africa) to the Red Sea, the Arabian Sea and the Persian Gulf within the following countries

**Population trend:** Both species and other Rhinidae are declining globally (White and McAuley, 2003; Dudley and Cavanagh, 2006; Moore et al., 2017). Declines of 50-80% within 4 decades in the Arabian Sea (Jabado et al., 2017). Local declines reported in Indonesia (Jaiteh et al., 2017). All Rhinidae listed by the IUCN Red List have decreasing population trends.

**Habitat status:** *Rhynchobatus australiae* and *Rhynchobatus djiddensis* are associated with shallow (< 70 m) soft-bottom habitats of tropical and warm-temperate waters. Habitat mostly located in coastal waters of developing/least developed countries, where there is widespread loss of mangrove, seagrass and coral reef habitat. Habitats are exposed to expanding, intensive and largely unregulated fisheries (Moore et al., 2017).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** *Rhynchobatus* spp. are in the 20 most common species in the shark fin trade in Hong Kong (global hub of shark fin markets, Fields et al., 2017). The fin category "Qun chi", which fetches the highest price, is entirely composed of Rhinidae and Glaucostegidae (Vannuccini, 1999). International fin trade is the highest threat to these species.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

Both species are listed as Vulnerable ver. 3.1 on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (White and McAuley, 2003; Dudley and Cavanagh, 2006). All Rhinidae listed in the IUCN Red List are classified as Vulnerable or Endangered. *Rhynchobatus australiae* was listed in Appendix II of the Convention of Migratory Species in 2017. In 2018 *R. djiddensis*, *R. laevis* and *R. australiae* were listed on the CMS global Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Sharks (Sharks MOU Annex 1). Low fecundity, slow growth, large size, high fin price and a distribution largely confined to developing and least developed countries with unregulated or unsustainable fisheries make Rhinidae one of the elasmobranch taxa with the highest risk of extinction (Moore et al., 2017).

## **3.Evaluation of trade data**

International trade is mostly limited to fin products, meat products are consumed on local markets. There is no international management of trading of Rhinidae, therefore it can be assumed that international trade of their fin products is mostly legal. Illegal fishing and

trading of *Rhynchobatus* spp. from foreign vessels has been documented in Australia (Holmes et al., 2009) based on DNA barcoding of confiscated fins.

#### **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

Individual Australian states have bag and size limits regulating recreational fishing. There is no binding regulation on international trade.

#### **5. Recommendations**

Artene er listet som sårbare eller utdryddingstruede på den globale rødlisten.

*Rhynchobatus australiae*, *Rhynchobatus djiddensis* og andre *Rhinidae* er alle svært etterspurt på det internasjonale haifinnemarkedet da finnene deres er priset høyt.

Forslaget om å liste *Rhynchobatus australiae*, *Rhynchobatus djiddensis* og andre *Rhinidae* arter i Appendiks II er i tråd med kriteriene i Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

Hovedtrusselen mot disse artene er internasjonal handel med haifinner, og det er sannsynlig at videre uregulert handel vil være ødeleggende for disse artenes overlevelse.

#### **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Compagno, L.J.V., Last, P.R. (1999). Rhinidae. In: Carpenter K.E. and Niem V.H., editors, FAO species identification guide for fishery purposes. The living marine resources of the Western Central Pacific. Volume 3. Batoid fishes, chimaeras and bony fishes part 1 (Elopidae to Linophrynidae). FAO, Rome, pp. 1418-1422

Dudley, S.F.J., Cavanagh, R.D. (2006). *Rhynchobatus djiddensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2006: e.T39394A10197912.

Fields, A.T., Fischer, G.A., Shea, S.K., Zhang, H., Abercrombie, D.L., Feldheim, K.A., Babcock, E.A., Chapman, D.D. (2018). Species composition of the international shark fin trade assessed through a retail-market survey in Hong Kong. *Conserv Biol* 32:376-389.

Giles, J.L., Riginos, C., Naylor, G.J., Ovenden, J.R. (2016) Genetic and phenotypic diversity in the wedgefish *Rhynchobatus australiae*, a threatened ray of high value in the shark fin trade. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 548:165-180.

Jabado, R. W., Kyne, P.M., Pollom, R.A., Ebert, D.A., Simpfendorfer, C.A., Ralph, G.M., Dulvy, N.K. 2017. The conservation status of sharks, rays, and chimaeras in the Arabian sea and adjacent waters. Environment Agency—Abu Dhabi, UAE and IUCN Species Survival Commission Shark Specialist Group. Vancouver, Canada. 236pp.

Jabado, R.W. (2018). The fate of the most threatened order of elasmobranchs: shark-like batoids (Rhinopristiformes) in the Arabian Sea and adjacent waters. *Fish Res* 204: 448-457.

Jaiteh, V.F., Hordyk, A.R., Braccini, M., Warren, C., Loneragan N.R. (2016) Shark finning in eastern Indonesia: assessing the sustainability of a data-poor fishery. *ICES J Mar Sci* 74:242-253.

Holmes, B.H., Steinke, D., Ward, R.D. (2009) Identification of shark and ray fins using DNA barcoding. *Fish Res* 95:280-288.

Las, t P., Naylo, r G., Séret, B., White W., de Carvalho, M., Stehmann, M. (2016) Rays of the World CSIRO publishing, Clayton South, Victoria, Australia.

Moore A.B. (2017) Are guitarfishes the next sawfishes? Extinction risk and an urgent call for conservation action. *Endangered Species Research* 34:75-88.

Vannuccini S. (1999) Shark utilization, marketing and trade Food and Agriculture Org. Rome, 463 pp.

White, W.T., McAuley, R. (2003). *Rhynchobatus australiae*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2003: e.T41853A10580429

CoP18 Prop. 2

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

Mongolia (supported by the United States of America) proposes to transfer the saiga antelope (*Saiga tatarica*) from Appendix II to Appendix I. The proponent claims this to be in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), Annex 1: Paragraph C (i.e. marked decline in the population size in the wild).

