

**Dr. GIAM Choo-hoo,
his connections to the shark fin trade
and a
Conflict of Interest in his role in CITES**

**Hong Kong
02.03.2012**

Introduction

Dr GIAM Choo-hoo is a representative for Asia on the CITES Animals Committee which advises CITES on shark conservation.

He is also a powerful ally and lobbyist on behalf of the shark fin industry and is well known in CITES for his opposition to almost any sort of restrictions being placed on the catching of sharks. Much of his lobbying to block shark conservation measures has been done within CITES.

There is a simple reason for this – **Dr GIAM is a representative of the shark fin industry!**

This report will:

- (a) highlight a clear and unacceptable **Conflict of Interest** on behalf of Dr GIAM in his role as a CITES committee member;
- (b) show Dr GIAM's links to and efforts on behalf of the shark fin trade, both within and outside of CITES; and
- (c) show how CITES own rules on committee membership are being ignored.

This report documents a blatant abuse of position and clearly demonstrates that Dr GIAM has stepped over the bounds of acceptable behavior expected of a regional representative on an international committee of an important UN Agency.

In this day and age, **Conflict of Interest** in any internationally representative decision making forum is unacceptable.

Based on the information contained in this report, it is recommended that a formal investigation be initiated into Dr GIAM's activities.

If the findings of this report are confirmed, Dr GIAMs continued representation in CITES is untenable and he should be relieved of his duties.

This report also recommends the need for a comprehensive review and overhaul of CITES rules and regulations regarding the operation of its committees.

Executive summary

Conflict of interest

A Conflict of Interest is a situation that has the potential to undermine the impartiality of a person because of the possibility of a clash between the person's public interest and his self interest.

A Conflict of Interest can only arise when the person is entrusted with some expectation of impartiality.

Dr GIAM's public interest

CITES is an international agreement between governments and is a representative body of the nations who are signatories to it.

Dr GIAM is an Alternate Member for Asia on the CITES Animals Committee.

He was chosen for the committee based on the fact that he is an expert in animals, in his case crocodiles.

The role of the Animals Committee is to provide scientific advice and guidance to the CITES Conference of Parties on all matters relevant to the international trade in animals.

Dr GIAM's self interest

Evidence that Dr GIAM works for the shark fin trade

In 2007, the author Juliet Eilperin travelled to Hong Kong to interview Mr. Charlie LIM of the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association for her book "Demon Fish: Travels Through the Hidden World of Sharks". After she entered his office, she describes the setting as follows:

"I am surrounded by the shark fin trade heavy weights of Hong Kong. Lim, the secretary of Hong Kong's Sharkfin and Marine Products Association, has convened a special meeting in his organizations conference room for my benefit, so he and his colleagues can explain what exactly they do for a living. Giam has come in from Singapore"

When interviewed for the book, Dr GIAM formally introduced himself to the author as:

"a representative of the shark fin industry in Singapore"

Representative of Species Management Specialists

Dr GIAM is also a representative of Species Management Specialists, an NGO operating out of Canberra, Australia headed by Robert (Hank) Jenkins, a former chairman of the CITES Animals Committee.

He has attended the following CITES committees as a representative of Species Management Specialists:

- (a) 54th Standing Committee in Geneva in October 2006;
- (b) Conference of Parties 14 in The Hague in June 2007; and
- (c) Conference of Parties 15 in Doha in March 2010.

Evidence of Conflict of Interest

The following are examples of Conflict of Interest in respect of Dr GIAM and his role in CITES.

Species Management Specialists “Voting Guide”

Species Management Specialists produce what a Board Member (Glenn Inwood) claims is an **influential voting guide** for the Conference of Parties. They have produced voting guides for CoP 13 in Thailand (2004), CoP 14 in The Hague (2007) and CoP 15 in Doha (2010).

At the same time and for the same meetings, Dr GIAM is a member of the Animals Committee which is tasked with providing scientific advice and guidance to the Conference of Parties.

Both he, as a CITES Animals Committee member, and his company are therefore offering advice to the Conference of Parties at the same time.

Lobbying inside CITES on behalf of the shark fin trade

Prior to the 22nd meeting of the Animals Committee in Lima in 2006 Dr GIAM was a member of the Technical Workshop on the Conservation and Management of Sharks. In this workshop he attacked almost every issue relating to shark conservation.

In an inter-sessional working group at this meeting, both Dr GIAM and Species Management Specialists raised difficulties in implementing certain shark conservation measures, in the same meeting, at the same time.

At the 24th meeting of the Animals Committee in Geneva in 2009 Dr GIAM tried to suppress a report on sharks which had been commissioned by the Australian Government.

Lobbying outside of CITES on behalf of the shark fin trade

In November 2006 Dr GIAM and Robert Jenkins attended a conference on shark conservation in Beijing, China. According to an observer attending the conference, they were there in an

advisory capacity to Charlie LIM of the Hong Kong based Shark Fin and Marine Products Association. Both Dr GIAM and Jenkins criticized shark conservation efforts at this conference. In September 2010 Dr GIAM and Robert Jenkins attended a closed conference in Hong Kong organised by Charlie LIM of the Marine Products Association where they both gave presentations speaking out against the need for the conservation of sharks.

In February 2012 Dr GIAM and Robert Jenkins attended a debate in Singapore “Shark’s Fin Soup: To Ban or Not To Ban” in which they both attacked the credibility of shark conservation efforts.

Weak systems in place

A major issue of concern is why Dr GIAM has been allowed to retain his position in CITES for so long. He has been a member of the Animals Committee since 1994, a period of 17 years. Part of the problem lies in the weak rules that CITES has in place regarding committees and terms of office.

Conclusion

Dr GIAM is a regional representative on an international committee. As such, he is entrusted with a duty of impartiality.

Based on the evidence in this report, there is a clear Conflict of Interest by Dr GIAM in CITES in respect of the following:

- (a) he has admitted he is a representative of the shark fin industry;
- (b) he has been identified by Mr. Charlie LIM as being a colleague of his in the shark fin industry;
- (c) he is member of the Animals Committee at the same time that he is a representative of Species Management Specialists. Both are producing reports aimed at influencing decisions within the Conference of Parties; and
- (d) he is a colleague and advisor to Charlie LIM of the Hong Kong based Shark Fin and Marine Products Association and is promoting the shark fin trade outside CITES, whilst at the same time aggressively lobbying against scientifically based shark conservation efforts inside CITES.

These are examples of clear and unequivocal Conflicts of Interest.

Furthermore, this case highlights the weak systems that are in place governing CITES committee membership, including the fact there are no clear guidelines in CITES on terms of office or provisos to cover Declarations of Interest.

Apart from dealing with the issue of Dr GIAM, CITES should conduct a comprehensive review of its systems governing all aspects of committee membership.

How CITES handles this case will determine how it wants to be viewed in the future.

Does it want to be seen as a cosy club, easily subject to the influence of vested interests, or an international association with science at the forefront, whose integrity and systems are above reproach.

Conflict of interest

A Conflict of Interest is a situation that has the potential to undermine the impartiality of a person because of the possibility of a clash between the person's self interest and his public interest.

A Conflict of Interest can only arise when the person is entrusted with some expectation of impartiality.

For a Conflict of Interest to occur
no money, favours or reward need to change hands.

If money, favours or reward do change hands, then in many jurisdictions
this constitutes
Bribery and Corruption.

Dr GIAM Choo-hoo

Background

Dr Giam Choo Hoo:

- is a recognized crocodile expert
- from 1961 until his retirement in 1995 was Deputy-Director of the Primary Production Department, Ministry of National Development, Singapore (now known as AVA).
- was the leader of the Singapore CITES delegations 1986-1995. He drafted the Singapore CITES law and was responsible for its implementation.
- is a CITES Animals Committee member. He is currently the Alternate CITES Animals Committee member for SE Asia. He was elected in 1994, and has since been regularly re-elected to become its longest serving member.
- was a founding board member of Jurong Bird Park and retired as its Deputy Chairman in 1996.
- has been closely associated with ASEAN on all CITES issues, and was an Advisor to the Royal Cambodian delegation at the CITES meeting, Bangkok 2-14 Oct 2004.
- is a member of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, England.
- was the Chief Veterinary Officer of Singapore. He is a Past-President of the Association of Veterinary Surgeons Malaysia/ Singapore, the Singapore Veterinary Association, and a CVA Regional Representative (Commonwealth Veterinary Association).
- is a member of the IUCN-Crocodile Specialist Group Steering Committee
- is co-author (with Charlie Manolis and others) of the IUCN-SCC Crocodile Specialist Group review on Crocodile Conservation and Management in Cambodia. 13 April 2005.

Species Management Specialists

Dr GIAM is a representative of Species Management Specialists (SMS), a Canberra based NGO.

The president of SMS is Robert (Hank) Jenkins, a former Chairman of the CITES Animal Committee (1992 – 2000).

In his LinkedIn page, the Species Management Specialists Public Relations consultant Glenn Inwood states:

“SMS promotes the sustainable utilisation of wildlife and marine species and an **influential voting guide** for the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES).....”

