

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

Strategic matters

WORLD WILDLIFE TRADE REPORT

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.
2. At its 19th meeting (CoP19; Panama, 2022), the Conference of the Parties (CoP) adopted Decisions 19.30 and 19.31 on *World Wildlife Trade Report*, as follows:

Directed to the Secretariat

19.30 *The Secretariat shall:*

- a) *issue a Notification to the Parties providing the pilot World Wildlife Trade Report, seeking feedback and views on such a report and the potential utility and drawbacks of producing such a report periodically; and*
- b) *provide the responses received from the Notification to the Standing Committee and present findings and make recommendations for consideration by the Standing Committee.*

Directed to the Standing Committee, in consultation with the Animals and Plants Committees

- 19.31** *The Standing Committee shall review the responses to the Notification and the findings and recommendations of the Secretariat, consult with the Animals and Plants Committees as appropriate and make recommendations to the 20th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.*

Implementation of Decision 19.30

3. The Secretariat published Notification to the Parties No. 2023/109 on 8 September 2023 inviting feedback and views of Parties on the pilot *World Wildlife Trade Report* (hereinafter referred to as “the Report”) and the potential utility and drawbacks of producing such a report on a regular basis. Notification to the Parties No. 2023/130 issued after the 77th meeting of the Standing Committee (Geneva, November 2023) reiterated this invitation and extended the deadline to submit responses.
4. Responses were received from the following Parties: Argentina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, China, Colombia, the European Union and its Member States, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria, South Africa, the United States of America and Zambia. Comments were also received from the following organizations: the United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Born Free Foundation, the International Fund for Animal Welfare, Species Survival Network, TRAFFIC, Wildlife Conservation Society and the World Wide Fund for Nature. In addition, the Animal Welfare Institute, Born Free Foundation, Center for Biological Diversity, David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation, Fondation Franz Weber, Pro Wildlife and Species Survival Network submitted a joint response.
5. Parties and organizations expressed their views about the objective, substance, methodology, and time frame and usefulness of the Report. They commented on the potential utility and drawbacks of the Report

as well as on the regular preparation of such reports proposed in document [CoP19 Doc.12](#). The summary below synthesizes the views expressed by focusing first on potential utility and other positive considerations, then on drawbacks and other concerns, and finally on additional considerations on the possible ways forward proposed in the responses.

Potential usefulness and other considerations in support of regular production of the Report

6. In support of the regular preparation of the Report, Parties and organizations highlighted the importance of having well-structured information on the routes, scale and patterns of international trade in CITES-listed species, the monetary value of the trade, conservation impacts and socioeconomic benefits of such trade. They welcomed the fact that the Report presents such information in an accessible way which is particularly helpful for a wider audience. The feedback varied considerably from recognizing the potential value of the Report to fully supporting the regular preparation of such reports.
 - a) Brazil considered the periodic publication of the Report to be pertinent and appropriate, noting that the information on trade in wood products would be particularly valuable by showing a global perspective of such trade, drawing parallels with the context within Brazil. According to Brazil, reports of this nature would be fundamental for identifying the main taxonomic groups traded, their origin (either wild-harvested or captive-bred/artificially propagated), as well as pointing out positive and negative impacts of the trade on the conservation of species listed in the Appendices.
 - b) Canada saw value in the Report as a communication tool and, with some reservation further described below, noted that producing the Report for each CoP might be a good tool to summarize the impacts of listing species at previous CoPs. It could also include the results on activities relating to capacity-building and conservation success stories and livelihood case studies summaries from the implementation reports submitted by Parties.
 - c) China considered that the Report held significant importance and should be produced regularly and recommended that efforts be made to enhance its usefulness.
 - d) Colombia welcomed the Report and shared some concrete suggestions for improving future reports which are included in the section below.
 - e) The European Union and its Member States considered the Report to be a useful addition to the available resources on international wildlife trade, particularly as it presented such information in an accessible way. This made it a useful tool to communicate to the wider public how international wildlife trade works, the estimated monetary value, and how better regulation of trade could, under certain circumstances, produce positive conservation and livelihood outcomes. In their view, the Report highlighted the importance of CITES enhancing its visibility.
 - f) Indonesia welcomed and supported the Report and the suggestion of periodic publication of such reports aiming to provide a comprehensive overview of wildlife trade from various perspectives, including the routes, scale and patterns of international trade in CITES-listed species, the monetary values, conservation impacts and socioeconomic benefits of such trade, as well as the interrelationships between legal and illegal trade. Indonesia indicated that such a report would be an important tool for CITES Parties in pursuing a balance between conservation and sustainable use, which would be especially important for Indonesia since several of its species were among the top 5 most traded species globally.
 - g) Mexico considered that the content of the Report is adequate and shared some specific suggestions for improvement, including two alternative scenarios for consideration, included below.
 - h) New Zealand (on behalf of the Oceania region) considered that there would be potential value in the Report.
 - i) South Africa indicated that the Report contained a wealth of valuable information important for assessing the current status of international wildlife trade. The infographics and figures were well presented, easy to interpret, and a rich resource illustrating global trade in CITES-listed species. South Africa considered that the regular production of such a report would allow CITES Parties, stakeholders, non-governmental organizations, and the general public to keep track of global trends in wildlife trade. It would be especially useful to monitor the species that dominate overall trade and wild-sourced trade, regional trade patterns, and trade in species/genera recently included in the Appendices.