**Species name:** Scientific name: *Saiga tatarica* (Linnaeus, 1766). Common name: Saiga antelope, Mongolian saiga, saiga. Norwegian name: Saigaantelope. Two subspecies are recognised: *Saiga tatarica tatarica* (to which the majority of the global population belongs), and *Saiga tatarica mongolica*, endemic to western Mongolia.

**Distribution:** The saiga is currently found in the following range States: Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Russian Federation and Uzbekistan, it is extinct in China and Ukraine. The species once inhabited the steppes and semi-desert regions of south-eastern Europe and across Central Asia, but the range has been greatly reduced. Currently, there are five saiga populations: one in Russia, three in Kazakhstan (one wintering in Uzbekistan) and one in Mongolia (IUCN, 2018).

**Population trend:** Decreasing. The number of mature individuals has been estimated to 123,450-124,200 (IUCN, 2018). According to the proposal, the number of individuals was over 1 million individuals as recently as the 1970s (CITES, 2019). The saiga is vulnerable to contagious diseases that wipe out large numbers, so called mass mortality events (MME). In 2015 200,000 saigas died in Kazakhstan within a few weeks, and most recently in 2017 a 54% reduction of the Mongolian population was estimated after an outbreak (IUCN, 2018).

**Habitat status:** Not fragmented (IUCN, 2018). Destruction of key habitats and traditional migration routes is a threat.

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Illegal hunting and international trade is considered to be the main threats to the survival of the saiga antelope (von Meibom et al. 2010). Saiga horn is popular in traditional Asian medicine (IUCN, 2018).

### 2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions

*S. tatarica* has been listed as Critically Endangered on the IUCN Red List since 2002. It has been listed in CITES Appendix II since 1995 and EU Wildlife Trade Regulations Annex B

since 1997. It has been listed on the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) Appendix II since 2002.

### **3.Evaluation of trade data**

According to the proponent every saiga range State has implemented a ban or moratorium on hunting, however, the CITES trade database has numerous records of trade in horns and derivatives from wild caught animals from recent years (including from China where the species is extinct). Hunting for horns has led to dramatic gender bias as only males have horns. The saiga antelope is among TRAFFICs priority species affected by wildlife cybercrime in Asia (<https://www.traffic.org/what-we-do/projects-and-approaches/wildlife-crime/wildlife-cybercrime-in-asia/>).

### **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

The saiga is legally protected in all countries of its breeding range and hunting is illegal in all five range States, at least until 2020 (CMS, 2015). The saiga has been legally protected in Mongolia since the 1930s (CITES, 2019).

### **5.Recommendations**

Saigaantilopen er vurdert til Kritisk truet av IUCN fordi bestanden har blitt redusert drastisk og oppfyller derfor Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), Annex 1: Paragraph C slik som søkeren hevder. Arten er sårbar for epidemier som har vist seg å kunne halvere bestander i løpet av kort tid, som for eksempel i Mongolia i 2017. Den er også svært utsatt for ulovlig jakt og handel da hornene er populære i tradisjonell asiatisk medisin. Handel kan være en trussel for overlevelsen av denne arten.

### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES 2019. CoP18 Proposal 2 (*Saiga tatarica*) Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Saiga-tatarica.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Saiga-tatarica.pdf).

CMS. 2015. Overview Report On Conservation Status And Mou Implementation. Prepared by IUCN/SSC Antelope Specialist Group and the Saiga Conservation Alliance on behalf of the CMS Secretariat. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 26-29 October 2015

IUCN 2018. IUCN SSC Antelope Specialist Group 2018. *Saiga tatarica*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2018: e.T19832A50194357.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-2.RLTS.T19832A50194357.en>. Downloaded on 05 March 2019.

von Meibom, S., Vaisman, A., Neo Liang, S.H., Ng, J., Xu, H. (2010). Saiga Antelope Trade: Global Trends with a Focus on South-east Asia. TRAFFIC project report to the CITES Secretariat. TRAFFIC Europe.

CoP18 Prop. 18

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Inclusion of Reeves's pheasant *Syrnaticus reevesii* in Appendix II of CITES, in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2 (a), of the Convention; Criterion B in Annex 2 a of Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), as proposed by China. China proposes that based on the available trade

data and information on the status and trends of the wild population, which is endemic to China, the international trade in specimens of *S. reevesii* should be regulated to ensure that continued smuggling will not drive poaching and threaten the survival of the wild population.

**Species name:** Scientific name: *S. reevesii* (J. E. Gray, 1829), English name: Reeves's pheasant, Norwegian: kongefasan.

**Distribution:** Endemic to North and Central China locally through Shaanxi, Henan, Anhui and North Hubei to South Gansu, Sichuan, Yunnan, Guizhou and Hunan; range much reduced and apparently has been extirpated from Shanxi and Hebei (McGowan and Kirwan, 2019). Introduced to several areas, but most of these populations probably not self-sustaining; well established in Czech Republic.

**Population trend:** The current population trend is categorized as decreasing by the IUCN (BirdLife International, 2018). Hunting and habitat loss and fragmentation remain important threats and together they are suspected to be driving a rapid population decline in this species (BirdLife International, 2018).