Dr GIAM’s connections to the crocodile skin trade

Heng Long International

Dr GIAM is an Independent Director, Member of the Audit Committee, Member of the Nominating Committee and Member of the Remuneration Committee of Heng Long International. See details below:

<http://investing.businessweek.com/businessweek/research/stocks/people/person.asp?personId=46573739&ticker=HLONG:SP&previousCapId=41080398&previousTitle=HENG%20LONG%20INTERNATIONAL%20LTD>

The company profile is:

- Heng Long International Ltd., an investment holding company, engages in importing, exporting, and processing leather materials to luxury and fashion industry.
- The company offers a range of crocodilian leather products, including raw and crusted crocodilian skin, finished crocodilian leather, and other exotic skin and leather products for the manufacture of handbags, garments, shoes and boots, watch straps, and other accessories.
- It sells its products primarily in Europe, the Asia Pacific, and the Americas. The company was incorporated in 2007 and is based in Singapore. Heng long International Ltd. is a subsidiary of Heng Long Holdings Pte. Ltd.

See attached:

<http://investing.businessweek.com/businessweek/research/stocks/snapshot/snapshot.asp?ticker=HLONG:SP>

See a photograph of “the Heng Long Holdings board”, including Dr GIAM:

<http://henglong.listedcompany.com/directors.html>

Dr GIAM divests his shares in Heng Long

On 2 November 2011 Heng Long International Limited issued a news release regarding “Notice of a Director’s (including a Director Who Is A Substantial Shareholder) Interest and Change of Interest” regarding Dr GIAM’s moves to divest himself of 150,000 shares in Heng Long International Limited:

See news release attached:

<http://henglong.listedcompany.com/news.html/id/274950>

Singapore Reptile Skin Trade Association

Dr GIAM has attended a number of CITES committee meetings as a representative of the Singapore Reptile Skin Trade Association.

KOH Chon-tong, Managing Director of Heng Long International Limited was co-founder of this Association and has been its secretary since 1987.

See his profile attached:

<http://henglong.listedcompany.com/directors.html>

CITES Committees

CITES (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora) is an international agreement between governments. Its aim is to ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival.

CITES works through 3 committees:

- (a) The Parties (member States) to CITES are collectively referred to as the Conference of the Parties (CoP). The **Conference of the Parties** meets every two to three years to review the implementation of the Convention;
- (b) a **Standing Committee** provides policy guidance to the Secretariat concerning the implementation of the Convention and oversees the management of the Secretariat's budget. Beyond these key roles, it coordinates and oversees, where required, the work of other committees and working groups; and
- (c) The **Animals and Plant Committees** are committees of experts established to fill gaps in biological and other specialized knowledge regarding species of animals and plants that are (or might become) subject to CITES trade controls. Their role is to provide technical support to decision-making about these species.

Dr GIAM has been a member of the Animals Committee since 1994 and is currently an Alternate Member for Asia on the Animals Committee. This is a period of 17 years.

CITES Animals Committee

According to CITES protocols, the CITES Animals Committee is a committee of experts established to fill gaps in biological and other **specialized knowledge** regarding species of animals and plants that are (or might become) subject to CITES trade controls.

The terms of reference of the Animals Committee includes:

- (a) providing **scientific advice** and guidance; and
- (b) advising when certain species are subject to unsustainable trade and recommending remedial action.

Members on the Animals Committee are individuals from the six major geographical regions (Africa, **Asia**, Europe, North America, Central and South America and the Caribbean, and Oceania)

They are elected at the meetings of the Conference of the Parties, with the number of regional representatives weighted according to the number of Parties within each region and according to the regional distribution of biodiversity.

As in the Standing Committee, there is an elected **alternate member** for each of the six regions who **represents the region** at meetings when the relevant member is unable to attend.

See details at:

http://www.cites.org/eng/disc/AC_PC.shtml#dir

At the 15th CoP meeting in Doha in March 2010 Dr GIAM Choo hoo was re-elected unopposed as the Alternate Member for Asia of the Animals Committee. See attached:

<http://www.cites.org/eng/cop/15/doc/E15-07-02-02.pdf>

When Dr GIAM attends Animals Committee meetings he does so in his **capacity as a scientist, an expert in his field** and as a **representative of the region**.

CITES Conference attendance

The following lists the CITES conferences attended by Dr GIAM, together with details of other SMS representatives who attended the same conferences:

CITES Standing Committee

54th meeting – Geneva, October 2006

Species Management Specialists - GIAM Choo-hoo

Conservation Force – Jenkins Hank (Species Management Specialists)

57th meeting – Geneva, July 2008

Species Management Specialists – Robert Jenkins

Singapore Reptile Skin Trade Association - GIAM Choo-hoo

58th meeting – Geneva, July 2009

Species Management Specialists – Jenkins Hank
Singapore Reptile Skin Trade Association - GIAM Choo-hoo

CITES Animals Committee

19th meeting – Geneva – August 2003

Alternate Member – Asia - Singapore - GIAM Choo-hoo

20th meeting – Johannesburg, April 2004

Alternate Member – Singapore - GIAM Choo-hoo

22nd meeting – Lima, July 2006

Alternate Member - Giam Choo-hoo
Species Management Specialists – Jenkins Hank

23rd meeting – Geneva, 2008

Alternate Member - Giam Choo-hoo
Species Management Specialists – Jenkins Robert W. G.

At the meeting, Dr GIAM was a member of the Shark Management and Conservation Committee:

<http://www.cites.org/common/com/AC/23/EFS23WG06-01.pdf>

24th meeting – Geneva, April 2009

Alternate Member - Giam Choo-hoo
Species Management Specialists – MANOLIS Charlie

Conference of Parties (CoP)

CoP 12 – Santiago. November 2002

Creative Conservation Solutions – Jenkins Hank
Dr GIAM is not listed as an official participant, although he was seen at the meeting.

CoP 13 – Bangkok October 2004

Species Management Specialists – Jenkins Robert (Hank)
Singapore Reptile Skin Trade Association - GIAM Choo-hoo

CoP 14 - The Hague June 2007

Species Management Specialists - GIAM Choo-hoo, INWOOD Glenn, JENKINS Robert W.

CoP 15 – Doha March 2010

Species Management Specialists - GIAM Choo-hoo, JENKINS Robert

Links

For details of the committees work, including participant details, see the following links:

CITES Standing Committee

<http://www.cites.org/eng/com/sc/index.shtml>

CITES Animals Committee

<http://www.cites.org/eng/com/ac/index.shtml>

Conference of Parties (CoP)

<http://www.cites.org/eng/cop/index.shtml>

Membership of Working Groups on Sharks

12th meeting – Animals Committee – Antigua, Guatemala 1995

At this meeting, Dr GIAM chaired an ad hoc working group on sharks.

From 1995 to 2003, a check of CITES meeting minutes suggests no formal involvement by Dr GIAM in shark affairs.

19th meeting – Animals Committee - Geneva – August 2003

Under the International Plan of Action (IPOA) for the Conservation of Sharks, Dr GIAM was the regional representative for Asia on Working Group 12 which was assigned to deal with an IUCN/Traffic report on the status and international trade in sharks.

See page 18 of the following link:

http://www.cites.org/eng/com/ac/19/summary_record.pdf

Lobbying in CITES for the shark fin trade.

CoP 12 – Santiago. November 2002

Parties propose the inclusion of Whale Sharks and Basking Sharks in CITES Appendix II.

At the meeting Dr Giam spoke on behalf of the Shark Fins Merchants Association expressing how any restrictions on trade in whale shark will deprive poor communities of their livelihoods.

According to an observer at the meeting, Dr GIAM was regularly in the company of the Secretary of the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association, CHIU Ching Cheung.

22nd meeting – Animals Committee – Lima, July 2006

Prior to the 22nd Animals Committee meeting in Lima, Dr GIAM was the Alternate Member/Representative for Asia on the Technical Workshop on the Conservation and Management of Sharks.

The minutes of this meeting indicate extensive attempts to change the agenda and composition of the workshop, as the following extracts from the minutes show:

Day 1

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of Agenda and working programme

The **Alternate Member** for Asia requested that the ‘trade-related threats to sharks’ be amended to ‘fisheries threats to sharks’. In his opinion the greatest threat to sharks stems from fisheries, since sharks are caught for their meat but fins are only an incidental product. He also noted that the total number of sharks taken is more important than the value per kilogram of the product, therefore sharks are a fisheries problem and should be tackled from this angle. He requested the Workshop keep trade impacts in perspective.

The WG referred to Decision 13.43, directed to the AC, and determined that the CoP had clearly directed them to consider trade-related threats, not other threats or welfare.

Agenda Item 5: Responses to CITES Notification 2005/044 Discussion

In respect of *Carcharodon carcharias*, *Cetorhinus maximu* and *Rhincodon typus* the **Alternate Representative** for Asia suggested that the response to the Notification indicates a low level of international trade and questioned the basis for the listing of three species of shark on the CITES Appendices.

Agenda Item 9: Establishment of subgroups

Dr GIAM was one of the participants in Sub-group 2 on Trade-related threats to sharks.

