

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



Thirtieth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 16-21 July 2018

Interpretation and implementation matters

Trade control and traceability

DEFINITION OF THE TERM 'APPROPRIATE AND
ACCEPTABLE DESTINATIONS'

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.
2. At its 17th meeting (CoP17, Johannesburg, 2016), the Conference of the Parties adopted the following Decisions on *Definition of the term 'appropriate and acceptable destinations'*:

Directed to the Secretariat

17.178 *The Secretariat shall, subject to available resources, report to the 29th meeting of the Animals Committee and the 69th meeting of the Standing Committee on the history and implementation of Resolution Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP17) on Definition of the term 'appropriate and acceptable destinations', and Article III, paragraphs 3(b) and 5(b), regarding findings that recipients of living specimens of CITES Appendix-I species are suitably equipped to house and care for them.*

Directed to the Animals Committee

17.179 *The Animals Committee shall, at its 29th meeting:*

- a) *consider the report of the Secretariat regarding Resolution Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP17) on Definition of the term 'appropriate and acceptable destinations', and make recommendations and develop guidance, as appropriate, for consideration of the Standing Committee and the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties;*
- b) *consider the report of the Secretariat regarding implementation of the requirements in Article III, paragraphs 3(b) and 5(b), regarding findings that recipients of living specimens of CITES Appendix-I species are suitably equipped to house and care for them, and make recommendations and prepare guidance, as appropriate, for consideration of the Standing Committee and the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.*

Directed to the Standing Committee

17.180 *At its 69th meeting, the Standing Committee shall:*

- a) *consider the report of the Secretariat, including any information from the Animals Committee, regarding Resolution Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP17) on Definition of the term 'appropriate and acceptable destinations', and make recommendations and develop*

guidance, as appropriate, for consideration at the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

- b) *consider the report of the Secretariat, including any information from the Animals Committee, regarding implementation of the requirements in Article III, paragraphs 3(b) and 5(b), regarding findings that recipients of living specimens of CITES Appendix-I species are suitably equipped to house and care for them and make recommendations and develop guidance, as appropriate, for consideration at the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.*

3. The requirement for a determination of 'appropriate and acceptable destinations' currently only applies to trade in *Ceratotherium simum simum* (Southern white rhinoceros) from South Africa and Swaziland; and to the export of live specimens of certain African populations of *Loxodonta africana* (African elephants). The current annotation to the Appendix II listing of certain African elephant populations, adopted at the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP14, The Hague, 2007), states in part "For the exclusive purpose of allowing trade in live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations, as defined in Resolution Conf. 11.20, for Botswana and Zimbabwe and for *in situ* conservation programmes from Namibia and South Africa".

History of Resolution Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP17)

4. The phrase 'appropriate and acceptable destinations' was first introduced following South Africa's proposal at the 9th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP9, Fort Lauderdale, 1994) to transfer its population of white rhinoceroses to Appendix II for the exclusive purpose of, *inter alia*, allowing trade in live specimens. The original proposal was amended to include 'appropriate and acceptable destinations' with the proponents explaining that the text was to prevent trade in rhinoceros horn being reopened [see [CoP9 Com. I 9.9 \(Rev.\)](#)]. The Conference of the Parties agreed to the additional condition that such trade should be authorized only to 'appropriate and acceptable destinations'. The same words were subsequently used in an annotation in relation to trade in live African elephants from Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe at the 10th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP10, Harare, 1997).
5. The text of the draft resolution on Definition of the term 'appropriate and acceptable destinations' proposed by Kenya and presented in document [CoP11 Doc. 26](#) (which was not adopted) stated:
- a) *that, where the term 'appropriate and acceptable destinations' appears in an annotation to the listing of a species in Appendix II of the Convention with reference to the export of live animals, this term shall be defined to mean destinations where animals will be:*
- i) *humanely treated;*
- ii) *free to exhibit a normal range behaviour, including social behaviour; and*
- iii) *able to contribute to the conservation of their species in the wild, including a likely possibility of successful breeding;*
- b) *that, if a number of potential destinations are available, priority should be given to destinations in range States where the animals can live in a wild or semi-wild state;*
- c) *that an annotation restricting trade in live animals to 'appropriate and acceptable destinations' shall be interpreted to mean that only export, and not re-export, is permitted under its terms; and*
- d) *that it is the responsibility of the Management Authority of the exporting State to determine that the terms of the annotation have been met;*