**Habitat status:** Species heavily dependent on natural forest; historical range has contracted by c. 50%; remaining habitats severely fragmented and degraded (BirdLife International 2018; McGowan and Kirwan 2019 and references therein).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Tail-feathers from male Reeves's pheasants have long been used in traditional Peking Opera performances. Male pheasants have a very long orange-buff tail (the longest of any pheasant), boldly marked black and white (tail 100–160 cm, up to 200 cm in oldest males; McGowan and Kirwan, 2019). Plastic of dyed stitched feathers, or a captive population in China, could satisfy this culturally important market, but poaching, especially in unprotected areas, is widespread, and illegal hunting and egg collected for food by local people is common (BirdLife International, 2018; McGowan and Kirwan, 2019; Zhou et al., 2015). According to the proponent, eggs, chicks and even adults are also collected to meet the demand from zoos and breeding centres.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*S. reevesii*, is categorized as Vulnerable (VU) on the IUCN Red List (Birdlife International, 2018), and as a national second-class protected species in China (State Council, 1988 cited in Zhou et al., 2015). According to the proponent, this species is listed as EN (endangered) in the China Biodiversity Red List in China published in 2015. Hunting, catching and killing of wildlife under special protection by the state (first and second class protected species) is prohibited; special hunting or catching licenses can be obtained for scientific, breeding, medicinal or educational purposes (Bureau of Legislative Affairs of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, 1992 cited in UNEP-WCMC, 2017). The proponent states that "the wildlife special marks are obligatory for these legal utilizations". *S. reevesii* is not



listed in the CITES Appendices. It was listed in Annex D of the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations on 26/11/1997.

The species was once widely distributed and relatively common (McGowan and Kirwan, 2019 and references therein). However, due to illegal hunting, habitat loss and fragmentation, the species' range has shrunk and become fragmented (Zhou et al., 2015 and references therein). Approximately 83, 26 and 20% of the 89 surveyed sites in 7 provinces/municipalities had direct evidence of poaching, habitat loss and poisoning (because crops are eaten by pheasants), respectively (Zhou et al., 2015). According to the proponent, The Database of Legal Instruments of China contains a few judgements including eleven *S. reevesii* poached for food by indigenous farmers, and one individual illegally traded in Anhui Province from 2013 to 2017.

The length of the tail feathers of male *S. reevesii* is an important secondary sex characteristic, and the large demand for the tail feathers of cocks for decoration can affect the success of male pheasant in courtship and mating (Andersson, 1994).

### **3.Evaluation of trade data**

Given that the species is not listed in the CITES Appendices, there is no reported direct trade from China (or other countries) to countries other than the EU-28 in the CITES trade database. On the basis of the Analysis of the European Union and candidate countries' annual reports to CITES 2014 (UNEP-WCMC, 2016), 60 taxa were identified as having noteworthy trends in EU imports of wild or ranched specimens, and three species – including *S. reevesii* – were selected for review (UNEP-WCMC, 2017). According to UNEP-WCMC (2017), direct exports of *S. reevesii* from China to the EU-28 over the period 2006-2015 comprised feathers, reported in both number and weight; imports of wild-sourced feathers in 2014 and 2015 were both reported by Germany. EU monitors imports of Annex D animal taxa, and stated that the import of 40 kg feathers of *S. reevesii* was of particular note; this trade was entirely wild-sourced and imported from China for commercial purposes (UNEP-WCMC, 2017). In contrast, according to the proponent, no specimens of *S. reevesii* have been approved to be used or exported with commercial purposes from the side of China.

A search in the <https://trade.cites.org/> database carried out 2019/03/08 for the period 2008-2018, showed that 1500 wild-sourced feathers of *S. reevesii* were imported to Spain from China in 2011, and 40 kg wild-sourced feathers was imported to Germany from China in 2014. Hence, trade is not documented to be limited to specimens bred in captivity.

According to the proponent, 32 live *S. reevesii* have been approved by the forestry department in Shandong Province for captive breeding and exhibition in zoos from 2016 to 2018, but the accurate number of individuals that have been approved for captive breeding and scientific exhibition in China is unknown. The proponent documents that online surveys on buying and selling posts of *S. reevesii* show that feathers are the main products in trade, but there are also some trade records of live individuals and eggs in some countries. This was confirmed by a search on e-bay <https://www.ebay.com/> carried

out 2019/03/07, using the search terms 'Reeves pheasant', which generated 355 hits, the majority of them announcing feathers for sale. Similarly, Facebook searches demonstrated trade in captive birds. Introduced populations of the species are treated as a game or sports species in the Czech Republic and Slovakia, and hunting licences are for sale on e.g. <http://www.shootingenterprise.com/pheasant-shooting-reeves-pheasant>.

#### **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

The unregulated demand for feathers and the exhibition specimens of *S. reevesii* will likely further stimulate captures in the wild. Trade in captive bred specimens is could potentially be detrimental for wild populations, since it is difficult to trace the source and origin. Both the actual and potential illegal trade may have negative effects on the wild population.

#### **5. Recommendations**

Handel med fjær og fugler av *Syrnaticus reevesii* kan føre til nedgang i viltlevende populasjoner i Kina. Kongefasan *S. reevesii* tilfredsstiller kriteriene i Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), for Appedix II arter, i henhold til artikkel II, paragraf (a) i konvensjonen; Kriterium B i Annex 2 a; regulering av handel er nødvendig for å sikre at høsting av individer fra den viltlevende populasjonen ikke reduserer den viltlevende populasjonen til et nivå der overlevelsen trues av fortsatt høsting eller andre faktorer.

#### **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

- Andersson, M. (1994) Sexual Selection. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- BirdLife International, 2018. *Syrnaticus reevesii*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018: e.T22679346A131873938. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-2.RLTS.T22679346A131873938.en>. Downloaded on 07 March 2019.
- Bureau of Legislative Affairs of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, 1992. Regulations for the implementation of the People's Republic of China on the protection of terrestrial wildlife.
- McGowan, P.J.K., Kirwan, G.M. (2019) Reeves's Pheasant (*Syrnaticus reevesii*). In: del Hoyo, J. et al., editors, Handbook of the Birds of the World Alive. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona. (retrieved from <https://www.hbw.com/node/53507> on 7 March 2019).
- State Council, 1988. The List of Wild Animals Under National Protection Issued by the State Council of the People's Republic of China on 10 December 1988. State Council, Beijing, China.
- UNEP-WCMC, 2016. EU Wildlife Trade 2014: Analysis of the European Union and candidate countries' annual reports to CITES 2014.
- UNEP-WCMC, 2017. Review of species selected on the basis of the Analysis of the European Union and candidate countries' annual reports to CITES 2014. UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge.
- Zhou, C., Xu, J., Zhang, Z. (2015) Dramatic decline of the Vulnerable Reeves's pheasant *Syrnaticus reevesii*, endemic to central China. *Oryx* 49: 529-534.

