

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



Thirty-second meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 19 – 23 June 2023

SUMMARY RECORD

Opening remarks of the Secretary-General *No document*

The Secretary-General gave an opening address and asked for a minute of silence in the memory of Dr. Thomas Althaus, CITES Animals Committee Chair from 2003 to 2009, who had recently passed away. The Secretary-General congratulated the Chair and the Vice-Chair on their election and gave an overview of the working programme, framing it within other initiatives at the international level, such as the Global Biodiversity Framework.

1. Confirmation of the election of the Chair and Vice-Chair *No document*

The Committee confirmed the election of its Chair, the representative for Europe (Mr. Mathias Lörtscher) and Vice-Chair, the representative for Oceania (Mr. Hugh Robertson).

Opening remarks of the Chair *No document*

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed the Members of the Committee, Party Observers, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to the meeting. The Chair expressed his satisfaction with the organization of this in-person meeting and asked the Committee to approach the week's meeting practically, hoping to get work done in manageable amounts.

2. Declaration of conflict of interest *No document*

The Chair informed the Committee that it had received standard disclosure forms for CITES declarations of interest from all Members and acting Members. One Member had declared a potential conflict of interest and none had declared a financial interest that they considered called into question their impartiality, objectivity or independence regarding any subject on the agenda for the meeting.

The Committee noted that no Member declared a financial interest that he or she considers calls into question his or her impartiality, objectivity or independence regarding any subject on the agenda for the meeting.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

3. Rules of Procedure AC32 Doc. 3

The Chair introduced the Rules of Procedure of the Committee in document AC32 Doc. 3, as amended at its 30th meeting (Geneva, July 2018) and indicated that these Rules of Procedure remained valid for the meeting.

The Committee noted that its Rules of Procedure, as amended at its 30th meeting (Geneva, July 2018) and set out in the Annex to document AC32 Doc. 3, remain valid for this meeting.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

4. Agenda..... AC32 Doc. 4

The Chair introduced the agenda for this meeting, presented in document AC32 Doc. 4.

The Committee adopted its agenda as set out in document AC32 Doc. 4.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

5. Working programme..... AC32 Doc. 5

The Chair introduced the working programme as set out in document AC32 Doc. 5.

The Committee adopted its working programme as set out in document AC32 Doc. 5.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

6. Admission of observers..... AC32 Doc. 6

The Secretariat introduced the list of observer organizations that had been invited to participate in the meeting, as presented in document AC32 Doc. 6 and drew the Committee's attention to the Secretariat's established practice to recommend to the Chairs of the Plants and Animals Committees that they approve the participation of any body or agency technically qualified in protection, conservation or management of wild fauna and flora, as well as any body or agency that has a legitimate and direct interest in CITES regulations, including representatives of industries such as fragrance, medicinal plants, cosmetics, timber and musical instrument organizations and other trade organizations.

The nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk) suggested that future documents on admission of observers could indicate the country of national non-governmental organizations.

The Committee noted the list of observer organizations that had been invited to participate in the meeting as set out in document AC32 Doc. 6 and further noted the current practice of approval of observer organizations in accordance with Rule 4, paragraph 3, of its Rules of Procedure. The Committee invited the Secretariat to include the country where national non-governmental organizations are based in its document on admission of observers.

7. Emerging operational matters of the committees.....PC26 Doc. 7 / AC32 Doc. 7

The Secretariat presented two different sets of exceptional circumstances (scenarios) that could prevent the establishment of quorum in person, i.e. scenario A – circumstances that are either global or at the location of the meeting preventing the organization of the meeting for a variety of reasons that could *inter alia* be political, or health- or security-related; and scenario B – circumstances that prevent representatives from several regions from being present in-person at the meeting – this would include *inter alia* geographically localized health crisis not affecting the location of the meeting but other regions of the world or disruptions to international travel. Based on these two scenarios, the Secretariat proposed possible solutions as outlined in the table below:

Scenario	AC/PC	SC
A (circumstances at the location)	Postpone meeting for a maximum of six months. If no alternative location is found within two months, the meeting to be organized fully online (possibly with an adapted agenda and working programme).	
B (circumstances in several regions)	Hybrid option for Members/acting Members only to ensure quorum	Hybrid option to be considered only in exceptional circumstances

The Secretariat also presented additional considerations related to the emerging operational issues, including a simplified intersessional decision-making process for certain issues. Finally, the Secretariat conveyed the recommendations adopted by the Plants Committee on this issue at its 26th meeting from 5 to 9 June 2023 as contained in information document AC32 Inf. 6.

The representative for Asia (Mr. Hamidy), the representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori), the representative for Europe (Ms. Zíková), the representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz), the representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson) and the nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk), echoed by Australia, Brazil, Mexico, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and

Zimbabwe were broadly supportive of the recommendations adopted by the Plants Committee, in particular of the need to hold back-to-back meetings that would reduce logistical and financial impediments for the participation of Party delegates, and also the carbon footprint of the participants and the need for an equitable timing for all regions should an online or hybrid meeting be organized. The CITES Secretary-General noted that while the Secretariat calculates carbon footprint for travel, it will also start calculating the carbon footprint of its meetings and will work towards carbon offsetting for Committee participants as part of the Climate Change Strategy developed by the United Nations Environment Programme.

The representative for Europe (Ms. Zíková) advised that any potential future online meetings should not cut on substance and also include agenda items such as the Review of Significant Trade. Regarding the possibility of a regional Member speaking on behalf of a Party that is absent, the representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori) suggested that such a request should be made with a formal letter, while Mexico noted that a regional representative could make a statement on behalf of a Party, but might not be able to answer follow-up questions on their behalf.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland expressed concerns about the second option in paragraph 21 of the document and noted that rolling out a facility to enable potentially multiple Parties to join discussions via an online platform on a routine basis could make the Review of Significant Trade process much more complex.

Finally, the Animal Welfare Institute suggested that online meetings should be the default in the future as this would allow for broader and more equitable participation and for a reduced environmental impact.

The Committee agreed with the recommendations of the Plants Committee as follows:

The Committee agreed to support the general way forward described in document PC26 Doc. 7 / AC32 Doc. 7. The Committee requested the Secretariat, in consultation with the Animals and Plants Committees through their Chairs, to prepare a document for the Standing Committee that would also propose a way to capture the guiding principles and other recommendations in document PC26 Doc. 7 / AC32 Doc. 7 in CITES official documentation, for instance in Resolution Conf. 18.2 on *Establishment of committees*.

The Committee requested the Secretariat to organize meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees back-to-back and to ensure that the timing of any online or hybrid meeting be equitable for all regions.

The Animals Committee further noted the concerns expressed by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland about the proposal (in paragraph 21 of document AC32 Doc.7) to enable the hybrid participation of Parties to join discussions via an online platform on a routine, rather than on an exceptional basis, noting the potential complications of managing these discussions considering that a number of countries could be involved, such as in Stage 1 of the Review of Significant Trade process (selection of species/country combinations to be reviewed).

8. Animals Committee strategic planning for 2023-2025 (CoP19-CoP20)

8.1 Resolutions and Decisions directed to the Animals Committee..... AC32 Doc. 8.1

The Chair introduced document AC32 Doc. 8.1 and its two Annexes on Resolutions and Decisions directed to the Animals Committee. Annex 1 provided an overview of the Resolutions in effect containing instructions that are directed or relevant to the Animals Committee. Annex 2 provided a list of all Decisions in effect directed to the Animals Committee that might require its inputs or assistance.

The Committee noted document AC32 Doc. 8.1.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

8.2 Animals Committee workplan..... AC32 Doc. 8.2

The Chair introduced document AC32 Doc. 8.2 that presents a list of instructions directed to the Animals Committee, or that may require that it be consulted or informed as articulated in the currently valid Resolutions (Annex 1) and Decisions (Annex 2). The document also identifies a lead or co-lead among the Members of the Animals Committee for each of the instructions.

The Committee noted the 2023-2025 workplan and agreed that, in the event of the Standing Committee establishing additional intersessional working groups, the lead or co-leads identified for the relevant Resolution or Decision in the current work plan would represent the Animals Committee on the working group concerned.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

9. CITES Strategic Vision.....PC26 Doc. 9 / AC32 Doc. 9

The Secretariat introduced document PC26 Doc. 9 / AC32 Doc. 9 that contains a mapping of the CITES Strategic Vision's objectives against the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) and its monitoring framework. The Secretariat highlighted the most relevant goals and targets of the GBF for CITES and invited feedback from the Committee on the mapping exercise and on possible indicators for objective 1.4 of the CITES Strategic Vision: "The Appendices correctly reflect the conservation status and needs of species." Finally, the Secretariat conveyed the recommendations adopted by the Plants Committee on this issue at its 26th meeting from 5 to 9 June 2023.

The representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Gongora) and the representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz), echoed by Argentina, Mexico and Peru, concurred with the recommendations of the Plants Committee. Argentina cautioned against using the possible indicators in paragraph 13 c) and 13 d) of the document since these were not very clear and any potential indicator should clearly stay within the CITES mandate. Zimbabwe asked for more time to provide feedback on the mapping and the possible indicators for objective 1.4. The International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation and its partner organizations agreed that Goal A and Target 4, 5 and 9 of the GBF were the key relevant targets for CITES and advised that the indicator(s) for objective 1.4 should also look at the needs of local communities.

The Committee agreed with the recommendations of the Plants Committee as follows:

The Committee invited Members and Parties to submit any comments they may have on the mapping of the *CITES Strategic Vision* and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and its monitoring framework as contained in the Annex to document PC26 Doc. 9 / AC32 Doc. 9 directly to the Secretariat that would consider them in its report to the Standing Committee.

The Committee invited the Secretariat to continue working with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime on SDG indicator 15.7.1 and to inform the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity of the outcome of this work.

The Committee requested the Secretariat to follow the work of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) and any work related to the monitoring framework of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework; and to provide data from relevant Strategic Vision indicators (such as indicator 1.1.1 on the National Legislation Project) and possible indicators for objective 1.4 to the CBD Secretariat, if requested.

The Committee noted the comments made on the possible indicators for objective 1.4 of the Strategic Vision proposed in paragraph 13 of document PC26 Doc. 9 / AC32 Doc. 9 and invited Members and Parties to submit any further comments directly to the Secretariat that would consider them in its report to the Standing Committee.

The Committee agreed that the Chair of the Animals Committee will coordinate the Committee's input on the partnership strategy called for in Decision 19.20.

The Committee further encouraged Members and Parties to submit their comments on the mapping and potential indicators for objective 1.4 to the Secretariat prior to the document deadline for the 77th meeting of the Standing Committee, i.e., before 7 September 2023.

10. Role of CITES in reducing risk of future zoonotic disease emergence associated with international wildlife trade..... PC26 Doc. 10 / AC32 Doc. 10

The Secretariat introduced document PC26 Doc. 10 / AC32 Doc. 10, containing a summary of Parties' responses on the measures they implemented to prevent and mitigate the risk of pathogen spillover and transmission from wildlife trade and associated supply chains. Opportunities for practical collaboration taking

into consideration the information provided by several organizations, including the World Organization for Animal Health, the Convention on Migratory Species and the United Nations Environment Programme were highlighted in the document. This information would be made available to Parties on a dedicated webpage on the CITES website. The Secretariat reflected on the consideration of a CITES advisory body and noted that institutional arrangements and structures at the national level that facilitate collaboration between relevant organizations and authorities seem to provide the platform needed to ensure a coherent response to address the risk of zoonotic disease emergence associated with international trade. Finally, the Secretariat conveyed the recommendations adopted by the Plants Committee on this issue at its 26th meeting from 5 to 9 June 2023.

Israel, as co-Chair of the Standing Committee's intersessional working group on zoonotic diseases, echoed by Brazil, Mexico, Senegal, the United States of America and Zimbabwe, highlighted the importance of this work and the contribution that CITES could make on this issue. Israel welcomed the input of the Animals Committee to the Standing Committee's working group and questioned whether a separate Animals Committee intersessional working group was necessary. The representative for North America (Mr. Benitez Diaz), echoed by Mexico, Senegal, the United States of America and Zimbabwe, indicated that an Animals Committee intersessional working group would be the best way to collect the Animals Committee's inputs.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) and Mexico both suggested that an CITES advisory body was not necessary since other platforms already existed. Further the representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz), echoed by IWMC-World Conservation Trust, suggested that a more focused strategy on specific species was needed.

Regarding the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the World Organisation for Animal Health and the CITES Secretariat, the representative for North America (Mr. Benitez Diaz) proposed that the MoU would ideally draw on wildlife health expertise in the CITES Authorities and not solely on the Secretariat via a mechanism for Parties to offer input. This could occur through consultations with the Animals Committee on products resulting from the MoU.

Mexico suggested the following amendments to the MoU:

- in the first bullet point of Article 2, insert "traceable and" after the word "safe" to read: "safe, traceable and legal international trade of wildlife";
- under Article 8, paragraph 4, add "in writing" to read: "Either Party may also terminate this MoU by giving six months' notice in writing to the other Party.";
- in the first section of the programme of work on "Wildlife Health and Trade", delete the area "CITES permits" since health aspects should not be included in the CITES permitting process as this goes beyond the requirements of the Convention;
- in the third section of the programme of work on "Coordination and Communication", second column, the participation of WOA in CITES meetings should be ensure by its Secretariat; and
- in the Spanish version of the MoU, ensure that the term OMSA is used throughout and not the old name OIE.

Israel suggested that the word "and hygiene" be added to the second bullet point of Article 2 to read: "Welfare and hygiene of live wild animals during their transport for the international trade;"

Brazil requested clarification from the Secretariat relating to the engagements with the intergovernmental negotiating body (INB) established by the World Health Organization (WHO)'s Member States to discuss a pandemic treaty. The Secretariat clarified that it has not been provided with a mandate to engage or to reach out to this body.

Born Free Foundation, speaking also on behalf of ADM Capital Foundation, Animal Welfare Institute, Center for Biological Diversity, David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation, Defenders of Wildlife, Fondation Franz Weber, Humane Society International, Natural Resources Defense Council, Pan-African Sanctuary Alliance, Pro Wildlife and Species Survival Network, called for a precautionary approach to wildlife trade for at risk species and for expanding the focus to include illegal trade and non-CITES listed species. Wildlife Conservation Society provided an update to the Committee on its active wildlife health programme and suggested that the term "prevention of pathogen spillover" should be used instead of "safe trade".

The International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation, echoed by Conservation Force, recalled that CITES should focus on its mandate and that the inclusion of health aspects in permits was beyond the mandate of CITES.

The Committee agreed to nominate the nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk) and the alternate representative for Asia (Mr. Diesmos) to participate in the Standing Committee's intersessional working group on the role of CITES in reducing risk of future zoonotic disease emergence associated with international wildlife trade, taking into account the comments made on paragraph 13 of document PC26 Doc. 10 / AC32 Doc. 10.

The Committee requested the Secretariat to incorporate the comments made during the meeting in its review of the draft MoU and joint work programme between CITES and the World Organization for Animal Health for consideration by the Standing Committee.

The Committee established an intersessional working group on zoonotic diseases with the mandate to review the information provided by the Parties, organizations and the United Nations Environment Programme and prepare recommendations for consideration by the Animals Committee at its 33rd meeting on:

- a) proposed effective and practical solutions for reducing pathogen spillover risk in wildlife supply chains; and
- b) opportunities for practical collaboration under the direction of existing Resolutions, Decisions and agreements.

The membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: the alternate representative for Asia (Mr. Diesmos) and the nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk);

AC Members: the alternate representative for Africa (Mr. Diouck) and the alternate representative for North America (Mr. Leuteritz);

Parties: Argentina, Australia, Canada, China, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, European Union, Germany, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Malaysia, Namibia, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa; Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Zimbabwe; and

IGOs and NGOs: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation, International Union for Conservation of Nature, Animal Welfare Institute, Association of Western Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, Born Free Foundation, Center for Biological Diversity, Dallas Safari Club, Defenders of Wildlife, European Animal Research Association, European Pet Organisation, German Society of Herpetology, Humane Society International, International Fund for Animal Welfare, International Fur Federation, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, National association for Biomedical Research, Organization of Professional Aviculturists, Pet Advocacy Network, Pro Wildlife, SUCO-SA, TRAFFIC, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wide Fund for Nature, Zoological Society of London.

11. Joint CITES-CMS African Carnivores Initiative AC32 Comp.

The Secretariat provided an update on the joint CITES-CMS African Carnivores Initiative (ACI), noting that the Second meeting of the range States of the Joint CITES-CMS African Carnivores Initiative took place from 1 – 4 May 2023 in Entebbe, Uganda (see information document AC32 Inf. 7 with the outcomes agreed by ACI range States). The ACI range States prioritized result areas in the ACI Programme of Work on a subregional basis, taking into consideration the conservation importance of the result area. Eight result areas had been rated as high conservation importance by all range States.