Day 2

Subgroup 2: Trade-related threats to sharks

The **Alternate Representative** for Asia noted that finning refers to the live finning of sharks; other Workshop members disagreed. ‘Finning’ is normally defined as the removal and retention of shark fins on board a vessel and the discard of the remainder of the carcass into the sea. This is primarily a sustainable management issue, which is why several Regional Fisheries Bodies now regulate it. The Chair stated that welfare issues were not considered by CITES.

Report 3: Key shark species threatened by trade

The **Alternate Member** for Asia questioned the Workshop’s role in highlighting species for CITES’ consideration, noting that only Parties can propose species listings to CITES. He queried whether the Workshop was either appropriate or competent enough to do so, and felt that there was not enough information or time to complete this task.

b) Procedural concerns

The **Alternate Member** for Asia had frequently raised concerns over the organisation, remit and expertise of the Workshop. He stressed his disagreement with a number of issues throughout the Workshop and noted that he will raise these with the Animals Committee in July. These included:

Workshop composition.

Why was the Workshop not open to Party States, and why were Parties not at least advised that it would be taking place? He considered that there was an inadequate geographical balance and representation, particularly from Asia.

The Secretariat explained that the membership of the Working Group was by the last Animals Committee meeting. The Chair explained that an invitation to attend had been sent to all Working Group members at the previous Animals Committee meeting and to those Parties who had not attended that Working Group session but had expressed an interest in participating in its work. All Parties had been advised at the last Animals Committee meeting that this meeting would take place, however it is not standard practice for Parties to attend inter-sessional Working Group meetings. Because these are not official CITES meetings, the AC Chair could also use his discretion to invite the participation of a small number of additional shark experts. Participants were attending from 17 States, including Singapore and China, (eight Parties, invited experts from three other States and two global regions (West Africa and Asia), and NGO/IGO observers of various nationalities).

The competency of the Workshop to make recommendations on species affected by trade.

The Chair explained that the invited shark experts had been selected in consideration of their broad range of knowledge, both geographically and across the fisheries and conservation sectors. He noted the high level of international competence present and that additional raw material had been made available for consideration prior to the meeting. This Working Group contributes towards a re-iterative process and the AC will provide further opportunity to review the recommendations generated at this meeting.

The remote location.

The request for a more accessible location for future Workshops was noted, as was the safe, timely arrival of all participants and the suitable facilities that had been made available.

See details in full at the following link:

<http://www.cites.org/common/com/ac/22/efs-ac22-inf03.pdf>

Inter-sessional working group

In an inter-sessional working group at this technical workshop **Dr Giam** underscored the difficulty of implementing non-detriment findings for commercially traded marine species. He noted that Australia is unable to make such findings for the Appendix II-listed great white shark. He also pointed out that New Zealand has exported basking shark fins without prior non-detriment findings, and enquired whether this consignment would be returned to the exporting country. New Zealand responded that it will not be returned since the export was not illegal.

Species Management Specialists cautioned against adopting recommendations with significant budgetary implications concerning non-CITES listed species.

See details of this report at the following:

<http://www.iisd.ca/vol21/enb2149e.html>

This exchange provides clear evidence of Conflict of Interest.

2009 - 24th Animals Committee Meeting – Geneva .

At the 24th CITES Animals Committee meeting in Geneva, Switzerland on 20 -24 April 2009 Dr GIAM challenged a report that had formally been commissioned by the Australian government from TRAFFIC (copyright is shared by DEWHA and TRAFFIC) and presented to the Animals Committee meeting by the Australian government as an official Information Document.

The minutes of this meeting are at:

<http://www.cites.org/eng/com/AC/24/E-AC24-Sum-Rec-FINAL.pdf>

Details of the report are at:

<http://www.cites.org/common/com/AC/24/E24i-02.pdf>

Dr GIAM tried very hard during the shark working group and the final plenary session to have this document withdrawn or expunged from the record and also to have the shark working group's report withdrawn.

The following is placed on record at this meeting(at page 33):

“The **alternate representative** of Asia (Mr Giam) requested that the following statement be recorded in the summary record.

“Document AC24 Inf. 2 Illegal, unreported and unregulated shark catch: A review of current knowledge and action by consultants M. Lack and G. Sant should not be accepted as a document of the meeting as it is neither (a) from a Party nor (b) from a recognized NGO, in spite of the heading of the publication TRAFFIC. Though given the impression that it is from Australia and TRAFFIC, the 'Disclaimer' in the publication shows otherwise. Therefore the (a) report of the Working Group AC24 WG5 Doc. 1 ‘Mandate 3, agenda item 14.3: Linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat, and illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing’ cannot AC24 Summary record – p. 34 be accepted, and the report of the Working Group to the Animals committee should also be expunged.”

Evidence that Dr GIAM works for the shark fin trade

In 2007, the author Juliet Eilperin travelled to Hong Kong to interview Mr. Charlie LIM of the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association for her book “Demon Fish: Travels Through the Hidden World of Sharks”. After she entered his office, she describes the setting as follows:

“I am surrounded by the shark fin trade heavy weights of Hong Kong. Lim, the secretary of Hong Kong’s Sharkfin and Marine Products Association, has convened a special meeting in his organizations conference room for my benefit, so he and his colleagues can explain what exactly they do for a living. Giam has come in from Singapore”

See book at:

http://www.amazon.com/Demon-Fish-Travels-Through-Hidden/dp/0375425128/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1305595400&sr=1-1-spell#reader_0375425128 (Search on GIAM – see passage on Page 89)

When interviewed for the book, Dr GIAM formally introduced himself to the author as:

“a representative of the shark fin industry in Singapore”

See quote in Blog at:

http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/blogpost/post/is-the-shark-fin-ban-culturally-biased/2012/02/21/gIQAbIj9SR_blog.html

Championing the shark fin trade out of CITES

2006 - Conference on Shark Conservation, Beijing, China.

In November 2006 Dr GIAM attended a conference on shark conservation in Beijing co-sponsored by WildAid. According to an observer at this conference, Jenkins and Dr GIAM were at the conference in an **advisory** capacity to the marine products trade industry, represented at

the conference by Charlie LIM, Secretary of the Hong Kong based Shark Fin and Marine Products Association.

See details at:

<http://www.wildsingapore.com/news/20061112/061109-6.htm>

After this conference, Dr GIAM made the following statements which were widely reported in the press:

"Sharks are not as endangered as made out by some extreme NGOs [nongovernment organizations]," said Giam Choo-hoo, an Animals Committee member of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna, or CITES.

He said only three species were on the CITES list of animals whose trade and consumption was in need of monitoring - the Basking Shark, the Whale Shark and the Great White. And none was on the most threatened list.

2006 - Article for the Singapore Straits Times - "Shark's fin soup- eat without guilt".

In December 2006 wrote an article for the Straits Times in Singapore entitled "Shark's fin soup- eat without guilt". See attached:

<http://www.iwmc.org/PDF/StraitsTPress.pdf>

This article is often quoted by supporters of the shark fin trade in support of their arguments.

2010 – September -International Marine Conference. Conrad Hotel, Hong Kong.

The International Marine Conference, organized by the Marine Products Association was held at the Conrad Hotel in Hong Kong on 21 September 2010, attended by seafood traders, international marine experts, officers' from the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department and the Customs and Excise Department.

Dr GIAM and Jenkins were keynote speakers. Although it was billed as an "International Conference", it appears to have been a closed shop affair, by invite only.

Details of the conference are in the following press report (in Chinese) given by Charlie LIM:

http://news.hotpot.hk/fruit/art_main.php?iss_id=20100922&sec_id=4104&art_id=14476566

The following is the content of Dr GIAM's presentation to this conference:

Slide 1 - Shark victims unite to save their Attackers

- Survivors gathered at United Nations
- Said 73 million sharks killed annually for shark fin soup
- Said decimate shark population just for soup

- Pew is lobbying to end fishermen slicing off fins

Slide 2

Singapore squashes PETA chicken protest at KFC A Shark Fin Promotion Backfires

Citibank Hong Kong withdrew the promotion

Ban --- Hawaii makes it illegal to serve shark fin soup

Campaign to stop eating of shark fin soup

Slide 3 – Accusation

1. Shark fin soup causes death of 77 millions sharks
2. Sharks endangered because of shark fin soup
3. Cruel live finning the way to obtain fins

Slide 4 – The Truth

* 77 millions sharks killed

1. **Europe** kills millions of sharks (a) 50 years ago and (b) Still now
2. **US** , Australia etc catches sharks
3. **By-catch** in millions as a result of longline tuna and other fishing
4. **By-catch** of artisanal fishing

Killed not for fins. A bycatch of general fisheries

Slide 5 – Sharks not Endangered

1. There are more than 500 shark species.
2. To say sharks are endangered like saying birds are endangered.
3. One has to ask which species.
4. UN CITES lists only three shark species in Appendix II (non---endangered)
5. No country proposed any shark to be on the endangered list at the Doha UN CITES meeting early this year
6. A mild proposal to list four sharks was defeated at the UN CITES meeting
7. No country bans the catching of sharks

Slide 6 – Live Finning

- *Live finning* is the cutting of fins from a struggling shark
- Forms a minute portion of all fins sold in the world
- 5% law
- Done by criminals and mafia

Slide 7 – Poor gets poorer

If campaign to ban shark fin soup succeeds, the poor fishermen in developing countries will be poorer - Cannot sell their fins

Slide 8 – Wrong target

1. Should campaign to stop shark catch
2. Stop serving shark meat in restaurants in Europe
3. Stop caviar sale and consumption

Slide 9 - Conclusion

- 90% of sharks are **accidentally** harvested
- Remaining **10%** are targeted and caught for **their meat**
- **No shark** species **endangered**
- **No country** says sharks are **endangered**
- Almost all **fins are taken after the sharks death**

The Chinese are not responsible for the sharks problem

Shark issue not same as whales for Japan

2012 – Debate in Singapore on shark conservation

In February 2012 Dr GIAM and Robert Jenkins attended a debate in Singapore “Shark’s Fin Soup: To Ban or Not To Ban” in which they both attacked the credibility of shark conservation efforts.