Furthermore, it went on to recommend that the Management Authority of a State of export, when considering whether to issue a permit for the export of live animals covered by such an annotation:

- a) *consult with the Scientific Authority in the State of import to determine whether the intended destination in the State meets the definition set out in this Resolution;*
- b) *make any other enquiries necessary to determine whether the proposed destination meets the definition of 'appropriate and acceptable', including public consultation;*

- c) *refuse to issue the export permit if the Scientific Authority of the State of import states that the intended destination does not meet the definition set out in this resolution, or if other cogent evidence is available showing that the definition is not met; and*
- d) *prepare a report detailing the reasons why the export permit was granted or refused, and communicate this to the Secretariat;*

6. When the draft resolution was being proposed at the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP11, Gigiri, 2000), the Secretariat commented that the proposal was due to a difference of opinion relating to interpretation of the term ‘appropriate and acceptable destinations’ regarding a shipment in 1998 of 30 elephant calves from the Tuli Block region of Botswana to South Africa, rather than because of a persistent and ongoing problem in the interpretation of the term (see document [CoP11 Doc. 26](#)).
7. When the text for Resolution Conf. 11.20 was adopted ([CoP11 Com 11.35](#)), it read as follows:

The Conference of the Parties to the Convention

AGREES that, where the term ‘appropriate and acceptable destinations’ appears in an annotation to the listing of a species in Appendix II of the Convention with reference to the export or international trade of live animals, this term shall be defined to mean destinations where the Scientific Authority of the State on import is satisfied that the proposed recipient of a living specimen is suitably equipped to house and care for it.

This text is identical to the requirements of Article 3 (b) of the Convention, which applies to trade in live specimens of Appendix I species.

8. Resolution Conf. 11.20 remained unchanged until CoP17 when the United States of America submitted a proposal to amend it (see document [CoP17 Doc. 40](#)).
9. The United States introduced document [CoP17 Doc.40](#) and stated that “Given the ongoing and unprecedented threats to elephant and rhinoceros populations, we believe it is appropriate to re-evaluate the measures in place under CITES for trade in live Appendix-II animals subject to ‘appropriate and acceptable destination’ annotations.”, and so suggested amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.20 [[CoP17 Com. II Rec. 5 \(Rev. 1\)](#)]. The US included conditions regarding the use of animals and their offspring traded under the annotation with respect to commercial trade and sport hunting. The Secretariat commented that “no information has been provided that the original guidance under Resolution Conf. 11.20 was not being followed by Parties, or that any of the animals exported under the annotation or their offspring have been subsequently sport-hunted.” In response to the comments by the Secretariat, the United States clarified that they were not asserting that guidelines were not being followed by Parties, but that they considered these guidelines to be insufficient, observing that the use of animals in sport-hunting activities outside range States was being considered by some ventures and that allowing commercial trade in parts and products of animals exported under an appropriate and acceptable destinations annotation would fuel demand and contribute to poaching of elephants and rhinos [[CoP17 Com. II Rec. 5 \(Rev. 1\)](#)].
10. The proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.20 on *Definition of the term ‘appropriate and acceptable* and draft decisions in document CoP17 Com. II. 30 (Rev. 1), as amended in summary record CoP17 Com. II Rec. 13, were adopted by the Conference of the Parties [[CoP17 Plen. Rec. 4 \(Rev. 1\)](#)].
11. The principle amendments to the Resolution are underlined below:

The Conference of the Parties to the Convention

1. *AGREES that, where the term ‘appropriate and acceptable destinations’ appears in an annotation to the listing of a species in Appendix II of the Convention with reference to the ~~export of or international~~ trade in live animals, this term shall be defined to mean destinations where:*
 - a) the Scientific Authority of the State of import is satisfied that the proposed recipient of a living specimen is suitably equipped to house and care for it; and*
 - b) the Scientific Authorities of the State of import and the State of export are satisfied that the trade would promote in situ conservation*

2. ENCOURAGES that any permit authorizing trade of live rhinoceroses or elephants under an 'appropriate and acceptable destinations' annotation contain a condition stating that the rhinoceros horn or elephant ivory from those animals and from their progeny may not enter commercial trade and be sport hunted outside of their historic range.

3. RECOMMENDS that all Parties have in place legislative, regulatory, enforcement, or other measures to prevent illegal and detrimental trade in live elephants and rhinoceroses and the minimise the risk of injury, damage to health and cruel treatment of live elephants and rhinoceroses in trade.