Conservation Force that had attended the ACI range States' meeting highlighted the urgency of addressing the needs of the range States; announced that a pledge to the ACI will be made later during the meeting and suggested that other actors be brought onboard to address issues such as land use and habitat degradation.

The Committee noted the information in document AC32 Comp. and the update provided by the Secretariat relating to the Joint African Carnivore Initiative.

12. IPBES Report on the Assessment of the Sustainable Use of Wild Species PC26 Doc. 12 / AC32 Doc. 12

The Chair introduced document PC26 Doc. 12 / AC32 Doc. 12. Considering that the Animals and Plants Committees are directed by the Conference of the Parties to review the scientific aspects of the IPBES thematic *Assessment of the Sustainable Use of Wild Species* and consider their relevance to the implementation of the Convention, he proposed the Committees consider the Summary for Policymakers and the relevant sections in Chapter 3 (Status of and trends in the use of wild species and its implications for wild species, the environment and people) and Chapter 4 (The drivers of the sustainable use of wild species). Annex 1 to the document included a provisional list of scientific aspects addressed in Chapters 3 and 4 that could be relevant for CITES implementation and processes. Annex 2 contained a table of these scientific aspects, and the current CITES Resolutions, Decisions, systems and processes that could address these aspects. Annex 3 contained the key findings in the Summary for Policymakers and the possible relevance to the mandates of the Animals and Plants Committees, as well as to the mandate of the Standing Committee. The Chair recommended that the Animals Committee agree with the recommendation of the Plants Committee to establish a joint intersessional working group.

The IPBES Secretariat provided a brief overview of IPBES, the assessments performed to date, and highlighted that the *Assessment of the Sustainable Use of Wild Species* had been approved by IPBES government members during the IPBES plenary in 2022 and showed that CITES was an important tool of trade regulation and that CITES processes, such as the development and implementation of non-detriment findings (NDFs), supported sustainable use. The IPBES Secretariat drew the Committees' attention to a few Chapters that are important to be considered by the Committees: Chapter 2 on *Conceptualizing the sustainable use of wild species* that could inform the further development of NDFs by pointing to additional indicators that could be considered; Chapter 6 on *Policy options for governing sustainable use of wild species* that address underlying factors that could enhance the sustainability of use and could therefore contribute to more enduring outcomes for species subject to CITES regulation (the importance of governance systems that are tailored to ecological, social and economic context, inclusive with participatory mechanisms, support fairness, rights and equity and recognize a variety of knowledge systems, including indigenous people and local communities knowledge systems was highlighted); and Chapter 5 on *Future scenarios of sustainable use of wild species* that reflect on future pressures that could inform processes to identify species most affected by international trade. The IPBES Secretariat expressed its readiness to support CITES work.

Argentina, Israel, Peru and the United States of America, echoed by Humane Society International (HSI), speaking also on behalf of Animal Welfare Institute, Born Free Foundation, Pro Wildlife and Species Survival Network, supported coordination between CITES and IPBES and noted that such a coordination should however not distract from core CITES work. The United States proposed the deletion of "the two Committees and the members of" from paragraph a) of the terms of reference of the working group as agreed by the Plants Committee.

The representative of Israel and the representative of HSI who were among the scientists who contributed to the review of the *Assessment of the Sustainable Use of Wild Species* noted that there was not a total overlap between IPBES and CITES and that it was important to differentiate between the two mandates. Israel pointed out that IPBES finding B.2.8 and C.1.3 identified in Annex 3 to the document were not pertinent for CITES. HSI further noted that some factual inaccuracies on CITES still remain in the Assessment, in particular in Chapter 4.

The Committee agreed to establish an intersessional working group jointly with the Plants Committee on the IPBES assessment report on the sustainable use of wild species that will work through electronic means to:

- a) review the scientific aspects of the thematic assessment of the sustainable use of wild species of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) relevant to CITES implementation as highlighted in the Annexes to document PC26 Doc. 12 / AC32 Doc. 12 and other aspects as agreed by the working group;
- b) identify aspects relevant to CITES implementation that are not adequately covered in existing Resolutions and Decisions and may require further consideration by the Animals and Plants Committees or the Standing Committee;

- c) prepare a draft report of the results of the review and possible recommendations for consideration by the joint sessions of the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee and the 27th meeting of the Plants Committee scheduled to take place in 2024; and
- d) prepare a document for consideration of the Animals and Plants Committees containing the outcome of the review and recommendations to be submitted for consideration by the 78th meeting of the Standing Committee.

The membership was decided as follows¹:

Chair for AC: Chair of the Animals Committee (Mr. Lörtscher);

Chair for PC: alternate representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz);

AC Members: representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori);

Parties: Argentina, Australia, Canada, China, Colombia, European Union, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zimbabwe; and

IGOs and NGO: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation, International Union for Conservation of Nature, Conservation Force, German Society of Herpetology, Humane Society International, Indonesian Coral, Shell and Ornamental Fish Association, International Fur Federation, International Wood Products Association, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, Natural Resources Defense Council, Pro Wildlife, Save our Seas Foundation, Species Survival Network, TRAFFIC, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Resources Institute, World Wide Fund for Nature.

13. Country-wide Review of Significant Trade..... PC26 Doc 14 / AC32 Doc. 13

The Chair of the Animals Committee introduced document PC26 Doc. 14 / AC32 Doc. 13 and proposed the establishment of a joint intersessional working group to enable the Animals and Plants Committees to, taking into account the progress made under the Compliance Assistance Programme and the development of a Capacity-Building Framework, consider whether the scientific and management issues identified in the country-wide Review of Significant Trade for Madagascar would be sufficiently addressed, or whether a new mechanism should be developed to provide targeted support to Parties at a national level. The Chair conveyed the recommendations adopted by the Plants Committee on this issue at its 26th meeting from 5 to 9 June 2023.

The representative of Oceania (Mr. Robertson) welcomed the continuation of the work on this issue and highlighted that some Parties in Oceania could benefit from such a structured assistance. Humane Society International noted that the country-wide Review of Significant Trade had started in 2000 and that therefore it would seem not to be a process that produced rapid and streamlined results.

The Committee established a joint intersessional working group on country-wide Review of Significant Trade with a mandate to:

- a) review the progress updates on the Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP) in document SC74 Doc. 29, document CoP19 Doc. 30 and Resolution Conf. 14.3 (Rev. CoP19) on *CITES compliance procedures*; and capacity-building activities in documents SC74 Doc. 22, document CoP19 Doc. 16 and Resolution Conf. 19.2 on *Capacity-building*;
- b) consider whether scientific and management issues identified in the country-wide Review of Significant Trade for Madagascar and outlined in document AC30 Doc. 12.3/PC24 Doc. 13.3 are sufficiently addressed through existing mechanisms or, if appropriate, propose amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18) or other existing resolutions, develop a new resolution, or propose a new mechanism to undertake such reviews; and

¹ This includes the expression of interest at the 26th meeting of the Plants Committee.

- c) present its findings and recommendations to the joint session of the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee and 27th meeting of the Plants Committee in 2024.

The membership was decided as follows²:

Co-Chairs for AC: Chair of the Animals Committee (Mr. Lörtscher) and alternative representative for North America (Mr. Leuteritz);

Chair for PC: representative for Europe (Ms. Smyth);

AC Members: representative of Oceania (Mr. Robertson)

Parties: Canada, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, European Union, Germany, Madagascar, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America; and

IGOs and NGOs: United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, International Union for Conservation of Nature, Association Technique Internationale des Bois Tropicaux, ForestBased Solutions, Humane Society International, Species Survival Network, TRAFFIC, World Wide Fund for Nature.

14. Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species

14.1 Overview of the Review of Significant Trade AC32 Doc. 14.1

The Secretariat introduced the overview document on the Review of Significant Trade and informed the Committee of the latest developments on the Review of Significant Trade (RST) Tracking and Management database.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) indicated that this agenda item provided a good opportunity to more fully explore the functionality and content of the new RST Tracking and Management system and proposed that additional input be sought following the meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees, perhaps through a second Notification, so that Parties having now used the database to prepare for the meetings can provide more insightful comments. The United States of America asked for an update on the case *Varanus ornatus*/Togo. The Secretariat thanked the United States of America for bringing the matter to the attention of the Secretariat. The Secretariat informed the meeting that the necessary changes were made to the CITES export quota tool to correctly reflect the status of the quota for *Varanus ornatus* for Togo on the CITES website.

The United Nations Environment Programme-World Conservation Monitoring Centre drew the Committee's attention to a new section of the Species+ database called CITES processes that also contains RST data.

The Committee noted document AC32 Doc. 14.1 and requested the Secretariat to publish a second Notification to the Parties asking for feedback on the Review of Significant Trade Tracking and Management Database.

14.2 Selection of new species/country combinations for review following CoP19 AC32 Doc. 14.2

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 14.2 that contained a summary from the CITES Trade Database of annual report statistics showing the recorded level of direct exports for Appendix-II species over the five most recent years (Annex 1), and an extended analysis of trade to inform the preliminary selection of species/country combinations (Annex 2). The extended analysis outlined the process used to identify possible species/country combinations for inclusion in the Review of Significant Trade based on the guidance contained in Annex 2 to Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18) on *Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species* and presented possible candidate species/country combinations for inclusion in Stage 2 of the review. As this was the first time that new cases for review would be selected since 2017, the Secretariat recalled the provisions of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev.

² This includes the expression of interest at the 26th meeting of the Plants Committee.

CoP18) on concerning this exercise, and outlined what the next steps that will be for those species-country combinations selected.

The Chair asked the Committee to aim for a selection of 20 new species/country combinations for review. The United States of America noted that no species/country combinations had been selected since after CoP17 due to the COVID-19 pandemic and indicated that such a limitation was not a firm limit and could not be found in Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18).

Mexico asked the Committee that all species/country combinations in the Annexes that involved Mexico not be retained since all the exports were based on robust non-detriment findings and, particularly for shark species, on scientific information regarding their populations, vulnerability and maximum sustainable yield models, as well as Sustainable Export Volumes estimated for each species and coastline, which are publicly available. China drew the Committee's attention to errors in the data in table 2 of Annex 1, indicating that some of the trade that involved China had either never occurred or was using the incorrect source code. The Democratic Republic of the Congo expressed concern about the increasing number of species that could be included in the RST process and queried why the data also looked at species of Least Concern.

The alternate representative for Africa (Mr. Diouck), the Maldives and Panama suggested that the new selection should focus on sharks as a priority. Japan noted that species included at the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties should probably not be included in the RST process since there would not be enough data on that trade.

The Committee established an in-session working group on the Review of Significant Trade with the mandate to, in accordance with paragraph 1 b) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18):

- a) review the information contained in the annexes to document AC32 Doc.14.2, as well as any additional available information; and
- b) recommend a limited number of species/country combinations of greatest concern for inclusion in Stage 2 of the Review of Significant Trade and an explanation for the selection.

The membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: representative for Europe (Ms. Zíková) and representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz);

Members: representative for Asia (Mr. Hamidy), representatives for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Gongora and Mr. Ramadori), representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson), nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk);

Parties: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, European Union, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Zimbabwe; and

IGOs and NGOs: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation, International Union for Conservation of Nature, ADM Capital Foundation, Association of Southeastern Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Association of Western Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, BirdLife International, Blue Resources Trust, Bloom Association, Born Free Foundation, Born Free USA, Center for Biological Diversity, Conservation Force, Dallas Safari Club, Defenders of Wildlife, European Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation, Florida International University, German Society of Herpetology, Global Guardian Trust, Humane Society International, Indonesian Coral, Shell and Ornamental Fish Association, International Fund for Animal Welfare, International Fur Federation, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, Marine Watch International, OCEANA, Organization of Professional Aviculturists, Ornamental Fish

International, Parrot Breeders Association of Southern Africa, Pro Vision Reef, Pro Wildlife, Safari Club International, Save our Seas Foundation, Society for Wildlife and Nature International, South African Taxidermy and Tannery Association, SUCO-SA, Sustainable Users Network, TRAFFIC, Whale and Dolphin Conservation, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wide Fund for Nature, Zoological Society of London.

The Committee agreed that the European Association of Zoos and Aquaria would participate in the in-session working group on the Review of Significant Trade.

Later in the meeting, the representative for Europe (Ms. Zíková) and the representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) introduced document AC32 Com. 3, noting that consensus had not been reached on all cases.

Regarding the table in document AC32 Com. 3 with species/country combinations:

Colombia indicated that the co-chairs of the in-session working group had noted in their oral report that there was a lack of consensus on the species/country combinations in the table, but that this lack of consensus was not reflected in the document. Colombia contested the use of the word “recommends” in the chapeau of the table in the document and asked that the following statement be included in the summary record:

After interventions by the representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori), the representative of Europe (Ms. Zíková), the representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz), the representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson), Canada, Indonesia, Senegal and Wildlife Conservation Society considering different options to indicate this lack of consensus, such as a footnote for some species/country combinations or a separate table, it was agreed to modify the chapeau to reflect the lack of consensus in the working group.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo announced that it had requested the Secretariat in writing to publish a zero-export quota for wild specimens for *Balearica regulorum* and for *Pandinus* spp. and therefore requested that these country/species combinations be excluded from Stage 1 of RST. Regarding *Pandinus* spp., France indicated its readiness to support the nomenclature specialist in order to clarify the taxonomy of the genus.

Regarding *Moschus moschiferus*/Russian Federation, the Russian Federation indicated they had checked the recorded data in the analysis in document AC32 Doc. 14.2 and that it did not match their records and did not meet the criteria for sharp increase. The United Nations Environment Programme-World Conservation Monitoring Centre confirmed that there was a reporting error with trade reported in kilograms, which should have been in grams. Austria, which had suggested this species/country combination for inclusion, expressed its satisfaction in learning that trade in this species was sustainable. The Russian Federation noted the interest expressed by Austria and Germany in their population management of musk deer and expressed its willingness to make that information public.

Regarding *Sphyrna lewini*/Mexico and *Sphyrna mokarran*/Mexico, Mexico requested that these two species/country combinations not be included in Stage 2 of RST because it had non-detriment findings (NDFs) for both species and that information was publicly available and has been provided in this meeting and in each response to the different Notifications to the Parties from Mexico. Mexico further highlighted that Parties without NDFs should be included as a priority in RST process. The United States of America expressed their concern that removing *Sphyrna lewini*/Mexico from RST would completely remove that species from the process and therefore proposed the inclusion of the whole *Sphyrna* genus in Stage 1 of RST. This proposal was supported by France, Germany, the Maldives, the Netherlands, Portugal and Senegal. These Parties highlighted that the RST process is meant to be supportive and not punitive. Florida International University, speaking also on behalf of Bloom Association, Blue Resources Trust, Defenders of Wildlife, Humane Society International, International Fund for Animal Welfare, Save our Seas Foundation, Sharks Advocates International, Shark Trust and Wildlife Conservation Society also supported the US proposal. Brazil, Canada and the Democratic Republic of the Congo did not support including these two species/country combinations. Japan drew the Committee's attention to Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18) that clearly indicated the criteria for the selection of country/species combinations. The representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson), echoed by the representative of Africa (Mr. Kasoma), the representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori), the representative for Europe (Ms. Zíková), Austria and the World-Wide Fund for Nature suggested keeping Mexico in Stage 1, noting that it should quickly be able to exit the process once these NDFs have been reviewed and further noting that Parties that were not present at

the Animals Committee's meeting were not able to present information and would be included any way. The Committee agreed to retain the two species/country combinations.

Regarding *Sphyrna lewini*/Indonesia, Indonesia requested that this species/country combination not be included in Stage 1 of RST because it had a non-detriment finding and it had only 3% of global trade, below a 10% threshold. Brazil and the Democratic Republic of the Congo concurred with Indonesia. The United States of America argued that, "out of fairness" and consistent treatment following the inclusion of the two species/country combinations from Mexico who also indicated that it had NDFs, *Sphyrna lewini*/Indonesia should also be included in the review. They urged the Committee to respect the RST process. This was supported by the representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori), the representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz), the representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson), China and Canada. Canada, France, Germany, Mexico and Senegal highlighted that Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev CoP18) did not mention any 10% threshold. The Committee agreed to retain the species/country combination in the list for inclusion in Stage 2.

The representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson), echoed by the nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk), Canada, France and Germany, proposed including the species/country combination *Sphyrna lewini*/Oman in RST, noting that the species/country combination *Sphyrna mokarran*/Oman had been originally proposed for exclusion based on expert knowledge that trade in *Sphyrna lewini* was incorrectly reported as *Sphyrna mokarran*. This was agreed by the Committee.

Regarding *Carcharhinus longimanus*/Colombia, Colombia indicated that, since 2021, it had prohibited all trade in specimens and derivatives of sharks, rays and chimaeras, including export, re-export and import in its national territory, and therefore this species/country combination should not be included in RST. The representative indicated that Colombia will request the Secretariat to publish a Notification informing Parties of these stricter domestic measures. The representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori), the representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson), Brazil and Mexico supported not including this species/country combination. This was agreed by the Committee.