Species Management Specialists (SMS)

Species Management Specialists (SMS) is an NGO based in Canberra:

<http://www.speciesms.org/>

Details of their membership is not available from their website, but research has identified the following persons as having a role in SMS:

- (a) Robert (Hank) Jenkins – President of SMS;
- (b) Glenn Inwood – Board member of SMS (2003 – 2010);
- (c) Dr GIAM Choo-hoo;
- (d) Dr Graham Hall – Executive Officer; and
- (e) Charlie Manolis.

SMS appears to come to prominence around 2005.

In terms of members, Dr Graham Hall and Charlie Manolis are quoted once in a press report in relation to SMS in 2006, and Charlie Manolis attended the 24th Animals Committee meeting in Geneva in April 2009. Dr Graham Hall is a Game Management expert and Charlie Manolis is a crocodile expert. Apart from this, neither has surfaced in any other connection during the research into this report and they are not discussed further.

The press report in which they are mentioned, entitled “Australia Scuttles Opportunity for Whale Management Plan: Dr Graham Hall” dated 29 May 2006 is attached below:

<http://jennifermarohasy.com/blog/2006/05/australia-scuttles-opportunity-for-whale-management-plan-dr-graham-hall/>

SMS has produced what it claims to be comprehensive reports for the deliberation of CITES panels at the following CITES Conference of Parties (CoP) meetings:

- (a) CoP 13 – Thailand 2004;
- (b) CoP 14 – The Hague 2007; and
- (c) CoP 15 - Doha 2010.

CITES Conference attendance

The following lists the conferences attended by various members of SMS:

CITES Standing Committee

54th meeting – Geneva, October 2006

Species Management Specialists - GIAM Choo-hoo

Conservation Force – Jenkins Hank (Species Management Specialists)

57th meeting – Geneva, July 2008

Species Management Specialists – Robert Jenkins

Singapore Reptile Skin Trade Association - GIAM Choo-hoo

58th meeting – Geneva, July 2009

Species Management Specialists – Jenkins Hank

Singapore Reptile Skin Trade Association - GIAM Choo-hoo

CITES Animals Committee

20th meeting – Johannesburg, April 2004

Alternate Member – Singapore - GIAM Choo-hoo

22nd meeting – Lima, July 2006

Alternate Member - Giam Choo-hoo

Observer - Species Management Specialists – Jenkins Hank

23rd meeting – Geneva, 2008

Alternate Member - Giam Choo-hoo

Observer - Species Management Specialists – Jenkins Robert W. G.

24th meeting – Geneva, April 2009

Alternate Member - Giam Choo-hoo

Observer - Species Management Specialists – MANOLIS Charlie

Conference of Parties (CoP)

CoP 12 - Santiago November 2002

Observer - Creative Conservation Solutions – Jenkins Hank

CoP 13 – Bangkok October 2004

Observer

Species Management Specialists – Jenkins Robert (Hank)

Singapore Reptile Skin Trade Association - GIAM Choo-hoo

CoP 14 - The Hague June 2007

Observer - *Species Management Specialists*

GIAM Choo-hoo

INWOOD Glenn

JENKINS Robert W.

CoP 15 – Doha March 2010

Observer - *Species Management Specialists*

GIAM Choo-hoo

JENKINS Robert

Links

For details of the committees work, including participant details, see the following links:

CITES Standing Committee

<http://www.cites.org/eng/com/sc/index.shtml>

CITES Animals Committee

<http://www.cites.org/eng/com/ac/index.shtml>

Conference of Parties (CoP)

<http://www.cites.org/eng/cop/index.shtml>

Robert (Hank) Jenkins

Background

Robert (Hank) Jenkins has an impressive CV:

- he is former Chairman of the CITES Animal Committee (1992 – 2000).
- he is a recognized crocodile expert.
- he was the Australia representative for the FAO report of the expert consultation on implementation issues associated with listing commercially exploited aquatic species on Cites Appendices. Rome, Italy. 25 – 28 May 2004. See attached:

<http://www.fao.org/docrep/007/y5751e/y5751e0c.htm>

- he is an Implementation Expert for the UN's FAO expert advisory panel for the assessment of proposals to amend Appendices I and II of CITES concerning commercially exploited aquatic species (Rome 7 – 12 December 2009). See attached:

<http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1899e/i1899e.pdf>

- he is a Vice Chairman for CITES on the Steering Committee of the IUCN's Crocodile Specialist Group. Dr GIAM is also on this committee. See attached:

[http://www.wmi.com.au/csgarticles/CSG_Newsletter_26\(3\)_Low.pdf](http://www.wmi.com.au/csgarticles/CSG_Newsletter_26(3)_Low.pdf)

- he was awarded the "Master of the Order of Australia" Medal in 2007 for his service to wildlife conservation and management, particularly through contributions to the development of policies for sustainable international trade in wild fauna.

Business interests

Jenkins is associated with the following companies:

Up to 2004

Principal
Creative Conservation Solutions,
PO Box 390,
Belconnen,
ACT 2616
Tel: 612 62583428
Fax: 612 62598757
Email: hank.jenkins@consol.net.au

After 2005 - present

President
Species Management Specialists Inc,
PO Box 390,
Belconnen,
ACT 2616

Influence in CITES

In September 2007 the IUCN Crocodile Specialist Newsletter posted the following comment in respect of Jenkins on his being awarded the “Master of the Order of Australia” Medal for his service to wildlife conservation and management, particularly through contributions to the development of policies for sustainable international trade in wild fauna:

“Since leaving government service in 2000, Hank has continued to pursue sustainable use of wildlife as a private consultant. Since 2003 he has headed up the non-profit organization, Species Management Specialists (SMS), which has provided **objective advice on wildlife conservation, management and trade issues debated at CITES CoP 13 (June 2004) and CoP 14 (June 2007).**”

There is a photograph of Jenkins after he received his award in this newsletter. See the attached link:

[http://www.wmi.com.au/csgarticles/CSG_Newsletter_26\(3\)_High.pdf](http://www.wmi.com.au/csgarticles/CSG_Newsletter_26(3)_High.pdf)

Species Management Specialists (SMS) report to CITES CoP 15 in Doha in March 2010

Robert Jenkins on behalf of SMS submitted a comprehensive report to the CITES CoP 15 meeting held in Doha in March 2010.

The report that Jenkins submitted is compared with the information in the original source documents.

The main sources of comparison are:

- (a) the SMS report submitted by Jenkins to the CoP 15 meeting; and
- (b) the Third FAO expert advisory panel for the assessment of proposals to amend Appendices I and II of CITES concerning commercially exploited aquatic species (Rome 7 – 12 December 2009).

It should be noted that Jenkins attended the FAO meeting in an Implementation Role as an Implementation Expert – see page 11 of the FAO report. He was a participant in the panel!!!

The SMS submission can be found at:

[http://www.speciesms.org/publications/pdfs/SMS_Guide_COP15_\(English\).pdf](http://www.speciesms.org/publications/pdfs/SMS_Guide_COP15_(English).pdf)

The FAO Expert Advisory Panel report can be found at:

<http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1899e/i1899e.pdf>

This comparison focuses on the proposals relating to sharks.

Proposal 15: Scalloped Hammerhead Shark (*Sphyrna Lewini*) and others

According to the IUCN Redlist *Sphyrna lewini* is marked as **Endangered**.

See details below:

<http://www.iucnredlist.org/apps/redlist/details/39385/0>

Furthermore, in a press statement issued by the IUCN in June 2009 it is stated:

"IUCN experts classify the Great Hammerhead (*Sphyrna mokarran*) and Scalloped Hammerhead (*Sphyrna lewini*) sharks, as well as Giant Devil Rays (*Mobula mobular*), as **globally Endangered**."

http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/species/red_list/?3362/Third-of-open-ocean-sharks-threatened-with-extinction

In his report Jenkins states:

"the IUCN Redlist **does not indicate that the global population is endangered** as claimed."

The FAO Expert Advisory Panel said:

"The FAO Expert Panel concluded that the available evidence supports the proposal to include scalloped hammerhead (*Sphyrna lewini*) in CITES Appendix II in accordance with Article II paragraph 2(a),..." – See page 17 of the report

In his report Jenkins states:

"The FAO Panel of Experts concluded, on the basis of the information available to it, that *S. lewini* probably did meet the theoretical decline criteria in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14)."