12. The adoption of the revised Resolution Conf. 11.20 (Rev CoP17) was accompanied Decisions 17.178-180 indicated in paragraph 2 above.

Article III, paragraphs 3 (b) and 5 (b)

13. As noted above, the original definition of the term 'appropriate and acceptable destinations' contained in paragraph 1 a) of Resolution Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP17) is identical to that used in the Convention. Article III, paragraph 3 (b) states that *the import of any specimen of a species included in Appendix I shall require the prior grant and presentation of an import permit and either an export permit or a re-export certificate. An import permit shall only be granted when a **Scientific Authority of the State of import is satisfied that the proposed recipient of a living specimen is suitably equipped to house and care for it.*** Paragraph 5 (b) states that in the case of *the introduction from the sea of any specimen of a species included in Appendix I shall require the prior grant of a certificate from a Management Authority of the State of introduction. A certificate shall only be granted when ... a **Management Authority of the State of introduction is satisfied that the proposed recipient of a living specimen is suitably equipped to house and care for it.***

Implementation of Decision 17.178

14. A revised timeframe was agreed at the 29th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC29, Geneva, July 2017) and the 69th meeting of the Standing Committee (SC69, Geneva, November 2017) to implement Decision 17.178, such that the Secretariat will report to this meeting of the Animals Committee and the 70th meeting of the Standing Committee.

15. At AC29, in document [AC29 Doc.18](#), the Secretariat informed the Animals Committee that it would consult with Parties on how the provisions in Resolution Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP17) were currently being implemented, whether they had encountered any problems, and if there were any cases where the provisions of the Resolution were found to be inadequate or to have been abused. The Secretariat further asked the Committee to suggest if guidance might be required to help Parties determine what would be considered an 'appropriate and acceptable destination'. The summary record from AC29 (AC29 Sum. Rec.) stated that during the plenary discussions "*Parties suggested that it would be important for the Secretariat not only to focus on cases where the Resolution had been found inadequate or abused, but also to catalogue instances where the provisions of the Resolution had been successfully implemented. Other Parties stressed that guidelines of what 'appropriate and acceptable destinations' means would be helpful, suggesting that a broad scoping study that covered information on food, housing, safety and climate zone, etc. should be included in a such a study. Overall, Parties felt that more time might be needed to assess the revised provisions in Resolution Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP17) on Definition of the term 'appropriate and acceptable destinations', and some voiced concern that this was essentially an animal welfare issue. Other participants recognised the importance of ensuring wildlife was delivered to facilities that are suitably equipped and suggested that broad guidance, as well as species-specific guidance on caring and housing wildlife would be useful.*

16. The Committee established an intersessional working group on the implementation of Decision 17.179 and the requirements in Article III, paragraph 3 (b) and 5 (b) of the Convention with the following mandate:

Review the study undertaken by the Secretariat in accordance with Decision 17.178 and draft findings and recommendations for consideration at the 30th meeting of the Animals Committee.

The membership was decided as follows: the AC representatives of Africa (Mr. Mensah) and North America (Ms. Gnam), and the acting representative of Asia (Mr. Ishii) (Co-Chairs); Argentina, Canada, China, Estonia, European Union, France, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Netherlands, Russian Federation, South Africa, Spain, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, and Zimbabwe; and International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN); Animal Welfare Institute, Association

of Zoos and Aquariums, Born Free Foundation, Conservation Force, Fondation Franz Weber, German Society of Herpetology (DGHT), Global Eye, Humane Society International, International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), Lewis and Clark College - International Environmental Law Project, ProWildlife, Safari Club International, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Animal Protection, World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA), World Wildlife Fund (WWF), Zoological Society of London, and Zoological Society of San Diego.