Regarding *Holothuria nobilis*, the representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson) noted that this listing only entered into force on 28 August 2020 and therefore that there were not enough trade data to propose inclusion of this species in the RST for this intersessional period. This was supported by the representative for Asia (Mr. Hamidy), the representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Indonesia and Japan. This was agreed by the Committee. The representative for Europe (Ms. Zíková), Austria and France expressed concern about this decision due to the high volume of trade in this species.

Israel queried the meaning of the asterisk in the table, and it was explained that it denoted a non-range State. Germany indicated that the justification for *Testudo horsfieldii* should be High Volume.

Regarding the additional recommendations after the table in document AC32 Com. 3:

Following a query by the nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk), Indonesia clarified that the zero-export quota for *Indotestudo forstenii* only concerned wild specimens.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo indicated that the recommendations on *Psittacus erithacus* did not reflect the proceedings of the working group and that the issue was not considered. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America noted that the issue had been raised but was not relevant to the Review of Significant Trade as it related to illegal trade. Indonesia and Namibia concurred with the Democratic Republic of the Congo and considered that this issue was outside the Review of Significant Trade. The Secretariat noted that the issue of illegal trade in *Psittacus erithacus* was already included the Article XIII process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The United States of America suggested that for species with a zero-export quota put in place due to the RST process, trade could start again only after a non-detriment finding had been reviewed and considered satisfactory by the Secretariat in consultation with the Committee through the Chair. The United States further suggested two factual edits for *Saiga tatarica*/Ukraine and *Monodon monoceros*/Greenland. Israel also suggested an edit for *Trionyx triunguis*/Ghana.

The Committee requested the Secretariat to publish a revised version of document AC32 Com. 3 that would better reflect the lack of consensus in the working group on Review of Significant Trade with a

revised chapeau above the table on page 2 that should read: “In accordance with paragraph 1 b) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18), the working group recommends the following species/country combinations be considered for inclusion in Stage 2 of the Review of Significant Trade, noting that consensus was not reached on all cases.”

The Committee adopted the substance of document AC32 Com. 3 amended as follows:

In accordance with paragraph 1 b) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18), the Committee recommended the following species/country combinations for inclusion in Stage 2 of the Review of Significant Trade.

Species	Country selected	Justification
<i>Falco cherrug</i>	Jordan (JO)	(2) Endangered species; High volume (GT)
<i>Kinixys homeana</i>	Ghana (GH)	(2) Endangered species; High volume (GT)
<i>Python regius</i>	Ghana (GH), Benin (BJ), Togo (TG)	(2) High volume (GT); Sharp increase
<i>Siebenrockiella crassicolis</i>	Indonesia (ID)	(2) Endangered species; High volume (GT)
<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>	Kenya (KE); Senegal (SN); Oman (OM); Yemen (YE)*	(3) Endangered species; Sharp increase (global); Sharp increase
<i>Mobula</i> spp.	Sri Lanka (LK)	(4) Endangered species; High volume (GT); Sharp increase (global); Sharp increase
<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>	Mexico (MX); Indonesia (ID); China (CN); Kenya (KE); Nicaragua (NI); Oman (OM); Sri Lanka (LK); Yemen (YE)	(4) Endangered species; High volume (GT); Sharp increase (global); Sharp increase
<i>Sphyrna mokarran</i>	Mexico (MX)	(3) Endangered species; Sharp increase (global); Sharp increase
<i>Testudo horsfieldii</i>	Uzbekistan (UZ)	(1) High Volume (GT)

* An asterisk denotes a non-range State.

Saiga tatarica/Ukraine

The Committee requested the Secretariat to follow up with Ukraine on its use of source code U for *Saiga tatarica* (noting that it is not a range State for the species) and report any issues of concern to the Standing Committee.

Trionyx triunguis/Ghana

The Committee requested the Secretariat to invite Ghana to provide clarification about the exports from Ghana and to present a case study on this species at the NDF workshop to be held later this year.

Indotestudo forsteri/Indonesia

The Committee agreed not to include this species/country combination in the review following Indonesia’s commitment to the publication of a zero quota for wild specimens from 2024 with trade resuming only after a non-detriment finding has been assessed as satisfactory by the Secretariat and the Animals Committee, through its Chair.

Monodon monoceros/Greenland

The Committee noted that *Monodon monoceros* from Greenland had been removed from RST at AC22 on the basis of a temporary ban. An NDF would be needed for trade to resume. The Committee noted that trade in *Monodon monoceros* had resumed and requested the Secretariat to follow up with Greenland on the NDF requirement.

Balearica regulorum/Democratic Republic of the Congo

The Committee agreed not to include this species/country combination in the review following the Democratic Republic of the Congo’s commitment to the publication of a zero quota for wild specimens from 2024 with trade resuming only after a non-detriment finding has been assessed as satisfactory by the Secretariat and the Animals Committee, through its Chair.

Pandinus spp./Democratic Republic of the Congo

The Committee agreed not to include this species/country combination in the review following the Democratic Republic of the Congo's commitment to the publication of a zero quota for wild specimens from 2024 with trade resuming only after a non-detriment finding has been assessed as satisfactory by the Secretariat and the Animals Committee, through its Chair.

Carcharhinus longimanus/Colombia

The Committee agreed not to include this species/country combination in the review and invited Colombia to request the Secretariat to publish a Notification informing Parties that Colombia has prohibited in all its national territory all trade in specimens and derivatives of sharks, rays and chimaeras, including export, re-export and import.

With regard the inclusion of Mexico in Stage 2 of the Review of Significant Trade for *Sphyrna lewini* and for *Sphyrna mokarran*, Mexico asked the group of experts in sharks for the scientific and technical elements behind their recommendation and that the following statement be included in the summary record:

Mexico expressed its disagreement with the decision of the Animals Committee to maintain its populations of Sphyrna mokarran and Sphyrna lewini in Stage 2 of the Review of Significant Trade even though non-detriment findings were made and Mexico shared enough technical justifications to be excluded. Mexico stated that the working group on sharks had taken the decision unilaterally without the presence of Mexico and questioned the fact that the rest of range countries of Sphyrna mokarran with similar percentages to those of Mexico were not included. Mexico therefore considered that the decision was not balanced or based on scientific elements. Mexico also objected to the setting of a limited number of 20 species/country combinations as established by the Chair, given that the Animals Committee is a scientific committee that should review issues on a case-by-case basis.

15. Captive-bred and ranched specimens

15.1 Review of trade in animal specimens reported as produced in captivity AC32 Doc. 15.1

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 15.1 that contained a summary from the CITES Trade Database of annual report statistics of species traded, derived from the five most recent years, under source codes C, D, F or R and an analysis of such data to identify species-country combinations for review, taking into account any recent nomenclatural changes and the breeding biology of the species, where feasible, using the criteria specified in paragraph 2 a) of Resolution Conf. 17.7 (Rev. CoP19) on *Review of trade in animal specimens reported as produced in captivity*. The Animals Committee was invited to select a limited number of species-country combinations for review.

Mexico indicated that the data in the different tables in the Annex mention trade in other 19 species distributed in Mexico, some of them endemic species, for which there are no evidence of import from range countries or it is known they are difficult to breed and expressed an interest in knowing how non-range States of these endemic Mexican species that are trading captive-bred specimens had acquired their parental stock.

15.2 Captive-breeding of spiny tailed lizards AC32 Doc. 15.2

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 15.2 that contains a report on captive breeding of spiny tailed lizards (*Ceratophora stoddartii*, *Ceratophora aspera* and *Lyriocephalus scutatus*) with information on breeding biology, breeding in captivity, prevalence in zoos, evidence of commercial breeding, and consultations with Species360, trade associations and a number of countries where evidence indicated that the species are bred. The Animals Committee was invited to determine whether any species/country combinations should be selected for review under Resolution Conf. 17.7 (Rev. CoP19).

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) supported the inclusion of the agamid lizard species endemic to Sri Lanka in the review and expressed concerns about the origin of founder stock for captive-breeding operations, noting that no native reptiles have been exported from Sri Lanka for nearly 30 years.

and

15.3 Exceptional case for inclusion of species-country combination in Review of trade in animal specimens as produced in captivity – *Macaca fascicularis*..... AC32 Doc. 15.3

The United States of America introduced document AC32 Doc. 15.3 that invited the Animals Committee to include *Macaca fascicularis* as an exceptional case in the Review of trade in animal specimens as produced in captivity based on the 2022 reclassification by the International Union for Conservation of Nature Red List of Threatened Species assessment of *M. fascicularis* as Endangered, the sustained high levels of exports of the species reported as produced in captivity, and recent indications of large-scale laundering of wild-caught specimens through captive-breeding facilities.

The representative for Asia (Mr. Hamidy) indicated that it would be important to hear from range States about the trade in *Macaca fascicularis*. Cambodia requested that the species not be included in the Review. As a range State of *M. fascicularis*, Cambodia indicated that this was a common and widespread species that had seen its population increase in the country to the point that it was considered an agricultural pest. Cambodia recalled the key role played by that species in biomedical research and in the production of a COVID-19 vaccine. China agreed with Cambodia's proposal and noted that range States were the best protectors of their own fauna and flora. They further suggested that Cambodia and the United States of America consult directly about the issue of illegal trade in *M. fascicularis*.

The Sustainable Use Coalition South Africa suggested that an increase in trade with source codes C, D, F and R implied that fewer specimens of wild source were in trade and recommended that trade data in captive-bred specimens be correlated with the population status of a species in the wild. Humane Society International responded that the review looked into the misuse of source codes and not into the population status of a species in the wild.

The European Animal Research Association challenged the data provided in document AC32 Doc. 15.3, included the IUCN assessment, and expressed concern about the impact of the inclusion of that species in the review on biomedical research.

The Committee established an in-session working group on captive-bred and ranched specimens with the mandate to, taking into account document AC32 Doc. 15.1 and its Annexes, document AC32 Doc. 15.2 and document AC32 Doc. 15.3:

- a) select a limited number of species-country combinations for review,
- b) prepare a brief explanation of the criteria used to justify each selection;
- c) draft general or specific questions for the countries selected for review;
- d) determine and prioritize for which species a request should be made for the commissioning of a short review of the breeding biology, captive husbandry and any impacts, if relevant, of removal of founder stock from the wild; and
- e) identify any urgent enforcement matters which need the attention of the Secretariat, the country concerned and/or the Standing Committee.

The membership was decided as follows:

Chair: Chair of the Animals Committee (Mr. Lörtscher);

Members: representatives for Africa (Ms. Maha and Mr. Kasoma), representative for Asia (Mr. Hamidy), representatives for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Gongora and Mr. Ramadori), representative for Europe (Ms. Ziková), representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz), alternate representative for Africa (Mr. Diouck), alternate representative for Oceania (Ms. McIntyre), nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk);

Parties: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, European Union, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America; and

IGOs and NGOs: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, International Union for Conservation of Nature, ADM Capital Foundation, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, BirdLife International, Born Free Foundation, Center for Biological Diversity, Defenders of Wildlife, European Animal Research Association, European Pet Organisation, German Society of Herpetology, Humane Society International, International Fur Federation, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, National Association for Biomedical Research, Natural Resources Defense Council, Organization of Professional Aviculturists, Ornamental Fish International, Pan African Sanctuary Alliance, Parrot Breeders Association of Southern Africa, Pro Vision Reef, Pro Wildlife, San Diego Zoo Wildlife Alliance, Society for Wildlife and Nature International, South African Taxidermy and Tannery Association, Species Survival Network, SUCO-SA, Sustainable Users Network, TRAFFIC, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wide Fund for Nature.

Later in the meeting, the Chair of the Animals Committee introduced document AC32 Com. 4.

Israel suggested that the Parties should also indicate the size of the specimens exported for the three *Testudo* species. This was agreed by the Committee.

The United States of America supported the recommendations, but expressed doubts about the regional distribution of the cases. They urged all Parties to be vigilant in ensuring that specimens traded as produced in captivity under source codes C, D, F, and R meet all requirements, including ensuring legal acquisition findings and non-detriment findings are made for parental stock, which also includes ensuring that parental stock has been sourced legally from range States.

Regarding *Chlamydotis macqueenii*/United Arab Emirates, the United Arab Emirates provided an explanation of its captive-breeding programme managed by the International Fund for Houbara Conservation that aims at reintroducing this species in its range. Information relating to the establishment, breeding capacity, expansion and successful re-introductions were shared by the United Arab Emirates. They further noted that their captive-breeding facility had been included in the CITES register in 2021. The United Arab Emirates requested that this species/country combination not be included in the review. This was supported by Israel, Saudi Arabia and the United States of America. This was agreed by the Committee.

Regarding *Rhyticerus undulatus*/South Africa, South Africa indicated that the permit corresponding to the trade data reported in document AC32 Doc. 15.1 had never been used and that the export never actually happened. South Africa therefore requested that this species/country combination not be included in the review. This was agreed by the Committee.

The Committee noted the process for the implementation of Decision 19.63 outlined in paragraph 21 of document AC32 Doc. 15.1.

The Committee adopted the substance of document AC32 Com. 4 amended as follows:

The Committee recommended the following species/country combinations for review. The table below includes a brief explanation for the selection and questions to be asked to the Party (for details on the criteria see page 4 in the Annex to document AC32 Doc. 15.1, while details on the questions can be found in the Annex to this document).

	Species	Country	Criterion met	Source code	Explanation for selection	Questions
1	<i>Macaca fascicularis</i>	Indonesia	ii)	F		F1, F2, F3, F4
2	<i>Macaca fascicularis</i>	Cambodia	ii) vi)	C, F, D	In relation to criterion vi) refer to document AC32 doc 15.3	C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6 F1, F2, F3, F4
3	<i>Macaca fascicularis</i>	Philippines	ii)	C		C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6
4	<i>Macaca fascicularis</i>	Vietnam	ii)	C		C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6
8	<i>Chlamydotis macqueenii</i>	Kazakhstan	i)	C		C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6
9	<i>Chlamydotis undulata</i>	Morocco	ii)	C		C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6
10	<i>Kinyongia boehmei</i>	Kenya	ii)	C		C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6
11	<i>Gecko gecko</i>	Indonesia	ii)	F		F1, F2, F3, F4
12	<i>Ctenosaura quinquecarinata</i>	Nicaragua	i)	C		C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6 In addition, explain the sudden increase in volume
13	<i>Ctenosaura similis</i>	Nicaragua	i)	C		C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6 In addition, explain the sudden increase in volume
14	<i>Testudo graeca</i>	Jordan	iii)	C	Might be difficult to breed in large numbers if kept "intensive"	C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6 In addition, explain the shift of source code Indicate the ages and sizes of animals exported
15	<i>Testudo horsfieldii</i>	Uzbekistan	ii) iii)	F, R, C		F1, F2, F3, F4 R2, R3 C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6 In addition, explain the shift of source code Indicate the ages and sizes of animals exported
16	<i>Testudo kleinmanni</i>	Syrian Arab Republic	i) vi) vii)	C	Appendix I, small population size, CR, reference was made to AC31 document and concerns were raised about one sudden high number of captive bred specimens in 2017 for a species not easy to breed in high numbers without information on legal acquisition (no range state and no	C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6 Indicate the ages and sizes of animals exported

					legal imports) of the breeding stock and if it has been established in a manner not detrimental to the wild population	
17	<i>Testudo kleinmanni</i>	Egypt	vii) (vi)	C	Appendix I, small population size, CR, no information if the breeding stock has been established in a manner not detrimental to the wild population	C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6 Indicate the ages of animals exported
18	<i>Nectophrynoides asperginis</i>	United States of America	ii)	F, C		Explain the use of F in combination with IUCN red list status EW If this is incorrect → F1, F2, F3, F4 C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6
19	<i>Dendrobatus auratus</i>	Nicaragua	ii)	C		C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6
20	<i>Oophaga pumilio</i>	Nicaragua	ii)	F, C		F1, F2, F3, F4 C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6
21	<i>Agalychnis callidryas</i>	Nicaragua	ii)	C	Large increase and all are captive bred	C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6
22	<i>Cheilinus undulatus</i>	Indonesia	ii)	R	Not meeting the definition of source code R in that the larvae are harvested after settlement, i.e, after the point of highest mortality in their life cycle, so it cannot be argued that they are taken when they would otherwise have had a very low probability of surviving to adulthood	R2, R3
23	<i>Hirudo medicinalis</i>	Azerbaijan	i) ii) vi)	C	Trade only started in 2019 rising to 1,498,500 in 2021 Not recognized as a range State for this species on Species+ Source of breeding stock unknown and whether regular introductions of wild into breeding stock occur	Confirm the presence of the species in Azerbaijan, Confirm whether Azerbaijan is a range State for this species and identify source of founder breeding stock. C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6
24	<i>Batagur borneoensis</i>	United States of America	vii)	C	Considered difficult to breed	C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6

						Please provide evidence for successful captive breeding Confirm how long the species has been bred in your country
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

The Committee noted that the use of source code R for *Diceros bicornis* used by South Africa and *Loxodonta africana* used by Zimbabwe is not appropriate and requested the Secretariat to remind these Parties accordingly.