Proposal 16 – Oceanic Whitetip Shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*)

The FAO Expert Advisory Panel said:

“The FAO Expert Panel concluded that, on balance, the available evidence supports the proposal to include the Oceanic whitetip shark, *Carcharhinus longimanus*, in CITES Appendix II.” – see page 49 of the report.

In his report Jenkins states:

“the Panel of Experts selected by FAO to examine this proposal, considered that, on balance, it may indeed meet the decline criterion.”

Proposal 17 – Porbeagle Shark (*Lamna nasus*)

The FAO Expert Advisory Panel said:

“The FAO Expert Panel concluded that the available evidence supports the proposal to include porbeagleshark, *Lamna nasus*, in CITES Appendix II.” – see page 67 of the report.

In his report Jenkins states:

“The FAO Panel of Experts considered that populations representing a large proportion of historical abundance of the species globally met the decline criteria for Appendix II.”

Proposal 18 – Spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*)

The FAO Expert Advisory Panel said:

“The FAO Expert Panel concluded that the available evidence does not support the proposal to include Spiny dogfish, *Squalus acanthias*, in CITES Appendix II.” – see page 92 of the report.

In his report Jenkins states:

“The FAO Panel of Experts concluded that the available evidence did not support the listing proposal.”

Comment:

Jenkins comments on the Spiny dogfish are important because where the findings of the FAO Expert Advisory Panel support his opinions, Jenkins quotes directly.

This refutes any idea that he is adding his “expert” interpretation to the FAO Expert Advisory Panels findings, demonstrating that he is quoting selectively.

FAO Advisory Panel press release on their findings

A press release issued in Rome on 14 December 2009, on the outcome of the FAO Advisory Panel deliberations states:

[Fisheries advisory panel offers recommendations on CITES proposals](#)

Panel outcomes

Following a thorough six-day review and using the CITES criteria, the panel determined that sufficient evidence exists to warrant placing the following species on CITES Appendix II:

Oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*), **Porbeagle** (*Lamna nasus*), and **Scalloped hammerhead shark** (*Sphyrna lewini*).

In addition, the proposed listing of "look-alike" shark species to help enforcement for Scalloped hammerhead shark was found to be justified in two of the four cases, **Great hammerhead shark** (*Sphyrna mokarran*) and **Smooth hammerhead shark** (*Sphyrna zygaena*).

See the following link:

<http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/38195/icode/>

Glenn Inwood

Background

According to his LinkedIn page, Glenn Inwood is currently:

- Managing Director of GlobalPR Limited.
- Managing Director and Owner of Omeka Communications.

In the past, he was:

- Board member at **Species Management Specialists**.
- Communications and Public Relations Manager at Te Ohu Kai Moana, Treaty of Waitangi Fisheries Commission.
- Political Advisor/Press Secretary at New Zealand Government.

Omeka Communications

Under **Omeka Communications**, he states:

- Wellington, New Zealand, based public relations and communications company. Experienced in managing high-profile public issues for corporates, government and non-government organisations. Involved in fisheries, whaling and marine environment issues, including provision of strategic policy and political advice to seafood industry in relation to proposed implementations for Marine Protected Areas and commercial fisheries related issues in New Zealand. Omeka Communications undertakes a variety of government-relations activities in New Zealand and the Asia-Pacific region.

He was with Omeka Communications from 2000 - present

Under **Species Management Specialists** he states:

- Founding member of Australian-based **Species Management Specialists** NGO along with biologists and wildlife managers. Serve as a board member. SMS promotes the sustainable utilisation of wildlife and marine species and produces an **influential voting guide** for the **Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)**, attends IWC annual meetings, participates in the organisation of educational and training symposia throughout the Asia Pacific region in areas regarding wildlife and marine species.

He was with **Species Management Specialists** from January 2003 to December 2010 (10 years).

Under his summary, he states:

For the past 10 years (2000 - 2011), I have been managing and operating my own public relations consultancy based in Wellington, New Zealand. This work has been focussed around resource and wildlife management issues, at both national and international levels.

Internationally, my company has been providing advice to clients on participating in the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna (CITES), providing media management and public affairs advice to the Government of Japan from 2000 to present attending the International Whaling Commission (IWC).

See Inwood's LinkedIn page at:

<http://nz.linkedin.com/in/glenninwood>

Omeka Media Centre's list of clients

According to the Omeka Media Centre website (archived records), their clients/associates are listed as:

- Aoteara Fisheries Limited, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Institute of Cetacean Research, Tokyo, Japan.
- Japan Whaling Association, Tokyo, Japan.
- Japan Fisheries Agency, Government of Japan.
- World Council of Whalers, Victoria, Canada.
- High North Alliance, Reine i Lofoten, Norway.
- **Species Management Specialists**, Canberra, Australia.
- Oceania Sustainable Use Specialists Group (Oceania SUSG), Auckland Secretariat.
- Imperial Tobacco, New Zealand, Wellington.

See link attached:

<http://web.archive.org/web/20050421184534/http://www.omeka.com/mediacentre>

http://web.archive.org/web/20050421184219/www.omeka.com/who_represent.htm

Press releases issued by Omeka on behalf of Species Management Specialists include:

4 October 2004 – Bangkok critical for International Wildlife Treaty

http://www.speciesms.org/newsroom/pdfs/press_statements/press_statement_4_oct_04.pdf

6 October 2004 – Trading the Kea to save it

http://www.speciesms.org/newsroom/pdfs/press_statements/northland_6_oct_04.pdf

The contact person on this press release is: Glenn Inwood, **Species Management Specialists.**
Connections to the Japanese Whaling industry causes a scandal

According to his entry in Wikipedia:

“Inwood worked as a press secretary for Lianne Dalziel, Immigration Minister in the New Zealand Labour Party government.

He also worked simultaneously for Morris Communications on the account of the Treaty of Waitangi Fisheries Commission.

In November 2000, the Commission hosted the 3rd Annual General Assembly of the World Council of Whalers in Nelson.

After Inwood's dual role as a Ministerial press adviser and speaker at a pro-whaling conference was raised in parliament,

Prime Minister Helen Clark found his "connections with whaling distasteful" and directed Inwood not to attend.

On September 28, 2000 Inwood resigned his position as Dalziel's press adviser.”

This episode was widely reported in the press and the Wikipedia sources support this account of the events. Also see the following reports:

New Zealand Herald:

http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=153425

Sydney Morning Herald:

<http://www.smh.com.au/news/whale-watch/a-maori-voice-for-a-japanese-cause/2008/01/18/1200620211150.html>

“Spying” on Sea Shepherd on behalf of Japanese whalers causes outrage

In January 2010 Omeka arranged for planes on behalf of the Japanese Whaling Industry to take off from Hobart (Australian soil) to spy on the activities of the Sea Shepherd anti whaling campaign in the Antarctic. Inwood was reportedly on these flights.

Details are in the following report:

<http://www.tasmaniantimes.com/index.php/article/japanese-whalers-in-spy-flights>

Shark Fin and Marine Products Association

The Shark Fin and Marine Products Association Limited is based in Hong Kong and represents many marine product interests, including the shark fin trade in Hong Kong. Its public face is Charlie LIM Tin-que.

Dr GIAM is a representative of the shark fin industry and a colleague of Charlie LIM in the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association, and Robert Jenkins and Dr GIAM are advisors to the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association.

Dr GIAM - Representative of the shark fin industry and a colleague of Charlie LIM

In 2007, the author Juliet Eilperin travelled to Hong Kong to interview Mr. Charlie LIM of the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association for her book “Demon Fish: Travels Through the Hidden World of Sharks”. After she entered his office, she describes the setting as follows:

“I am surrounded by the shark fin trade heavy weights of Hong Kong. Lim, the secretary of Hong Kong’s Sharkfin and Marine Products Association, has convened a special meeting in his organizations conference room for my benefit, so he and his colleagues can explain what exactly they do for a living. Giam has come in from Singapore”

When interviewed for the book, Dr GIAM formally introduced himself to the author as:

“a representative of the shark fin industry in Singapore”

Also present at this meeting were CHIU Ching-cheung, chairman of the association and YIP Chiu-sung, vice-chairman of the association.

Advisors to the Hong Kong Shark Fin and Marine Products Association

Conference on Shark Conservation, Beijing, China. November 2006

In November 2006 Jenkins and GIAM attended a conference on shark conservation in Beijing co-sponsored by WildAid. According to an observer, Jenkins and Dr GIAM were at the conference in an advisory capacity to the marine products trade industry, represented by Charlie LIM, Secretary of the Hong Kong based Shark Fin and Marine Products Association.

See details of this conference at:

<http://www.wildsingapore.com/news/20061112/061109-6.htm>

After this conference, the following statements were widely reported in the press:

Dr GIAM

"Sharks are not as endangered as made out by some extreme NGOs [nongovernment organizations]," said Giam Choo-hoo, an animals committee member of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna, or CITES. He said only three species were on the CITES list of animals whose trade and consumption was in need of monitoring - the Basking Shark, the Whale Shark and the Great White. And none was on the most threatened list, he said.