- j) The United States of America underlined that it would be important to understand the patterns and trends in CITES-listed species, and in particular the conservation impacts of such trade, and would be open to further discussion on which sections and topics in the Report might be appropriate to consider for future reports or alternative solutions to providing useful information for the use of Parties. The United States of America also noted that the financial value of trade in CITES-listed species would be important from various perspectives, including at national level for CITES implementation and the creation of development projects.
- k) Zambia noted that the Report had attempted to provide a comprehensive overview of international trade in CITES-listed species and considered that the Report had clearly defined the routes, scale and patterns of international trade in CITES-listed species together with values, conservation impacts and socioeconomic benefits of such trade, as well as linkages between legal and illegal trade. Zambia added that legal trade in CITES-listed species provided a significant contribution to its local communities that were mainly found in the remote parts of the country. Zambia stated that the periodic production of the Report would ensure that there would be adequate data to inform Parties to the Convention on the realistic status of trade in CITES-listed species which would be beneficial to decision-makers.
- l) UNEP-WCMC saw value in a regular assessment of the status of the implementation of the Convention, building on the Report, adding that future editions of the Report could act as a mechanism to compile and assess the *CITES Strategic Vision* indicators to track progress towards the CITES goals. It might also be an avenue for compiling and communicating wildlife trade-related information that could be used in the context of monitoring progress towards the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. UNEP-WCMC saw many benefits for the Convention to have this type of regular stocktaking to ensure that there was an improved monitoring mechanism to assess whether CITES was achieving its objectives and to identify any gaps to ensure that the trade would be legal and sustainable.
- m) ITTO recognized the value of such a Report and noted that the Report attempted to address some of the limitations that came to light in many of the studies that ITTO had carried out in reviewing the trade in CITES-listed timber species. This concerned particularly the lack of reporting on the value of shipments in CITES annual reports, and the inconsistency in the use of units such as “pieces” and “carvings” that made the aggregation of quantity information based on these reports difficult or impossible.
- n) TRAFFIC was of the opinion that an in-depth analysis of global legal trade in CITES-listed species, an exploration of the socioeconomic value and associated conservation benefits of such trade, as well as information to improve the understanding of the links between legal and illegal wildlife trade, would be invaluable. TRAFFIC considered that a regularly available report of this nature would enhance knowledge of trade in CITES-listed species and would support Parties’ decision-making processes, thus resulting in better informed national and international wildlife trade policies. TRAFFIC encouraged Parties to provide feedback that would ensure that a robust, inclusive, balanced and evidence-based approach would be taken in the development of the Report and that the output would meet the expectations and needs of the Parties.
- o) The World Wide Fund for Nature considered the Report to be an excellent and highly accessible overview of global trade in CITES-listed species and expressed the hope that funds would be available to expand on this work.

Drawbacks and other concerns

7. Funding needs, reporting burden, lack of value added, the difficulty and sensitivity of collecting price data were among the key concerns of some of the respondents. Some Parties perceived that the Report was biased on the positive impact of legal trade in CITES-listed species and that the intent of the Report went beyond the mandate of the Convention.
 - a) Argentina considered that it was not clear how the Report would contribute to ensuring that species listed in CITES would receive the required protection, in a similar way that processes such as non-detriment findings, legal acquisition findings or the Review of Significant Trade did. The preparation of the Report would entail a significant amount of work that would be difficult to carry out due to the collection of the data and its variability and low reliability. Due to the volume of work, the funds required, as well as the difficulty of collecting reliable data and the sensitivity of the data, Argentina did not support the proposal to regularly publish the Report.