In relation to table 7 in the Annex to document AC32 Doc 15.1, the Committee agreed to refer the contents of the table to the Standing Committee for its consideration.

In relation to table 8 in the Annex to document AC32 Doc 15.1, the Committee agreed to refer the contents of the table to the Secretariat for further consultation with the Parties concerned and to refer any issues of concern to the Standing Committee. Specific concerns about *Uromastix acanthinurus* from Mali were raised, noting that Mali is not a range State for this species, but trade has mostly been in source F, and there have been no imports recorded.

The Committee requested that, in its ongoing compliance discussions with the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Secretariat investigate the issue of legal acquisition of founder stock for captive-breeding facilities for *Macaca fascicularis* in the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

In relation to document AC32 Doc 15.2 on spiny tailed lizards (*Ceratophora stoddartii*, *C. aspera* and *Lyriocephalus scutatus*), the Committee noted the concerns raised in the document regarding the protection and conservation status of these three endemic species in Sri Lanka. The three species were not recommended for inclusion in the review at this current time as there has been no reported international trade since the species were listed on the Appendices. The Committee encouraged Parties to scrutinize legal acquisition and breeding claims when faced with export/import applications and any shipments presented for import/(re-)export of these species.

The Committee noted the concern raised by the Pan African Sanctuary Alliance regarding trade in a number of primate species, including Appendix-I species, great apes, small apes, and endangered species, from Syria under source code C.

With the regard to the use of the ISO code TW in documents AC32 Doc. 14.2 and AC32 Doc. 15.1, China asked that the following statement be included in the summary record:

There is only one China in the world. The Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole legal government representing the whole of China.

Taiwan is an inalienable part of the Chinese territory. The "one China" principle is one of the fundamental norms governing international relations. Any act that creates "two Chinas" or "one China, one Taiwan" violates international law.

It is not acceptable to China to include Taiwan in the species/country combination. On this related note, China kindly urges the Secretariat to correct all the expression of species/country combination into "species/country (region)" combination in all AC32 documents and report to properly present Taiwan as a province of China following the resolution of the United Nations.

16. Non-detriment findings PC26 Doc. 17 / AC32 Doc. 16

The Secretariat introduced document PC26 Doc. 17 / AC32 Doc. 16 summarizing ongoing work in the CITES non-detriment finding (NDF) project. The Secretariat noted that the United Nations Campus (UNON) in Gigiri, Nairobi (Kenya) had been identified as the venue for the NDF workshop, scheduled to take place from 4 to 8 December 2023.

The Species Survival Network asked that the workshop be open to Parties and observers beyond the experts involved in the different workstreams and asked for observers to be able to comment on the draft guidance before it is submitted to the workshop.

The Committee noted the continuation of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and the progress of the CITES NDF project. The Committee further noted the likely dates and venue of the international expert workshop, and the advice regarding its organization and work plan made by the TAG at its second meeting.

17. Non-detriment findings for specimens of Appendix-II species taken from areas beyond national jurisdiction AC32 Comp.

The Secretariat presented progress on the implementation of Decisions 19.189 to 19.191 on *Non-detriment findings for specimens of Appendix-II species taken from areas beyond national jurisdiction*. The Secretariat noted that the workstream on "Non-detriment findings (NDFs) for marine or aquatic species, including regional implications for shared species, introduction from the sea, and NDFs for marine or aquatic invertebrates" of the NDF workshop scheduled to take from 4 to 8 December 2023 would partly address the making of NDFs from areas beyond national jurisdiction. Given the possible overlap in participants of the technical workshop referred to in this Decision and in Decision 19.189 on *Aquatic species listed in the CITES Appendices*, the Secretariat explained it was considering convening two workshops back-to-back in early 2024, subject to available funding and a host for the workshops.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland highlighted the importance of this work considering the high number of sharks included in the Appendices at the 19th meeting of the Conference of the Parties and supported the proposed organization of back-to-back workshops. The International Union for Conservation of Nature, speaking also on behalf of TRAFFIC, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wide Fund for Nature and the Zoological Society of London, stressed that coordination among Parties fishing in the high seas was crucial for sustainability and called for improved regional coordination for shared stocks.

The Committee noted the information relating to *Non-detriment findings (NDF) for specimens of Appendix-II species taken from areas beyond national jurisdiction* as contained in document AC32 Comp. The Committee further noted the comments made in plenary, especially the idea of holding back-to-back workshops on NDF for specimens of Appendix-II species taken from areas beyond national jurisdiction and on aquatic species listed in the Appendices.

18. Guidance on non-detriment findings for trade in leopard (*Panthera pardus*) hunting trophies AC32 Comp.

The Secretariat provided an updated on the implementation of Decisions 18.166, 18.168 (Rev. CoP19) and 18.169 (Rev. CoP19) on *Guidance on non-detriment findings for trade in leopard hunting trophies* and indicated that it would reach out to Parties with quotas for leopard hunting trophies to exchange information and lessons learnt as required in those Decisions. Further, the Secretariat noted that it had not secured funding for the development of NDF guidance in accordance with paragraph b) of Decision 18.169 (Rev. CoP19).

Austria suggested that regular surveys of leopard populations should be undertaken by all range States. The United Republic of Tanzania noted that the quotas indicated in Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP19) on *Quotas for leopard hunting trophies and skins for personal use* had been accepted as non-detrimental by the Conference of the Parties and welcomed any support to conduct population surveys. Senegal highlighted that hunting was a way to manage populations and had to rely on population surveys.

Conservation Force considered that these Decisions go beyond Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP19) on *Quotas for leopard hunting trophies and skins for personal use* and Resolution Conf. 9.21 (Rev. CoP18) on *Interpretation and application of quotas for species included in Appendix I* and announced that Conservation Force and Dallas Safari Club Foundation were pledging the funds necessary for the development of guidance in the making of non-detriment findings for trade in leopard hunting trophies.

Humane Society International, speaking also on behalf of Animal Welfare Institute, Born Free Foundation, Center for Biological Diversity and Species Survival Network, considered that guidance needs to be in place before quotas are established and that long term management of the populations was needed. They expressed their deep concerns about the quotas in Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP19) and called for the suspension of all quotas until the development of guidance and non-detriment findings.

The Sustainable Use Coalition South Africa considered that halting trade in leopard hunting trophies would be severely detrimental to leopard populations, while the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation highlighted the challenges associated with leopard population surveys and the high cost of these surveys.

The Committee noted the information relating to *Guidance on non-detriment findings for trade in leopard hunting trophies* as contained in document AC32 Comp.; the concerns raised in plenary; and the funding

pledged by Conservation Force and Dallas Safari Club Foundation for the development of guidance in the making of non-detriment findings for trade in leopard hunting trophies.

19. Materials for the identification of specimens of CITES-listed species

19.1 Report of the Secretariat..... PC26 Doc. 19 /AC32 Doc. 19.1

The Secretariat introduced document PC26 Doc. 19 / AC32 Doc. 19.1 and noted that Decision 19.142 directs the Animals and Plant Committee to establish a joint intersessional working group to review selected identification materials and to assess the need for revision and improvement, taking into account materials that have been developed by Parties, and materials requested in Decisions and Resolutions. To support this work, the Secretariat had prepared a list of references to species identification in Resolutions, contained in Annex 1 and to Decisions, contained in Annex 2. The Secretariat also conveyed the recommendations adopted by the Plants Committee on this issue at its 26th meeting from 5 to 9 June 2023.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) and the United States of America supported the proposed way forward and agreed with the terms of reference of the intersessional working group as adopted by the Plants Committee. Following a query by the representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson), the Chair indicated that the work to be undertaken by China as described in agenda item 19.2 could be considered by the intersessional working group under paragraph a) of its mandate. Following a query by the German Society of Herpetology, the Chair further explained that identification materials prepared by observer organizations could also be considered by the intersessional working group.

India called for the sharing of images of seized tiger skins with the national focal points or agencies in tiger range States, which have photographic identification databases for tigers, including India, in accordance with Resolution Conf. 12.5 (Rev. CoP19) on *Conservation of and trade in tigers and other Appendix-I Asian big cat species*. India also provided an update on its tiger monitoring programme.

The Committee established a joint intersessional working group on materials for the identification of specimens of CITES-listed species with a mandate to, in consultation with the Secretariat:

- a) review selected identification materials and assess the need for their revision and improvement, taking into account the materials that are being developed or have already been developed by Parties and materials requested in Decisions or Resolutions as well as materials received in response to the Notification to the Parties No. 2023/051, and other relevant information, such as that compiled during previous discussions of joint intersessional working groups established since CoP16 (Bangkok, 2013);
- b) take into consideration other items on the agendas of the Animals and Plants Committees related to the development of identification material to support coordination and avoid duplication of effort;
- c) when assessing gaps in identification materials, take into account those taxa that have been included in the Appendices at higher taxon levels solely due to look-alike issues, as well as the need for frontline and forensic identification tools;
- d) consider ways to improve the accuracy and availability of identification materials on CITES-listed species, including considerations and implications of linking identification materials directly in the *Checklist of CITES Species* (checklist.cites.org/#/en); and
- e) report on the progress with these activities to the joint session of the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee and 27th meeting of the Plants Committee.

The membership was decided as follows³:

Chair for AC: representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson);

Chair for PC: alternate representative for Asia (Mr. Chong);

³ This includes the expression of interest at the 26th meeting of the Plants Committee.

PC Members: representative for Africa (Mr. Balama);

Parties: Argentina, Canada, China, European Union, Germany, India, Kuwait, Mexico, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America; and

IGOs and NGOs: United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, American Herbal Products Association, Association Technique Internationale des Bois Tropicaux, European Association of Zoos and Aquaria, European Pet Organisation, ForestBased Solutions, German Society of Herpetology, Humane Society International, International Wood Products Association, South African Taxidermy and Tannery Association, Species Survival Network, SUCO-SA, Wildlife Conservation Society.

The Committee noted the update provided by India on its photographic identification work on tigers.

19.2 Identification Manual of animals listed in CITES Appendix I AC32 Doc. 19.2

China introduced document AC32 Doc. 19.2 and noted that, after 50 years since the signing of CITES, identification materials for Appendix-I animal species needed to be updated. China asked for the support of relevant experts and specialists to sort out and summarise existing identification materials for Appendix-I listed animal species and compile an updated "Identification manual of animals listed in CITES Appendix I" that would be shared with the intersessional working group.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) and the representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson) both welcomed China's initiative and noted that this work should feed into the work of the intersessional working group. The representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson), South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania, the German Society of Herpetology, Humane Society International and Wildlife Conservation Society expressed an interest in contributing to this initiative. Following a query from Humane Society International, China indicated that the identification materials would be available in Chinese, English, French and Spanish.

The Committee welcomed the initiative by China and encouraged China to feed the results of this identification work into the joint intersessional working group on materials for the identification of specimens of CITES-listed species. The Committee requested the Secretariat to publish a Notification to the Parties asking Parties and observers to communicate to China their interest in participating in the initiative on Identification Manual of animals listed in CITES Appendix I.

20. Transport of live specimens PC26 Doc. 21 / AC32 Doc. 20

The United States of America introduced document PC26 Doc. 21 / AC32 Doc. 20 that proposed a way forward for the organization of a workshop to share best practices related to live animal and plant transport and conveyed the recommendations of the Plants Committee on this agenda item.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) supported the recommendations in the document.

Israel, echoed by Austria, the Association of Zoos and Aquariums and Wildlife Conservation Society, asked the Secretariat to work with the International Air Transport Association (IATA) so that Parties that need to comply with the *IATA Live Animal Regulations* can have access to it free of charge.

The Association of Zoos and Aquariums recommended that the workshop also be open to importers, exporters and transporters since they are the ones implementing the IATA regulations. Wildlife Conservation Society suggested that webinars and training videos on how to transport CITES live specimens be prepared and made available to Parties. Born Free Foundation, speaking also on behalf of Defenders of Wildlife, Humane Society International and Species Survival Network, welcomed the continuation of the work on the *Guidelines for the non-air transport of wild animals and plants* to which they had contributed and recommended that the workshop also be open to observers and to the World Organisation for Animal Health.

The Committee requested the alternate representative for Asia (Ms. Terada) and the alternate representative for Europe (Mr. Benyr), in collaboration with the Secretariat, to develop the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the virtual workshop to share best practices related to live animal and plant transport and submit the ToR for consideration by the Standing Committee. The Committee furthermore requested the Secretariat to publish

a Notification to the Parties to welcome feedback about the workshop content and to request expressions of interest from Parties and relevant experts in serving as workshop instructors.

The Committee noted the comments made in plenary and invited its representatives working on the TOR of the workshop to convey these ideas and concerns.

21. Use of coded-microchip implants for marking live animals in trade AC32 Doc. 21

The Chair introduced document AC32 Doc. 21 and indicated that Resolution Conf. 8.13 (Rev. CoP17) on *Use of coded-microchip implants for marking live animals in trade* may need an update as the technologies and standards have changed. He also noted that there are several specific recommendations in other Resolutions concerning the marking of specimens in trade, such as Resolution Conf. 17.12 on *Conservation, sustainable use of and trade in snakes* or Resolution Conf. 11.12 (Rev.CoP15) on *Universal tagging system for the identification of crocodylian skins*. He proposed that as Chair of the Animals Committee, he will work intersessionally with the CITES Secretariat and the ISO Secretariat to develop a proposal on this matter for consideration by the Animals Committee at its 33rd meeting.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) welcomed the document and looked forward to progress on this issue. Germany announced that it will commission a study on methods for individual marking of animal species based on recent scientific and practical evidence/experience, taking into account animal welfare issues, different methods of markings, the issue of manipulations and technical limitations for diverse taxa.

The Committee noted document AC32 Doc. 21 and further noted that Germany would commission in 2024 a study on methods for individual marking of animal species based on recent scientific and practical experience.

22. Specimens produced through biotechnology PC26 Doc.22 / AC32 Doc. 22

The Secretariat introduced document PC26 Doc. 22 / AC32 Doc. 22 since Cuba, the author of the document and Chair of the Standing Committee's intersessional working group on specimens produced through biotechnology, was not present at the 32nd meeting of the Animals Committee. The document provided an update on the work of the Standing Committee's working group and invited the Animals and Plants Committees to nominate representatives for that working group. The Secretariat noted that it had not secured the necessary funding estimated at USD 80,000 to organize a meeting and develop guidance on the implementation of the amendment to Resolution Conf. 9.6 (Rev. CoP19) on *Trade in readily recognizable parts and derivatives*. Finally, the Secretariat conveyed the recommendations adopted by the Plants Committee on this issue at its 26th meeting from 5 to 9 June 2023.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) lamented the lack of funding to convene an in-person meeting but supported the organization of an online meeting to start the work.

The Committee noted document PC26 Doc. 22 / AC32 Doc. 22 and agreed to nominate the alternate representative for North America (Mr. Leuteritz) and the alternate representative for Oceania (Ms. McIntyre) to participate in the Standing Committee's intersessional working group on specimens produced through biotechnology.

23. Trade in stony corals (Scleractinia spp.)

23.1 Report of the Chair of the Animals Committee AC32 Doc. 23.1

The Chair introduced document AC32 Doc. 23.1 that relayed some concerns that had been raised about trade in stony corals, specifically "confusion in relation to what 'coral rock' means, what forms of coral rock are subject to the provisions of the Convention and how coral rock should be reported in trade". The Annex to document AC32 Doc. 23.1 contained proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.10 (Rev. CoP15) on *Trade in stony corals* to address the issues raised. The Animals Committee was invited to draft a Notification to the Parties, seeking advice from coral reef nations and coral experts, in the implementation of Decision 19.177 and to establish an intersessional working group to progress work on the issue.

and

23.2 Reporting of trade in stony corals (*Scleractinia* spp.) AC32 Doc. 23.2

Sweden, on behalf of the European Union, introduced document AC32 Doc. 23.2 that proposed amendments to the *Guidelines for the preparation and submission of CITES annual reports* in order to address reporting issues related to trade in stony corals. Sweden asked that this issue be included in the terms of reference of the proposed intersessional working group.

The representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson) expressed an interest in taking the lead in the drafting of the Notification to the Parties.

The representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Gongora) relayed the concerns of Central America and the Caribbean about trade in stony corals. The loss of corals due to climate change had a significant impact on the biodiversity of the countries of the region, but also on their economy that relies on tourism.

Mexico and the United States of America agreed to the proposed way forward as reflected in the document and indicated that they had edits on the proposed amendments to the Resolution and the *Guidelines* that they would forward directly to the Secretariat and the intersessional working group. Australia also agreed with the proposed way forward and, echoed by Pro Vision Reef and Ornamental Fish International, highlighted the issue of units of measure and conversion factors in reporting in trade in stony corals.