Robert Jenkins

"It's mischievous for advocates for shark protection to talk about endangered species of sharks due to overfishing," added Hank Jenkins, president of Australia's Species Management Specialists. "Large environmental change is likely to be global warming or habitat destruction. They're the factors that are going to produce biological extinction, not fishing," he said

2010 - Dr GIAM quoted by the Marine Products Association.

An online article entitled "Tiger penis already banned, endangered-species rules may snare China's sexy shark fins next" published on 27 January 2010, states:

"The **Hong Kong-based Marine Products Association** declined to comment on how important shark fins are to the local economy, or how many were sold, or any other questions asked, but [Charlie](#) Lim, the association's general secretary, did forward a letter from **Choo-hoo Giam**, a member of the animals committee at the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, published in the South China Morning Post in October 2009.

The letter claimed most shark kills were the by-product of other fishing activities, quoting figures from the World Wildlife Fund that said fishing killed "300,000 small whales, dolphins and porpoises; 250,000 turtles; and 100,000 sharks in the Mediterranean Sea alone per year."

The letter said Germany and England were great eaters of shark meat, although it was usually served under different names, and that third-world countries also eat the meat.

"Campaigning to change the Asian palate is wrongly conceived. Sharks are dying because of universal consumption and they will continue to die and deplete," the letter concludes."

See below:

<http://www.allvoices.com/contributed-news/5116346-tiger-penis-already-banned-endangeredspecies-rules-may-snare-chinas-sexy-shark-fins-next>

International Marine Conference, 21 September 2010. Conrad Hotel, Hong Kong.

The International Marine Conference, organized by the Marine Products Association, was held at the Conrad Hotel in Hong Kong on 21 September 2010, attended by seafood traders, international marine experts, officers' from the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department and the Customs and Excise Department.

Dr GIAM and Jenkins were keynote speakers. Although it was billed as an “International Conference”, it appears to have been a closed shop affair, by invite only.

Details of the conference are in the following press report (in Chinese) given by Charlie LIM:

http://news.hotpot.hk/fruit/art_main.php?iss_id=20100922&sec_id=4104&art_id=14476566

A copy of the presentations made by Dr GIAM and Robert Jenkins to this conference are appended below:

Dr GIAMs presentation

Slide 1 - Shark victims unite to save their Attackers

- Survivors gathered at United Nations
- Said 73 million sharks killed annually for shark fin soup
- Said decimate shark population just for soup
- Pew is lobbying to end fishermen slicing off fins

Slide 2

Singapore squashes PETA chicken protest at KFC A Shark Fin Promotion Backfires

Citibank Hong Kong withdrew the promotion

Ban --- Hawaii makes it illegal to serve shark fin soup

Campaign to stop eating of shark fin soup

Slide 3 – Accusation

4. Shark fin soup causes death of 77 millions sharks
5. Sharks endangered because of shark fin soup
6. Cruel live finning the way to obtain fins

Slide 4 – The Truth

* 77 millions sharks killed

5. **Europe** kills millions of sharks (a) 50 years ago and (b) Still now
6. **US** , Australia etc catches sharks
7. **By-catch** in millions as a result of longline tuna and other fishing
8. **By-catch** of artisanal fishing

Killed not for fins. A bycatch of general fisheries

Slide 5 – Sharks not Endangered

1. There are more than 500 shark species.

2. To say sharks are endangered like saying birds are endangered.
3. One has to ask which species.
4. UN CITES lists only three shark species in Appendix II (non---endangered)
5. No country proposed any shark to be on the endangered list at the Doha UN CITES meeting early this year
6. A mild proposal to list four sharks was defeated at the UN CITES meeting
7. No country bans the catching of sharks

Slide 6 – Live Finning

- *Live finning* is the cutting of fins from a struggling shark
- Forms a minute portion of all fins sold in the world
- 5% law
- Done by criminals and mafia

Slide 7 – Poor gets poorer

If campaign to ban shark fin soup succeeds, the poor fishermen in developing countries will be poorer - Cannot sell their fins

Slide 8 – Wrong target

1. Should campaign to stop shark catch
2. Stop serving shark meat in restaurants in Europe
3. Stop caviar sale and consumption

Slide 9 - Conclusion

- 90% of sharks are **accidentally** harvested
- Remaining **10%** are targeted and caught for **their meat**
- **No shark species endangered**
- **No country** says sharks are **endangered**
- Almost all **fins are taken after the sharks death**

The Chinese are not responsible for the sharks problem

Shark issue not same as whales for Japan

Robert Jenkins presentation

Title: PRESENT & FUTURE PROBLEMS FACING THE SHARK FIN TRADE

Slide 1 - Campaign characteristics

- Two strategies are being used by NGOs to put an end to the tradition of consuming shark fin soup.

- Banning international trade by achieving legal recognition that sharks are endangered species through listing species in Appendix I and Appendix II of CITES.
- Winning over the ‘hearts and minds’ of Chinese consumers to boycott shark fin soup and have it removed from the menus at hotels and restaurants.
- ‘Education packs’ are produced by wealthy international NGOs to indoctrinate NOT EDUCATE young students.

Slide 2 - The issues

- There is increasing opposition (nationally and internationally) to the use of shark fins by Chinese societies.
- This opposition was initiated and is being driven by campaigns by wealthy international NGOs and a sympathetic media.
- These campaigns are based on lies and misinformation.
- Chinese society is being portrayed as the principal public enemy.
- An absence of a ‘counter campaign’ by industry and consumer groups.

Slide 3 - Why these campaigns?

(Self-justification by NGOs)

- Over-fishing sharks for protein throughout the world is causing sharks to become threatened with extinction.
- Unlike many other species of fish, sharks are slow to reach maturity and produce few offspring.
- These characteristics make sharks more vulnerable to extinction through over-fishing.

Slide 4 – Misinformation

- a campaign characteristic!
- Sharks are caught only for their fins.
- The demand for and high value of shark fin in China are driving fishing effort for sharks specifically for their fins.
- Many sharks have their fins removed while still alive and then returned to the sea to die a slow and painful death.
- Globally, sharks have declined significantly.
- Over-fishing will cause the biological extinction of sharks.

Slide 5 – Reality

- The majority of sharks are either caught directly for their meat or are caught accidentally by other fisheries.
 - There is no fishery operating at present that is targeted specifically and only on shark fins - these allegations are economic nonsense.
 - Shark fins imported into China (including Hong Kong) are purchased

from three sources:

- by-products from artisanal fisheries that catch sharks for local consumption;
- by-products from directed commercial shark fisheries; and
- by-products of sharks caught accidentally (by-catch) by commercial fisheries targeting other species (tunas and swordfish).

Slide 6 – Reality

- Three species of shark are included in Appendix II of CITES (great white shark, basking shark and whale shark).
- Sawfishes are included in Appendix I of CITES and no international trade in wild-caught specimens is permitted for commercial purposes.
- Although some species are listed by IUCN as endangered or vulnerable, these categories do not have any legal status.
- The meeting of CITES in Doha (March 2010) rejected proposals to include eight species of sharks in Appendix II.
- Relative to environmental catastrophes such as oil spills and global warming, over-fishing for any species is never likely to result in biological extinction.
- Commercial extinction will occur long before biological extinction is a threat.

Points made by Charlie Lim

- (a) The Marine Product Association understood the importance of sustainability issues and was willing to work with NGOs, universities, marine biologists, fishery management sectors and the FAO to tackle such problems;
- (b) The message that over-exploitation of sharks is entirely due to consumption of shark fins is not true;
- (c) There are over 440 species of sharks. CITES does not regulate 437 of these species, which they would do if trade threatened their extinction. Thus the claim that over-exploitation of sharks is serious is a gross exaggeration;
- (d) Shark meat is in fact the main driver of shark fisheries worldwide, so that even if the consumption of shark fins was banned, this would not result in fewer sharks being caught around the world, because the market would remain open for sharks and other fish meat;
- (e) Shark fins are no more than a fisheries by-product; and
- (f) The Marine Product Association is committed to achieving sustainability of all marine natural resources and have set up a conservation and management committee, comprising

industry representatives and international marine experts and resources managers, to further these objectives.

Comment

Looking at the presentations given at this conference, it is apparent that the Marine Products Association does not accept that any problem exists, and it is clear this is all part of a makeover to clean up their image, not their act.

It is clearly a case of re-branding, but business as usual. From the content of the presentations given by Dr GIAM and Robert Jenkins, these appear to be cosmetic changes, aimed at tidying up their image.

CITES Conference attendance

The following lists the conferences attended by various members of the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association Limited:

CITES Standing Committee

54th meeting – Geneva, October 2006

CHONG Kam po
LIM Tin que
YIP Chiu sung

CITES Animals Committee

22nd meeting – Lima, July 2006

Observer
YIP Chiu sing

Conference of Parties (CoP)

CoP 12 - Santiago November 2002

Observer
CHIU Ching cheung
CHONG Kam po
LAM Tin que
SHU Mei gyo

CoP 13 – Bangkok October 2004

Observer

CHIU Ching cheung
CHONG Kam po
LAM Tin que
NONTHAPUN Pramote

CoP 14 - The Hague June 2007

Observer
CHIU Ching cheung
CHONG Kam po
KWONG Yue pang
LAM Tin que
YIP Chiu sing

CoP 15 – Doha March 2010

Observer
The Marine Products Association
CHIU Ching cheung
CHONG Kam po
LAM Tin que

Comment: Note the name change!

