

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



Seventy-eighth meeting of the Standing Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 3-8 February 2025

Administrative and financial matters

Arrangements for the 20th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

1. This document has been submitted by the Standing Committee Chair, as the Chair of the Standing Committee's working group on the Rules of Procedure.*

Background

2. At its 18th meeting (CoP18; Geneva, 2019), the Conference of the Parties adopted Decision 18.1 on *Rules of Procedure* that directed the Standing Committee with the support of the Secretariat to "review Rule 7.2 a) and Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure of the Conference of the Parties and propose amendments as appropriate to the 19th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties with the view to ensuring the effective conduct of the meetings." An intersessional working group was formed to carry out this work and the Standing Committee's Report and its recommendations are found in Document CoP19 Doc. 4.1.
3. At its 19th meeting (CoP19; Panama, 2022), the Conference of the Parties amended and adopted changes to Rule 7.2 a), Rule 25.5, and corresponding amendments to the first part of Rule 25.6, but consensus could not be reached on additional proposed amendments to Rule 25.6. Therefore, the Conference of the Parties adopted Decision 18.1 (Rev. CoP19) that directed the Standing Committee with the support of the Secretariat "to review Rule 25.6 of the Rules of Procedure of the Conference of the Parties and propose amendments, as appropriate, to the 20th meeting of the Conference of the Parties with the view to ensuring the effective conduct of meetings." See CoP19 Plenary Discussion; CoP19 Plen. Rec. 1 (Rev. 1), https://cites.org/sites/default/files/documents/E-CoP19-Plen-Rec-01-R1_0.pdf; CoP19 Plen Rec. 4 (Rev. 1) <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/documents/E-CoP19-Plen-Rec-04-R1.pdf>.
4. At its 76th meeting (Panama, November 2019), the Standing Committee formed an intersessional working group with its mandate to review Rule 25.6 of the Rules of Procedure and with its membership as follows (26 Parties ; 15 Observers): Argentina, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, European Union, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Namibia, Rwanda, South Africa, Tonga, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America (Chair), Zimbabwe; Center for Biological Diversity, Conservation Force, David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation, Defenders of Wildlife, European Federation of Association for Hunting and Conservation (FACE), International Association for Wildlife (IAW), IWMC-World Conservation Trust, Law of the Wild, Lewis & Clark – Global Law Alliance, Professional Hunters Association South Africa (PHASA), Safari Club International, South African Taxidermy and Tannery Association, Sustainable Use Coalition, Southern Africa, Wildlife Ranching South Africa (WRSA), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF).

Approach of the working group (WG)

5. The WG Chair solicited views of the WG on the current Rule 25.6 that reads:

"If two or more proposals including proposals amended in accordance with Rule 24, paragraph 2 or in accordance with paragraph 5 of this Rule, relate to the same taxon, but are different in substance, the

Conference shall first decide on the proposal that will have the least restrictive effect on the trade and then on the proposal with the next least restrictive effect on the trade, and so on until all proposals have been submitted to decision. When however, the adoption of one proposal necessarily implies the rejection of another proposal, the latter proposal shall not be submitted to decision.”

6. The WG Chair invited WG members to discuss this Rule 25.6 with a focus on re-framing the work to ensure that all proposals to amend the CITES Appendices submitted by Parties are discussed and decided upon by Parties at a meeting of the CoP. In the past discussions, while the goal had been to ensure that all proposals were given fair consideration, discussed, and decided pursuant to CITES listing criteria, focus of debate had been on the order of the proposals to consider – starting with the least restrictive versus the most restrictive proposal. These discussions, over the order and reversing the order, failed to reach consensus and were divisive. WG members expressed their views on this issue and considered if any alternative solutions existed that would allow all proposals to be considered and decided upon.
7. In discussions, WG members provided examples of scenarios of overlapping proposals in an effort to elucidate the understanding of members of what the WG wanted the rule to accomplish. The group examined the actual application of Rule 25.6 at CoP16 that prevented a number of turtle proposals from being considered and much of the working group’s deliberations were focused on options for addressing this type of scenario for future CoPs. In general, WG members agreed that the text of the rule should be clear and simple to implement and be understood by Parties. Many WG members could not accept text that gives the Chair of Committee I the discretion to change the order for discussion of the proposals. Parties in the working group agree to maintaining the current order in the Rule, of proceeding from least restrictive to most restrictive, but with support for all proposals to be introduced, discussed, and decided upon. The Conference would therefore decide in a stepwise approach on the appropriate level of restrictions (as outlined below in the example scenarios). However, prior to SC77 the WG members had not yet agreed upon text for the amendments that would clearly explain the stepwise decision-making process at the meeting when multiple proposals are moving in the same direction toward more restrictions with regard to the same taxon.
8. At SC77, the WG Chair presented a report on deliberations in the working group and discussions of past examples of species proposals that could raise issues from application of the present rule and how consideration of all proposals with a stepwise approach could be applied (see SC77 Doc. 11 for reference). It would be helpful here to recall information presented at SC77. This brief overview is elaborated in the paragraphs below for the benefit and consideration of Standing Committee Members and Parties.