Ornamental Fish International, speaking also on behalf of the European Pet Organisation, Pet Advocacy Network and Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association, indicated that any amendment should reflect how trade operates and should not lead to confusion and unintended consequences.

The Committee established an in-session working group on trade in stony corals with the mandate to draft a Notification to the Parties concerning the implementation of Decision 19.177, seeking advice from coral reef nations and coral experts.

The membership was decided as follows:

Members: representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Gongora) and representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson);

Parties: Australia, European Union; and

IGOs and NGOs: United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Ornamental Fish International, Pro Vision Reef.

The Committee established an intersessional working group on stony corals with the mandate to:

- a) review the responses to the Notification to the Parties concerning the implementation of Decision 19.177, seeking advice from coral reef nations and coral experts;
- b) make recommendations on possible amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.10 (Rev. CoP15) on *Trade in stony corals* and
- c) provide advice on the conversion factors used to analyse trade in corals for the Review of Significant Trade process;
- d) propose amendments to the *Guidelines for the preparation and submission of CITES annual reports* and the *Guidelines for the preparation and submission of the CITES annual illegal trade reports*; and
- e) present its findings to the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee.

The membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Gongora) alternate representative for Asia (Mr. Diesmos);

Parties: Australia, Brazil, China, European Union, France, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America; and

IGOs and NGOs: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, Center for Biological Diversity, European Pet Organisation, Indonesian Coral, Shell and Ornamental Fish Association, Ornamental Fish International, Pet Advocacy Network, Pro Vision Reef.

Later in the meeting, the representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson) introduced document AC32 Com. 1 and the United States of America proposed some specific edits as reflected below.

The Committee adopted document AC32 Com. 1 with the following amendments:

- add the following text at the beginning of the first sentence of paragraph 3 in the draft Notification to the CITES Parties: “At the request of the Animals Committee..”;
- amend the title in Annex 1 to replace the term “Proposed” with “Possible”; and
- amend the title in Annex 2 to replace the term “Suggested” with “Possible”.

24. Definition of the term ‘appropriate and acceptable destinations’ AC32 Comp.

The Secretariat provided an update on the implementation of Decision 19.164 on *Definition of the term “appropriate and acceptable destinations”*. The Secretariat indicated it would issue a Notification in the third quarter of 2023 inviting Parties to provide feedback on experience with using the guidance documents and other information provided on the CITES webpage “Appropriate and acceptable destinations”. The Secretariat would bring any feedback reported to the attention of the Animals Committee at its 33rd meeting in 2024.

The United States of America agreed with the proposed way forward in the document.

Pro Wildlife, speaking also on behalf of Born Free Foundation, Fondation Franz Weber, Humane Society International, Pan-African Sanctuary Alliance and Species Survival Network, expressed reservations about the non-binding documents and reminded Parties of Decision 19.168 on *Trade in live African elephants* (*Loxodonta africana*). They encouraged Parties to provide feedback on the non-binding guidance.

The Committee noted document AC32 Comp.

25. Review of CITES provisions related to trade in specimens of animals and plants not of wild source

25.1 Report of the Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committees PC26 Doc. 23 / AC32 Doc. 25.1

The Chair of the Animals Committee introduced document PC26 Doc. 23 / AC32 Doc. 25.1 proposing the establishment of a joint intersessional working group to support the implementation of Decision 19.180. The Chair noted that this proposed way forward had been agreed by the Plants Committee at its 26th meeting from 5 to 9 June 2023.

Canada, as Chair of the Standing Committee’s intersessional working group on trade in specimens not of wild source, provided an update on the working group’s activities and drew the Committee’s attention to information document AC32 Inf. 5 that provided a draft road map for a review of CITES provisions related to trade in specimens of animals and plants not of wild source. Canada would welcome comments on the draft roadmap.

Ornamental Fish International, speaking also on behalf of the European Pet Organisation, Pet Advocacy Network and Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association, drew the Committee’s attention to the issue of the marking of small-bodied animals and the issue of legal acquisition findings of founder stocks for captive-breeding operations.

The Committee agreed with the recommendations of the Plants Committee as follows:

The Committee established a joint intersessional working group on trade in specimens not of wild source that will work separately and jointly with the mandate to:

- a) consider the key elements in the current implementation of Article VII paragraphs 4 and 5 for animals and plants, respectively, in the current applicable Resolutions;
- b) determine if there is a need to implement Article VII paragraphs 4 and 5 differently for either animal specimens from species bred in captivity or plant specimens that are artificially propagated than what is outlined in existing Resolutions, and provide their recommendations to the Standing Committee in time for its 78th meeting;
- c) provide any other scientific advice and guidance on CITES provisions concerning trade in non-wild specimens of CITES-listed animal and plant species to the Standing Committee upon request and as appropriate; and
- d) report on progress to the joint session of the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee and 27th meeting of the Plants Committee.

The membership was decided as follows⁴:

Chair for AC: representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz);

Chair for PC: representative for Oceania (Mr. Wrigley);

AC Members: representative for Europe (Ms. Zíková);

Parties: Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, European Union, Germany, India, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America; and

IGOs and NGOs: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, Euromed, European Pet Organisation, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, Organization of Professional Aviculturists, Ornamental Fish International, Parrot Breeders Association of Southern Africa, Species Survival Network, Sustainable Users Network, TRAFFIC, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wide Fund for Nature.

The Committee agreed to nominate the Chair for AC of the joint intersessional working group (Mr. Benítez Díaz) to participate in the Standing Committee's intersessional working group and invited the co-Chairs of the Standing Committee's intersessional working group to work closely with the AC/PC joint intersessional working group in implementing their mandates.

The Committee agreed that the European Association of Zoos and Aquaria would participate in the joint intersessional working group on trade in specimens not of wild source.

25.2 Considerations and recommendations for ranching of marine species AC32 Doc. 25.2

The United States of America introduced document AC32 Doc. 25.2 that outlined its concerns of the use of the source code R for marine species. The United States indicated that the original purposes of the term include ensuring the ranching programme must be primarily beneficial to the conservation of the local population and must have sufficient safeguards to ensure that adequate numbers of animals are returned to the wild if necessary and where appropriate. They further noted that evidence must be provided that the taking from the wild would have no significant detrimental impact on wild populations. The Animals Committee was invited to consider whether guidelines for the making of NDFs for specimens of marine species sourced from ranching operations are needed and whether the making of NDFs for specimens of marine species sourced from ranching operations should be included in the agenda of the upcoming NDF workshop scheduled to take place in December 2023.

⁴ This includes the expression of interest at the 26th meeting of the Plants Committee.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz), Peru and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland supported the recommendations in the document and echoed the concerns raised about the use of source code R for marine species, noting the lack of monitoring of these practices. The United Kingdom indicated that different taxa have different life history traits and therefore different case studies would be needed *inter alia* to define what “very low probability of surviving to adulthood” means.

The International Union for Nature, speaking also on behalf of TRAFFIC, the World Wide Fund for Nature and the Zoological Society of London, supported the recommendations and suggested that the work should cover all aquatic species.

The Committee recommended that the upcoming global expert workshop on non-detriment findings (NDF) consider guidelines for the making of NDFs for specimens of marine species sourced from ranching operations and report back on this issue to the Animals Committee at its 33rd meeting.

26. Assessment of Appendix-I listed species..... PC26 Doc.25 / AC32 Doc. 26

The Secretariat introduced document PC26 Doc. 25 / AC32 Doc. 26 and presented the result of a rapid assessment of conservation status of, and legal and illegal in trade in species include in Appendix I. The Secretariat selected a list of ten species for detailed assessments, which included eight fauna species. The Secretariat provided a summary of detailed assessments of these 10 species in the Annex to the document and indicated that the detailed assessments will be shared with range States to provide information not readily available in scientific literature. Based on the responses, the detailed assessments will be finalized and the Secretariat will prepare a report, which will include recommendation on possible actions within the CITES mandate to improve the status of the species and provide information to refine the methodology for an assessment of Appendix-I species. Finally, the Secretariat conveyed the recommendations adopted by the Plants Committee on this issue at its 26th meeting from 5 to 9 June 2023.

The Committee established a joint intersessional working group on Appendix-I species to:

- a) review the results of the rapid assessment in information document AC31 Inf. 6/ PC25 Inf. 8 on Rapid assessment of Appendix-I taxa that could potentially benefit from further CITES action, the suggestions in document AC31/PC25 Com. 1 (Rev. by Sec.), the Annex to the present document, the case studies and responses from range States on the 10 species selected for detailed assessments;
- b) refine the methodology and its criteria for carrying out an assessment of species listed in Appendix I that might benefit from measures adopted by the Conference of the Parties; and
- c) formulate draft recommendations for consideration at the joint session of the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee and 27th meeting of the Plants Committee.

The membership was decided as follows⁵:

Co-Chairs for AC: representative for Asia (Mr. Hamidy) and alternate representative for Oceania (Ms. McIntyre);

Chair for PC: representative for Asia (Ms. Zeng);

AC Members: representative for Africa (Ms. Maha);

PC Members: representative for North America (Mr. Boles);

Parties: China, Colombia, European Union, Germany, India, Indonesia, Japan, Madagascar, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, United States of America, Zimbabwe; and

IGOs and NGOs: United Nation Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, International Union for Conservation of Nature, BirdLife International, Conservation Force, European Association of Zoos and Aquaria, ForestBased Solutions, German Society of

⁵ This includes the expression of interest at the 26th meeting of the Plants Committee.

27. Identifying information on species at risk of extinction affected by international trade PC26 Doc. 26 /AC32 Doc. 27

The Chair of the Animals Committee introduced document PC26 Doc. 26 / AC32 Doc. 27 focusing on a possible process or mechanism under Resolution Conf. 19.2 on *Capacity-building* to provide Parties with information to be considered in the preparation of listing proposals when Parties request such information. A few options for sharing information were contained in paragraph 8 of the document and capacity-building options included in paragraph 9. The Chair noted that the Plants Committee had established a joint intersessional working group to move forward on this work.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as Chair of the Standing Committee's intersessional working group on the issue, provided an update on its work: it had shared a tentative timeline with members of the working group indicating that the working group discussions depended on the timing of recommendations coming from the Animals and Plants Committees and that there would be a small window for the working group to develop its recommendations to the 78th meeting of the Standing Committee following the 27th meeting of the Plants Committee and 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee.

Canada and Senegal supported the establishment of the intersessional working group and highlighted the importance of this work. Canada noted that the Virtual College had some sections on how to make amendment proposals that could be updated. Israel, echoed by Humane Society International, indicated that it would have been preferable to focus on finding species that were at risk of extinction for the Conference of the Parties to consider including them in the Appendices.

TRAFFIC drew the Committee's attention to the methodology of the review that analysed and assessed Mexican species in trade that could benefit from an inclusion in the Appendices. The United Nations Environment Programme-World Conservation Monitoring Centre informed the Committee that it had developed a new mechanism to identify endangered species in the Red List and at risk of international trade.

The Committee established a joint intersessional working group on species at risk of extinction with the mandate to develop draft recommendations on:

- a) a possible process or mechanism under Resolution Conf. 19.2 on *Capacity-building* to provide Parties with information to be considered in the preparation of listing proposals when Parties request information such as:
 - i) relevant studies, analyses or other sources of information on the identification of species at risk of extinction that are not yet regulated under CITES and may be affected by international trade, or
 - ii) relevant studies, analyses or other sources of information on the identification of species that may receive insufficient CITES regulation and may be affected by international trade;
- b) possible processes/ mechanisms for providing support or guidance to Parties in the development of listing proposals in addition to the process or mechanism referred to under a) above;
- c) coordination with the CITES Secretariat, CITES Parties, IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, FAO, regional competent authorities, and relevant experts, as appropriate as part of a possible process/es or mechanism/s to provide Parties with information to be considered in the preparation of listing proposals when Parties request information; and
- d) report back with its recommendations to the joint session of the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee and 27th meeting of the Plants Committees.

The membership was decided as follows⁶:

Co-Chairs for AC: Chair of the Animals Committee (Mr. Lörtscher) and the nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk);

⁶ This includes the expression of interest at the 26th meeting of the Plants Committee.

- Chair for PC: representative for North America (Mr. Boles);
- PC Members: Chair of the Plants Committee (representative for Africa, Ms. Koumba Pambo) and the representative for Asia (Ms. Zeng);
- Parties: Brazil, Canada, China, European Union, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Russian Federation, Senegal, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zimbabwe; and
- IGOs and NGOs: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, International Union for Conservation of Nature, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, BirdLife International, Center for Biological Diversity, Conservation Force, Defenders of Wildlife, European Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation, European Pet Organisation, German Society of Herpetology, Humane Society International, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, Natural Resources Defense Council, OCEANA, Organization of Professional Aviculturists, Safari Club International, Species Survival Network, SUCO-SA, TRAFFIC, Zoological Society of London.

The Committee agreed to nominate its Chair (representative for Europe, Mr. Lörtscher) and the nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk) to participate in the Standing Committee’s intersessional working group on species at risk of extinction.

28. Aquatic species listed in the Appendices AC32 Comp.

The Secretariat provided an update on the implementation of Decisions 19.189 to 19.191 on *Aquatic species listed in the CITES Appendices* and informed the Committee it had not secured funding for the convening of a workshop on the issue estimated at a cost of USD 80,000. Given the possible overlap in participants of the technical workshop referred to in this Decision and in Decision 19.136 on *Non-detriment findings for specimens of Appendix-II species taken from areas beyond national jurisdiction*, the Secretariat explained it was considering convening the two workshops back-to-back in early 2024, subject to available funding and host for the workshops.

The United States of America, echoed by the Wildlife Conservation Society, supported the proposed organization of back-to-back workshops that should have the broadest possible participation.

The Committee noted the information relating to *Aquatic species listed in the CITES Appendices* as contained in document AC32 Comp.

29. West African vultures AC32 Doc. 29

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 29 and summarised the responses it had received from Parties about the implementation of the Decisions on *West African vultures (Accipitridae spp.)* (see information document AC32 Inf. 8). The Secretariat noted that the most significant threats facing West African vultures were the mortality caused by intentional poisoning in the form of poison baits set illegally for the deliberate collection of vultures or their parts as fetishes for belief-based use, and by poachers deliberately targeting vultures to prevent them from drawing the attention of wardens to illegally killed elephants. The Secretariat also provided a summary of direct international trade data covering the period 2000 to 2022, with the two species most traded over the period being *Gyps africanus* (White-backed vulture) and *Gyps fulvus* (Griffon vulture) and with the number of trade transactions declining over time. The Secretariat noted that Guinea had requested technical and financial support to make non-detriment findings and that this would be provided as part of the Compliance Assistance Programme.

The Committee encouraged West African range States to undertake a Periodic Review of the vulture species referred to in Decision 19.192 pursuant to Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP19) on *Periodic Review of species included in Appendices I and II*, taking note of the offer of the Vulture Specialist Group of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) to assist range States in such endeavour. The Committee invited the representatives for Africa to reach out to the West African vulture range States to engage the IUCN on this matter.

The Committee noted that Guinea requested technical and financial support and that this support will be provided through the Compliance Assistance Programme and further noted that poisoning remains one of the main concerns and that international trade transactions have declined over time.

The Committee noted the information submitted by the Secretariat in accordance with Decision 19.194, paragraph e).

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

30. Conservation of amphibians (Amphibia spp.)..... AC32 Doc. 30

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 30 and informed the Committee that it had secured funding for the preparation of three studies on (1) identification of non-CITES listed amphibian species that are in international trade; (2) assessment of the emerging threat of diseases to amphibians that are traded internationally; and (3) a compilation of existing national legislation relevant to the trade in both CITES listed and non-CITES listed amphibians; as well as the organization of two online workshops that would be held later this year.

The representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori) and Colombia, as the second country with the greatest diversity in amphibians, called for the work to focus on Centrolenidae and for the studies to also look at illegal trade. Colombia highlighted its capacity and financial needs relating to amphibians.

France drew the Committee's attention to the problem of labelling of amphibians and to a 2012 study that had found that 17 species of frogs were included in a frozen box of frog legs under the label "frogs".

Following a query from Humane Society International, the Chair indicated that paragraph 4 b) of the document should read "this study will explore the emerging threat of diseases to and from amphibians that are traded internationally".

Mexico asked that the results of the three studies be shared prior to the workshops so that Parties could comment and assess whether or not they should attend the workshops. The Secretariat indicated that it would issue a Notification after this meeting of the Animals Committee seeking information from Parties, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations for the studies. The Animals Committee will be invited to consider the results of the workshops at its 33rd meeting. The German Society of Herpetology expressed concern as to the narrow timeframe for this work and expressed its readiness to support it.

The Committee noted document AC32 Doc. 30 and the oral report by the Secretariat. The Committee further noted the comments made in plenary on the three studies described in the document.