**FAO/CITES Workshop to review the application and effectiveness of international regulatory measures for the conservation and sustainable use of elasmobranchs.
Genazzano, Italy. July 2010**

Conservation and Management Committee of Marine Products Association (Hong Kong)
LIM Charlie

Comment: Note the name change!

CITES Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP14)

Establishment of committees

The following are selected extracts from Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP14) on the establishment of committees:

Regarding regional representation in the Standing Committee

RECOMMENDS that the following guidelines be implemented:

A. Selection of regional members and alternate regional members

a) In the selection of regional members and alternate regional members, the following considerations should be taken into account:

i) **for regions with one member and one alternate member, a rotation in the selection is recommended;** and

ii) for regions with more than one member and one alternate member, the selection should try to achieve a balanced representation (geopolitical, cultural, ecological);

b) The regional candidatures should be officially submitted by the interested Parties through a **governmental channel**, at least 120 days before a meeting of the Conference of the Parties. These candidatures should be communicated to all the Parties of the region through the Secretariat;

d) **The election of a member and of the alternate should take place at the end of the term of office of their predecessors**, in accordance with the above-mentioned procedure, through successive votes during a single process; and

B. Timing of replacement of members and alternate members

a) The terms of office of the regional members and their alternates shall commence at the close of the regular meeting at which they are elected and shall expire at the close of the second regular meeting thereafter;

b) For regions with one member and one alternate member, the selection should occur at every second meeting; and

c) For regions with more than one member and one alternate member, to guarantee some continuity, not all members and alternate members should be changed at the same meeting;

Regarding regional sessions at meetings of the Conference of the Parties

AGREES that:

- c) each region has specific tasks to fulfil, as follows:
 - ii) selection of the members and alternate members of the **Animals and Plants Committees**. In accordance with Annex 2 of this Resolution the members and alternate members of the Animals and Plants Committees are persons. The persons to be chosen should be **experts** in animals or plants in general and with regard to the region they are representing in particular;

Regarding representation in the Animals and Plants Committees

RECOMMENDS that the following guidelines be implemented:

A. Election of the candidates

- a) Parties proposing candidates as representatives should confirm, at the time of nomination, that the candidate will be supported and **that they will obtain the necessary means to undertake their activities;**
- b) The names of the proposed candidates, and their *curricula vitae*, should be circulated to the Parties of the region concerned at least 120 days before the meeting of the Conference of the Parties at which the representatives will be elected. Although not regional representatives the same process should apply to candidates seeking election as specialists on botanical and zoological nomenclature;
- c) Ideally the candidates should be associated with a **Scientific Authority**, have adequate knowledge of CITES and receive sufficient institutional support to carry out their duties. This information should also be included in the *curricula vitae*; and

B. Timing of replacement of regional members and alternate members

- a) The **procedure should be the same as that described above for the Standing Committee;**
- b) As alternate members are alternates of specified members, they should be elected at the same time as the members;
- c) If a region wishes to re-elect a member or alternate member, there is nothing to prevent it from doing so; and
- d) in the event that no nominations be received before the deadline the incumbent shall remain, if so willing and able, as an representative until a replacement is elected; and

Establishment of the Standing Committee of the Conference of the Parties

THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

DETERMINES:

- a) the following principles for the composition of the Standing Committee:
 - iii) the membership of the Committee shall be reviewed at every regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The terms of office of the regional members shall commence at the close of the regular meeting at which they are elected and shall expire at the close of the second regular meeting thereafter;

Annex 2

Establishment of the Animals and Plants Committees of the Conference of the Parties

THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

RESOLVES to re-establish **the Animals and Plants Committees** of the Conference of the Parties, with the following terms of reference:

- a) provide **scientific advice** and guidance to the Conference of the Parties, the other committees, working groups and the Secretariat, on all matters relevant to international trade in animal and plant species included in the Appendices, which may include proposals to amend the Appendices;

DETERMINES that:

- c) the membership of the Committees shall be reviewed at every regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The terms of office of the members shall commence at the close of the regular meeting at which they are elected and shall expire at the close of the second regular meeting thereafter;

DETERMINES further the following principles for the payment of travel expenses to members of the Plants or **Animals Committee**:

- c) members should make every effort to pay their own travel expenses; and

Link

The resolution on the establishment of CITES committees can be found at the following link.

<http://www.cites.org/eng/res/11/11-01R14.shtml>

Comment

The following issues are relevant to this report:

The rules in general

The rules on the establishment of committees are difficult to interpret. They lack clarity and are therefore open to liberal interpretation and abuse. They are a classic example of rules which have been added to over time, but never properly edited.

Animals Committee members

Committee members are chosen for their expertise and scientific knowledge and are expected to provide scientific advice to the committee.

Timing and rotation of committee membership

There should be a regular rotation of committee members.

However if a region wishes to re-elect a member or alternate member, there is nothing to prevent it from doing so and in the event that no nominations be received before the deadline the incumbent shall remain, if so willing and able, as an representative until a replacement is elected.

Financing of activities

When candidates are proposed, that they need to obtain the necessary means to undertake their activities and members of the Animals Committee should make every effort to pay their own travel expenses.

This has the potential to limit the field of candidates to well funded scientists, not necessarily the best qualified scientists.

Furthermore, it may drive scientists to seek funding from trade interests, but at what cost to their independence?

Decisions of the Conference of the Parties to CITES in effect after the 15th meeting in Doha, March 2009

Conflicts of Interest

A list of decisions made at the 15th CoP meeting in Doha in March 2009 can be found at the following link:

<http://www.cites.org/eng/dec/index.shtml>

The following gives details of decision 15.9 and covers the issue of **Conflict of Interest**:

15.9 Rules of Procedure of the Animals and Plants Committees

Directed to the Standing Committee

- 15.9 Considering that members of the Animals and Plants Committees serve in a personal capacity, the Standing Committee shall review the need for the Rules of Procedure of those Committees to deal with potential conflicts of interest of its members relating to their activities in the Committees, and shall report on this matter at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

See attached:

http://www.cites.org/eng/dec/valid15/15_09.shtml

Rules of Procedure for meetings of the Animals Committee

Surprisingly, the issue of Conflict of Interest is currently not covered in the Rules of Procedure of the Animals Committee. See the attached link:

<http://www.cites.org/eng/com/ac/19/E19-02.pdf>

Schedule of next meetings

CoP meetings are held every 3 years, so the next CoP isn't scheduled to be held until 2012.

The next Animals Committee meeting is scheduled to be held in Geneva from 18 – 22 July 2011.

Time Line – Key events

1994 - 2000

This timeline should be viewed in the following context:

- (a) From 1994 up until 2000, sharks were a topic of discussion at CITES, but in 2000 the first serious attempt to get three shark species listed in CITES Appendix II was undertaken.
- (b) This proposal must have set off alarm bells in the shark fin trade.

2000

CoP 11 – Nairobi. April 2000

Parties propose inclusion of Whale Sharks, Basking Sharks and the Great White Shark in CITES Appendix II. The proposal was defeated.

2002

CoP 12 – Santiago. November 2002

Parties propose the inclusion of Whale Sharks and Basking Sharks in CITES Appendix II.

At the meeting Dr Giam spoke on behalf of the Shark Fins Merchants Association, expressing how any restrictions on trade in whale shark will deprive poor communities of their livelihoods.

According to an observer, Dr GIAM was regularly in the company of the Secretary of the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association, CHIU Ching-cheung.

The proposal is passed and Whale Sharks and Basking Sharks are included in CITES Appendix II.

2004

CoP 13 - Bangkok – October 2004.

Parties propose the inclusion of the Great White Shark in CITES Appendix II. The proposal was passed.

2005

Creative Conservation Solutions changes its name to Species Management Specialists.

2006

22nd Animals Committee - Lima - July 2006

Dr GIAM was the Alternate Member/Representative for Asia on the Technical Workshop on the Conservation and Management of Sharks. The minutes of this meeting indicate extensive attempts by Dr GIAM to change the agenda and composition of the workshop.

In an inter-sessional working group at this meeting, Dr GIAM as an Animals Committee member, and Robert Jenkins representing Species Management Specialists argue against certain issues which would be harmful to the shark fishing trade.

Standing Committee – Geneva - October 2006

Dr GIAM attended the meeting as a representative of Species Management Specialists.

Conference on Shark Conservation in Beijing - November 2006

Dr GIAM and Jenkins act as advisors to Charlie LIM of the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association at a conference on Shark Conservation held in Beijing.

Article in Straits Times in Singapore - December 2006

Dr GIAM December 2006 writes an article for the Straits Times in Singapore entitled “Shark’s fin soup- eat without guilt”.

