

AMERICAN BIRD CONSERVANCY ✧ DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE
EUROGROUP FOR ANIMAL WELFARE ✧ FRIENDS OF THE EARTH EUROPE
GREENPEACE ✧ IFAW ✧ JANE GOODALL INSTITUTE
NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY ✧ RSPCA ✧ PRO WILDLIFE
WORLD PARROT TRUST

THE EUROPEAN UNION WILD BIRD DECLARATION

An NGO Call to Halt Wild Bird Imports into the European Union

We write you today as a group of 226 non-governmental organisations - representing millions of members throughout Europe and around the world - to urge a permanent end to the importation of wild birds into the European Union. Each year, hundreds of thousands of wild-caught birds are imported into the EU. These imports pose serious and substantial risks to the species traded, to the health and livelihoods of European citizens, and to our identities as responsible and humane global citizens. The EU recognised these risks when it imposed a precautionary moratorium on imports of wild caught birds earlier this year and extended the moratorium again this summer. In our collective view, the most responsible, humane, and science-based course of action is for the EU to make that ban permanent, and join the growing number of nations around the world that have withdrawn from the risky and unacceptable commercial trade in wild birds¹. For this reason, we respectfully call upon the European Union to immediately and permanently halt the commercial importation of wild birds.

Wild Bird Imports Threaten Human Lives and Livelihoods

International movements of wildlife amplify disease risks to humans, livestock, and local wildlife. Despite our best efforts to quarantine, control, and screen for infectious diseases, history has repeatedly demonstrated that importing wild birds poses recurrent and serious disease risks for both human and animal populations, that outbreaks of such diseases are difficult to prevent and costly to control, and that their impacts are felt throughout the economy. Two recent avian disease outbreaks exemplify our concerns and give credence to the scale and immediacy of the problem at hand.

Avian Influenza

The current epidemic of avian influenza in Asia is only one of many ongoing outbreaks of this deadly and virulent disease. Outbreaks of various avian flu strains have also crippled or are now devastating the poultry industry in Europe (Netherlands, Germany, and Belgium in 2002) and North America (British Columbia, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Texas in 2004). They cause massive interruptions in trade, the destruction of millions of birds, and in some cases human illness or even death. Recent avian flu outbreaks have had serious economic consequences for EU members. For example, in 2003, an outbreak of avian flu in the Netherlands and Belgium required the culling of over 30 million birds, infected over 80 people, and killed one veterinarian (WHO 2004). The 1999-2000 avian flu outbreak in

Italy required the destruction of 16 million birds and cost an estimated 510 million Euros (CREV 2004). Although the full economic costs of the current outbreak have yet to be determined, the death of over 100 million birds (US Department of State 2004) and massive disruptions in trade flows from Asia to both the EU and the USA make it the largest outbreak event in history. (Byrne 2004).

Exotic Newcastle Disease

In a recent outbreak of exotic Newcastle disease (END) in the western USA, containment of the disease cost the United States Government over US\$175 million (Velez 2003, Senne 2004). Although the exact source of such an outbreak can seldom be determined, pet parrots purchased in southern California in the spring of 2002 were diagnosed with a strain of END that proved to be nearly identical and possibly ancestral to the strain that caused the poultry epidemic (Pedersen et. al, 2004). Parrots and pet birds in general are frequently implicated in the spread of this disease; the U. S. Department of Agriculture singles out imported pet birds as a major risk factor, stating that:

“... pet birds, especially Amazon parrots from Latin America, pose a great risk of introducing exotic Newcastle into U.S. poultry flocks. Amazon parrots that are carriers of the disease but do not show symptoms are capable of shedding END virus for more than 400 days.” (USDA 2003)

The international body charged with addressing animal health and zoonotic disease, the Office International des Epizooties (OIE), concurs with this concern in its Technical Card on END (OIE 2004), stating:

- A carrier state may exist in psittacine (parrots) and some other wild birds
- Some psittacine birds have been demonstrated to shed ND virus intermittently for over 1 year

Europe is not immune to these risks. In recent months, a consignment of 4,000 wild parrots and other birds imported into Italy from Pakistan tested positive for END (Landolfo 2004) and the entire group was destroyed. Disturbingly, other European recipients of birds from the same shipment were not alerted to the confirmed detection of END in Italy, nor were the appropriate OIE or EU authorities notified within the required timeframes.