**1. Review of listing proposal under CITES**

China and the European Union are proposing to include the species of the genus *Tylototriton* in Appendix II of CITES in accordance with Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), Annex 2a, A and B, and Annex 2b, B, since many of the species of this genus are in trade and that the remaining species resemble those that are commercially exploited. Of the 25 species described so far, 20 are endemics. Species discovery rate is high in this genus, with several cryptic species and the number of known species increasing from only 8 as recent as in 2010.

**Genus name:** *Tylototriton* Anderson, 1871. Common names: Crocodile Newts, Knobby Knewts

**Distribution:** The genus is distributed in mountain ranges from eastern Himalaya, through Indochina, to southern and central China, including: Nepal, India, Bhutan, Myanmar, Thailand, Laos, Viet Nam and China at elevations from 181 to 2,679 m above sea level (asl.) (Nishikawa et al., 2014, Sparreboom 2014).

**Population trend:** Of the 12 species assessed by the IUCN, 10 are listed as being in decline (Ohler et al., 2004; van Dijk et al., 2008; Datong et al., 2004; IUCN Amphibian Specialist Group, 2016a; 2016b; 2017a; 2017b; 2017c; Liang and Changyuan, 2004; Haitao and Chan, 2008). The population trend for the remaining species is not known, although there are indications of local extinctions for several species (CITES, 2019a). *Tylototriton* species are philopatric and show strong habitat affinity, thus they are particularly vulnerable to habitat loss and degradation (CITES, 2019a).

**Habitat status:** Fragmented (CITES, 2019a). Habitat is decreasing for all species assessed by the IUCN (CITES, 2019a). Anthropogenic activities such as conversion of land for agriculture, logging, mining, slash and burn activities are all threats to *Tylototriton* populations and their habitat (CITES, 2019a)

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Collection of wild individuals for the pet trade is considered a threat to the majority of the Southeast Asian species of newt (i.e. the species of the genera *Tylototriton*, *Paramesotriton* and *Laotriton*) (Rowley et al., 2016).

**2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant convention**

Twelve species have been assessed by the IUCN, and of those, 2 are listed as Endangered, 5 as Vulnerable, 2 as Near Threatened and 3 as Least Concern (CITES; 2019; IUCN). The genus is listed in Annex D of EU Wildlife Trade Regulations (since 2009) (Species+).

**3. Evaluation of trade data**

In the CITES Trade Database between 2010 and 2018 there are 1755 importer registered entries concerning specimens of *Tylototriton*. The specimens are either reported as wild caught or as coming from an unknown source, and for commercial purposes (CITES Trade Database). Import of a total of 35, 237 individuals of *Tylototriton* spp. were registered in the LEMIS database of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service between 1999 and 2017, from which 76 % were wild caught, with the majority of trafficked animals (99 %) being live specimens for trade purposes (CITES, 2019a). Rowley et al. (2016) did an extensive market analysis of global trade in Southeast Asian Newts and found that large numbers of newts are harvested from the wild to meet the demand of the international pet trade. Internet trade is contributes to the global extent of the trade, with Southeast Asian Newts for sale in 15 countries throughout Europe, Asia, and North America at between USD 30 - 260 each (Rowley et al., 2016). The situation of *Tylotriton* is similar to that of *Parnesotriton* spp. which was also part of the market analysis of Rowley et al. (2016) and are also proposed to be included in Appendix II at CoP18 (CITES, 2019b). Rowley et al. (2016) concludes: "Given that international trade is a major threat, we strongly recommend that all Southeast Asian Newts be listed in CITES so that their trade is monitored, and data can be used to inform conservation decisions".

#### **4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

Several new and cryptic species have been discovered over the past decade, and species previously believed to have wide distributions are now split in to several species with smaller ranges and fewer populations (CITES, 2019). In the breeding season, adult animals concentrate around breeding sites, which makes them relatively easy to collect (CITES, 2019). *Tylototriton* been included in a list of 20 genera of salamanders that are present in the international pet trade and pose a risk of introducing Bsal into North America (CITES, 2019a). Captive breeding programs are taking place in several range countries, and there also 53 institutions in Asia, U.S and Europe) keeping *Tylotriton* species (CITES, 2019).

#### **5. Recommendations**

De aller fleste salamanderartene av slekten *Tylototriton* som er vurdert for den globale rødlisten er i nedgang, det samme gjelder habitatet deres. Slekten inneholder mest sannsynlig en rekke fortsatt ubeskrevne kryptiske arter. Flere arter i slekten er vanlige i internasjonal handel. Forslaget om listing av *Tylototriton* i Appendix II virker å være i tråd med Anneks 2a, A og B, og Anneks 2b, kriterium A av Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), i og med at mange allerede er i internasjonal handel og at de fleste artene er vanskelig å skille fra hverandre («look-alikes»). Uregulert handel vil kunne være ødeleggende for flere av disse artenes overlevelse.

#### **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES, 2019a. CoP18 Proposal 41 (*Tylototriton* spp.). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Tylototriton-spp.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Tylototriton-spp.pdf)

CITES, 2019b. *Paramesotriton* spp. CoP18 Proposal X. Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Paramesotriton-sppxx.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Paramesotriton-sppxx.pdf)

Annemarie Ohler, Lu Shunqing, Yang Datong 2004. *Tylototriton shanjing*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2004: e.T59485A11934078. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T59485A11934078.en>.