Past examples

9. In discussions, some WG members did not recall there being problems with application of Rule 25.6 in the past particularly with regard to consideration of the least restrictive proposal first. Other WG members recalled that Rule 25.6 was originally intended to provide a stepwise approach in those cases where there are different proposals addressing the same taxon and with different effects, allowing each successively more restrictive proposal to be considered and adopted or rejected in stages at the CoP. At SC46, “The Secretariat suggest[ed] that an improvement would be to decide first on the least trade-restrictive proposal and then on the next least trade-restrictive proposal. In this way the Conference can decide by stages what level of trade-restriction is adequate. This approach is further consistent with generally accepted principles, such as that trade restrictions should be imposed only when they are necessary and that any measures imposed should be the least trade-restrictive required.” (See document SC46 Doc. 7.4). However, some WG members also recalled that the rule in practice has not been interpreted and implemented this way at a meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
10. WG members also provided examples of proposal scenarios. We examined examples of the actual application of Rule 25.6 that prevented certain proposals from being considered. It was noted that in these examples Rule 25.6 was applied with substantial difficulty, led to an inefficiency of process, and put extra work on proponent Parties to bring proposals at later meetings, while simultaneously foreclosing the opportunity to debate and decide based on differing views on the species status when the proposals were originally brought.

Example 1: CoP16 Prop. 33 (Cuora galbinifrons) was not able to be considered at CoP16 because of an interpretation of Rule 25.6 that adoption of CoP16 Prop. 32 necessarily implied rejection of CoP16 Prop. 33. New taxonomy for the species was adopted at CoP17, splitting the species into Cuora galbinifrons, Cuora bourreti, and Cuora picturata. Subsequent proposals at CoP18 and CoP19 were needed to consider and complete the transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I that could have been considered at CoP16: CoP16 Prop. 33 (Cuora bourreti), CoP18 Prop. 34 (Cuora picturata), and CoP19 Prop. 26 (Cuora galbinifrons).

Example 2: CoP16 Prop. 35 (*Mauremys annamensis*) was also not able to be considered at CoP16 because of an interpretation of Rule 25.6 that adoption of CoP16 Prop. 32 necessarily implied rejection of CoP16 Prop. 35. A subsequent proposal at CoP18 was needed to consider and complete the transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I that could have been considered at CoP16: CoP18 Prop. 35 (*Mauremys annamensis*).

11. Much of the WG's deliberations were focused on options for addressing this type of scenario for future CoPs. Concerns were expressed that the proponent Party in each of these examples did not have the opportunity to introduce its proposal and have it considered. Rather, the WG members generally preferred that the full range of proposals (all) be considered before decisions are reached. There were also some discussions in the WG on the whether the Chair should be allowed to change the order of debate and under what conditions.
12. It was generally agreed that the text of the rule should be clear and simple to implement and be understood by Parties, so that effective decisions can be taken and implemented with little ambiguity. However, it was also acknowledged that some additional detail may be needed to ensure that there is no ambiguity in the meaning of the rules to ensure effective conduct of the meetings.