- b) Burkina Faso expressed concerns over the significant financial and human resources to be mobilized for this purpose, which it considered could instead be used to support the work already underway to implement the Convention. Burkina Faso was of the view that the Report went beyond the mandate of the Convention which was not intended to demonstrate the benefits that trade can bring, but rather to protect such species from overexploitation. It therefore concluded that a periodic report would not be necessary.
- c) Canada called for consideration of the factors of cost, capacity, value added, and resources needed from Parties versus the use of the Report as a tool to influence national and international policy. Canada warned that the dependence of the preparation of such a Report on extrabudgetary funding made the latter very concerning as CITES was already very polarized. It was therefore very important that the Report remain neutral and not vulnerable to influence by special interest groups.
- d) The European Union and its Member States considered that the added value of the Report in terms of contributing to the CITES decision-making process or everyday management operations was unclear. Given the limited resources and capacities of the CITES Secretariat, concerns were raised as to additional workload needed to produce such a report that might come at the expense of responding to other, more urgent, needs. The European Union also observed that the Report lacked balance in terms of providing the overview of positive and negative impacts of the trade on wild populations and ecosystems and especially on society and economy. With regards to the price data, the European Union considered that the inclusion of price data as a requested data field within CITES annual reports would significantly increase the reporting burden for CITES authorities and might require adaptation of permit issuing process and potentially also additional legal basis as Management Authorities did not necessarily currently have access to such information. The European Union noted that, due to frequent and substantial variation in prices, the price data had to be seen as a momentary glimpse of the situation and could only be used as a very rough estimate of the value. The European Union also warned that providing the highest estimated unit price might have some negative consequences on the species.
- e) Kenya did not support the periodic production of the Report due to its concern over cost implications and the belief that resources should be deployed to other priority areas for the implementation of the Convention, including compliance assistance for Parties. Kenya also considered the proposal to include price data in annual or implementation reports of the Parties not practical as the monetary value and price data were often considered sensitive and might be difficult for authorities to collect or estimate.
- f) Due to its concern over the lack of reliable and quality information, at the current stage, Mexico saw no benefits in producing the Report periodically. It further explained in detail the risks of generating a report with the objectives proposed and with the incomplete and biased information that was currently available.
- g) New Zealand, on behalf of the Oceania region, shared the concern that the collection of price data often involved commercially sensitive information and, for some Parties, would require legislative reform to request this information. This could be a significant problem in some countries and the proposed process could be an unnecessary additional reporting burden. Any decision concerning these value data therefore had to be non-binding.
- h) The United States of America expressed concerns over the added burden to Parties and the Secretariat in contributing to and evaluating such a report periodically; the uncertainty of the utility of regularly producing such a report, especially how it would advance the purposes of the Convention; cost implications and the availability and quality of data in order to draw meaningful conclusions. It therefore urged caution in suggesting any continuation of this effort. In addition, the United States of America provided the following specific considerations:
 - i) The fundamental step to understand patterns and trends of the trade should be to improve the quality of the CITES trade data which could only be achieved by improving the capacity of Parties to effectively manage and report such data.
 - ii) The conservation impacts of legal trade in CITES-listed species were already considered in ongoing work such as non-detriment findings (NDF) and development of NDF guidance, the Periodic Review of the Appendices, the Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species, etc.

- iii) The data and methodologies used in the chapter on the financial value of trade in CITES-listed species were significantly flawed and therefore did not lend to drawing any meaningful and objective conclusions regarding the issue.
- iv) The examination of the impact of CITES trade on socioeconomic effects extended beyond the conservation aim of the Convention.

The United States found that these drawbacks of the Report outweighed the potential utility overall and was unable at this time to support producing such a report periodically.