Fei Liang, Ye Changyuan 2004. *Tylototriton wenxianensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2004: e.T59488A11935450. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T59488A11935450.en>.

Haitao, S. and Chan, B. 2008. *Tylototriton hainanensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: e.T59483A11933304. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T59483A11933304.en>.

IUCN SSC Amphibian Specialist Group 2016a. *Tylototriton vietnamensis*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2016: e.T135868A88920562.

IUCN SSC Amphibian Specialist Group 2016. *Tylototriton anguliceps*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016b: e.T79427218A88441865. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-3.RLTS.T79427218A88441865.en>.

IUCN SSC Amphibian Specialist Group 2017a. *Tylototriton zieglerei*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2017: e.T47144899A47144905. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2017-2.RLTS.T47144899A47144905.en>.

IUCN SSC Amphibian Specialist Group 2017b. *Tylototriton shanorum*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2017: e.T73736309A73736329. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2017-2.RLTS.T73736309A73736329.en>.

IUCN SSC Amphibian Specialist Group 2017c. *Tylototriton podichthys*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2017: e.T84335689A88444689. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2017-2.RLTS.T84335689A88444689.en>.

van Dijk, P.P., Truong, N., Wai Neng Lau, M., Ermi, Z. and Shunqing, L. 2008. *Tylototriton asperimus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: e.T59482A11932895. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T59482A11932895.en>.

Yang Datong, Lu Shunqing, Wu Guanfu 2004. *Tylototriton kweichowensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2004: e.T59484A11933654. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2004.RLTS.T59484A11933654.en>.

### 1.Review of listing proposal under CITES

Argentina proposed to transfer the Vicuna population of the Province of Salta (Argentina) from Appendix I to Appendix II with annotation I, in accordance with the criteria in Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

**Species name:** *Vicugna vicugna* (Molina, 1782). Common name: Vicuña or vicuna. Norsk navn: Vikunja. Two sub-species are recognized (Northern *V. vicugna mensalis* and Southern *V. vicugna vicugna*). Only *V. vicugna vicugna* is present In Argentina (Acebes et al., 2018).

**Distribution:** The species is native to Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru, and there is an introduced population in Ecuador (Acebes et al., 2018).

**Population trend:** Increasing. The population size of mature individuals is estimated to 350,000 individuals (Acebes et al., 2018). In Argentina, the total population size, last estimated in 2006, was between 72,800 and 127,072 animals (Acebes et al., 2018). In the province of Salta, the estimated minimum number of Vicunas is 58,387 individuals (Ianni and Bernados, 2018, cited in CITES, 2019), which is an increase from 38,393 in 2015 (CITES, 2019).

**Habitat status:** Not fragmented (Acebes et al., 2018). Vicuna is a high altitude species distributed across the Andes Mountains, at altitudes from 3,000 to 5,000 meter above sea level (Acebes et al., 2018). Habitat is lost to mining, and is negatively affected by mining operations causing water extraction and pollution of water resources (Mata et al., 2016)

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** Vicuna wool is considered as one of the finest natural fibres, and is exported as dirty fibre, pre-dehaired, dehaired or washed fibre or as products (threads, cloths and garments) (Kasterine and Lichenstein, 2018). In Argentina, exploitation of wild vicuna is only possible in the province of Jujuy and Catamarca, because they were included in CITES Appendix II in 1997 and 2002 respectively. In Salta, there are currently two registered captive breeding populations, where animals originate from registered farms, and these populations are included in Appendix II of CITES (CITES, 2019). Trade exports from Argentina recorded in the CITES trade Database are of hair/fibres, with almost 50% of the reported being re-exports of from Peru/Bolivia.

### 2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions

The Vicuna is listed as Least Concern on the Red List of Threatened species (Acebes et al., 2018). All Vicuna populations were included in CITES Appendix I in 1975. Most populations have later been transferred to Appendix II, including the whole Peruvian population, the Ecuadorian population, the Bolivian population, the population of the Primera Region of Chile and the Argentinian population of the Province of Jujuy and the

semi-captive populations of the Province of Jujuy, Salta, Catamarca, La Rioja and San Juan were transferred to Appendix II (Species+). The species is listed under EU Wildlife Trade Regulations, with the majority of the populations listed in Annex B (same as for CITES Appendix II) and the remaining populations in Annex A (Species+). In 1969, the Vicuña Convention prohibits the commercialization of vicuña fibre for a period of 10 years in the signatory countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru). After a complete ban on trade in vicuña products (reinforced by the CITES Appendix I listing in 1975), a ratification of the Vicuña Convention, with the new denomination of Convention for the Conservation and Management of the Vicuña, lifts the prohibition of the commercialization of the fibre of vicuña, given sustainable management (Ecuador is included) (Kasterine and Lichenstein, 2018).

### **3.Evaluation of trade data**

The local people in the farming communities in Vicuna range capture, shear and process the fibre before it is shipped off to domestic or international buyers, and for this work the communities obtain between 2 and 6% of the value of the final products (Kasterine and Lichenstein, 2018). While only a small portion of the actual revenue goes to these local communities, the fibre trade generates income for some of the most isolated and poor communities in Latin America (Kasterine and Lichenstein, 2018). The illegal killing of wild Vicunas for their fibres is a major threat to the species, and there has been an alarming increase in poaching throughout the species native range (Acebes et al., 2018). Several factors contribute to the severity of the poaching situation. Among them are the geographic characteristics of the habitat, with low density of Vicunas and high degree of isolation and the high value of the fibres and hairs (Acebes et al., 2018).