Consideration of all proposals

13. In cases where there are different proposals addressing the same taxon and with different effects, as addressed in Rule 25.6, the rules should enable the Parties to hear a diverse array of perspectives and for each proposal to be introduced and considered, prior to reaching a decision for the taxon. This issue is proposed to be addressed by adding new language at the end of the first sentence of current Rule 25.6. See paragraph 22 below ("If two or more proposals including proposals amended in accordance with Rule 24, paragraph 2 or in accordance with paragraph 5 of this Rule, relate to the same taxon, but are different in substance, the Chair shall so advise the Conference, clearly indicating the implications of the adoption of one proposal for the other(s), and allow each of the proposals to be introduced prior to submitting any of them for discussion and decision. ...").

Consideration of all taxa in each proposal

14. Consistent with conservation goals and to ensure that each proposal is given due consideration, WG members generally agreed that proposals on non-overlapping species should be discussed at the CoP, regardless of the result of overlapping species. In other words, if some parts of a proposal are necessarily rejected through adoption of another proposal with respect to the same taxon (see paragraph 16, scenario 2 below), the parts of the proposal that relate to other taxa that are not rejected would still be considered on their own merits. This issue is proposed to be addressed through amending the final sentence of current Rule 25.6. See paragraph 22 below ("... If, in relation to the same taxon, ~~When however,~~ the adoption of one proposal necessarily implies the rejection of another proposal ..., the latter proposal shall nevertheless ~~not~~ be submitted to decision in relation to any remaining taxon.").
15. There remained some additional discussion to take place in the WG about whether additional text is needed to clarify that Rule 25.6 does not conflict with Rule 25.5 or other parts of Rule 25, or whether this is already clear in the rules. As discussed below, the WG later agreed to add a sentence to the rule to address this issue. See paragraph 22 below ("Nothing in the procedure stipulated in this paragraph is intended to affect the procedure in the other paragraphs of Rule 25.") Examples are provided to illustrate how the two rules operate.

Example A:

Species Xx is a plant included in Appendix II with no annotation. All other species in Genus X are also included in Appendix II with no annotation.

Proposal 1 is to remove Species Xx from the Appendices. (removing current restrictions)

Proposal 2 is to transfer Genus X to Appendix I. (adding restrictions)

Proposal 1 is considered first (as it is the proposal that will have the least restrictive effect on the trade). Assume for this example that Proposal 1 is amended by the Conference under Rule 25.5 to reduce its scope and maintain Species Xx in Appendix II subject to an annotation excluding certain parts and derivatives from the listing, and this Proposal 1, as amended under 25.5, is adopted.

Proposal 2 would necessarily be rejected with regard to only Species Xx. This is because adoption of Amended Proposal 1, as amended under 25.5, was a decision of the Parties to remove current restrictions on trade in Species Xx rather than to add restrictions on the same trade. This implies that Proposal 2 to add restrictions is rejected with regard to Species Xx (per the text in the final sentence of 25.6, see paragraph 17, paragraph 20 scenario 2 below).

Proposal 2 would nevertheless be considered with regard to all other species in Genus X other than Species Xx. The amendment of Proposal 1 under Rule 25.5 does not affect reaching a decision on Proposal 2 under 25.6 with regard to the other species in Genus X. If Proposal 2 is adopted, then Genus X would be included in Appendix I (Except Species Xx which would be included in Appendix II subject to an annotation). If Proposal 2 is rejected, then Genus X remains included in Appendix II (Species Xx would be subject to an annotation).

Example B: Same as above, except Proposal 1 is to remove Genus X from the Appendices.

Species Xx is a plant included in Appendix II with no annotation. All other species in Genus X are also included in Appendix II with no annotation.

Proposal 1 is to remove Genus X from the Appendices. (removing current restrictions)

Proposal 2 is to transfer Genus X to Appendix I. (adding restrictions)

Proposal 1 is considered first (as it is the proposal that will have the least restrictive effect on the trade). Assume for this example that Proposal 1 is amended by the Conference under Rule 25.5 to reduce its scope to remove species other than Species Xx from consideration, and to maintain Species Xx in Appendix II subject to an annotation excluding certain parts and derivatives from the listing, and this Proposal 1, as amended under 25.5, is adopted. Proposal 1 cannot later be reamended to consider species other than Species Xx because this would expand the scope of the proposal.

Proposal 2 would necessarily be rejected with regard to only Species Xx. This is because adoption of Amended Proposal 1, as amended under 25.5, was a decision of the Parties to remove current restrictions on trade in Species Xx rather than to add restrictions on the same trade. This implies Proposal 2 to add restrictions is rejected with regard to Species Xx (per the text in the final sentence of 25.6, see paragraph 17, paragraph 20 scenario 2 below).