17. In order to gather additional information from Parties and other stakeholders, particularly those focused on transport of live animals, or housing and caring for live animals, the Secretariat published a Notification to the Parties on 29 March 2018 ([Notification No. 2018/033](#)). The Notification invited Parties to submit any relevant information, including the following:
- a) Explanations of how Resolution Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP17) is currently being implemented by the CITES authorities in the State of import. For example:
 - i) how do CITES authorities determine what can be considered an ‘appropriate and acceptable destination’?
 - ii) whether this is determined on a case-by-case basis, or if CITES authorities have developed or used general guidelines?
 - iii) what sort of guidance would, in your view, be most useful?
 - b) Descriptions of any instances where the provisions of the Resolution have been successfully implemented.
 - c) Descriptions of any cases where the provisions of the Resolution have been found inadequate or abused.
 - d) Descriptions of problems encountered in implementing the Resolution prior to, or after, its revisions at CoP17.
 - e) Assessments of any impact (positive or negative) that the amendments to the Resolution, as agreed at CoP17, may have had.
 - f) An explanation of how Article III paragraphs 3 (b) and 5 (b), of the Convention, are applied by the State of import. For example:
 - i) what procedures and/or guidance are used to assess whether recipients of living specimens of CITES Appendix-I species are “suitably equipped to house and care for them”?
 - ii) is this determined on a case-by-case basis, or have the CITES authorities developed or used general guidelines?
 - iii) circumstances or examples where the implementation of the provisions in Article III paragraphs 3 (b) and 5 (b) were problematic, and information on how difficulties were overcome.
 - iv) the sort of guidance that, in your view, would be most useful.

The Notification also invited organizations and other relevant stakeholders, particularly those involved in either transport of live animals, or housing and caring for live animals, to submit any relevant information, including documents they might have developed or used to provide guidance on best practices in relation to housing and caring for live Appendix-I listed animals, or of relevance to the implementation of Resolution Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP17).

18. By the deadline of 26 April 2018, the Secretariat had received responses from the following eleven Parties: Australia, Canada, China, Mexico, Monaco, Philippines, Slovakia, Thailand, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Submissions were also received from the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA), Born Free Foundation, Global Eye, Humane Society International (HSI), Wild Welfare and World Animal Protection. The responses have been summarised in this report, and the full replies have been collated into the Annex to this document in the language and format in which they were received.

19. Unfortunately, because of the late completion of this document, the intersessional working group was unable to complete its mandate in time for the submission of a report by the document deadline of AC30.
20. With the document now available, the intersessional working group has confirmed that it will continue working until the present meeting to fulfil the tasks outlined in its mandate. The Co-Chairs of the working group will provide an oral update at this meeting.

Summary of responses from Parties concerning implementation of Resolution Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP17)

21. Most Parties responded that they had no or limited experience in determining what can be considered an 'appropriate and acceptable destination'. It appears that those Parties that have had cause to make 'appropriate and acceptable destinations' determinations in the past had done so primarily for the import of specimens into licensed zoos or travelling exhibitions. Australia indicated that it has stricter domestic measures with the effect that all African populations of elephant and rhinoceros are treated as though they are in Appendix I and therefore they do not apply the *in situ* provisions of the Resolution, which applies to Appendix II populations of these two species
22. The majority of Parties indicated that determining if a destination was 'appropriate and acceptable' has either been or would be done on a case-by-case basis, with some Parties indicating that they would take into account any regulatory requirements and published guidelines on husbandry and welfare and consult with the exporting Party to ensure that the trade would promote *in situ* conservation.
23. The majority of Parties indicated that importers are required to submit supporting details (in some cases a standard form is provided) with their licence application to assist the Scientific Authority in determining suitability, and that this would apply for all live specimens of Appendix I species (as well as those subject to 'appropriate and acceptable destinations' restrictions through an annotation). Such supporting information could include: details on the intended enclosure (materials, measurements, heating, light, indoor/outdoor space, security, etc); intended social grouping for the species; environmental stimuli; dietary needs; veterinary access; financial resources; expertise of keepers/staff; etc. In addition, most Parties indicated that where necessary, they would consult species and veterinary experts, or have the premises inspected prior to the import permit being granted.
24. From the responses, it is evident that Parties make use of a range of available resources to carry out assessments of what would be considered an 'appropriate and acceptable destination'. These included best practice guidance for zoos and zoo accreditation checklists, animal husbandry information, advice from specialist groups of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), etc. However, a number of Parties indicated that they would like to improve access to and sharing of such materials.
25. When asked what sort of guidance would be most useful, several Parties suggested that general guidance (possibly in the form of a checklist) on the characteristics that a facility should demonstrate in order to be considered an 'appropriate and acceptable destination' would be desirable. It appears that such checklists have already been developed by a number of Parties. In addition, best practices developed by Parties or accredited associations for the two species for which the need to define this term is currently relevant (White rhinoceros and African elephant) could be useful. There are differences of opinion concerning how this guidance should be made available: e.g. through a central repository (such as the CITES website) where Parties could upload relevant material and share experience, or as non-binding guidance in an Annex to the Resolution.
26. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UK) provided two examples where the provisions of the Resolution in their view have been successfully implemented, including one example where the import application was rejected on the grounds that it was not part of an *in situ* conservation programme, and one that was approved as the movement was recommended by the European Endangered Species breeding programme coordinator and the Taxon Advisory Group Chair.
27. No Party gave an example where the provisions of the Resolution in their view had been found inadequate or abused, though the UK pointed out that "as there is no formal agreed definition of what constitutes an 'appropriate and acceptable destination' then this is left to individual Parties to interpret".
28. When asked to describe problems encountered in implementing the Resolution prior to, or after, its revision at CoP17, most Parties reiterated that they had not had much cause to implement the Resolution either before or after CoP17. Some pointed out that as the revisions are relatively new, there had not been sufficient time to assess whether or not there would be any problems. Of the Parties that responded, none indicated