31. Pangolins (Manis spp.)..... AC32 Doc. 31

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 31 and informed the Committee that it had worked with the Species Survival Commission Pangolin Specialist Group of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) to develop conversion parameters for all pangolin species that would enable the reliable determination of the number of animals associated with any quantity of pangolin scales seized, in collaboration with the pangolin range States (see the table in paragraph 6 of the document). IUCN provided an update on its work on conversion parameters and noted that it had enough data for six of the pangolin species and that they were still gathering data for two species.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) and Cameroon welcomed the report and noted that additional work was needed before the finalization of the conversion parameters. The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) proposed that the Secretariat issue a Notification asking for samples of pangolin scales for this work. Cameroon noted that, as a range State of tree pangolin species, it was awaiting the results of this work to implement it in its national legislation.

The Committee noted document AC32 Doc. 31 and comments made during the plenary and invited the International Union for Conservation of Nature to provide an updated report to the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee. The Committee requested the Secretariat to publish a Notification to the Parties to solicit samples from relevant and potential sources holding carcasses and skins, including zoos and museums,

that can be used to increase the sample sizes to meet or exceed the minimum baseline of 30 specimens for those species not adequately represented.

32. African lions (*Panthera leo*)..... AC32 Doc. 32

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 32 and indicated that several issues relating to the African lion, including the *Guidelines for the conservation of lions in Africa*, had been discussed by the second range States' meeting of the joint CITES-CMS African Carnivores Initiative (ACI). The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), in consultation with the range States, would update the *Guidelines* and would prepare, in collaboration with the CITES and CMS Secretariats, a web-based document on the ACI web-portal that would be a "living" document to be updated as new information becomes available. A group responsible for the review of proposed amendments to the *Guidelines* before its online publication had been established (see information document AC32 Inf. 7, containing the outcomes of the ACI range States' meeting).

The Secretariat informed the Committee that it was developing guidance on the making of non-detriment findings for African lions in collaboration with IUCN and in close consultation with the range States. To initiate the process, questions on existing information and processes relating to NDFs for lions were prepared and shared with the ACI range States for inputs.

The Secretariat provided the Committee with information relating to the implementation of previous Decision 18.246.

The Secretariat furthermore informed the Committee that the study entitled *The legal and illegal trade in big cats* was presented at the Big Cat Task Force that took place in April 2023 in Entebbe, Uganda (see information document AC32 Inf. 9 with the outcomes of the Big Cat Task Force). The Standing Committee would consider the outcomes of the CITES Big Cat Task Force that included strategies, measures and activities to improve international collaboration regarding the enforcement of the Convention to address illegal trade in specimens of big cat species.

The representative for Africa (Mr. Kasoma) stressed that African carnivores were under pressure due to human-wildlife conflict and that, more than funding for studies, resources were direly needed for on-the-ground activities where there are human-wildlife conflicts. Cameroon and Zimbabwe echoed this call for additional support, noting that it would welcome support for the production of NDFs.

India noted the outcomes of the ACI2 meeting and called for Parties to join the International Big Cat Alliance launched by India in April 2023 to promote the conservation of big cats and to fight *inter alia* illegal trade.

Born Free Foundation, speaking also on behalf of ADM Capital Foundation, Animal Welfare Institute, Centre for Biological Diversity, Fondation Franz Weber, Humane Society International, Pro Wildlife and Species Survival Network, suggested that importing countries should also be consulted in the development of guidance for NDFs and expressed disappointment that funding was never secured to assess whether the trade in lion specimens reported under purpose code "H" follows the guidance in Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP19) on *Permits and certificates*.

The Committee noted document AC32 Doc. 32 and the updates provided by the Secretariat that includes information shared through information documents AC32 Inf. 7 and Inf. 9.

The Committee also noted that a revised *Guidelines for the conservation of lions in Africa* is not available for review by the Animals Committee and that the CITES Big Cat Task Force considered the study entitled *The legal and illegal trade in big cats* during its meeting that resulted in outcomes agreed.

The Committee further noted the comments made by the regional representative for Africa (Mr. Kasoma) that additional funding should be provided to tackle issues of human-wildlife conflict on the ground.

33. Leopards (*Panthera pardus*) in Africa..... AC32 Doc. 33

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 33 and informed the Committee that the range States of the joint CITES-CMS African Carnivores Initiative had discussed the *Roadmap for the conservation of the leopard* during their second range States' meeting and had agreed that the International Union for Conservation of Nature would update the *Roadmap* and finalize it in consultation with range States.

Furthermore, range States agreed to focus on the development of regional conservation strategies for leopard, using the *Roadmap* as strategic guidance.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) supported the collaborative effort for leopard conservation, but expressed concern about the timing of the review of the *Roadmap*. Humane Society International, speaking also on behalf of Born Free Foundation, Center for Biological Diversity, Species Survival Network, Animal Welfare Institute and Pro Wildlife, echoed by the World Wide Fund for Nature, called for the suspension of all leopard hunting trophies quotas.

The Committee noted document AC32 Doc. 33 and the updates provided by the Secretariat that includes information shared through information document AC32 Inf. 7. The Committee further noted that a revised *Roadmap for the conservation of leopards* is not available for review by AC32. The Committee invited the Secretariat to submit the revised *Roadmap for the conservation of leopards* to the Animals Committee when available.

34. Songbird trade and conservation management (Passeriformes spp.)..... AC32 Doc. 34

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 34 and informed the Committee that it was producing a preliminary study with an overview of the current state of knowledge on the scale and scope of international songbird trade to consider the management and conservation priorities of songbird taxa involved in such trade. This study was expected to produce a preliminary list of the songbird taxa (species and species groupings) that are traded internationally. An in-person technical workshop would be convened by the Secretariat in the last quarter of 2023 to review the preliminary study and to consider the management and conservation of songbird taxa involved in international trade.

The representative for Asia (Mr. Hamidy) commented on paragraphs 5 and 6 of the document describing the study and suggested that trade in captive-bred birds should be considered by the study, while the representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson), also on the same paragraphs, noted that the study should also consider the consumer end of the chain. Humane Society International suggested that the study should also look at the domestic trade component.

The United States of America confirmed that it was providing funding for this workshop that should include interpretation in all three languages of the Convention and should cover trade in all regions. The Democratic Republic of the Congo echoed the latter comment of the United States, noting that trade in songbirds also occurred in Africa. The United States of America further announced they were offering funding via the Species Conservation Catalyst Fund for a study on songbird trade in the Western hemisphere.

Mexico asked that the results of the study be shared prior to the workshop so that Parties could comment and assess whether or not they should attend the workshop. Alternatively, the workshop could be hybrid. The Secretariat indicated that it would issue a Notification after this meeting of the Animals Committee seeking information from Parties, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations for the study. The Secretariat would also look into the organization of a hybrid workshop, noting that it had cost implications. The Animals Committee would be invited to consider the results of the workshops at its 33rd meeting.

Birdlife International drew the Committee’s attention to the establishment of a “Friends of songbirds” group among CITES observer organizations.

The Committee noted document AC32 Doc. 34 and the comments made in plenary on the preparatory work, including the studies and the organization of the workshop.

35. Saiga antelope (Saiga spp.)..... AC32 Doc. 35

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 35 and informed the Committee that the 4th meeting of the signatories of the Memorandum of Understanding concerning Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Use of the Saiga Antelope (*Saiga* spp.) or MOS4 was held in the Russian Federation in September 2021 with the support of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS). The Secretariat noted that the successful conservation and management measures taken by Kazakhstan had led to substantial increases in the saiga population that had recorded over 1.2 million saiga in 2021 and over 1.9 million in 2022. The Secretariat attended a virtual and in-person meeting hosted by Kazakhstan with the support of the CMS Secretariat to provide information on the implementation of the CITES in relation to saiga and effective stockpile management and monitoring.

The Russian Federation asked for its intervention to be included in the summary record as indicated below:

We would like to make some suggestions and comments to the document.

1. *Paragraph 11 (b). We agree that linear infrastructure has a negative impact on S. tatarica populations. At the same time, we note that it helps with solving the problems of disease transmission and conflicts with farmers.*
2. *Paragraph 11 (d). We consider it possible to add that illegal trade is carried out most often lay through transit non-range states, where restrictive measures have not been established.*
3. *Paragraph 10 (e). We would like to note that the mass die-offs of saigas has never been recorded in the Russian Federation. Veterinary studies are currently being conducted.*
4. *Paragraph 11 (f). Dissatisfaction with saiga antelopes on the part of local livestock herders due to growing competition for pastures and water and suspicion of transmission of the disease to livestock is seen as a challenge in the Russian Federation. This problem requires special attention. Solutions to reduce conflicts have not yet been found. We shall continue work in this direction.*
5. *Paragraph 17 reads:*

The Russian Federation considers it appropriate to further clarify the data provided in paragraph 17 of document AC 32 Doc. 35. Since 2016, the Russian Federation has issued one certificate for the export of one saiga – one skin, two horns, one skull from the animal bred in captivity to the United States for educational purposes.

In the absence of information about the origin, we consider it appropriate to exclude this information.

6. *The Russian Federation ensures the implementation of the measures laid down in the Medium-term International Program of Work on the Saiga Antelope for 2021-2025 and previous years, including the improvement of legislation. In particular:*
 - a) *Saiga is listed in the federal and regional Red Books.*
 - b) *The extraction or turnover of saiga products entails criminal liability.*
 - c) *A National Strategy for Saiga Conservation in Russia has been prepared and approved.*
 - d) *A Roadmap for the conservation and restoration of Saiga has been prepared and approved.*
 - e) *The Russia-Kazakhstan Intergovernmental Agreement on the Conservation and Use of Transboundary Saiga Populations has been signed.*
 - f) *The fight against poaching has been intensified, which has already led to the fact that no cases of illegal hunting have been registered in Kalmykia since 2019.*
 - g) *A methodology for counting of saiga using unmanned aerial vehicles has been prepared, as well as a methodology for automobile counting of saiga.*
 - h) *Work is underway to develop methods for the genetic identification of saiga antlers to identify their places of origin.*

Currently, saiga conservation works are funded in the Russian Federation at the federal level, and we also conduct certain work to attract private sector investors.

The work on the conservation of saiga is extremely important and we consider it important for CITES to raise more external funding to support the conservation of Saiga species (S. tatarica, S. borealis).

The United States of America welcomed the support provided by the Secretariat to Kazakhstan but noted that paragraph 12 of the document lacked nuance. The United States stated that, when there is “A zero export quota for wild specimens traded for commercial purposes”, re-exports would be lawful only when there is a proof of lawful export of the specimen according to Article IV, paragraph 5 (a). They explained that

range States stopped exporting saiga by 2005, so the only current legal international trade in saiga specimens would be re-exports of saiga specimens with evidence the specimens were imported under valid CITES permits prior to the end of commercial exports by range States in 2005. The United States also queried the use of purpose code M (Medical) for the trade indicated in table in paragraph 15 of the document. Wildlife Conservation Society echoed the concerns of the United States and suggested that the issue of stockpile management should be brought to the attention of the Standing Committee.

The Committee noted document AC32 Doc. 35 and the oral report provided by the Secretariat. The Committee invited the Secretariat to convey to the Standing Committee the concerns raised by the United States of America about the re-exports of *Saiga* spp. when there is a zero export quota for wild specimens traded for commercial purposes and about the possible incorrect use of purpose code M for a 2021 trade record (see paragraph 18 of paragraph document AC32 Doc. 35).

36. Eels (*Anguilla* spp.)..... AC32 Doc. 36

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 36 that provided an update on the implementation of Decisions 19.219 and 19.220. While a considerable number of responses had already been received to the Notification to the Parties No. 2023/062 published on 18 May 2023 inviting range States of European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*), transit and importing Parties to submit information *inter alia* on current levels of, or emerging trends in, trade in specimens of *Anguilla* spp., the Secretariat noted that it would continue to seek responses, particularly from China, Egypt and Türkiye. In accordance with Decision 19.220, the Committee was invited to consider the recommendations in paragraph 16 of the document prepared by the Secretariat for the more effective future management of harvest and trade. The Secretariat also invited the Committee to consider the potential use of source code R (ranching) for specimens of European eels (*A. anguilla*) from aquaculture production systems and the potential risks and benefits of reintroducing seized, live European eels to the wild, possibly as part of an intersessional working group.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) and Canada supported the Secretariat's recommendations and the establishment of an intersessional working group. Canada provided an update on its license and traceability system for harvesting American eels and China indicated that it had submitted a response to the Notification to the Parties in the week before the 32nd meeting of the Animals Committee. The International Union for Conservation of Nature highlighted changes in international trade in eels that presented a risk of unsustainable trade.

The Committee agreed the recommendations in paragraph 16 of document AC32 Doc. 36 as follows:

The Committee:

- a) encouraged Parties when recording data on *Anguilla* eel species to record to the species level (rather than recording as *Anguilla* spp.) and to differentiate between juvenile (glass eels) and larger size live eels to improve accurate trade monitoring for all *Anguilla* eel species;
- b) encouraged Parties to use the descriptions for specimen codes provided in the *Guidelines for the Preparation and Submission of CITES Annual Reports* and the *Guidelines for the preparation and submission of CITES annual illegal trade reports* to standardize reporting and facilitate better data collection;
- c) encouraged range States to collaborate and share their experiences on the making of non-detriment findings;
- d) encouraged range States to share their experiences with any challenges and benefits of available techniques and mechanisms to address identification issues concerning *Anguilla* species in trade;
- e) encouraged range States to conduct research to increase the understanding of the basic biology and life histories of anguillid eel species; conduct joint programmes of work, experience knowledge and best practice; and manage their *Anguilla* resources in a sustainable manner;
- f) encouraged range States to establish abundance monitoring programmes for the different life stages of *Anguilla* species; and
- g) encouraged range States to fully implement Decision 19.218.

The Committee established an intersessional working group on eels with the mandate to:

- a) review the summary of the responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2021/018 and Notification to the Parties No. 2023/062 on eels, including any updates provided under Decision 19.218 and any recommendations from the Secretariat;
- b) review the potential use of source code R (ranching) for specimens of European eel (*A. anguilla*) from aquaculture production systems and the potential risks and benefits of reintroducing seized, live European eels to the wild; and
- c) make draft recommendations on the conservation and management of European eel for consideration by the Animals Committee at its 33rd meeting.

The membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Gongora), representative for Europe (Ms. Zíková), alternate representative for Europe (Mr. Novitsky);

Parties: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, China, European Union, Germany, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Portugal, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America; and

IGOs and NGOs: International Union for Conservation of Nature, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Global Guardian Trust, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, Species Survival Network, World Wide Fund for Nature, Zoological Society of London.

37. Sharks and rays (*Elasmobranchii* spp.) AC32 Doc. 37 (Rev. 1)

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 37 (Rev. 1) that presented information related to conservation and management of sharks and rays as reported by Parties to Notification to the Parties No. 2023/027, including copies of non-detriment findings (NDF) and conversion factors. The Secretariat also provided information from the CITES Trade Database on commercial trade in CITES-listed sharks and rays since 2000. The Secretariat noted the NDF workstream on “NDFs for marine or aquatic species, including regional implications for shared species, introduction from the sea, and NDFs for marine or aquatic invertebrates” of the upcoming NDF workshop scheduled to take place in December 2023 was working on draft guidance that could be used on sharks and rays. Decision 19.226 directs the Standing Committee, in consultation with the Animals Committee, to discuss challenges related to the transport of biological samples for research and data collection purposes in the context of fisheries management. For the implementation of this Decision, the Standing Committee had established an intersessional working group; the Secretariat proposed that the Animals Committee leads on the agenda item represent the Animals Committee in the Standing Committee’s intersessional working group.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) and Peru agreed that the Animals Committee leads on the agenda item represent the Animals Committee in the Standing Committee’s intersessional working group.

The representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson), echoed by the alternate representative for Africa (Mr. Diouck), proposed that an in-session working group that includes specialists on sharks and rays could propose species/country combinations for sharks and rays to the in-session working group on Review of Significant Trade.

China noted that a large number of shark species had been included in Appendix II at the 19th meeting of the Conference of the Parties and that some Parties might encounter difficulties in the development of NDFs for these species and would welcome the Secretariat’s continued support.

The Committee agreed to nominate the representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Gongora) and the representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson) to participate in the Standing Committee’s intersessional working group on sharks and rays.