Proposal 1 would not be considered with regard to all other species in Genus X, because the amended Proposal 1 superseded the original Proposal 1 according to Rule 25.5. Amended Proposal 1 cannot be reamended to broaden its scope. The final sentence of Rule 25.6 does not change the effect of Rule 25.5.

Proposal 2 would nevertheless be considered with regard to all other species in Genus X other than Species Xx (per the text in the final sentence of 25.6). The amendment of Proposal 1 under Rule 25.5 does not affect reaching a decision on Proposal 2 under 25.6 with regard to the other species in Genus X. If Proposal 2 is adopted, then Genus X would be included in Appendix I. Assume, for example there are two proposals, and 90% of Parties find the least restrictive proposal is best. They will vote for it first. It will be adopted. Then the second proposal will be considered, they will not vote for it, and it will be rejected. So, Proposal 1 will be adopted.

Now assume, for example 90% of Parties find the most restrictive proposal is best, but when deciding first on the least restrictive proposal, they do not know how many Parties support which proposal. They would not want to vote no to the first proposal and risk adding no protections compared to the current status [Another quick example illustrates this point. Assume 50% of Parties support Proposal 1. And assume 50% support Proposal 2 but could accept Proposal 1. If Parties only voted for the outcome, they most support, both proposals would fail. This would not be a logical outcome for the Convention or the species.]. So, they would vote yes to ensure at least the first proposal is adopted. Then, moving stepwise, they would vote yes on the second proposal. And the outcome would be as the 90% decided, the second proposal would be the decision (or, when as normal the proposals are first considered in Committee I, the recommendation of Committee I to the Conference).

Stepwise Approach

16. SC77 Doc. 11 outlined the following three scenarios with practical examples to help Parties come to a common understanding of the stepwise approach.

Scenario 1) Compared to current status, all proposals are moving in the same direction toward more restrictions. In this scenario, more than one proposal may be initially adopted, and the Parties decision to continue to adopt more restrictions through a stepwise approach means logically that the last proposal the Parties adopt is the decision of the Parties. They may adopt none and there is no change. They may adopt any one and that is the decision. They may adopt any two and the second adopted is the decision. They may adopt any three and the third adopted is the decision. And so on. Each time, the Parties make an active, informed, stepwise decision to add some amount more restrictions or reject adding more restrictions, based on the will of the Conference. After considering all the proposals, the largest adopted change is the decision.

Scenario 2) Compared to current status, proposals are moving in opposite directions toward less restrictions and toward more restrictions. If the Parties adopt a proposal to reduce restrictions, then they necessarily reject a proposal to increase restrictions for the same taxon. [A quick example illustrates this point: population of a species currently included in Appendix II; Proposal 1 is to delist the population, Proposal 2 is to transfer the population to Appendix I. Adoption of Proposal 1 necessarily implies rejection of Proposal 2 with regard to the population.] This is also logical. If at least two-thirds of the Parties find there should be fewer restrictions than there are currently for the trade in the taxon, then it is assumed they would not later vote to increase restrictions from the current status for the same taxon.

Scenario 3) Compared to current status, all proposals are moving in the same direction toward less restrictions. Because Rule 25.6 starts with the least restrictive proposal, if the Parties adopt the first proposal to reduce restrictions, then they have done as much as can be done at the meeting to reduce restrictions. [A quick example illustrates this point: if there is a zero export quota for the taxon and Proposal 1 is to increase the quota to 200, Proposal 2 is to increase the quota to 100, and Proposal 3 is to increase the quota to 50. Adoption of Proposal 1 necessarily implies rejection of Proposal 2 and Proposal 3.] This is also logical, and consistent with the outcomes of scenarios 1 and 2 above. The adoption of the first proposal in this case is farthest away from the current status, and necessarily rejects adoption of the other proposals that would not have moved as far from the current status.

17. Building on recommendations from the WG and in consideration of these three scenarios, the WG Chair suggested a new sentence to address scenario 1 and new parenthetical language to address scenarios 2 and 3, as found in paragraph 21 of SC77 Doc. 11.

Progress of the working group since SC77

18. Since time was limited at SC77 for discussion of this agenda item, SC members, Party observers and NGO observers were invited to provide comments to the document via CITES Notification No. 2023/130. In response to this Notification, comments were received from Australia, Brazil, the European Union, Japan, Kenya, the North American Region, and Born Free. Comments focused on the draft language presented in document SC77 Doc. 11, paragraph 21, and described in document SC77 Doc. 11, paragraph 15. Comments were shared with the WG members and discussions ensued to further the progress made on Rule 25.6.
19. The comments were mostly supportive of the proposed amendments to Rule 25.6 presented in document SC77 Doc. 11, paragraph 21. Additional comments, notably those from Australia and Brazil expressed the need for clarity and simplicity in the proposed amendments. Relating to the amendment proposed by Japan, described in document SC77 Doc. 11, paragraph 15, there was limited support and no opposition was expressed. To accommodate the comments from Japan, the Chair suggested amending the proposed text found in SC77 Doc. 11 paragraph 21 by adding at the following sentence to the end of the rule, which was agreed by the WG: "Nothing in the procedure stipulated in this paragraph is intended to affect the procedure in the other paragraphs of Rule 25."
20. Working Group members continued their work on the draft rule 25.6 using a stepwise approach from least restrictive to most restrictive with all proposals being introduced and discussed by the Parties to reach decisions on their adoption or rejection. While several NGO working group members (Center for Biological Diversity, David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation, Born Free, Natural Resources Defense Council, and the Global Law Alliance for Animals and Environment at Lewis Clark Law School) and Liberia still expressed a preference for starting with most restrictive proposal first, they could accept the updated way forward with

starting with the least restrictive proposal as long as all the proposals are discussed and put forward for decision. Other members of the WG Japan, Canada, Germany, and the United States supported the updated text with a slight edit to delete “should” in the first sentence, and edits were suggested to further clarify and simplify the parenthetical and move it into a footnote. Following comments provided by IWMC-World Conservation Trust and Canada, the WG acknowledged that even when differing proposals are presented, the CoP will remain enabled to find consensus when possible based on Rule 25.1, which would also clearly be preserved by the new final sentence at the end of the Rule 25.6. China offered additional comments for consideration. The first issue raised by China involved the use of the wording “same taxon” China noted that members had differing understanding of “the same” taxon. However, it was also noted that this same term is used in Rule 25.4 and a change would result in an inconsistency between the rules. The WG Chair recommended a clarification to replace the term “remaining taxon” with “other taxon remaining in the latter proposal” to better clarify the rule and resolve this issue, and this was agreed. A second issue raised by China related to the listing criteria of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) on *Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II*, however it was noted that potential amendments to the criteria or other resolutions were beyond the scope of the working group. It should be noted that China supported a systematic way to thinking and thus, all the Parties would be enabled to make informed decisions on a fair basis. Zimbabwe also offered additional comments, noting that if the Chair was required to indicate the implications of the adoption of one proposal for the other(s), and allow each of the proposals to be introduced prior to submitting any of them for discussion and decision, it should be fairly assumed that Parties would decide from an informed position and with the full knowledge of the implications of the decision hence, where applicable, automatic rejection would be possible. Zimbabwe also shared that it did not support adoption of incompatible or contrasting decisions. Although their preference was to keep the rule as it is currently written, they could accept moving forward with the work from this working group.

21. In light of the discussions, the WG Chair recommended inclusion of an additional sentence. See paragraph 22 below (“If any proposal to reduce the restrictive effect on the trade in the taxon is adopted, then no further decision will be made on proposals to add restrictions on the same trade for the same taxon.”). While the additional sentence was not considered necessary by all members of the WG, it was considered to further clarify the intent of the rule’s stepwise process that no incompatible or contrasting decisions would be adopted. In particular, if a proposal to reduce restrictions is adopted, then as outlined in scenario 2 and the new footnote any conflicting proposal to add restrictions on the same trade for the same taxon would not be put forward for decision. Therefore, Scenario 1 (described by the sentence “After this stepwise process, if more than one proposal is adopted to add restrictions for the same taxon, then the last proposal adopted will be the decision of the Conference for the taxon.”) would only be applicable to decide incrementally on multiple proposals to add restrictions if no conflicting proposal to reduce restrictions is adopted.
22. After further discussion within the WG, the WG proposed the following final recommendations for draft amendments to Rule 25.6 for consideration by the Standing Committee. With these amendments, the rule would maintain the least-to-most restrictive stepwise process that the working group agreed to early in the deliberations. It would ensure all proposals are introduced and have a fair chance to be heard, including consideration of all taxa in each proposal. It would ensure all proposals are decided unless necessarily rejected as described in the example scenarios. And it would not affect the operation of other paragraphs in Rule 25.

If two or more proposals including proposals amended in accordance with Rule 24, paragraph 2 or in accordance with paragraph 5 of this Rule, relate to the same taxon, but are different in substance, **the Chair shall so advise the Conference, clearly indicating the implications of the adoption of one proposal for the other(s), and allow each of the proposals to be introduced prior to submitting any of them for discussion and decision.** The Conference shall first decide on the proposal that will have the least restrictive effect on the trade and then on the proposal with the next least restrictive effect on the trade, and so on until all proposals have been submitted to decision. **If any proposal to reduce the restrictive effect on the trade in the taxon is adopted, then no further decision will be made on proposals to add restrictions on the same trade for the same taxon. After this stepwise process, if more than one proposal is adopted to add restrictions for the same taxon, then the last proposal adopted will be the decision of the Conference for the taxon. When however if, in relation to the same taxon,** the adoption of one proposal necessarily implies the rejection of another proposal,* the latter proposal shall **nevertheless** not be submitted to decision **in relation to any other taxon remaining in the latter proposal. Nothing in the procedure stipulated in this paragraph is intended to affect the procedure in the other paragraphs of Rule 25.**

*** E.g., if the effect of one proposal is to reduce the restrictive effect on the trade and the effect of another proposal is to increase the restrictive effect on the same trade for the same taxon, then adoption of one necessarily implies rejection of the other for the taxon.**

A clean version of the proposed new Rule 25.6 follows:

If two or more proposals including proposals amended in accordance with Rule 24, paragraph 2 or in accordance with paragraph 5 of this Rule, relate to the same taxon, but are different in substance, the Chair shall so advise the Conference, clearly indicating the implications of the adoption of one proposal for the other(s), and allow each of the proposals to be introduced prior to submitting any of them for discussion and decision. The Conference shall first decide on the proposal that will have the least restrictive effect on the trade and then on the proposal with the next least restrictive effect on the trade, and so on until all proposals have been submitted to decision. If any proposal to reduce the restrictive effect on the trade in the taxon is adopted, then no further decision will be made on proposals to add restrictions on the same trade for the same taxon. After this stepwise process, if more than one proposal is adopted to add restrictions for the same taxon, then the last proposal adopted will be the decision of the Conference for the taxon. If, in relation to the same taxon, the adoption of one proposal necessarily implies the rejection of another proposal,* the latter proposal shall nevertheless be submitted to decision in relation to any other taxon remaining in the latter proposal. Nothing in the procedure stipulated in this paragraph is intended to affect the procedure in the other paragraphs of Rule 25.

* E.g., if the effect of one proposal is to reduce the restrictive effect on the trade and the effect of another proposal is to increase the restrictive effect on the same trade for the same taxon, then adoption of one necessarily implies rejection of the other for the taxon.

The WG Chair notes that after concluding the deliberations and circulating the draft working group report to the WG, four Parties in the WG expressed their preference to retain the current rule with an amendment because of concerns with the stepwise approach. China raised concerns with the fairness of the stepwise process and its treatment of overlapping taxon in proposals. Unfortunately, time was insufficient for all WG members to discuss their new amended text of the existing Rule 25.6.

23. The WG agreed that the reports from this and the previous working group provide explanatory examples that can be used by the Secretariat to develop detailed reference material and guiding examples for the benefit of the future Chairs and the Parties.

Recommendations

24. The Standing Committee is invited to;
- a) take note of the progress made in implementation of Decision 18.1 (Rev. CoP19);
 - b) provide any advice or comments on the document or process;
 - c) consider proposing to the 20th meeting of the Conference of the Parties amendment to Rule 25.6 presented in paragraph 22; and
 - d) request the Secretariat to prepare detailed reference material and guiding examples for the benefit of future Chairs and the Parties as described in paragraph 23.