Original language: English SC77 Inf. 32

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

CIE

Seventy-seventh meeting of the Standing Committee Geneva (Switzerland), 6–10 November 2023

INDONESIA'S CLARIFICATION ON REVIEW OF TRADE IN ANIMAL SPECIMENS REPORTED AS PRODUCED IN CAPTIVITY FOR SPECIES OF CACATUA ALBA

This document has been submitted by Indonesia in relation to agenda item 36.*

-

The geographical designations employed in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the CITES Secretariat (or the United Nations Environment Programme) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The responsibility for the contents of the document rests exclusively with its author.

Indonesia's Clarification on Review of Trade in Animal Specimens Reported as Produced in Captivity for Species of Cacatua Alba

Further to our previous document Ref S.321/KKHSG/ PSG.1/KSA.2/05/2022 related Resolution Conf. 17.7 (Rev. COP 18) on Review of Trade in Animal Specimens Reported as Produced in Captivity, we would like to confirm our statement as follows:

- As mentioned before in our previous letter, combined inspection and observation to the breeding
 facility was conducted by the Management Authority and Scientific Authority, we found that is the
 facility and has successfully bred *Cacatua alba* to the second generation. This is supported by
 appropriate cages, nests, incubators, nutritious feed and experienced keepers. The reproductive
 performance shows the successful hand rearing.
- 2. We believe that the reproductive performance is very important to the captive breeding operation and is a chronic challenge on most captive breeding operation. Therefore, this has led to re-monitoring of the reproductive performance and to be more convincing, we re-examined the birth record. Due to clerical error, we found a slight difference with the previous report which was previous written as follows:

F0	Unknown						
F1	PARENT (1)			PARENT (2)			
	MALE	Х	FEMALE	MALE	X	FEMALE	
	13 BEF 055		13 ABT 090	13 ABT 092		13 BEF 056	
YEAR	CHICKS (F2)			CHICKS (F2)			
2004	13 ABT 852, 13 ABT 854, 13 ABT 855			13 ABT 832, 13 ABT 833, 13 ABT 834, 13 ABT 895, 13 ABT 896, 13 ABT 901, 13 ABT 902			
2005	13 ABT 932, 13 ABT 933			13 ABT 934, 13 ABT 935			
2014	-			13 ABT 2269, 13 ABT 2270			
2015	13 ABT 1504, 13 ABT 1505, 13 ABT 1509, 13 ABT 1510, 13 ABT 1538, 13 ABT 1539, 13 ABT 1548, 13 ABT 2379, 13 ABT 2380, 13 ABT 2381, 13 ABT 2443, 13 ABT 2451, 13 ABT 2452, 13 ABT 2473, 13 ABT 2474			13 ABT 1497, 13 ABT 1498, 13 ABT 1525, 13 ABT 1526, 13 ABT 2382, 13 ABT 2383, 13 ABT 2438, 13 ABT 2439			
2016	13 ABT 1595, 13 AB	BT 1596, 13	ABT 1577	13 ABT 1595, 13 ABT 1596, 13 ABT 1577			

The correct information should be as follow:

F0	Unknown					
	PARENT (1)			PARENT (2)		
F1	MALE	Х	FEMALE	MALE	Х	FEMALE
	13 BEF 055		13 ABT 090	13 ABT 092		13 BEF 056
YEAR	CHICKS (F2)			CHICKS (F2)		

2004	13 ABT 852, 13 ABT 854, 13 ABT 855	13 ABT 832, 13 ABT 833, 13 ABT 834, 13 ABT 895, 13 ABT 896, 13 ABT 901, 13 ABT 902	
2005	13 ABT 932, 13 ABT 933	13 ABT 934, 13 ABT 935	
2013	13 ABT 1504, 13 ABT 1505, 13 ABT 1509, 13 ABT 1510	-	
2014	13 ABT 1538, 13 ABT 1539, 13 ABT 1548	13 ABT 2269, 13 ABT 2270	
2015	13 ABT 2379, 13 ABT 2380, 13 ABT 2381, 13 ABT 2451, 13 ABT 2443 13 ABT 2452, 13 ABT 2473, 13 ABT 2474	13 ABT 1497, 13 ABT 1498, 13 ABT 1525, 13 ABT 1526, 13 ABT 2382, 13 ABT 2383, 13 ABT 2438, 13 ABT 2439	
2016	13 ABT 1595, 13 ABT 1596, 13 ABT 1577	13 ABT 1569, 13 ABT 1570, 13 ABT 1576, 13 ABT 1638, 13 ABT 1639	

- a. Due to clerical error, in the offspring's tagging code (F2) from breeding pair 13 ABT 092 x 13 BEF 056 (F1) in 2016 was written with the same tagging codes from other breeding pair 13 BEF 055 x 13 ABT 090 (F1). The correct tagging codes for the offspring (F2) are 13 ABT 1569, 13 ABT 1570, 13 ABT 1576, 13 ABT 1638, and 13 ABT 1639. This clarifies that offspring's tagging code from breeding pair 13 BEF 055 x 13 ABT 090 (F1) differs from the offspring's tagging code from 13 ABT 092 x 13 BEF 056 (F1).
- b. We would also like to revised the data on offspring's tagging code (F2) from breeding pair 13 BEF 055 x 13 ABT 0090 (F1) in 2015 that consist of fifteen (15) offspring's tagging code, were supposedly an offspring of 2013 (4 birds), 2014 (3 birds), and 2015 (8 birds).
- c. These new findings were collected from data tracking, and interviews with the owner, manager, and keeper. We found that there were discrepancies in the records, i.e., there were hatchings in 2013 and 2014, but they were not recorded in the same year respectively, and they recorded all of the hatching only in 2015 instead.
- d. This missed information occurred due to a transfer of ownership and management revitalization, as well as the relocation of facilities. There was a transition period from the old management to the new management in 2014, and it resulted in incorrect data being provided.
- 3. In order to monitoring on this breeding facility, the regional office also regularly inspects the captive breeding facility after we found that missed information. The regional office also witnesses and inspect the birth as well as mortality and then established Official Record. We hope for your kind consideration of this revised data, as it will be a valuable lesson learned for us in the future.