Given the virulence and economic impacts of recent outbreaks, it comes as no surprise that bioterrorism experts view END as a significant threat (CIDRAP 2003), and that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has specified END as a biological agent of concern in the Agricultural Bioterrorism Act of 2002 (USDA 2002). With the EU awash in wild bird imports – particularly of species known to be potent carriers of this very disease – current EU policies inadvertently facilitate the purposeful introductions of these agents.

As with most avian diseases, avian flu and END will continue to threaten Europe through a variety of sources, including migratory birds, and legally and illegally traded domestic and wild birds (Dierauf 2004). Importation of wild birds into the EU is a substantial and well-documented risk factor, one which a number of countries have effectively eliminated with relative ease. With the precedent-setting decision to halt the importation of pet birds from many Asian countries this year, the EU has clearly demonstrated

that such steps are not only feasible, but also prudent and effective in reducing disease threats (Byrne 2004).

International borders challenge any effort to limit the introduction of infectious disease. With the rapid enlargement of the EU in May 2004, attempts to enforce CITES, to implement EU trade policies, and to effectively screen hundreds of thousands of imported birds will inevitably go from difficult to impossible. In a recent study on the effects of EU enlargement on wildlife trade, TRAFFIC Europe found numerous problems in candidate countries, "... such as the lack of staff, resources and finances, the need for training of enforcement officers and the lack of efficient communication and co-ordination" (Berkhoudt 2002). We view EU border expansion as a welcome opportunity to re-evaluate risky import policies and to eliminate the wild bird trade that presents a clear and present danger to the European economy.

With hundreds of thousands of wild birds now arriving each year in Europe, legally and illegally, infectious disease outbreaks in the European poultry industry are inevitable. Recent events demonstrate that it is simply a question of when and where the next outbreak will occur, and how many hundreds of millions of Euros it will cost to contain.

Wild Bird Imports Threaten Species Survival

The principal international instrument for controlling international trade in wild species is the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). Since the early 1970's, all European countries have worked within the framework of CITES to ensure that the international trade in threatened species would not cause declines of these plants and animals in the wild. In 1975, 24 parrot species were included on Appendix I of CITES, thus prohibiting commercial international trade in these birds. Since that initial listing, continued threats from international trade have lead CITES Parties to add an additional 32 parrot varieties to Appendix I, including nine in the last four years².

Yet hundreds of other species remain heavily traded, and far too frequently, CITES controls and the current EU regulations have proven inadequate to prevent declines in many of these species. Although both CITES and EU regulations require that exports of wild-caught birds be non-detrimental, the basic scientific information needed to make such a finding is often entirely lacking, with no consequence to the continued trade. For example, the Senegal parrot (*Poicephalus senegalus*) is the most heavily traded of all birds on CITES Appendix II, with an average of 44,000 birds traded annually from 1998-2001, of which 85-90% are imported by EU nations (*cf.* CITES.org). To date, there have been no systematic field surveys or scientific assessments of population trends for this species and yet the combined export quotas for 2004 stand at over 44,000 birds (CITES 2004).

In the rare instances where adequate scientific assessments are conducted, the findings are frequently ignored. For example, a recent of analysis of the trade in Grey Parrots in Guinea conducted for CITES and the IUCN found this species to be highly threatened by trade (Clemmons 2003). Although the report recommended the suspension of all exports from Guinea, the export quota remains unchanged (CITES 2004). In an extensive scientific review of the Blue-fronted Amazon (*Amazona aestiva*) harvest in

Argentina, a group of 97 parrot experts from around the globe concluded that the harvest could in no way be deemed sustainable (FWS Letter 2003), yet neither the CITES nor the EU have taken steps to end this unsustainable trade.

A recent scientific review on the poaching of parrots in the New World overturned long-held myths about the wild bird trade (Wright et al. 2001). First, the study found that, contrary to longstanding opinion, wildlife trade bans do not “drive the trade underground” and make it less sustainable. In fact, the contrary is often true. The study found a strong positive correlation between the existence of legal markets for parrots and levels of illegal trade; when the legal trade into the USA was stopped by the Wild Bird Conservation Act of 1992, the illegal trade all but disappeared.

Results from North America and elsewhere demonstrate that simple and clear rules – i.e. “no birds allowed” – are the most effective conservation tools for two reasons. A simple ban is far easier for border personnel to implement than a complex regulatory scheme; when a ban extends across all birds, it becomes more effective still, because mislabelling a prohibited species as a permissible import becomes impossible. At the same time, clear rules deter would-be smugglers because they know that they cannot successfully disguise a parrot or any bird as a mammal or reptile. More fundamentally, prohibiting imports can change the consumer attitudes that drive the trade, reducing the overall demand for wild birds. The success of the Wild Bird Conservation Act in the United States is powerful evidence that a legislative restriction can have substantial impacts on wildlife markets and tremendous benefits for traded wildlife. The study by Wright et al. documents that the USA’s withdrawal from the wild bird market was followed by a decline in nest poaching rates from 48% to 20%. For the wild bird trade, the unequivocal message is that legislation works surprisingly well; since 1992, this one legislative act has saved an estimated 8.5 million wild birds³.

In the past, many believed that purchasing wild birds would support nature conservation by lending value to native forests and creating jobs for indigenous people. Over the past three decades, this hope has not been realised, and profits generated by the wild bird trade have been overwhelmingly monopolised by retailers and middlemen, creating only seasonal and meagre wages for local trappers (Thomsen, et al. 1992, Wiedenfeld, et al, 1999, Clemmons 2003).

Because valuable birds are long lived and slow to reproduce, the sustainability of any such harvest has never been demonstrated. Indeed, the trapping of wild parrots is akin to mining or clear-cutting, where a species is rapidly removed from the landscape. In an especially clear instance, a rare parrot in Bolivia, the Blue-throated Macaw (*Ara glaucogularis*), first documented by western researchers in 1992, was reduced to less than 100 wild birds within 20 years of its discovery. This remnant wild population is dwarfed by the thousands of Blue-throated Macaws now held in captivity in Europe and North America (*cf.* Snyder et al, 2000).

In the broader context of ensuring that our trade practices reflect our values and principles as global citizens, there are manifold reasons for ending the trade today. By supporting the extractive use of wild

birds, European imports impede the development of positive and non-extractive uses of wildlife such as ecotourism, which have proven highly effective in generating real jobs and meaningful conservation. Moreover, the EU's refusal to commercialise its own wild birds (*cf.* Birds Directive) while continuing to trade and profit in the wild birds of other countries may rightly be seen as blatant hypocrisy.

As the largest remaining international market for wild-caught birds, the European market represents a central threat to international wildlife conservation, driving the overexploitation of natural resources and the erosion of biodiversity in many developing countries. Simple, clear, and implementable legislation can eliminate the threat posed by this market virtually overnight. Indeed, it is a rare opportunity when such a minor and uncontroversial⁴ legislative change can generate such positive and concrete benefits for so many sectors of society, while at the same time modernizing and harmonizing the EU's policies with those of other progressive countries.

Wild Bird Imports are Inhumane

For wild parrots, flight is much more than a mode of transport; their physiologies, anatomies, and lifestyles are designed around this essential quality of life as a bird. They pair and flock with others of their kind, and they live for decades, feeding, breeding, and thriving in their natural habitat. Commercial sale on the EU market results in the extraction of these birds from their wild state by methods that are painful, injurious and often lethal. Once in hand, the birds are forced to eat novel and typically unhealthy foods, and many starve outright. At the export markets in developing countries, the birds are co-housed in overcrowded conditions, typically with a mixed variety of species, where they are exposed to a range of diseases and deprived of any vestige of their natural environment.

Upon arrival, those birds that survive the trip to the EU are then subjected to similarly unnatural and dangerous co-housing, and deprived of free flight and their natural diets. Entire shipments of these birds may be killed when disease is detected or suspected in even a single individual (CREV 2004, Argentine Wildlife Office 2000). Those birds that survive quarantine and subsequent shipment to their retail destination face a harsh fate far different from life in their natural environment. The majority are sold as pets to live out their lives in cages too small for meaningful flight. Those birds arriving as wild adults never become tame, and are prone to an array of captivity-induced psychoses, significantly impairing their quality of life and making them unmanageable or undesirable as pets. Thus, they may be passed from home to home, or be given to rescue facilities.

Subjected to a battery of stresses between their capture in the wild and arrival at their final destination, huge numbers of these birds succumb to disease or malnourishment, and die. It is well documented that the trapping and transfer of wild birds to the EU negatively affects far more birds than those which turn up in our pet markets. Studies in both Africa and the Americas have reported that 40-70% of all wild birds captured die before they are exported from their home country.⁵ Still more birds die during international shipment, quarantine, and distribution, the number of birds reaching consumers therefore represents only a fraction of the total birds lost to this destructive and wasteful trade.