### **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

At the national level, activities related to Vicuna differ among provinces. In the Province of Salta, there are two companies involved in vicuna shearing from live animals. 41 % of the Salta vicuna population occurs in the protected area of Los Andes Provincial Reserve (CITES, 2019). Hunting of the species is prohibited across the country (CITES, 2019)

### **5.Recommendations**

Vikunja ull er utbredt på det internasjonale markedet og det er sett på som svært verdifullt. Vikunja har kommet seg fra å være nesten utryddet før 1980, til å nå (2018-vurderingen) være listet som «Least Concern» på den internasjonale rødlisten. De aller fleste bestandene av arten er allerede overført til Appendix II, og den foreslåtte overføringen av Argentinas Salta-bestand virker å være i tråd med føre-var kriteriene i Anneks 4, Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Det er ikke sannsynlig at handel vil ha en ødeleggende effekt på denne artens overlevelse.

### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

Acebes, P., Wheeler, J., Baldo, J., Tuppia, P., Lichtenstein, G., Hoces, D. and Franklin, W.L. 2018. *Vicugna vicugna*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2018: e.T22956A18540534. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-2.RLTS.T22956A18540534.en>.

Benítez, V.; Borgnia, M. y M. H. Cassini. 2006. Ecología nutricional de la vicuña (*Vicugna vicugna*) un caso de estudio en la Reserva Laguna Blanca, Blanca. Cap. 5. En: Vilá B. (Ed.). Investigación, conservación y manejo de vicuñas. Proyecto MACS, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 3 (*Vicugna vicugna*) (Spanish version only). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/S-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Vicugna-vicugna-Argentinaxx.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/S-CoP18-Prop_draft-Vicugna-vicugna-Argentinaxx.pdf)

Kasterine, A. and Lichtenstein, G (2018). Trade in Vicuña: the Implications for Conservation and Rural Livelihoods. International Trade Centre, Geneva, Switzerland  
Mata, C., Malo, J.E., Galaz, J.L., Cadorzo, C. Lagunas, H. (2016) A three-step approach to minimise the impact of a mining site on vicuña (*Vicugna vicugna*) and to restore landscape connectivity. Environmental Science and Pollution Research 23: 13626-13636.

#### CoP18 Prop.4

### **Amend the name of the population of Chile from “population of the Primera Región” to “populations of the region of Tarapacá and of the region of Arica and Parinacota”**

*Vicugna vicugna* (population of Chile)

In April 2007, Chile published Law 20, 175 that created the XV region of Arica and Parinacota. These two regions were previously known as the Primera Región.

In 2002, The Vicuña population of the Primera Región was transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II. Chile wishes to amend the annotation of the Appendix II listing in line with the content of the political-administrative modification brought on by Law 20, 175. The proposed amendment is “population of the Primera Región” will be changed to “populations of the region of Tarapacá and of the region of Arica and Parinacota”. This amendment will not affect conservation of the species.

Den foreslåtte endringen av annotasjonen til Appendiks II listingen Vikunja bestanden i Chile er en følge av at Primera Región nå er delt inn i Tarapacá, Arica and Parinacota. Denne endringen vil ikke ha noen effekt på bevaring av arten.

#### CoP18 Prop. 50

### **1.Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Malawi proposes to list the species *Widdringtonia whytei* in CITES Appendix II without annotation specifying the types of specimens to be included, in order to include all readily recognizable parts and derivatives in accordance with Resolution Conf. 11.21 (Rev. CoP17). *Widdringtonia whytei* is a conifer species endemic to Malawi that produces highly valued, decay- and termite-resistant wood. The species is IUCN Red List assessed as Critically Endangered (Farjon, 2013). Illegal logging has completely eradicated mature



trees from the wild population as of 2018 (CITES 2019, CoP18 Prop. 50, p. 1). The proponents infer that regulation of trade in the species is necessary to avoid it becoming eligible for inclusion in Appendix I in the very near future.

**Species name:** *Widdringtonia whytei* Rendle (1894). Common name: Mulanje cedar.

**Distribution:** *Widdringtonia whytei* is endemic to the Mount Mulanje massif in southeastern Malawi (Chapman et al 1991).

**Population trend:** The species is IUCN Red List assessed as Critically Endangered (Farjon, 2013). In 2007, Bayliss et al. still found densities between 41 and 131 stems per hectare of trees above 5 cm diameter, and 78,159 m<sup>3</sup> of standing live volume. In 2014, a Forest Department survey found 38,138 mature, living cedar trees (and another 25,609 dead trees) but by 2017, field surveys found only seven mature living trees (BGCI 2017). As of 2018, the seven reproductively mature standing individuals had been felled (Mount Mulanje Conservation Trust, pers. obs. in CITES 2019, CoP18 Prop. 50, p. 3).

**Habitat status:** Habitat degradation and loss on Mount Mulanje's lower slopes occurs through a combination of logging, fuelwood collection, agricultural expansion, crop-burning fires and establishment of exotic tree plantations such as *Pinus patula* and *Cupressus macrocarpa* (CITES 2019, CoP18 Prop. 50, p. 3). The biggest threats to *W. whytei* are targeted illegal logging (BGCI 2017).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** There is no legal export of Mulanje cedar (Farjon 2013). No logging licences for living trees have been issued since 2007. The last licenses for salvage logging were also issued in 2007, and that year a total of 1233 trees were harvested, of which 393 (31.8%) were illegally cut living trees. This means that 100% of both dead and living tree volume harvested from 2008 onwards has been illegal. Given the volume estimates done by Bayliss et al. (2007), this means that almost 115,000 m<sup>3</sup> of cedar have been illegally harvested in the last ten years.

## **2.Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

The conservation status of the remaining wild trees of *W. whytei* is bleak, but management measures of wild and cultivated trees have been initiated. Outside the known habitat on Mount Mulanje, there are 66.2 ha of plantation on Zomba Mountain and another 76 ha in the large timber plantations of the Viphya Plateau (Chanyenga, 2018). Since 2017, a major restoration project has planted approximately 325,000 seedlings throughout areas of known former cedar habitat, and has the goal of planting another 250,000 on the mountain and selling 250,000 seedlings commercially to remove pressure from the Mount Mulanje population (Shaw, pers. comm.). However, it should be noted that low seedling survival is a consistent problem, as well as low natural regeneration and relatively high mortality rates observed by all recent studies conducted (Edwards, 1982; Sakai, 1989; Lawrence et al., 1994; Makungwa, 2004).