The Committee established an in-session working group on sharks with the mandate to:

- a) consider document AC32 Doc. 37 (Rev.1) and the scientific elements in its Annexes, the information on *Elasmobranchii* spp. in document AC32 Doc. 14.2 and any other relevant information, and
- b) make recommendations, if necessary, on whether any species/country combination should be considered under the selection process for the Review of Significant Trade;
- c) identify information pertinent to the development of guidance on non-detriment findings for sharks and rays, taking into account the ongoing or planned work described in document AC32 Doc. 37 (Rev. 1), paragraph 11 and 12;
- d) identify information on gaps and needs for the identification of CITES-listed shark-products in trade;
- e) review capacity needs identified by Parties, especially as it relates to assisting developing countries and small island developing states, in the implementation of the Convention for sharks and rays with a particular focus on the species included at the 19th meeting of the Conference of Parties; and
- f) draft recommendations for consideration by the Animals Committee and submission to the Standing Committee as appropriate

The membership was decided as follows:

Co-Chairs: representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Gongora) and representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson);

Members: alternate representative for Africa (Mr. Diouck)

Parties: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, European Union, Germany, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Malaysia, Maldives, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Spain, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America; and

IGOs and NGOs: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, International Union for Conservation of Nature, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, Bloom Association, Blue Resources Trust, Defenders of Wildlife, Florida International University, Global Guardian Trust, Humane Society International, International Fund for Animal Welfare, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, OCEANA, Save our Seas Foundation, Shark Advocates International, Shark Trust, TRAFFIC, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wide Fund for Nature, Zoological Society of London.

Later in the meeting, the representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson) introduced document AC32 Com. 5.

The AC Chair, Mexico, the United States of America and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations proposed some minor edits to the document.

Following a query by Mexico, the representative of Oceania (Mr. Robertson) explained that the publication of a negative NDF on the CITES website can help Parties understand under what circumstances they can decide not to trade.

Peru indicated that they are using the *9-step NDF Guidance* to prepare their NDFs and would welcome the translation of the eNDFs tool in Spanish. Blue Resources Trust indicated that the eNDFs tool came with an automatic translation. Mexico informed the Committee of the publication of a book on the [conservation and sustainable use of Mexican sharks](#). The Wildlife Conservation Society drew the Parties' attention to the visual identification guide developed jointly with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Elasmobranch Project for all sharks and rays listed prior to CoP19 and indicated that this was being updated to include the species listed at CoP19 to be released ahead of the entry into effect date of the Carcharhinidae species.

The Committee adopted the substance of document AC32 Com. 5 amended as follows:

The Committee invited Parties to submit new non-detriment findings (NDFs) to the Secretariat, including negative NDFs, to be posted on the CITES website.

The Committee agreed to draw to the attention of Parties that export sharks and rays of the availability of the useful eNDFs tool⁷, to facilitate the preparation of NDFs with associated conditions, if necessary, and enable NDFs to be standardized between Parties to the extent possible, taking into account additional guidance that will be available after the 2nd NDF expert workshop.

The Committee encouraged Parties that catch and trade in relevant shark species to engage and provide input into the implementation of Decisions 19.135 to 19.139 on *Non-detriment findings for specimens of Appendix-II species taken from areas beyond national jurisdiction*.

The Committee encouraged Parties to use genetic / genomic methodologies to assist with stock assessments, including close-kin-mark-recapture techniques and further encouraged organizations and other key stakeholders to support Parties on the use of these methodologies.

The Committee encouraged Parties and relevant stakeholders to develop artificial intelligence, genetic and isotopic tools for the identification of shark and ray species, parts and derivatives and their geographic origins at various stages in the supply chain.

The Committee invited Parties and organizations to submit genetic sequences of sharks and rays from voucher specimens or scientific studies to open access databases such as the Barcode of Life Data Systems (BOLD) and the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI), taking into consideration FAO's report on Genetic Technologies for Fisheries and Aquaculture.⁸

The Committee encouraged Parties to consider including a broader range of sectors in their capacity building activities, including fishers, media, law enforcement officers, members of the judicial system and other relevant entities.

The Committee agreed to consider the circumstances in which it would be appropriate for the RST process to include country/species combinations at a higher taxonomic level or broader geographic scope, taking into account lessons learned from previous cases, including the country-wide Review of Significant Trade for Madagascar.

The Committee encouraged national CITES Authorities to collaborate with national fisheries authorities to validate shark and ray landings and international trade (species, volumes, etc.).

The Committee encouraged Parties to inform the Secretariat of any voluntary export quotas, including any zero export quotas, negative NDFs and national prohibitions on catch for sharks and rays to further facilitate general compliance with CITES and enforcement by all participants in the trade.

The Committee noted the importance of biological data for informing shark and ray stock assessments and the transport of scientific samples and support for scientific research should be enabled even in the case where a negative NDF is issued and there is a consequent negative opinion for permitting trade in other types of specimens for commercial purposes.

The Committee noted that in the RST process a limited number of species/country combinations are chosen; however for CITES-listed sharks that are highly mobile and/or have shared stocks managed at the regional level by a single Regional Fisheries Management Organization, the RST process could be more effective if focused on a larger grouping of Parties, including on an ocean basin-wide basis.

The Committee invited Parties to respond to the Notification that will be published as mandated in Decision 19.224, paragraph a), and to Notification to the Parties No.2023/050 on *Request for information on non-detriment findings for specimens of Appendix-II species taken from areas beyond national jurisdiction*.

The Committee invited the Standing Committee to:

- a) encourage Parties to report the trade of sharks and rays using the preferred terms and units (as identified in the latest *Guidelines for the preparation and submission for CITES annual reports*) at the species level and consider the addition of taxon-specific terms to assist in the reporting;

⁷ <https://user.cites-endf.org>

⁸ <https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cc1236en:%20>

- b) consider implications of the limited number of species-specific HS codes available under the WCO's Harmonized System (HS);
- c) request that Parties adopt more comprehensive national classifications based on WCO's HS Nomenclature;
- d) encourage Parties to use the available HS codes when reporting trade in the annual trade reports;
- e) consider the development of new digital reporting and traceability mechanisms; and
- f) consider the appropriate use of pre-Convention permitting for different shark and ray product types for specimens that meet the requirements of Resolution Conf. 13.6 (Rev. CoP18) on *Implementation of Article VII, paragraph 2, concerning 'pre-Convention' specimens*.

The Committee invited the Secretariat to:

- a) issue another Notification to the Parties as mandated in Decision 19.224 paragraph a) and report on the responses received to the next meeting of the Animals Committee;
- b) consider the issues raised regarding the apparent mismatch between the trade in products of CITES-listed sharks recorded in the CITES Trade Database and what would be expected against the information available on catches of listed species in information document AC32 Inf. 3 when implementing Decision 19.223 paragraph c); and
- c) consider the feasibility of including the addition of catch locations, at a minimum by ocean basin, of sharks and rays in the annual reports and the amendment of the Guidelines for the preparation and submissions for CITES annual reports.

38. Seahorses (*Hippocampus* spp.)

38.1 Report of the Secretariat..... AC32 Doc. 38.1 (Rev.1)

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 38.1 (Rev. 1) and provided an update on available information on trade in seahorses. The Secretariat drew the Committee's attention to the recommendations contained in Annexes 1 and 2 to the document and the recommendations of the expert workshop contained in document AC32 Doc. 38.2 and proposed the establishment of an intersessional working group to carry the work forward.

and

38.2 Implementing CITES for seahorses - Asia region workshop..... AC32 Doc. 38.2

The United States of America introduced document AC32 Doc. 38.2 and presented the outcomes of the Asia region workshop on implementing CITES for seahorses held from 14 to 17 March 2023 in Cebu, Philippines, hosted by Project Seahorse, the Seahorse, Pipefish and Seadragon Specialist Group of the Species Survival Commission of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and the Zoological Society of London-Philippines and co-hosted by the Philippines.

The representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori) and the representative for North America (Mr. Benitez Diaz) agreed with the proposed establishment of an intersessional working group. The representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori) further highlighted the conservation work done by Peru for seahorses.

China shared its concerns about the depletion of wild seahorses' populations because of illegal trade and, echoed by Indonesia, called for more work to develop guidelines for the sustainable management of seahorse populations and non-detriment findings (NDFs). India noted that hunting of and trade in seahorses was prohibited in India and that the Project Seahorse study was a misrepresentation of the measures taken by India. Following India's query, the Secretariat clarified that it had not commissioned the Project Seahorse study but had found it provided relevant insight for the implementation of the Decisions on seahorses.

The Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center welcomed the output of the Asia region workshop and announced that it would continue to help with the implementation of the Convention for seahorses in its member countries, especially for the development of NDFs. The Zoological Society of London highlighted the report in document AC32 Doc. 38.2 as a case study for addressing capacity needs for the development of NDFs.

The Committee noted document AC32 Doc. 38.2 and invited the Secretariat to confer bilaterally with India about the concerns they raised relating to the information about India contained in the report produced by Project Seahorse.

The Committee established an intersessional working group on seahorses with the mandate to:

- a) review available information on trade in seahorses; including the recommendations contained in Annexes 1 and 2 to document AC32 Doc. 38.1 (Rev.1), taking into consideration the issues raised in paragraphs 8 and 9 of that document; and the recommendations of the expert workshop contained in document AC32 Doc. 38.2; and
- b) produce a consolidated set of recommendations for consideration by the Animals Committee at its 33rd meeting.

The membership was decided as follows:

Chair: representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori);

Members: alternate representative for Asia (Ms. Terada);

Parties: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, European Union, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Portugal, Senegal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America; and

IGOs and NGOs: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, International Union for Conservation of Nature, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, Center for Biological Diversity, Ornamental Fish International, Pet Advocacy Network, TRAFFIC, World Wide Fund for Nature, Zoological Society of London.

39. Queen conch (*Strombus gigas*) AC32 Doc. 39

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 39 and provided an update on several projects that the Secretariat had been involved in recently concerning *Strombus gigas*. The Secretariat also provided information relating to relevant meetings that have taken place, including the sixth meeting of the Queen Conch Working Group (QCWG) that was held in San Juan, Puerto Rico on 16 March 2023 and the Scientific, Statistical and Technical Advisory Sub-group (SSTAG) of the QCWG that met on 12 and 13 April 2023. The Secretariat participated remotely in both meetings.

The members of the SSTAG will continue to work with the Secretariat on the development of simplified guidance for making NDFs, through the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute (GCFI) and this work should be ready as a case study to the upcoming NDF workshop scheduled to take place in December 2023.

The Secretariat further informed the Committee that, through the BioTrade project on queen conch, it was able to provide targeted assistance to Grenada to help it overcome current trade suspensions based on a lack of annual reporting and the Review of Significant Trade (RST) process for queen conch. The Secretariat also drew the Committee's attention to a project involving the University of Rhode Island and GCFI looking at genetic variation as a way to identify queen conch subject to illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing.

The Committee noted document AC32 Doc. 39 and the oral report by the Secretariat.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

40. Marine ornamental fishes AC32 Doc. 40

The Secretariat introduced document AC32 Doc. 40 and informed the Committee it would convene an in-person technical workshop in the last quarter of 2023 or first quarter of 2024 to consider the management and conservation of marine ornamental fishes involved in international trade. The objective of the workshop should be to determine if and which marine ornamental fish taxa are negatively impacted by international trade and make recommendations to ensure the conservation of those taxa. The results of the workshop would be presented for consideration by the Animals Committee at its 33rd meeting. The Animals Committee was invited to consider and agree to the terms of reference and *modus operandi* for the technical workshop on marine ornamental fishes presented in the Annex to document AC32 Doc. 40.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland recognized the importance of this workshop and proposed a small amendment to the terms of reference. The United Kingdom, echoed by the United States of America, Fondation Franz Weber (speaking also on behalf of Center for Biological Diversity, Pro Wildlife, Species Survival Network, ADM Capital Foundation, Pan African Sanctuary Alliance and Humane Society International), Ornamental Fish International (speaking also on behalf of European Pet Organisation, Pet Advocacy Network and Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association) and IWMC-World Conservation Trust, expressed concern about the potential need to prioritize participation based on funding limitations and called for a broad representation of interest, among Parties, but also the private industry. They proposed that any prioritization should be done in consultation with the Animals Committee and, as a mitigation measure, suggested that provision be made for online participation in the workshop. The Secretariat informed the Committee that it would look into the organization of a hybrid workshop, noting that it had cost implications.

Indonesia announced that they would host the proposed workshop on marine ornamental fishes.

The Committee thanked Indonesia for offering to host the workshop on marine ornamental fishes and agreed the terms of reference and *modus operandi* for the technical workshop on marine ornamental fishes presented in the Annex to document AC32 Doc. 40 with paragraph 2 to read “The workshop will contribute to the following outcomes:”

41. Trade in medicinal and aromatic plants PC26 Doc.34 / AC32 Doc. 41

The Secretariat introduced document PC26 Doc. 34 / AC32 Doc. 41 containing draft terms of reference for an analysis of e-commerce supply chains in products of CITES-listed medicinal and aromatic plant species as well as draft terms of reference for an intersessional working group. The Secretariat informed the Animals Committee that the Plants Committee had agreed to develop a new resolution on medicinal and aromatic plants and not to amend Resolution Conf. 10.19 (Rev. CoP14) on *Traditional medicines*.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) suggested that further work by the Animals Committee was not needed on this issue since Resolution Conf. 10.19 (Rev. CoP14) on *Traditional medicines* was not being reviewed.

The Committee agreed that it did not need to contribute to the Plants Committee’s work on this issue.

42. Periodic Review of species included in Appendices I and II PC26 Doc. 35 / AC32 Doc. 42

The Secretariat introduced document PC26 Doc. 35 / AC32 Doc. 42 and reported that it had not been able to secure funding to undertake the assessment required under paragraph 3 b) i) of Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP19) on *Periodic Review of species included in Appendices I and II*. Should the required funding become available in time to undertake the assessment, the outputs could be presented for the 27th meeting of the Plants Committee and 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee, respectively.

The nomenclature specialist drew the Committee’s attention to document AC32 Com. 2 that recommended the inclusion of *Ramphastos vitellinus citreolaemus* in the Periodic Review.

Mexico, echoed by IWMC-World Conservation Trust, highlighted the Periodic Review’s role as one of the pillars of the Convention to ensure that species are included in the correct Appendices and expressed concern about the lack of funding for this process. They encouraged the Secretariat to seek funding for this work and find alternative ways to undertake the assessment by the next meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees.

The Committee noted document PC26 Doc. 35 / AC32 Doc. 42 and the concerns raised in plenary about the lack of funding for this work. The Committee emphasized the importance of the Periodic Review process. The Committee proposed to include *Ramphastos vitellinus citreolaemus* in the Periodic Review and invited the representatives for Central and South America and the Caribbean to reach out to seek a volunteer from their region for the review. The Committee noted the offer made by the United States of America to provide technical support for the review.

43. Annotations..... PC26 Doc. 42.1 / AC32 Doc. 43

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland introduced document PC26 Doc. 36 / AC32 Doc. 43 and presented the progress achieved so far by the Standing Committee's intersessional working group on annotations.

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) supported the increased involvement of the Animals and Plants Committee in the Standing Committee's working group and argued that consideration of Plants and Animals annotations should be done separately. Zimbabwe proposed that the Standing Committee's intersessional working group on annotations look into paragraphs g) and h) of annotation A10 for *Loxodonta africana* that contain elements that have now expired.

The Committee agreed to nominate the representative for Africa (Ms. Maha) and the representative for Europe (Ms. Zíková) to participate in the Standing Committee's intersessional working group on annotations.

The Committee invited the working group to consider paragraphs g) and h) of annotation A10 for *Loxodonta africana* as part of its mandate.

44. Informal review mechanism for existing and proposed annotations* PC26 Doc. 39 / AC32 Doc. 44

The Secretariat introduced document PC26 Doc. 39 / AC32 Doc. 44 providing an update on proposal on the feasibility and requirements for an informal review mechanism for existing and proposed annotations, noting that funding had been secured for this activity.

The Committee noted the Secretariat's report on progress in the implementation of Decisions 19.266 and 19.267.

No other intervention was made during discussion of this item.

45. Botanical and zoological nomenclature

45.1 Nomenclature of Appendix-III listings..... PC26 Doc.42.1 / AC32 Doc. 45.1

The nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk) introduced document PC26 Doc. 42.1 / AC32 Doc. 45.1 highlighting a number of cases of higher taxon listings that created complex situations and emphasizing the need to consider the impacts of existing and future higher taxon listings. The nomenclature specialist invited the Committee to review the scientific implications and impacts of higher taxon listings in the Appendices and to consider whether the difference between a higher taxon listing and a list of all individual species in that higher taxon is sufficiently substantive to require a formal proposal to change a listing in the Appendices. The nomenclature specialist proposed the establishment of a joint intersessional working group, as already agreed by the Plants Committee at its 26th meeting from 5 to 9 June 2023.

and

45.2 Higher taxon listings in the Appendices PC26 Doc 42.2 /AC32 Doc. 45.2

The nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk) introduced document PC26 Doc. 42.2 / AC32 Doc. 45.2 proposing that, should nomenclature changes be proposed for Appendix-III listing, the Animals or Plants Committees be consulted to determine if the change would alter the scope of protection for fauna and flora under the Convention. If the proposed nomenclature changes would lead to inclusion or deletion of species or populations in the Appendices, the Secretariat could consult the listing Party and other affected range States, and Appendix III could be amended based on feedback from the Parties. Alternatively, the Secretariat could inform the listing Party about the nomenclature change and its implications and invite the Party to consult with affected range States and submit a request to amend

the Appendix-III listing. The nomenclature specialist proposed the establishment of a joint intersessional working group, as already agreed by the Plants Committee at its 26th meeting from 5 to 9 June 2023.