Recent scientific findings show that parrots and other birds function cognitively and socially in a manner similar to primates, dolphins, and human children (Hunt 1996, Pepperberg and Lynn 2000, Emery and Clayton 2001). Committing hundreds of thousands of wild animals to fates such as these cannot by any reasonable definition be deemed “humane.” Notwithstanding misguided arguments that this trade is somehow “good for developing countries,” “sustainable and well controlled” or “causing few conservation impacts,” the nations of Europe should end their involvement in this massive, destructive, and inhumane market in the lives of wild birds.

Why the European Union?

Europeans are often surprised to learn that such risky, environmentally harmful, and inhumane policies are still accepted by the EU. Perhaps the European Parliament’s adopting a clear and strong resolution to end the trade in the early 1990’s led Europeans to believe their governments had already taken the high road and stopped importing wild birds (European Parliament 1991). Most species breed readily in captivity, and captive bred specimens of several hundred species are easily available to collectors, breeders, and pet owners in the EU. In fact, European aviculturists already produce more birds than are needed to meet domestic demand, and unwanted exotic birds have begun to fill rescue centres. The continued importation of wild birds under these circumstances defies logic.

So why does the EU continue to import hundreds of thousands of wild birds? Aside from the trade-for-conservation fallacy addressed above, a handful of EU bird traders justify the imports simply because buying and selling wild parrots is a profitable business. In our view, the personal profit of this select few is far outweighed by the tremendous risks to the health and livelihoods of the many, by the unsustainable impact on the species being traded, and by the moral unacceptability of Europe’s continued participation in this inhumane and wasteful trade.

Nor does the wild parrot trade make economic sense for Europe. The domestic production and sale of birds in the EU supports aviculturists, veterinarians, and other associated professions. In contrast, the continued importation of wild birds negatively impacts these same professions and sends millions of Euros overseas. For this reason, many American aviculturists who once traded in wild birds, now regard the ending of these imports in the early 1990’s as a major positive step for their domestic avicultural industry. In any event, the cost of controlling a single serious outbreak of any number of avian diseases will easily dwarf the value of the entire wild bird market.

For reasons such as these, many developed countries have chosen to end the practice of importing wild birds for the pet trade, creating substantial benefits for human and animal health, conservation, and their economies. Their ranks include most prominently Australia, Canada, the USA, Israel, and Sweden. At the same time, a growing number of former bird exporting countries from around the world have recognized the threat to their natural resources and national heritage and have ended or substantially reduced their involvement in the wild bird trade.⁶

The European Union now stands prominently among the community of nations as the world's largest importer of wild birds. It is our view that such economically risky, environmentally regressive, and inhumane policies have no place in the modern Europe. As organizations with expertise in wildlife conservation and trade, the economic and health impacts of bird-borne diseases, and animal welfare, we stand united in our belief that the European Union should immediately and permanently halt the importation of all wild birds. We respectfully urge you to act immediately to end this trade.

SIGNATORY ORGANIZATIONS:

1World	UK
Action Against Poisoning	Netherlands
Advocates for Animals	Scotland
African Conservation Centre	Kenya
African Conservation Foundation	Tanzania
Aktive Tierschutzgruppe Salez	Switzerland
Al Wabra Wildlife Preservation	Qatar
Alliance of Veterinarians for the Environment	International
American Bird Conservancy	International
Amerindian Arts	USA
ANDA Asociación Nacional para la Defensa de los Animales	Spain
Angry Parrot Inc	USA
Anima- foreningen for alle dyrs rettigheder	Denmark
Animal Aid	UK
Animal Aid Unlimited	USA
Animal Alliance of Canada	Canada
Animal Concern	UK
Animal Friends Croatia	Croatia
Animal Protection Agency	UK
Animal Protection Institute	USA
Animal Rights Sweden	Sweden
Animal Societies Federation (NSW)	Australia
Animal Welfare Institute	International
Animal Welfare Sweden	Sweden
Animalia	Australia
Animalia	Finland
Animals Asia Foundation	International
Animals Australia	Australia
APREFLOFAS Asociación Preservacionista de Flora y Fauna Silvestre	Costa Rica
ARGOS Animal Welfare Society	Greece
ARKA Society for the Protection and Welfare of Animals	Serbia & Monten.
Arkansas Audubon Society	USA
Armonia	Bolivia
Asociación ALIHUEN	Argentina
Asociación Colombiana de Ornitología	Colombia
Assisi A.R.C.	Ireland
Asociación Defensa Derechos Animal, ADDA	Spain

Association Française de Soutien à Pro Animals, Roumanie AFSPA	France
Association of Liberia Environmental journalist, ALEJ	Liberia
Association Veg'Asso	France
Attica Zoological Park	Greece
Avian Welfare Coalition	USA
Beauty Without Cruelty, Calcutta	India
Belgian Bird Protection, Ligue Royale Belge pour la Protection des Oiseaux (LRBPO)	Belgium
BioBrasil Foundation	Brazil
Bird Adoption and Placement Center	USA
Bird Conservation Network	USA
Birding in Venezuela	Venezuela
BirdLife Netherlands, Vogelbescherming Nederland	Netherlands
Birdlife Slovakia	Slovakia
Birdline UK	UK
BirdsFirst	UK
Blaikiewell Animal Sanctuary	UK
Born Free Foundation	International
Born Free USA	USA
Budongo Forest Project	Uganda
Cairns Tropical Zoo	Australia
Care for the Wild International	UK
Caring for the Animals Trust	UK
Centro Mexicano de Derecho Ambiental	Mexico
Cetacea Defence	UK
CIVITAS: Citizens for Planetary Health	USA
Club degli Psittacidi – Italy	Italy
Comité Anti Stierenvechten	Netherlands
Commonbonds Group	Australia
Community Led Animal Welfare	South Africa
Compassion and Responsibility for Animals, CARA	Philippines
Compassionate Crusaders Trust	India
Concern for Helping Animals in Israel	Israel
Conservative Animal Welfare Group	UK
Consumer Association Penang	Malaysia
Cousteau Society & Equipe Cousteau	USA/France
Crete Animal Welfare Group	Crete
Czech Society for Ornithology	Czech Republic
David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation	UK
De Faunabescherming	Netherlands
Defenders of Wildlife	International
Deutscher Tierschutzbund e.V., German Animal Welfare Organisation	Germany
Documentation Center for Species Protection, DCSP	Austria
Dutch Society For The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	Netherlands
EcoEcuador	Ecuador
ECOTERRA Intl.	International
Eet geen dierenleed	Netherlands
Ente Nazionale Protezione Animali	Italy
Environment Voters	Canada
EQUIVITA, Scientific Committee	Italy

Especializacion en Educaci3n y Gesti3n Ambiental, Universidad Distrital Francisco Jos3 de Caldas	Colombia
Eurogroup Against Birdcrime, EABC	International
Eurogroup for Animal Welfare	International
Farplace Animal Rescue	UK
Federation Feline of Greece	Greece
Foster Parrots Inc.	USA
Fota Wildlife Park	Ireland
FrettenStichting	Netherlands
Friends of Animals Galway	Ireland
Friends of National Parks Foundation	Indonesia
Friends of the Earth Europe	Europe
Friends of The Earth Malaysia, Sahabat Alam Malaysia	Malaysia
Fundacion Amigos del Rio San Juan	Nicaragua
Fundacion Antonio Haghenbeck y de la Lama, Iap	Mexico
Fundacion Argentina para el Bienestar Animal	Argentina
Fundacion Inalafquen	Argentina
Fundaci3n La Casa de Coko	Spain
Fundaci3n ProAves Colombia	Colombia
Gabriel Foundation	USA
Gesellschaft zur Rettung der Delphine	Germany
Gesellschaft zum Schutz der Meeressaeugetiere, GSM	Germany
Giardino Zoologico di Pistoia - Italy	Italy
Givskud Zoo	Denmark
Gondwana New Caledonia	New Caledonia
Grahamstown Feral Cat Rescue	South Africa
Great Green Macaw Research and Conservation Project	Costa Rica
Greenpeace	International
Grupo de los Cien, Mexico	Mexico
GSM Denmark, Society for the Conservation of Marine Mammals	Denmark
Hawk Conservancy Trust	UK
Humane Society of Canada	Canada
Humane Society of the United States/ Humane Society International	International
IAATE, International Association of Avian Trainers and Educators	International
IFAW, International Fund for Animal Welfare	International
Independent Voice for Animals	USA
Indonesian Animal Rescue Center Network	Indonesia
Indonesian Parrot Project	USA
Instituto de Pesquisa e Conserva3o da Natureza - Id3ia Ambiental	Brazil
International Animal Rescue, Malta	Malta
International Crane Foundation	International
International Primate Protection League	UK
International Society for Environmental Ethics, Eastern Europe	Poland
International Zoo Veterinary Group	International
Jane Goodall Institute	International
Justice & Freedom for Animals	UK
Kenya Society for the Protection and Care of Animals, KSPCA	Kenya
kolkata Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	India
Komitee gegen den Vogel mord	Germany
Koninklijke Nederlandse Maatschappij voor Diergeneeskunde	Netherlands