### 3.Evaluation of trade data

There is no legal trade in *W. whytei*. Illegal logging and trade has eradicated all remaining mature wild trees, and trade is currently dropping as a result (CITES 2019, CoP18 Prop. 50, p. 2).

### 4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states

Widdringtonia whytei has not been previously listed on CITES Appendices and no previous proposals have been made. The taxon is endemic to Malawi and apart for the literature reviewed in this proposal little is known about the species. Botanic Gardens Conservation International (BGCI) has an ongoing project on Domestication of the Mulanje Cedar for improved livelihoods funded by a UK DEFRA Darwin Initiative Project.

### 5.Recommendations

Malawi foreslår å inkludere *Widdringtonia whytei* på CITES Appendix II. Denne arten er kritisk truet og populasjonen har redusert drastisk de siste årene. Den nåværende vurderingen er at ingen voksne kongle-bærende trær er igjen. CITES Appendix II listningen kan potensielt øke bevisstheten internasjonalt om arter, men holder muligheten åpen for regulert internasjonal handel med dyrkede trær i fremtiden.

### 6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)

- Bayliss, J., Makungwa, S., Hecht, J., Nangoma, D., Bruessow, C. (2007) Saving the Island in the Sky: the plight of the Mount Mulanje cedar *Widdringtonia whytei* in Malawi. *Oryx* 41: 64-69
- BGCI (Botanical Gardens Conservation International) (2017) Mulanje Mountain Ecological Baseline Survey. Available upon request. Project online at: <http://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/project/23026/>
- Chapman, J.D., Seyani, J.H., Chikuni, A.C. (1991) The Mulanje Mountain in Malawi – a world heritage resource worth conserving. Paper presented at the XIIIth AETFAT Congress, Zomba, Malawi.
- CITES (2019). CoP18 Prop. 50. List the species *Widdringtonia whytei* in CITES Appendix II. Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/010319/E-CoP18-Prop-50.pdf>
- Edwards, I. (1982) A Report on Mulanje Cedar (*Widdringtonia nodiflora*) Resources on Mulanje Mountain. Report no. 82035, Forestry Research Institute of Malawi, Zomba, Malawi.
- Farjon, A. (2013) *Widdringtonia whytei*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013: e.T33216A2835167. Available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-1.RLTS.T33216A2835167.en..>
- Lawrence M.J., Oshino, A., Chinguwo, C. (1994) Mulanje cedar (*Widdringtonia cupressoides* Endlicher) inventory. Report No 94010, Forestry Research Institute of Malawi, Zomba, Malawi.
- Makungwa, S. (2004) Inventory results of Mulanje Cedar resources on Mulanje Mountain. A report submitted to Mulanje Mountain Conservation Trust.
- Sakai, I. (1989) A report on the Mulanje cedar resources and the present crisis. Forestry Record 65. FRIM, Malawi.

**1. Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Australia proposes to transfer *Xeromys myoides* from CITES Appendix I to II in accordance with the provisions of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), Annex 4 precautionary measures A. 1. and A. 2. A) i) since the species is not in trade. The species was selected for Periodic Review of the Appendices at the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee. Australia undertook the review and presented the results at the 30<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee (Geneva, 2018).

**Species name:** *Xeromys myoides* Thomas, 1889. Common name: Water Mouse, False Water-Rat.

**Distribution:** *X. myoides* is known from northern Australia (Northern Territory and Queensland) and Papua New Guinea (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016).

**Population trend:** Decreasing (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016).

**Habitat status:** Fragmented (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** There are no trade records for this species in CITES Trade Database, or any other reported incidences of trade in this species (CITES, 2019).

**2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*X. myoides* has been listed in CITES Appendix I since 1975 and in EU Wildlife Trade Regulations Appendix A since 1997. The species is listed as Vulnerable B2ab (ii,iii,v) Ver.3.1 on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016).

**3. Evaluation of trade data**

N/A

**4. Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

The species was subject to Periodic Review of the Appendices, and the Animals Committee, at its 30<sup>th</sup> meeting (Geneva, 2018) concluded with the following: The Committee determined that in accordance with subparagraphs 2 g) and h) of Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP17) the six species reviewed by Australia meet the criteria in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) for transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II as outlined in documents AC30 Doc. 29.2.1 to 29.2.6 (CITES, 2018a). The Committee asked the Secretariat to invite Australia to submit these proposals to the Conference of the Parties at its 18th meeting (CITES, 2018b).

**5. Recommendations**

Det er habitatødeleggelse og fragmentering som er hovedtrussel mot denne artens videre overlevelse. Listeforslaget er i tråd med føre-var kriteriene A1 og A2 i), Anneks 4, Res.

Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) da det ikke er noen indikasjoner på at den noen gang har vært i handel. Handel utgjør ikke en trussel for denne artens videre overlevelse.

## **6. References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 16 (*Xeromys myoides*). Available online at: [https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Xeromys-myoides.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Xeromys-myoides.pdf)

CITES, 2018a. AC30 Doc. 29.2.5: *Xeromys myoides* – Report of Australia

CITES, 2018b. AC30 Sum. 3 (Rev. 1). Available online at: <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/30/sum/E-AC30-ExSum-03-R1.pdf>

Woinarski, J. and Burbidge, A.A. 2016. *Xeromys myoides*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T23141A22454469. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-2.RLTS.T23141A22454469.en>.

## CoP18 Prop.17

### **1. Review of listing proposal under CITES**

Australia proposes to transfer *Zyzomys pendunculatus* from CITES Appendix I to II. Australia argues that the transfer is in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) Annex 4 precautionary measures A.1 and A.2 (a)(i), as the species is not in demand for international trade.

**Species name:** *Zyzomys pendunculatus* (Waite, 1896). Common name: Central Rock-Rat, Central Thick-tailed Rock Rat. Synonyms: *Conilurus pendunculatus* (Waite, 1986).

**Distribution:** *Z. pendunculatus* is endemic to Australia, and is currently only known to occur in the MacDonnell Range, west of Alice Springs (McDonald et al., 2017).

**Population trend:** *Z. pendunculatus* populations are undergoing dramatic fluctuations in response to climate conditions, particularly rainfall (McDonald, 2012 cited in CITES, 2019). The long-term trend is decreasing population size (Woinarski et al., 2014, Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016).

**Habitat status:** Species range is expected to continue to decline (Woinarski et al., 2014, Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016). Changes in habitat quality is brought about by changed fire regimes and impacts of climate change (Threatened Species Specific Committee, 2018 cited in CITES, 2019).

**Describe known/suspected level of trade:** No trade recorded in the CITES Trade Database.

### **2. Literature review of biological status and conservation status, including information on status in other relevant conventions**

*Z. pedunculatus* is listed as Critically Endangered (A2abce ver.3.1) on the IUCN Red List of Threatened species (Woinarski and Burbidge, 2016), and on the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations Appendix A since 1997 (Species+). *Z. pedunculatus* is listed on CITES Appendix I (since 1975). No commercial trade is permitted and any non-commercial trade

would require CITES permits. *Z. pedunculatus* is listed as Critically Endangered under Australia's national environmental legislation - the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act). The species is also listed as Endangered in the Northern Territory under the Territory Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 2000 and as Critically Endangered in Western Australia under the Wildlife Conservation Act 1950.

### **3.Evaluation of trade data**

No trade data are recorded for this species.

### **4.Potential other information by CITES reviews and on nature management issues in range states.**

The primary threats to this species are extensive fires and predation by feral cats (Threatened Species Specific Committee, 2018 cites in CITES, 2019).

The species was selected for Periodic Review of the Appendices at the 29<sup>th</sup> Animals Committee meeting in Geneva (2017). Australia conducted the review. Based on the findings of this review process, Australia presented, at the 30<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee (Geneva, 2018), a draft proposal for transferring *Z. pedunculatus* from Appendix I to Appendix II. The Animals Committee recommended that the proposal should be submitted to the CoP18.

### **5.Recommendations**

*Zyzomys pedunculatus* er truet av brann og predasjon fra villkatter. Sammen med en rekke andre pungrotter ble *Z. pedunculatus* valgt ut til det periodiske gjennomgangen av CITES Appendiksene, og basert på vurderingen lagt frem etter denne prosessen anbefalte dyrekomiteen at forslaget om nedlisting skulle sendes til CoP18. Det er ikke registrert hverken legal eller illegal handel med denne arten, og listeforslaget er derfor i tråd med Resolution Conf .9.24 (Rev. CoP17) Anneks 4, føre-car kriterier A.1 og A.2 (a)(i). Det er ikke sannsynlig at handel vil være ødeleggende for denne artens videre overlevelse.

### **6.References (literature list and reference to relevant webpages)**

CITES, 2019. CoP18 Proposal 17 (*Zyzomys pedunculatus*). Available online at:

[https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119\\_d/E-CoP18-Prop\\_draft-Zyzomys-pedunculatus.pdf](https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/18/prop/020119_d/E-CoP18-Prop_draft-Zyzomys-pedunculatus.pdf)

McDonald, P.J. (2012). Threatened Species of the Northern Territory – Central Rock-rat *Zyzomys pedunculatus*. Available online at:

[https://nt.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0013/205510/central-rock-rat.pdf](https://nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0013/205510/central-rock-rat.pdf)

Threatened Species Specific Committee (2018). Conservation advice *Zyzomys*

*pedunculatus*. Threatened Species Scientific Committee Available at:

<http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/species/pubs/68-conservation-advice-15022018.pdf>

Woinarski, J. and Burbidge, A.A. 2016. *Zyzomys pedunculatus*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2016: e.T23324A22456932. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-1.RLTS.T23324A22456932.en>.

Woinarski, J.C.Z., Burbidge, A.A. and Harrison, P.L. (2014). The Action Plan for Australian Mammals 2012. CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood.

## 4 Uncertainties

For many species and species groups, the available data on status, population size and trends are not based on reliable or up to date scientific sources. To confidently evaluate whether or not trade will be detrimental to the survival of a species is sometimes not possible due to lack of such information. Moreover, the control of trade executed by the range States can be inadequate and/or the level of trade may be underreported to CITES. In several cases there are also gaps between the numbers provided by exporters and importers in the CITES trade database. Reliable assessments of trade impact should ideally be based on exact or close to exact trade numbers to ensure that trade is not going to be detrimental to a species' survival. Given that only a small percentage of illegal trade is documented, there is significant uncertainty in the actual trade numbers and thus the assessment of trade impact on the species survival.

## 5 Data gaps

The illegal market in animal and plant species is massive, but only a fraction of trade is actually documented. The amount of illegal trade is estimated from seizure data, but again these only represent a proportion of actual illegal trade. While searching for alternative databases and indicators of trade online (e.g. dramatic fluctuations in the price of derived products), it is evident that for many of the species evaluated in this report, the actual trade pressure is unknown. For several species evaluated in this report the data on population size, trends, general biology and conservation status is very limited and this is noted, where appropriate.

## 6 References

Note that references are included for each of the species assessments presented in section 3 of this report.

The following websites have been used for the majority of the assessments (as specified in the text of the assessments) and are not included in the literature list of each proposal:

CITES Trade Database: <https://trade.cites.org/>

SPECIES+: <https://speciesplus.net/>

TRAFFIC: <https://www.traffic.org/>