2007

Interview in Hong Kong by Juliet Eilperin

In 2007, the author Juliet Eilperin travelled to Hong Kong to interview Mr. Charlie LIM of the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association for her book “Demon Fish: Travels Through the Hidden World of Sharks”. After she entered his office, she describes the setting as follows:

“I am surrounded by the shark fin trade heavy weights of Hong Kong. Lim, the secretary of Hong Kong’s Sharkfin and Marine Products Association, has convened a special meeting in his organizations conference room for my benefit, so he and his colleagues can explain what exactly they do for a living. Giam has come in from Singapore”

When interviewed for the book, Dr GIAM formally introduced himself to the author as:

“a representative of the shark fin industry in Singapore”

CoP 14 - The Hague – July 2007

Parties unsuccessfully propose the inclusion of the Porbeagle shark and Spiny Dogfish in CITES Appendix II.

Dr GIAM attended the meeting as a representative of Species Management Specialists, together with Robert Jenkins and Glenn Inwood, their Public Relations Consultant.

Species Management Specialists produce a voting guide for the meeting.

2009

24th CITES Animals Committee meeting – Geneva – April 2009

Dr GIAM unsuccessfully tried to have a report that had formally been commissioned by the Australian government on sharks withdrawn or expunged from the record.

2010

CoP 15 – Doha - March 2010

Species Management Specialists produce a voting guide to the meeting. The section in respect of sharks is not an accurate reflection of the information in the original source documents.

Dr GIAM attended the meeting as a representative of Species Management Specialists.

Parties unsuccessfully propose the inclusion of the Scalloped Hammerhead Shark (and 4 look-a-like species), Oceanic White Tip, Porbeagle and the Spiny Dogfish. in CITES Appendix II.

Charlie LIM and team attend the meeting under the newly named **The Marine Products Association**. They have dropped “Shark Fin” from their title.

FAO meeting in Italy - July 2010

Charlie LIM attended the FAO meeting in Genazzano, Italy representing the **Conservation and Management Committee of Marine Products Association (Hong Kong)**.

Conference in Hong Kong in September 2010

Dr GIAM and Robert Jenkins give presentations on behalf of the Marine Products Association at the International Marine Conference held at the Conrad Hotel in Hong Kong on 21 September 2010.

2012

Debate in Singapore in February 2012

In February 2012 Dr GIAM and Robert Jenkins attended a debate in Singapore entitled “Shark’s Fin Soup: To Ban or Not To Ban” in which they both attacked the credibility of shark

conservation efforts.

Conclusions

This report highlights the following issues:

Specific issues regarding Dr GIAM

Working for the shark fin trade

In 2007, the author Juliet Eilperin travelled to Hong Kong to interview Mr. Charlie LIM of the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association for her book “Demon Fish: Travels Through the Hidden World of Sharks”. After she entered his office, she describes the setting as follows:

“I am surrounded by the shark fin trade heavy weights of Hong Kong. Lim, the secretary of Hong Kong’s Sharkfin and Marine Products Association, has convened a special meeting in his organizations conference room for my benefit, so he and his colleagues can explain what exactly they do for a living. Giam has come in from Singapore”

When interviewed for the book, Dr GIAM formally introduced himself to the author as:

“a representative of the shark fin industry in Singapore”

This is clear evidence that not only is Dr GIAM a colleague of Charlie LIM in the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association, but also that he is a representative of the shark fin industry in Singapore.

Conflict of interest

Dr GIAM has been a member of the Animals Committee since 1994 and is currently an Alternate Member for Asia on the Animals Committee. This is a period of 17 years. His role as a member of the Animals Committee is to provide scientific advice and guidance to the Conference of Parties.

Dr GIAM has attended three CITES meetings as a representative of Species Management Specialists, namely the 54th meeting of the CITES Standing Committee in Geneva in October 2006, CoP 14 in the Hague in June 2007 and CoP 15 at Doha in March 2010.

Species Management Specialists have produced three voting guides for the Conference of Parties, namely CoP 13 in Thailand in 2004, CoP 14 in the Hague in 2007 and CoP 15 in Doha in 2010. In the words of their PR consultant, Species Management Specialists produce an “**influential voting guide**” for the Conference of Parties.

During an inter-sessional working group at the 22nd meeting of the Animals Committee meeting in Lima in 2006, Dr GIAM, as a member of the Animals Committee and Robert Jenkins of

Species Management Specialists both tried to get items unfavourable to the shark fishing industry diluted.

As a result, at the same time that Dr GIAM has provided advice to the Conference of Parties as an independent scientist, Species Management Specialists has been trying to influence votes in the same committee.

This constitutes a clear and unacceptable Conflict of Interest on behalf of Dr GIAM.

Lobbying on behalf of the shark trade

According to an observer, at CoP 12 in Santiago in 2002, Dr GIAM spoke on behalf of the Shark Fins Merchants Association against imposing any restrictions on the trade in Whale Sharks.

Within CITES, Dr GIAM has lobbied extensively on behalf of the shark trade, most notably during an inter-sessional working group at the 22nd meeting of the Animals Committee meeting in Lima in 2006 and during the 24th Animals Committee meeting in Geneva in 2009.

Outside of CITES, he, together with Robert Jenkins attended a Conference on Shark Conservation in Beijing in 2006, where according to an observer, they were both acting in an advisory capacity to the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association.

In September 2010 Dr GIAM, together with Robert Jenkins attended a conference organized by the Marine Products Association (they have dropped Shark Fin from their title), where both he and Jenkins sought to actively promote and defend the shark fin trade.

In February 2012 Dr GIAM and Robert Jenkins attended a debate in Singapore “Shark’s Fin Soup: To Ban or Not To Ban” in which they both attacked the credibility of shark conservation efforts.

Dr GIAM is a representative of the shark fin trade and has been lobbying on behalf of the trade both within and outside of CITES. Dr GIAM is a crocodile expert, and yet within CITES he is challenging qualified shark experts.

This activity is consistent with Dr GIAM being a representative of the shark fin trade and a colleague of Charlie LIM in the Hong Kong based Shark Fin and Marine Products Association, and puts into context all of his efforts inside CITES to block shark conservation efforts.

Another potential Conflict of Interest

Whilst not explored in this report, the following matters are equally of concern.

As a CITES committee member, Dr GIAM is supposed to provide scientific advice and guidance.

At the same time, he is an Independent Director, member of numerous committees and until recently a substantial shareholder with Heng Long International, a crocodile skin company and

he has attended the following CITES meetings as a representative of the Singapore Reptile Skin Trade Association:

- (a) CoP 13 in Bangkok in 2004;
- (b) 57th meeting of the CITES Standing Committee in Geneva in 2008; and
- (c) 58th meeting of the CITES Standing Committee in Geneva in 2009.

It should be noted the Singapore Reptile Skin Trade Association was set up by KOH Chon-tong, the Managing Director of Heng Long International, who has been secretary of the Association since 1987.

The question arises, when Dr GIAM attends Animals Committee meetings, is he attending as a scientist or a reptile skin trade representative, because he is attending some CITES meetings as a representative of the reptile skin trade, or has he been representing his own interests in Heng Long International, being until recently a substantial shareholder in the company.

General issues for CITES

Research into this report has identified the following issues of concern which are relevant to the operation of CITES:

The rules in general

The rules on the establishment of committees are very difficult to read. They lack clarity and are therefore open to liberal interpretation and abuse. They are a classic example of rules which have been added to over time, but never properly edited.

Timing and rotation of membership

CITES rules on the establishment of committees suggest a rotation in selection of members is recommended (Conf.11.1 (Rev.CoP 14)). These “rules” have clearly not been applied to Dr GIAM, who has now been a member of the Animals Committee for 17 years.

Financing of members

CITES rules on the establishment of committees states that parties proposing candidates as representatives should confirm, at the time of nomination, that candidates will be supported and that **they will obtain the necessary means to undertake their activities.**

Such funding arrangements for members, many of whom are expected to be supported or self financing, are clearly open to abuse.

Conflict of Interest

CITES committees are currently not covered by Conflict of Interest provisos.

Decision 15.9 made at the 15th CoP meeting in Doha in March 2009, covers the issue of conflict of interest:

“Considering that members of the Animals and Plants Committees serve in a personal capacity, the Standing Committee shall review the need for the Rules of Procedure of those Committees to deal with potential conflicts of interest of its members relating to their activities in the Committees, and shall report on this matter at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties”

Recommendations

This report recommends:

- (a) A formal investigation be initiated into Dr GIAM’s activities within and outside of CITES, and if the findings in this report are confirmed, Dr GIAM’s continued representation in CITES is untenable and because of his actions he should be removed from office,
- (b) CITES initiate a comprehensive review of its guidelines on committees, to make them more easy to understand and apply,
- (c) CITES specifically and with some urgency review its provisos on Conflict of Interest, and consider immediately implementing action to ensure that all committee members make a “Declaration of Interests” at the beginning of any new meeting, workshop or working group,
- (d) CITES specifically and with some urgency review its provisos on rotation in selection of members, to introduce fixed terms of office for committee members, and
- (e) CITES specifically and with some urgency review its provisos on funding arrangements for members, so that they don’t become beholden to trade interests.

It is recommended that issues (b) to (d) are made the subject of an independent Corruption Prevention Study.