- i) The Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and the Associations of Midwest, Northeast, West, and Southeast Fish and Wildlife Agencies indicated that it would be difficult to allow Parties and observers to have a comprehensive review of the Report before its publication. They considered that the costs associated with the preparation of such reports would be better spent on ensuring effective implementation of CITES' ongoing work.
- j) Born Free Foundation was of the view that the Report was biased towards trade and went beyond the mandate of CITES. The organization pointed out that the impacts of trade on conservation and socioeconomic aspects were difficult to assess, highly variable and subject to multiple factors. In addition, the Report's preparation between each CoP would be expensive and divert limited funding from core work.
- k) The International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) advised against dedicating CITES resources to producing this Report, given how stretched they already are. The overemphasis on the monetary value of products in trade in the Report did not address the primary concerns or scope of CITES. IFAW considered that the Report failed to address the need to consider the impact of species loss and overexploitation on indigenous peoples and local communities' livelihoods and culture.
- l) Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) expressed concerns over funding needs and reporting burden. It also questioned the usefulness of collecting price data.
- m) In their joint response, the Animal Welfare Institute, Born Free Foundation, Center for Biological Diversity, David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation, Fondation Franz Weber, Pro Wildlife and Species Survival Network were of the opinion that the Report did not respond to needs identified by the treaty or collectively by CITES Parties and added more work to CITES' already overburdened mandate.

Additional considerations on the way forward

8. The following additional considerations on the way forward were offered by some of the respondents as alternatives under the assumption that the preparation of such reports would be an option.

a) Timeframe and frequency

Canada considered that, given the exceptional reporting burden of Parties related to specific ongoing CITES initiatives, producing such a report during each CoP cycle might be an unsustainable burden on the Parties and the Secretariat. In the same vein, the European Union and its Member States considered that it could be useful to compile such a report every five to ten years, depending on the availability of funding and the workload of the Secretariat, under the condition that no additional reporting requirements be imposed on Parties.

Colombia suggested that the timeframe covered by such reports should be consistent for all analysis in the report, e.g. for both the overview of CITES trade and the estimation of the financial value of CITES exports, in an effort to ensure comparative and meaningful analysis of the topics discussed.

b) Authorship

New Zealand, on behalf of the Oceania region, suggested that it might be more appropriate for the report to be prepared by a university or institute. Wildlife Conservation Society suggested that CITES Parties might wish to mobilize the considerable scientific and technical expertise within civil society to produce a regular report on the state of CITES-listed species and their conservation, use and trade.

c) *Methodology*

Colombia stressed the need to define the general methodology to estimate export values, as well as values for plants and animals. The Party further proposed that guidelines be developed under the Convention for the periodic preparation of future reports. To achieve the objective of the Report and to demonstrate the benefits of trade on the conservation of species, Colombia suggested that it would be necessary to ensure consistency in the information from statistics and that the information on the conservation of species must be provided by the Parties.

d) *Content*

Having expressed its concerns on the challenges of producing such a report on a regular basis, Canada stated that, as an alternative consideration, a report for each CoP could summarize the impacts of listing species at previous CoPs, the results of activities relating to capacity-building and conservation success stories and livelihood case studies summaries from the implementation reports submitted by Parties. Otherwise, if the truly valuable elements of the report could be identified, they could be incorporated in other ways, for example in the CITES Wildlife Trade Review portal or a theme page on the CITES website.

Colombia discouraged the use of “grey literature” in the Report since it could either overstate or underestimate trade or conservation impacts which might lead to erroneous conclusions. Instead, Colombia encouraged the establishment of a mechanism to compile data from official sources or records from Parties.

Kenya highlighted the importance of objective and meaningful reporting which should, among other things, include information on the potential of negative impacts from wildlife trade.

Mexico pointed out that information available at national level on the economic, social and ecological issues linked to the listing of species in CITES was limited and insufficient to feed the Report. The Party therefore proposed two alternative scenarios:

- i) compile and thoroughly analyse case studies provided by Parties on international trade in CITES-listed species in order to focus on the ecological, economic and social aspects of wildlife trade; or
- ii) use the results of the evaluations in the context of the *Strategic Vision* indicators to be agreed upon by the Parties in order to have solid data on the implementation of CITES.

Nigeria suggested that Parties might wish to mandate the regular development and dissemination of a report on collective progress towards the accomplishment of CITES Strategic Vision objectives and the goals and targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KM-GBF), specifically using the indicators and types of data agreed to by Parties through intergovernmental consultation.

With respect to regional trade patterns, South Africa recommended that the analysis determine whether the top exporting regions are trading mostly in non-indigenous species, and similarly, which regions were the major exporters of indigenous species. Given the importance of the conservation and socioeconomic impacts of legal trade in CITES-listed species, South Africa suggested that research and analyses on such impacts should be conducted on a regular basis as it provided an invaluable method of monitoring the impact of CITES so that CITES implementation could be adapted accordingly to enhance the positive impacts and minimize the negative impacts.

UNEP-WCMC proposed that, in future iterations of the Report, a chapter on the conservation status of CITES-listed species should be included. It might also be an avenue for compiling and communicating wildlife trade-related information that could be used in the context of monitoring progress towards the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. The latter was echoed by the Wildlife Conservation Society.

e) *Scope*

In case the Report was not deemed useful in its entirety, the United States of America considered that the summary statistics in the *CITES at a Glance* section could be informative and might be produced periodically as a stand-alone product.

f) *Mechanism for further consideration*

Nigeria recommended the establishment of an intersessional working group to consider the value of the Report and whether it could be reframed to be more useful for Parties.

g) *Funding*

ITTO considered that some of the new funds recently pledged to a new phase of the CITES Tree Species Programme could be targeted at addressing some of these trade data issues for timber species. The source of funding was not discussed in other responses.

Feedback from the Animals and Plants Committees (Decision 19.31)

9. As requested by Decision 19.31, the Secretariat shared the above feedback and views of Parties on the World Wildlife Trade Report through document PC27 Doc. 11 / AC33 Doc. 12 which was considered at the joint session of the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee and the 27th meeting of the Plants Committee held in Geneva, Switzerland from 12 to 13 July 2024. The Animals and Plants Committees noted the document and requested the Secretariat to consider the comments made in plenary in its report to the Standing Committee (see summary records AC33 SR and PC27 SR). The discussion was summarized as follows in the summary record of the joint session:

The AC representative for Europe (Mr. Benyr), Israel, New Zealand, the United Republic of Tanzania and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland did not support the World Wildlife Trade Report in its current format but recognized its value in providing a global overview of legal trade in CITES species that could be useful as a communication tool linked to the CITES Strategic Vision. The United Kingdom, supported by the United Republic of Tanzania, suggested that it could be scaled back to the levels and patterns of legal trade (i.e. Chapter 2) with a more detailed analysis. Argentina and Zimbabwe indicated that they could be amenable to the option presented by the United Kingdom. New Zealand and the United Republic of Tanzania expressed concern about the analysis in the report, including the use of price data.

The AC representative for Europe (Mr. Benyr) and New Zealand did not support the production of the Report every three years and indicated the need for a more dynamic alternative. The World Wide Fund for Nature suggested that a detailed report could be prepared for 2030, the last year of the CITES Strategic Vision.

The PC representative for North America (Mr. Boles), the AC representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori), Argentina, India, Kenya and Wildlife Conservation Society estimated that the report drew too many human and financial resources and could constitute a reporting burden on Parties. The PC representative for North America (Mr. Boles) suggested that any additional resources could be allocated to strengthen the CITES Trade database, including the Trade View.

China reminded Parties of Resolution Conf. 8.3 on Recognition of the benefits of trade in wildlife and of Resolution Conf. 16.6 (Rev. CoP18) on CITES and livelihoods that recognize the benefits of trade, including for livelihoods. China underscored the importance for Parties to understand the significance of trade in CITES-listed species for the global economy and noted that any technical issues could be resolved and should not be used as an excuse. They supported the regular production of a World Wildlife Trade Report. This statement was supported by South Africa.

Discussion and possible ways forward

10. Views expressed by Parties in response to the Notifications and the feedback provided by the Animals and Plants Committees on the future production of a World Wildlife Trade Report are diverse and divergent, although there appears to be a general recognition of the merit of such a report. The difference in opinion largely lies on the scope of the report and the frequency of the production, as well as the human and financial resources associated with the production of the report. Furthermore, Parties refer to different uses of the Report, ranging from a source for national briefing materials on global trade in taxa/commodity of national interest, a communication tool on the trade trends to a wider audience in an accessible manner, a visibility material for demonstrating the impact of CITES to a tool that can contribute to informed decision-making.
11. Based on an analysis of the feedback and inputs received from Parties and observers and taking into account the human and financial resource constraints of the CITES Secretariat as well as of Parties, the Secretariat

would like to propose a two-pronged approach for the next two intersessional periods. The idea would be to prepare two different types of reports serving different purposes and with a different content as follows:

- a) For CoP21 (2028), the Secretariat proposes that a short Overview Report providing an **overview of CITES trade** be prepared. This could include an overview of the routes, trends and patterns of the trade change over time from a global perspective, and potentially also some analyses of regional trends and trade trends in major taxa. Such information would help Parties to the Convention and other stakeholders to keep track of the trends in global trade in CITES-listed species. There appear to be no other report that serves this purpose. In this context, information provided earlier in a similar report showed a new trend with a significant shift from wild-sources towards sources from captive-breeding or artificially propagation. The analysis of data records showing this shift has been very useful in raising awareness on the characteristics of trade in CITES-listed species and in better informing policy-making. The preparation of the Overview Report could be led by UNEP-WCMC with support of partners when necessary and in consultation with the Secretariat. Such a Report would be based on CITES trade data. In the past, UNEP-WCMC has produced similar reports such as [information document CoP16 Inf.32](#) in 2013.
 - b) Prior to CoP22 (2031), the Secretariat proposes that a **comprehensive World Wildlife Trade Report** be prepared for publication in 2030 on the occasion of the final year of the CITES Strategic Vision: 2021-2030. In addition to the content of the Overview of CITES Trade, the Comprehensive Report would aim to provide insights on both the positive and negative impacts of international trade in CITES-listed species on the conservation of species and landscapes/habitats. The Report could also consider broader issues related to the positive and negative impacts on livelihoods, as well as the role such trade may play in providing incentives for habitat conservation, thereby reducing the risks to wildlife from alternative forms of land use. It would also consider the contribution of CITES to achieving the goals in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDG), in particular to stimulate investment in biodiversity conservation and provide incentives for achieving such goals. The preparation of the Report could be coordinated by the Secretariat with contributions from partner organizations on the parts of the Report that are most relevant to their areas of expertise and mandates, using the experience from the preparation of the pilot World Wildlife Trade Report.
12. The Secretariat proposes to alternate between an Overview Report and a Comprehensive World Wildlife Trade Report in the future, if Parties so agree. In view of the diversity of the comments and inputs provided on the pilot World Wildlife Trade Report, the Secretariat would consult with the Standing Committee on the scope and content of both reports, including by presenting an outline of the reports at the relevant meeting(s).
 13. To help decide whether the monetary value of legal trade in CITES-listed species could be included in the long-term Comprehensive Report, the Secretariat proposes that Parties be invited to provide feedback on the feasibility and challenges in providing price data on a voluntary basis. Importantly, the Secretariat notes that price data will only be used to demonstrate the aggregate monetary value of the trade at a global level and not to be tied to individual transactions, Parties or taxa.
 14. The Secretariat would also endeavor to raise funds from external sources to support the preparation of both the Overview Report and the comprehensive World Wildlife Trade Report, noting that the pilot World Wildlife Trade Report was prepared with extrabudgetary resources.

Recommendations

15. The Standing Committee is invited to:
 - a) review the comments from Parties, other stakeholders and the Animals and Plants Committees summarized in the present document;
 - b) consider the way forward presented in paragraphs 11-15 above;
 - c) review and submit the draft decisions in the Annex to the present document to the Conference of the Parties; and
 - c) agree that Decisions 19.30 and 19.31 have been implemented and can be proposed for deletion.

DRAFT DECISIONS ON
WORLD WILDLIFE TRADE REPORT

Directed to Parties

20.AA On voluntary basis, Parties are invited to:

- a) explore the feasibility of collating and compiling information at the national level on the conservation and socio-economic impacts of trade in CITES-listed species and of including price data of CITES specimens in trade in annual reports; and
- b) share with the Secretariat their experience on the feasibility and challenges in collecting and sharing the above-mentioned information.

Directed to the Standing Committee

20.BB The Standing Committee shall

- a) review and provide feedback on the outline of an Overview Report, the initial outline of a comprehensive World Wildlife Trade report, submitted by the Secretariat under Decision 20.CC, paragraph a) and the study prepared by the Secretariat under Decision 20.CC, paragraph d);
- b) review the report by the Secretariat prepared under Decision 20.CC, paragraph c); and
- c) make recommendations to the 21st meeting of the Conference of the Parties, as appropriate.

Directed to the Secretariat

20.CC Subject to extrabudgetary resources, the Secretariat shall:

- a) prepare an outline of the Overview Report and an initial outline of the comprehensive World Wildlife Trade Report for publication at CoP21 and CoP22 respectively with explanations on the content, authorship and methodology to be used for the preparation of the reports for consideration by the Standing Committee;
- b) prepare an Overview Report providing information on global trade in CITES-listed species, covering the trends and patterns of global trade in CITES-listed species as observed during the reporting period, and submit it as an information document to the 21st meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP21); and
- c) compile Parties' inputs from Decision 20.AA and share the findings with the Standing Committee.