With regard to paragraph 11 of the document, the Russian Federation suggested that, should conflict arise regarding the choice of taxonomic authority for which no standard references have been adopted by the Conference of Parties, a list specialized expert institutions could be consulted.

The Committee agreed with the recommendations of the Plants Committee as follows:

The Committee established a joint intersessional nomenclature working group with a mandate to:

- a) review the scientific implications and impacts of existing and future higher taxon listings in the Appendices, taking into consideration the aspects raised in document PC26 Doc. 42.2 / AC32 Doc. 45.2; and
- b) review and revise document PC26 Doc. 42.1 / AC32 Doc. 45.1; and
- c) develop draft recommendations and guidance for consideration at the joint session of the 27th meeting of the Plants Committee and the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee scheduled to take place in 2024.

The membership was decided as follows⁹:

Chair for AC: the nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk);

Chair for PC: the nomenclature specialist (Ms. Klopper);

PC Members: representative for Asia (Ms. Zeng);

Parties: Austria, Brazil, Canada, China, European Union, France, Georgia, Germany, India, Japan, Madagascar, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zimbabwe; and

IGOs and NGOs: United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, International Union for Conservation of Nature, BirdLife International, Center for Biological Diversity, Humane Society International, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, Parrot Breeders Association of Southern Africa, Pro Wildlife, South African Taxidermy and Tannery Association, Species Survival Network, World Wide Fund for Nature.

45.3 Development of a standardized global checklist of species PC26 Doc 42.3 /AC32 Doc. 45.3

The nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk) introduced document PC26 Doc. 42.3 / AC32 Doc. 45.3 elaborating on the involvement of the two nomenclature specialists in ongoing global initiatives aimed at producing global consensus classifications for plants and animals and highlighted the potential benefits for CITES.

The nomenclature specialist responded to the Russian Federation's query about what was meant by "other organisms" in paragraph 5 of the document. "Other organisms" referred *inter alia* to fungi, micro-organisms and viruses that are not covered by CITES.

The Committee noted document PC26 Doc. 42.3 / AC32 Doc. 45.3.

46. Report of the specialist on zoological nomenclature AC32 Doc. 46

The nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk) introduced document AC32 Doc. 46 that provided an overview of the nomenclatural matters that were referred to the Animals Committee at the 19th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, including the issue of taxonomy and nomenclature of African elephants (*Loxodonta* spp.). The nomenclature specialist proposed the establishment of an in-session working group

⁹ This includes the expression of interest at the 26th meeting of the Plants Committee.

to make progress on some of the nomenclature issues and that an intersessional working group be established for those issues that were not concluded at the present meeting.

The Secretariat provided an update on the use of time-specific versions of online databases as standard nomenclature references. In order to receive a time-stamped version of the WoRMS database for use as a standard nomenclature reference, the Secretariat would need to enter a legal agreement with WoRMS and to develop an internal data policy framework to advise on all future agreements such as this. The Secretariat stated it would provide an update on progress at the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee. Following the query from the Russian Federation, the nomenclature specialist explained the importance of time-stamped extracts within the context of a permitting system that cannot be changed every time there is a nomenclature update in an online database.

Regarding the taxonomy of African elephants, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe, echoed by Conservation Force and IWMC-World Conservation Trust, highlighted the need for the Animals Committee to focus on science and noted that science had recognized the existence of two different species of African elephants (*Loxodonta africana* and *Loxodonta cyclotis*). The alternate representative for Africa (Mr. Diouck) concurred that science had indeed recognized the existence of two different species of African elephants but that the question was complex and would have a significant impact on the implementation of the Convention. Cameroon, as a range State for both species, also expressed an interest in getting clarity on what this nomenclature change would mean for the implementation of the Convention. Following a query by the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the nomenclature specialist explained that the hybrid specimens of *L. africana* and *L. cyclotis* would not be considered a third distinct species and would be considered as being included in Appendix I. Wildlife Conservation Society echoed the earlier interventions in recognizing that there was no debate in science about the existence of the two species of African elephants and agreed with Israel's suggestion that a genus listing could be a possible way forward for CITES, including for the issue of hybrids. Israel proposed that the Secretariat be asked to publish a Notification asking range States or maybe all Parties to comment on the proposed nomenclature change.

Mexico provided inputs on the other nomenclature references, including those on Iguanidae and Phrynosoma, in document AC32 Doc. 46 and agreed with the different nomenclature updates for the Mexican species. The United States of America supported the establishment of an intersessional working group due to the important volume of nomenclature work.

The Committee established an in-session working group with a mandate to:

- a) consider the matters raised in paragraphs 2 to 5 of document AC32 Doc. 46 and the report of the Secretariat, and advise about possible ways forward to address the use of online databases as standard nomenclature references;
- b) consider the scientific merit of CITES recognition of two species of African elephants, and, as appropriate, recommend the retention or an appropriate replacement nomenclature standard reference for these animals;
- c) consider further the implications of adopting the HBW/BI *Illustrated Checklist of the Birds of the World*, and in particular whether the adoption of one of the subsequent annual updates would be desirable, and if so, up until what year;
- d) provide guidance for the preparation of future checklists based on time-bound extracts from online databases;
- e) consider the draft checklists proposed for the lizard family Iguanidae in paragraph 20 and for the genus *Phrynosoma* in Annex 1 to document AC32 Doc. 46;
- f) review the nomenclatural changes summarized in Annex 2 and Annex 3 for possible adoption at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties;
- g) consider the deletion of *Ramphastos vitellinus citreolaemus* from Appendix II, by reducing the scope of the listing of *R. vitellinus* in Appendix II to *Ramphastos vitellinus vitellinus* only;
- h) develop terms of reference for an intersessional nomenclature working group that will incorporate the elements that the in-session working group could not cover and a review of possible changes in nomenclature ahead of AC33; and

- i) report back to the Committee at this meeting.

The membership was decided as follows:

Chair: the nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk);

Members: representative for Africa (Ms. Maha);

Parties: Cameroon, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, European Union, Japan, Namibia, Russian Federation, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Zimbabwe; and

IGOs and NGOs: United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, International Union for Conservation of Nature, BirdLife International, Center for Biological Diversity, Conservation Force, Fondation Franz Weber, Humane Society International, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, Parrot Breeders Association of Southern Africa, Safari Club International Foundation, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wide Fund for Nature.

Later in the meeting, the nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk) introduced document AC32 Com. 2, highlighting that *Ramphastos vitellinus citreolaemus* could possibly be included in the Periodic Review Process. The representative for North America (Mr. Benitez Diaz) noted that any Party can start a periodic review at any time and the United States of America suggested that the representatives for Central and South America and the Caribbean could reach out to Parties in their region to identify a Party to undertake the review, noting that the United States was ready to provide technical support for this review.

Regarding the nomenclature of African elephants, Conservation Force queried why suggestions for nomenclature standard references would be requested, noting that document AC32 Doc. 46 already suggested a nomenclature reference. The nomenclature specialist explained that the document already mentioned two options and that more might be welcome, noting that different nomenclature references sometimes indicate different distributions for the species. Humane Society International recalled that there was consensus on this recommendation in the working group.

The Committee adopted the substance of document AC32 Com. 2 amended as follows:

- a) The Committee encouraged the Secretariat to continue its work on the use of online databases as standard nomenclature references and report back to AC33.
- b) The Committee acknowledged the scientific merit of recognizing the two species of African elephants, recognizing that hybrids and mixed-species groupings occur, and noted that a relevant nomenclature standard reference for these animals be further deliberated intersessionally, with the outcomes of deliberations reported back to AC33.
- c) The Committee requested the Secretariat to include in the Notification described in Decision 19.275, paragraph a), a request for suggested publications that can serve as nomenclatural standard reference for African elephants.
- d) The Committee recommended that the review of the implications of adopting the HBW/BI *Illustrated Checklist of the Birds of the World* be continued and that a report be submitted for consideration by the Committee at AC33.
- e) The Committee recommended that in terms of the preparation of future checklists based on time-bound extracts from online databases, the essential elements to include are the valid species name, taxonomic synonyms, taxonomic hierarchy, and countries of distribution. Desirable but not essential are a distribution map and illustrations for each species. The intersessional working group shall further consider this matter, including options to prepare simplified checklists, with the outcomes of deliberations reported back to AC33.
- f) The Committee recommended for adoption by the Parties at CoP20 the checklists proposed for the lizard family Iguanidae in paragraph 20 and for the genus *Phrynosoma* in Annex 1 to document AC32 Doc. 46.

- g) The Committee established an intersessional working group on nomenclature with a mandate to:
- i) continue the work on checklists based on time-limited extracts from online databases;
 - ii) identify an appropriate nomenclature standard reference for the African elephant(s);
 - iii) review the nomenclatural changes summarized in Annex 2 and Annex 3 of document AC32 Doc. 46;
 - iv) consider options to address the present status of *Ramphastos vitellinus citreolaemus* in the CITES Appendices; and
 - v) report to the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee.

The membership was decided as follows:

Chair: nomenclature specialist (Mr. van Dijk);

Member: representative for Africa (Ms. Maha);

Parties: Cameroon, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, France, India, Japan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Zimbabwe; and

IGOs and NGOs: United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, International Union of Conservation of Nature, BirdLife International, Center for Biological Diversity, Conservation Force, Dallas Safari Club, Humane Society International, International Fur Federation, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, Parrot Breeders Association of Southern Africa, Safari Club International Foundation, South African Taxidermy and Tannery Association, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wide Fund for Nature.

47. Regional reports

47.1 Africa AC32 Doc. 47.1

The representative for Africa (Mr. Kasoma) introduced document AC32 Doc. 47.1.

47.2 Asia AC32 Doc. 47.2

The representative for Asia (Mr. Hamidy) introduced document AC32 Doc. 47.2.

47.3 Central and South America and the Caribbean AC32 Doc. 47.3

The representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr. Ramadori) introduced document AC32 Doc. 47.3.

47.4 Europe *No document*

The representative for Europe (Ms. Zíková) presented an oral report on the activities of her region. She also informed the Committee of her imminent resignation as a Regional Member of the Committee and thanked colleagues for the collaboration over the years in the Committee.

47.5 North America AC32 Doc. 47.5

The representative for North America (Mr. Benítez Díaz) introduced document AC32 Doc. 47.5.

47.6 Oceania AC32 Doc. 47.6

The representative for Oceania (Mr. Robertson) introduced document AC32 Doc. 47.6.

The Committee noted the oral reports and documents AC32 Doc. 47.1, AC32 Doc. 47.2, AC32 Doc. 47.3, AC32 Doc. 47.5 and AC32 Doc. 47.6.

48. Any other business..... *No document*

There was no intervention.

49. Time and venue of the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee..... *No document*

The Committee noted that the 27th meeting of the Plants Committee and the 33rd meeting of the Animals Committee should take place in Geneva from 8 to 19 July 2024.

50. Closing remarks..... *No document*

The Secretary-General and the Chair thanked the Committee members, in particular those that chaired in-session working groups, as well as Party observers, intergovernmental organizations, and non-governmental organizations, the interpreters, the operators, the government of Switzerland for the support in terms of the venue and the Secretariat; and the Chair closed the meeting.

Questions to be asked to countries depending on the source code reported for the species selected:

Source code C

Question code	Question
C1	How many facilities in your country are breeding specimens of the species concerned which are subsequently being exported? For how long have the facilities been established in your country? How does the breeding facility meet the criteria of a closed environment according to Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.) on <i>Specimens of animal species bred in captivity</i> ? Since when do the facilities successfully breed to F1/ F2?
C2	Have all of these facilities been inspected to ensure that the specimens produced comply with Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.) on <i>Specimens of animal species bred in captivity</i> ? Please explain further any regulations or measures currently in place for monitoring facilities which claim to be captive breeding this species, for example whether facilities are required to keep records of the acquisition, maintenance or breeding of animals of this species, and whether authorities verify these records?
C3	Which authority carries out these inspections and how often are they undertaken?
C4	For each facility in question 1, either complete the Data Collection Form (document AC29 Inf. 1 may be of assistance), or provide the information on the form in a different way.
C5	How was it determined that the breeding stock was established in accordance with the provisions of CITES and relevant national laws and in a manner not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild?
C6	Has the breeding stock received additional specimens from the wild since establishment and if so, how many and when and how was it determined that they were obtained in accordance with the provisions of CITES and relevant national laws and in a manner not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild?

DATA COLLECTION FORM

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE FACILITY

Date of inspection: _____	Name of senior inspecting officer: _____
Facility name: _____	

Name and position(s) of all inspecting officer(s) present:

1. _____

2. _____

Type of inspection: Initial Date of last inspection: _____

Routine

Follow-up (*in cases where discrepancies or anomalies, detected during a previous inspection, remain outstanding*)

Facility trading name(s): _____

Facility owner(s): _____

Facility address and contact information: _____

Year the facility was established: _____

How many staff are currently employed at the facility?

 Full time Part time

Name and job title of facility staff accompanying inspecting officer(s):

Does the operation have access to professional veterinary services? Yes No

If yes, what is the name and address of vet? _____

Does this company keep animals at any other location(s)? Yes No

If yes, where? _____

If yes, make arrangements to inspect the location(s) as soon as possible

DATA COLLECTION FORM

SPECIES INFORMATION *(to be completed separately for each species held at the facility)*

Date of inspection: _____	Name of senior inspecting officer: _____
Facility name: _____	Species : _____

*Date species first acquired? _____ Source and life-stage of initial stock? _____

Numbers of initial stock, and sexes, if known _____ Males? Females?

*Have additional animals been obtained since you acquired the initial stock? If so, from where?

Do you **BREED** this species? Yes No

When did you start breeding? _____

litters/clutches per year? _____

offspring/eggs in litter/clutch? _____

produced in the previous year? _____

ADULT BREEDING STOCK	Facility information	Inspector count <i>(where possible)</i>
Number of adults present?	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Number of males present?	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Number of females?	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
What % of females breed each year?	<input type="text"/>	
What do you feed adult animals? _____		

REARING STOCK (CAPTIVE BRED AND RANCHED COMBINED)	Facility information	Inspector count <i>(where possible)</i>
Number of juveniles present?	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Age at sexual maturity (years)?	<input type="text"/>	
Size or mass at sexual maturity (cm or g)?	<input type="text"/>	
Size at sale (cm or g)	<input type="text"/>	
What percentage of juveniles survive beyond 2 weeks? <i>Includes mortalities of eggs that didn't hatch.</i>	<input type="text"/>	
What do you feed rearing and juvenile animals? _____		

Source code R

Question code	Question
R1	In relation to all species that have been transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II under the provisions of Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev CoP15) on <i>Ranching and trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II</i> , please provide any missing reports under paragraph 5 a) and the information specified under paragraph 5 b) of that Resolution.
R2	1. In relation to all species that have <u>not</u> been transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II under the provisions of Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev CoP15) on <i>Ranching and trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II</i> , please provide the following information [from paragraph 5 a) and b) of that Resolution]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the status of the wild population concerned established by monitoring at an appropriate frequency and with sufficient precision to allow recognition of changes in population size and structure owing to ranching; ii) the number of specimens (eggs, young or adults) taken annually from the wild and the percentage of this offtake used to supply ranching operations; iii) details of the annual production levels, and product types and quantity produced for export; iv) an estimate of the percentage of the annual wild production of eggs, neonates or other life stages taken for the ranching operation; v) the number of animals released and their survival rates estimated on the basis of surveys and tagging programs, if any; vi) the mortality rate in captivity and causes of such mortality; vii) conservation programs and scientific experiments carried out in relation to the ranching operation or the wild population concerned; and viii) an estimation of the percentage of the distribution area of the species where the ranching is operating
R3	How many facilities in your country are ranching specimens of the species concerned which are subsequently being exported? Have all of these facilities been inspected to ensure that the specimens produced comply with the definition of Ranching in Res. Conf. 12.3 (Rev. COP19) on Permits and Certificates? Please explain further any regulations or measures currently in place for monitoring facilities which claim to be ranching this species, for example whether facilities are required to keep records of the acquisition, maintenance or breeding of animals of this species, and whether authorities verify these records?

Source code F

Question code	Question
F1	Why are you reporting this trade under source code F.
F2	Please confirm that non-detriment findings have been made for the export of all specimens of the species concerned with the source code F and the way in such findings have been made, particularly for species not native to your country.
F3	How many facilities in your country are producing specimens of the species concerned which are subsequently being exported?
F4	Has the breeding stock received additional specimens from the wild since establishment and if so, how many and when and how was it determined that they were obtained in accordance with the provisions of CITES and relevant national laws and in a manner not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild?