**FAITAG meeting 27 September 2012**

Innsbruck, Austria

Attendees:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Institution** |
| Claudia Gili | Acquario di Genova |
| Sandra Langguth | Zoo Leipzig |
| Marion Willle | Aquazoo Dusseldorf |
| Volker Grün | Zoo Duisburg |
| Noam Werner | Jerusalem Zoo |
| William van Lint | EAZA |
| Ville Vepsäläinen | Helsinki Zoo |
| Koen Brouwer | Bursa Zoo |
| Tülay Temizel | Faruk Yalcin Zoo |
| Yügel Yilmaz | Faruk Yalcin Zoo |
| Adéla Obračajová | Ostrava Zoo |
| Ivan Cizelj | Zoo Zagreb |
| Therese Österberg | Universeum |
| Ramiro Fuentes | Universeum |
| Alexis Lécu | Paris Zoo |
| Jacek Jedrzejewski | Plock Zoo |
| Krzysztof Kelman | Plock Zoo |
| Jirka Novák | Zoo Ostrava |
| Andrea Caiozzi | ALPZA |
| Gerardo Garcia | Chester Zoo |
| Monika Haefner | Zoo Schwerin |
| Clemens Becker | Karlsruhe Zoo |
| Frank Miller | Zoo München |
| Mark Bushell | Bristol Zoo Gardens |
| Luke Harding | Colchester Zoo |
| Kris Jansen | Dierenrijk Europa |
| Angelica Curlisca | RZAF |
| Nuria Baylina | Oceanrio de Lisboa |
| Warren Spencer | Artis Royal Zoo |
| Brian Zimmerman | Zoological Society of London |

The FAITAG meeting was divided into two parts, a reporting session for the eight existing ESBs including a proposal for a new ESB and a discussion workshop to address four topics that relate to the FAITAG’s role and functioning.

The following ESB reports were presented:

1. Zebra shark, *Stegostoma fasciatum,* by Brian on behalf of Max Janse
2. White-spotted eagle ray, *Aetobatus narinari ,*by Brian on behalf of Max Janse
3. Ribbontail (blue-spotted) stingray, *Taeniura lymma,* by Nuria Baylina
4. Sandbar shark, *Carcharhinus plumbeus,* by Brian on behalf of Jean Philippe Catteau
5. Blue-spotted stingray, *Neotryon kuhlii,* by Brian on behalf of Daniel Abed-Navandi
6. Horned shark, *Heterodontus francisci,* by Warren Spencer
7. Long-snouted (Spiny) seahorse, *Hippocampus guttulatus,* by Brian on behalf of Laura Castellano
8. Short-snouted seahorse, *Hippocampus hippocampus,* by Brian on behalf of Olivia Walter
9. Proposal for new ESB for *Pristis* sp. (Sawfish) by Katy Duke (The Deep) in partnership with Pablo Areitio (Oceanografic, Valencia) note: this proposal was later submitted to the EEP committee for consideration.

A proposal was introduced to consider splitting the FAITAG into more than one TAG since it collectively deals with a very broad taxonomic group and is too large to manage effectively as one. The proposal suggests that FAITAG should ultimately be split into five areas of interest: Elasmobranchs, Marine teleosts, Freshwater teleosts, Corals, Other aquatic invertebrates.

This process would be initiated by polling the level of interest from members in each of these broad taxonomic areas and requesting that they form sub-groups. The first goal of each sub-group would be to begin the development of the RCP for those taxa. The nominated coordinator for each sub-group would then become Vice-chair of FAITAG and ultimately the Chair of a newly formed TAG.

In the second half of the meeting four points relating to FAITAG were introduced and the group was divided into smaller groups to discuss and later present on each. Each of the four topics was chosen because they address key issues relating to how the FAITAG is managed and how to better prioritise what work we are doing and the species we manage.

Notes on discussion workshop:

Four topics were introduced and the group was divided into four smaller groups to discuss each. The four topics related to: FAITAG, Non-zoo/aquarium participation, Developing the RCP, Management of Extinct in the Wild species.

1. FAITAG
   1. Should it be just one TAG?
      1. *For now but if all species need management they should be divided into smaller more manageable sized TAGS (elasmobranchs, teleosts, etc).*
   2. If not, how should it be split?
      1. *As was proposed: Elasmobrachs, marine teleosts, freshwater teleosts, corals, other invertebrates. But only when it’s the right time, there are coordinators and there is better EUAC/EAZA collaboration.*
   3. How can we improve EUAC/EAZA collaboration?
      1. *Very important issue to address. The two boards should be put together for discussion.*
      2. *Could EUAC “manage” fish directly or take a more active role?*
      3. *Should EAZA manage all ESBs and EEPs? There is an increasing requirement for more managed programmes and legislation and public pressure will necessitate this.*
      4. *There is a need to reinforce EAZA’s image and positive benefits to EUAC members (citing how EAZA responds and represents the zoo/aquarium community in legislation, etc.)*
      5. *Need to understand the reasons “why” and focus on each issue to answer them.*
      6. *EAZA needs to make itself more appealing to aquariums (e.g. don’t overlap the FAITAG meeting with marine mammals/seabirds) and perhaps condense the aquarium-specific meetings to one day so that aquarium professionals will attend the meetings.*
2. Regional Collection Plan (RCP)
   1. What is the best strategy for sorting through the large number of species?
      1. *Divide them into sub-groups (freshwater, saltwater, etc.)*
      2. *Conduct a survey of “what we have and what we would like to have” both of EAZA and non-EAZA institutions.*
      3. *Consider the conservation status of each species, along with sustainability, costs, research and educational purpose via the decision tree.*
      4. *Develop links with IUCN specialist groups and other conservation NGOs for advice.*
   2. How do we prioritise species for conservation, education and research?
      1. *In relation to which criteria they match on the RCP categories for conservation, education, research (decision tree), then rank them.*
      2. *Find a champion for each species.*
   3. What are the best management regimes for those species prioritised? (ESB, EEP, Monitoring, etc).
      1. *Whatever improves sustainability of captive populations and reduces wild caught acquisitions.*
      2. *Those that create strong safety net populations for those species that need conservation.*
      3. *Needs more research on reproductive techniques to improve how we manage them.*
3. Non-Zoo/Aquarium involvement
   1. Is it appropriate to involve non-EAZA/EUAC institutions or individuals in our programmes?
      1. *Yes to develop sustainable collections and exchange knowledge, provided they adhere to our criteria, ethics.*
   2. Who can be involved?
      1. *Non-member aquariums, private collections, dealers if they fulfil requirements, other NGOs, government bodies, local fishermen.*
   3. How is it best to involve them?
      1. *Through educational workshops, by keeping them on the communication platform, informing them of our role and policies.*
4. Extinct in the Wild species
   1. Should we prioritise these species and if so why?
      1. *Yes because they attract visitors and stresses the importance and role of zoos and aquariums.*
      2. *Yes because if we don’t, who will?*
   2. What specifically should zoos/aquariums be doing with them?
      1. *Working to reintroduce them where appropriate.*
      2. *Continue education and outreach programmes that focus on them.*
   3. What additional activities should we engage in with these species?
      1. *Research*