that they had experienced any problems implementing the Resolution prior to CoP17, though China indicated that establishing whether or not there are *in situ* conservation benefits was proving challenging.

29. Similarly, Parties expressed difficulties in assessing the impact (positive or negative) that the amendments to the Resolution have had due to the short time that has elapsed since the amendments were adopted. However, Canada noted that “any conditions as described in Resolution 11.20 (Rev. CoP17) which would be set on a foreign CITES export permit would not be enforceable” under its domestic legislation. Canada further noted that conditions become even less enforceable when the foreign permit expires (6-months after the date of issuance) and could not apply to offspring, which are not the specimens specified on the permit itself.
30. The issue of *in situ* conservation benefits seems to be problematic to interpret for some Parties. As noted above, some Parties indicated that they would consult with the Scientific Authority of the exporting country to establish what the *in situ* benefits might be. The United States of America (USA) stressed the importance of consulting with the Scientific Authority of the State of export to help to determine whether or not there are any *in situ* conservation benefits. The UK stated that Scientific Authorities in the European Union (EU) member States would consider the purpose of the introduction into the EU to ensure that the purpose is one of those specified in Regulation 339/97 (i.e. breeding, education, or research aimed at the conservation of the species) or another which is not detrimental to the survival of the species concerned and consistent with Resolution Conf. 11.20 and/or annotation.

Summary of responses from Parties concerning the application of Article III paragraphs 3 (b) and 5 (b) of the Convention

31. Parties clearly have more experience at applying the provisions of Article III, as they apply to all live specimens of Appendix I species. Parties demonstrated good examples of applying paragraph 3 (b) in particular; while some noted that the provisions of paragraph 5 (b) (live specimens introduced from the sea) are rarely, if ever, encountered.
32. Imports under Article III paragraphs 3 (b) and 5 (b) of the Convention can concern (i) imports by zoos or breeders; (ii) imports by non-commercial breeders and (iii) household moves of personal pets. When faced with an import application of a live Appendix I specimen, Parties demonstrated that in spite of the lack of guidance on how to determine whether or not a facility is suitably equipped to house and care for them, many have developed checklists to undertake a systematic assessment. Generally, this requires the importer to provide detailed information to the CITES authorities, and can involve seeking species or veterinary expertise, and, in many cases, involves site inspections. Parties appear to systematically request information concerning the following:
 - construction and security of the intended enclosure,
 - the physical environment (space, heat, light, etc.),
 - social grouping for the species,
 - if it will have a sufficiently stimulating environment,
 - and that the appropriate diet will be offered.

They may also consider whether the persons or organization responsible for its care have the necessary skills and experience to care for the specimen. In general, Parties indicated that each application is dealt with on a case-by-case basis, although taxon-specific guidance can sometimes be used. Some Parties indicated that they work on the assumption that certain recipients automatically meet the requirements of “suitably equipped to house and care for them”, such as accredited zoos and aquaria (noting that these are regularly inspected to acquire operating licences), CITES-registered breeders, and government agencies participating in activities such as reintroduction programmes.

33. The USA indicated that its national CITES implementing regulations include an outline of the factors that are considered in making a determination of whether an applicant is suitably equipped to house and care for a live specimen. This includes any factors that would help to determine whether an applicant would be able to provide proper housing to maintain the specimens for the intended purpose, and the expertise to provide proper care and husbandry. Facilities must have adequate enclosures to prevent escape, and appropriate security to prevent the theft of specimens. Other factors evaluated include:

- the maintenance and construction of enclosures to ensure that they provide sufficient space to allow each animal to make normal postural and social adjustments with adequate freedom of movement;
 - whether appropriate environmental enrichment is provided;
 - if the wildlife is on public display, an off-exhibit area, consisting in indoor and outdoor accommodations, as appropriate, that can house the wildlife on a long-term basis if necessary;
 - provision for water and nutritious food, as appropriate;
 - staff who are trained and experienced in providing daily care and maintenance; and
 - readily available access to experienced veterinary care.
34. While the Convention does address some animal welfare considerations, these particular considerations fall outside the scope of the Convention, and they are matters for each country to decide upon and regulate at the national level. Some Parties indicated that they have national legislation regarding animal welfare. For example, Australian legislation requires that the person receiving the animal is suitably equipped to manage, confine and care for the animal, including meeting the behavioral and biological needs of the animal. For this, the CITES Scientific Authority of Australia conducts a case-by-case assessment of the recipient facility. The facility is required to respond to a series of questions about the security and physical features of the proposed animal enclosure, as well as information about staff expertise, diet, behavioral enrichment and animal management. These responses are assessed against best practice standards such as Australian State or Territory exhibited animal standards, husbandry manuals produced by peak zoological bodies, scientific literature, and expert advice. Only facilities that are assessed as meeting the behavioral and biological needs would be granted a permit.
35. Some Parties provided examples where the implementation of the provisions in Article III paragraphs 3 (b) and 5 (b) were problematic. The UK highlighted that some species have specialist husbandry requirements by virtue of their size, diet, high rates of mortality, etc., and these cases would require particularly careful assessment. In addition, species that are not often found in captivity pose more difficulties due to the lack of published information on their husbandry requirements. Seeking an expert's opinion may also be restricted where the CITES authorities need to maintain applicant confidentiality. Canada also pointed out the potential challenges of undertaking this type of assessment for personal pets that will be housed in private homes or facilities, where it is difficult to assess someone's capabilities, especially for long term care, which would be the case for parrots which are long-lived, or for arowanas which can become quite large.

Conclusions

36. To date, those Parties that responded to the Notification have been applying the provision of Resolution Conf. 11.20 (Rev CoP17) on a case-by-case basis, and they have not reported issues with its implementation.
37. Parties have demonstrated that they have considerable experience in applying the provisions of Article III, in particular paragraph 3 (b), which is essentially the same as paragraph a) of Resolution Conf. 11.20. Making a determination of what is an 'appropriate and acceptable destination' is primarily an extension of the checks carried out under Article III, with the additional requirement to take into account the issue of *in situ* conservation.
38. The provisions related to *in situ* conservation were only adopted in late 2016 (at CoP17) and Parties may not have had sufficient time to assess whether or not these new provisions are adequate.
39. A number of Parties have made it clear that it would be useful to have a checklist or best practice guidance made available as reference material to assist in determining whether a facility can be considered an 'appropriate and acceptable destination' or is suitably equipped to house and care for live specimens. The Animals Committee may wish to consider ways of making the currently available material more readily accessible to Parties, e.g. through a central repository on the CITES website (similar to the page on non-detriment findings), non-binding guiding principles, or other.
40. A number of Parties have developed standard forms for collecting information on accommodation and standards of care, which could potentially serve as a non-binding checklist for Scientific Authorities to use when undertaking an assessment. Such a checklist may include the following elements:

- Physical housing (size, construction, availability of indoor/outdoor or summer/winter housing, shelter from sun/rain, provisions to expand as the animal grows);
- Husbandry (provision of heat, light, appropriate diet, water quality parameters for aquatic species);
- Management (appropriate social groupings for the species, methods of integration, ability to separate the group where needed);
- Species specific enclosure furnishings (for example provisions of pools, climbing equipment, hides, nest boxes, plants and hiding places);
- Experience of staff; and
- Physical care (adequate provisions of suitable veterinary care).

Recommendations

41. The Animals Committee is invited to:

- a) consider the information provided in this document and its Annex;
- b) consider developing a non-binding checklist similar to that outlined in paragraph 40; and
- c) taking account of any analysis or review carried out by its intersessional working group, consider establishing an in-session working group to make recommendations, as appropriate, for the Committee's consideration and submission to the 70th meeting of the Standing Committee, in accordance with Decision 17.179.