Last Great Ape Organization	Cameroon
Latin America Environmental Society	Netherlands
LEAL Lega Antivivisezionista	Italy
Ligue pour la Protection des Oiseaux	France
Live Arico; Protectora de Animales y Plantas de Tenerife	Spain
Los Angeles Audubon Society	USA
MAARS - Midwest Avian Adoption & Rescue Services	USA
Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences	USA
Massachusetts Animal Rights Coalition	USA
Michigan Humane Society	USA
NABU Naturschutzbund Deutschland e.V.	Germany
Nadace na ochranu zvirat, The Animal Protection Trust	Czech Republic
Natagora, Birdlife Belgium	Belgium
National Animal Sanctuary Alliance	UK
National Audubon Society	International
National Cat Society of Malta	Malta
Nature Uganda	Uganda
Natuurpunt, BirdLife Belgium	Belgium
Nederlandse Organisatie van Pluimveehouders	Netherlands
Netherlands Institute of Ecology (NIOO-KNAW)	Netherlands
New Life Foundation	India
New Life Parrot Rescue & Helpline Service	UK
Observadores de Aves de Pernambuco	Brazil
Ocean Defense International	USA
International Organisation for Animal Protection, OIPA	International
Palawan Animal Welfare Association, Inc	Philippines
Paphaikos & CCP Animal Welfare	Cyprus
Paradise Park	UK
Parrot Coalition	USA
Parrots International	USA
Partij voor de Dieren	Netherlands
People For Animals Trust	India
Peru Verde	Peru
Politischer Arbeitskreis für Tierrechte in Europa - PAKT e.V.	Germany
Pollution Control Association of Liberia, POCAL	Liberia
Pracownia na rzecz wszystkich istot: Workshop for All Beings	Poland
ProAvesPeru	Peru
ProFauna Indonesia	Indonesia
ProFauna International	International
Project Bird Watch	USA
Projeto Arara Azul	Brazil
Pronatura Noreste	Mexico
PROVITA	Venezuela
ProWildlife	Germany
Quaker Concern for Animals	UK
Rare Species Conservatory Foundation	USA
RENTAS -Rede Nacional de Combate ao Trafico de Animais Silvestres	Brazil
Roanoke Valley Bird Club	USA
RSPCA, Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	UK
S.O.S.Strays vzw	Belgium

Samrakshan Trust	India
Scooby Protectora de Animales	Spain
Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	Scotland
SHARAN - Sanctuary for Health and Reconnection to Animals and Nature	India
Shoreham Protester	UK
SIMBIOSIS - Mensch u.Natur e.V.	Germany
Skopelos Caring for Animals and Nature	Greece
Società Italiana di Ecopatologia della Fauna	Italy
Società Italiana Veterinaria per Animali Esotici, SIVAE	Italy
Sophia-Vereeniging	Netherlands
SOS GRAND BLEU	France
SPAZ, The Society for the Protection of Stray Animals	Greece
Species Survival Network, Bird Working Group	International
Sri Lanka Environmental Journalists Forum, SLEJF	Sri Lanka
Stichting AAP, Sanctuary for Exotic Animals - The Netherlands	Netherlands
Stichting Dierenhulp Venezuela	Netherlands
Stichting Greyhounds in Nood Nederland	Netherlands
Stichting Papegaaien en Parkieten Welzijn, SPPW	Netherlands
Stichting Papegaaienhulp	Netherlands
Stichting SPOTS	Netherlands
Tegal Alur Wildlife Rescue Centre	Indonesia
Teyeliz	Mexico
The Australian Vegetarian Society	Australia
The Blue Cross of Hyderabad	India
The Canopy, Inc.	International
The Wildlife Trust	USA
Tropical Nature Inc.	International
UÑOPATUN Foundation	Argentina
Veganswines.com	Germany
Vogelbescherming Vlaanderen vzw	Belgium
Vogelschutz-Komitee e. V.	Germany
Wild World	Netherlands
Wildlife Action Group - South Africa	South Africa
Wildlife Friends of Thailand	Thailand
Wildlife Protection Society of India	India
Wildlife Society of Orissa	India
Wildlife Trust of India	India
Wildlife Works, Inc.	USA
Wildlives Rescue and Rehabilitation Centre	UK
Winsome Constance Kindness Trust	Australia
Wisconsin Society for Ornithology	USA
Witty Kitties, Inc.	USA
World Animal Conscience	Malta
World League for Protection of Animals	Australia
World of Birds Show	USA
World Parrot Trust	International
World Society for the Protection of Animals	International
World Whale Police	USA
Worldwide Veterinary Service	International
Zoologicka zahrada Decin Pastyrská stena	Czech Republic

References:

- Argentine Wildlife Office. 2000. Information on *Amazona aestiva* [Blue-fronted Amazon parrot] as it relates to the Rules for Sustainable Use under the WBCA (Wild Bird Conservation Act). U.S. Dept. State, Office on Language Services, Translating Division. LS No. 0500270.
- Berkhoudt, K. 2002. Focus on EU enlargement and wildlife trade: review of CITES implementation in candidate countries. TRAFFIC Europe.
- Byrne, D. 2004
http://europa.eu.int/rapid/start/cgi/guesten.ksh?p_action.gettxt=gt&doc=IP/04/123|0|RAPID&lg=EN&display=
- CIDRAP 2003. http://www.cidrap.umn.edu/cidrap/content/biosecurity/ag-biosec/anim-disease/exnewcastle.html#_Newcastle_Disease_as
- CITES 2004. www.CITES.org export quotas for 2004, all countries combined.
- Clemmons J.E. 2003. Status survey of the african grey parrot (*Psittacus erithacus timneh*) and development of a management program in Guinea and Guinea-bissau. Report to the CITES Secretariat, Geneva, Switzerland. 99 pages.
- CREV 2004. Influenza aviaria in Italia: Evoluzione della situazione epidemiologica - Anni 1999 – 2003. Report from the Centro Regionale Epidemiologia Veterinaria Legnaro.
- Dierauf, L. 2004. Avian Influenza in Wild Birds. NWHC Wildlife Health Bulletin 04- 01. Emery, NJ and N.S. Clayton. 2001. Effects of experience and social context on prospective caching strategies in scrub jays. *Nature* 414: 443-446.
- European Commission 2000. Commission Decision of 16 October 2000 laying down the animal health requirements and the veterinary certification for the import of birds, other than poultry and the conditions for quarantine (notified under document number C(2000) 3012. Official Journal of the European Communities 31.10.2000, 278/26
- European Parliament 1991. Resolution on the trade in exotic birds. Official Journal of the European Communities No C 267/226 14.10.91.
- Fotso, R. 1998a. Etude sur l'état, la répartition géographique et l'utilisation du perroquet gris (*Psittacus erithacus*) dans la République démocratique du Congo. CITES, Geneva, Switzerland.
- FWS Letter 2003. Comments to the US Fish and Wildlife Service regarding a proposal to import Blue-fronted Amazons into the USA under the Wild Bird Conservation Act. Submitted October 2003, signed by 97 parrot researchers. Text and list of signatories available at:
<http://worldparrottrust.org/news/usaamazon.htm>
- Hunt, G.R. 1996. Manufacture and use of hook-tools by New Caledonian crows. *Nature* 379, 249 - 251.
- Iñigo E and Ramos, M. 1991. The Psittacine Trade in Mexico. In J.G. Robinson and K.H. Redford eds. Neotropical Wildlife Use and Conservation, pp. 380-392 The University of Chicago Press. Chicago.
- Landolfo, F. 2004. A series of stories in the "Roma" newspaper of Naples, headline translated as, "Worrysome report by the World Parrot Trust. Infected parrots in Naples. Alarm for the lethal avian influenza: 4,000 birds burned" and another as, "Health risk. The alert is still on for the bird shipment sent to Naples affected with Newcastle disease. Enquiry on the parrots. The Ministry of Environment enquires on the mysterious silence. 6-8 March 2004.
- McGowan, P. 2001. Status, Management and Conservation of the African Grey Parrot, *Psittacus erithacus* in Nigeria. CITES, Geneva, Switzerland.
- OIE 2004. END Technical Card on Exotic Newcastle Disease
http://www.oie.int/eng/maladies/fiches/a_a160.htm
- Pedersen, J.C., D.A. Senne, P.R. Woolcock, H.Kinde, D.J. King, M.G. Wise, B. Panigrahy, B.S. Seal. 2004. Phylogenetic relationships among the California 2002/2003 and other recent North American 1996/1997 virulent Newcastle disease virus isolates. *J. Clin. Microbio.* *In press.*
- Pepperberg, I.M., and Lynn, S.K. (2000). Perceptual consciousness in Grey parrots. *American Zoologist* 40: 893-901.
- Senne, D. A. 2004. Dr. Dennis Senne, USDA, Ames Iowa, personal communication by telephone with James Gilardi, World Parrot Trust, 25 March 2004.
- Snyder, N., P. McGowan, J. Gilardi, A. Grajal. 2000. Parrots. Status Survey and Conservation Action Plan 2000-2004. IUCN, Gland Switzerland and World Parrot Trust, Cornwall UK, x+180 pp.
- Thomsen, J.B., S.R. Edwards, T.A. Mulliken. 1992. Perceptions, conservation, and management of wild birds in trade. Species in Danger Series report, TRAFFIC International. 165 pp.
- USDA 2002. <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/bta.html>

- USDA 2003. Exotic Newcastle Disease. Veterinary Services January 2003
http://www.aphis.usda.gov/lpa/pubs/fsheet_faq_notice/fs_ahend.html
- US Department of State. 2004. Report provided to various embassies, including Hong Kong and Australia. <http://canberra.usembassy.gov/hyper/2004/0322/epf108.htm>.
- Velez, V. 2003 END Task Force report on 8/19/03, California Division of Food and Agriculture.
- Wiedenfeld, D.A., J.M. Molina, and M. Lezama L. 1999. Status, management, and trade of Psittacines in Nicaragua, 1999. Report to the office of CITES-Nicaragua, Ministerio del Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (Managua, Nicaragua), 15 October 1999. 116 pages.
- Wright, T. F., C. A. Toft, E. Enkerlin-Hoeflich, J. Gonzalez-Elizondo, M. Albornoz, A. Rodriguez-Ferraro, F. Rojas-Suarez, V. Sanz, A. Trujillo, S. R. Beissinger, V. Berovides A, X. Galvez A, A. T. Brice, K. Joyner, J. Eberhard, J. Gilardi, S. E. Koenig, S. Stoleson, P. Martuscelli, J. M. Meyers, K. Renton, A. M. Rodriguez, A. C. Sosa-Asanza, F. J. Vilella, and J. W. Wiley. 2001. Nest poaching in neotropical parrots. *Conservation Biology* 15:710-720.
- World Health Organization 2004. Fact Sheet on Avian Influenza.
http://www.who.int/csr/don/2004_01_15/en/

Notes:

1. We recognise an essential distinction between commercial and non-commercial interests in wild birds, and for the purposes of this declaration, we presume that importation of birds for internationally recognised and legitimate forms of 1. academic research, 2. public education, and 3. conservation activities, will be permitted under any such legislation. Likewise, we anticipate the need for an exemption for the importation of personal companion animals as long as, 1. importers are subject to conservative lifetime limits, 2. importers have a well documented personal history with the individual bird(s) in question, and 3. that imported animals are subject to a complete EU quarantine and disease screening conducted at the expense of the importer.
2. At the CITES COP in Santiago, November 2002, all parrots brought up for consideration for uplisting to Appendix I were approved. These were all birds heavily sought after by the pet trade and collectors and recent declines in their populations apparently justified the additional protection of Appendix I status. In October 2004, two more heavily traded parrot species were added to Appendix I following dramatic declines due primarily to legal trade.
3. As James Leape of WWF stated in US Congressional hearings, between 1980 and 1991, the USA imported more than 7.4 million birds, primarily for the pet market. Assuming no change in demand since 1992, subtract 15% of those as captive bred, and factor the numbers for years 1992-2004, these figures predict that roughly 6,870,000 wild birds would have been imported during this period. Conservatively estimating a 25% pre-import mortality caused by this harvest yields approximately 5,152,500 wild birds saved since the enactment of the WBCA.
4. The Wild Bird Conservation Act of 1992 was passed with consensus votes in both Houses of the US Congress and signed into law by George H.W. Bush.
5. Recent post-capture mortality figures for the heavily traded African Grey Parrot are in the range of 60-66% for Nigeria (McGowan 2001), 50% for Guinea-Bissau (Clemmons 2003), and 40-50% for the Democratic Republic of Congo (Fotso 1998). Similar figures have been reported for a variety of Mexican parrots, with 49% of harvested bird dying prior to export (Iñigo and Ramos 1991).
6. Notable examples of countries, which no longer export their wild birds include Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mauritania, Panama, Sudan, and Uganda.