

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



Fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties  
Doha (Qatar), 13-25 March 2010

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Exemptions and special trade provisions

PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Standing Committee Working Group on Personal and Household Effects. It has not received the prior endorsement of the Standing Committee.

Background

2. At its 14th meeting (CoP14, The Hague, 2007), the Conference of the Parties adopted Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) on *Control of trade in personal and household effects*, which incorporates *Guidelines for amending the list of personal and household effects of Appendix-II species with quantitative limits*.
3. The Conference also adopted Decision 14.64 which states:

*The Standing Committee shall extend the operation of its Working Group on Personal and Household Effects until the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP15) and oversee the Group's work in fulfilling the following terms of reference:*

- a) *clarify the relationship between 'tourist souvenirs' and 'personal and household effects';*
  - b) *clarify the interpretation of Article VII, paragraph 3(b), of the Convention;*
  - c) *assess whether there are specific species or types of personal or household effects which, in view of conservation concerns, would require different treatment under Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14);*
  - d) *collate information about how each Party has implemented Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14), particularly with regard to requirements for export permits, and assess whether this indicates the need to amend the Resolution; and*
  - e) *report at each regular meeting of the Standing committee until CoP15 and at CoP15.*
4. In his report for the 57th meeting of the Standing Committee (SC57, Geneva, July 2008), contained in document SC57 Doc. 28, the Chair of the Working Group explained that the Group had begun discussing its terms of reference using a set of questions that he had developed, in consultation with the Secretariat. The Committee noted the progress that had been made by the Working Group.
  5. As reported at the 58th meeting of the Standing Committee (SC58, Geneva, July 2009), in document SC58 Doc. 31: "Electronic discussions were held during the second half of 2008 on an initial set of questions developed by the Chair. These questions related to the Working Group's terms of reference contained in Decision 14.64 of the Conference of the Parties. Several members provided thoughtful comments in response to the questions, which reflected various points of view".

6. Further progress by the Working Group was slowed when the Chair (Mr CS Cheung) retired in May 2009 from government service in the CITES Management Authority for Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China. Mr Cheung submitted his resignation to the Chair of the Standing Committee and proposed that his colleague Mr Alfred KC Wong of Hong Kong, who had chaired the Working Group at CoP14 on his behalf, replace him.
7. Working Group members expressed appreciation to Mr Cheung “for the wisdom and guidance that he had provided as Chair of the Working Group”. Mr Wong thereafter initiated another round of electronic discussions on the Working Group’s terms of reference, “aimed at generating new thoughts and identifying common ground among members”. This resulted in an additional exchange of comments, which again reflected various points of view.
8. Members of the Working Group held an informal face-to-face meeting in the margins of SC58. As the Chair could not attend, he asked one of the Group’s members (Mr Bruce Weissgold of the CITES Management Authority of the United States of America) to serve as acting Chair. The Group had good discussions and agreed that electronic discussions would continue on two key issues (i.e. the need to define the terms ‘tourist souvenir’ and ‘hunting trophy’ and the need to clarify the interpretation of Article VII, paragraph (b), of the Convention), with the aim of submitting a ‘value-added document’ to the present meeting. As the original mandate of the Working Group contained a number of complicated issues, the acting Chair suggested at SC58 that the Working Group would need to meet in the margins of the present meeting to achieve as many results as possible.
9. The Standing Committee requested the Working Group on Personal and Household Effects to prepare a report, pursuant to Decision 14.64, for direct submission to and consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its 15th meeting. This report should indicate that it had not received the prior endorsement of the Standing Committee.
10. At the time of writing (October 2009), members of the Working Group included: China (chair), Chile, Germany, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, New Zealand (on behalf of Oceania), South Africa, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States, Zimbabwe, the European Commission, International Environmental Law Project, IUCN, Safari Club International Foundation (SCIF) and Species Survival Network. To date, electronic discussions have mostly involved China, Germany, Italy, the United States and SCIF. Members have recognized that diversifying and balancing regional participation in the Working Group is important as not all regions have participated in electronic or other discussions. It has also been suggested that the development of regional positions could facilitate the work of the Group. No Customs officer currently participates in the Working Group, and members have agreed that the participation of either a Customs officer representing a Party or a representative of the World Customs Organization would be helpful.
11. The present report has been prepared in accordance with the decision taken at SC58.

#### Discussion of the Working Group’s terms of reference

- a) *Clarify the relationship between ‘tourist souvenirs’ and ‘personal and household effects’*
12. While putting questions to the Working Group to stimulate an exchange of views, the Chair pointed out that Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) defines the term ‘personal or household effects’ but does not define ‘tourist souvenirs’. He asked whether such a definition was needed and, if so, suggested that one could be provided either by expanding the existing definition of ‘personal or household effects’ or by developing a separate definition. He also asked whether the Group should consider how Customs define this term.
13. During subsequent discussions, it was suggested that ‘personal and household belongings’, ‘tourist souvenirs’ and ‘hunting trophies’ might be entire or partial sub-sets of a broader category called ‘personal and household effects’. Although the terms ‘tourist souvenirs’ and ‘hunting trophies’ do not appear in the text of the Convention, they do occur in Resolutions of the Conference of the Parties.
14. Some Working Group members did not think it was necessary to define the term ‘tourist souvenirs’, as they were effectively treated as a type of personal or household effect under Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14). One member explained that the Resolution had already resulted from a merging of Resolution Conf. 12.7 on *Personal and household effects* with Resolution Conf. 10.6 on *Control of trade in tourist souvenir specimens* and suggested that ‘tourist souvenirs’ could even be deleted from Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14). Another member noted that Parties, if they wished, could adopt stricter domestic

measures under Article XIV of the Convention in order to treat tourist souvenirs differently from other types of personal and household effects.

15. One member thought that a separate definition for 'tourist specimens' could be included in the Resolution. Such a definition might be very similar to the definition of 'personal or household effects', but would indicate that tourist souvenirs were acquired outside the owner's State of usual residence, were not part of a household move and were not live specimens. Another member recommended that any definition of tourist souvenirs which the Working Group might propose be quite broad, because it would be difficult to describe specific items that might be covered.
16. Another member suggested that consideration might be given to including in Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) conditions, case examples, explanations or interpretations for various 'personal or household effects,' in order to give better guidance to Parties regarding what is meant by 'specimens of species included in Appendix II of CITES'.
17. It was suggested that Customs procedures had been considered in relation to Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) when Parties determined that personal or household effects, "at the time of import, export or re-export ... [should be] worn, carried or included in personal baggage".
18. Other considerations deemed relevant to the possible development of additional definitions included: the ownership of a specimen, in relation to its status as a personal and household effect, how long and under what circumstances a specimen might continue to be considered as a personal or household effect; and when it would be acceptable for such an effect to be sold. Such considerations went to the heart of how the legal acquisition of a personal or household effect was determined.

#### *Hunting trophies*

19. The Chair asked Working Group members whether hunting trophies should be considered as tourist souvenirs and whether hunting trophies that are sent to their owners after preparation should be treated differently from those that accompany their owners.
20. Some members thought that hunting trophies could be a type of tourist souvenir, if they were acquired outside the owner's usual State of residence. One member strongly objected to hunting trophies being treated as tourist souvenirs because the context of acquiring a hunting trophy was very limited and specific and should not be associated with the purchase of a mass-produced souvenir item sold by a retailer. The same member contended that, in relation to a significant number of species, hunting trophies had been accorded a special status compared with other personal or household effects because of the conservation benefits delivered by trophy hunting.
21. Several members of the Working Group considered that hunting trophies could be personal or household effects. One Party member said that it exempted certain hunting trophies from CITES documentation requirements. Trophies accorded the personal and household effects exemption were covered by a bilateral agreement, came from a specific Appendix-II species and accompanied the hunter across the border. If the same trophy were shipped at another time (i.e. after processing), however, it was no longer considered to be a personal effect and had to be accompanied by an export permit from the country of origin.
22. Another Party member similarly required an export permit from the country of origin for any Appendix-II hunting trophy which did not accompany the hunter. Its research showed that 10 other importing countries required such permits and nine exporting countries had a practice of issuing such permits. No import permits seem to have been required, under stricter domestic measures, for Appendix-II hunting trophies. One member recommended that the definition of personal or household effect in Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) be amended to include hunting trophies that were shipped to the hunter after the hunt was over. It urged the Working Group to avoid recommending restrictive measures, which went beyond Article VII, in relation to hunting trophies.
23. The Chair advised members that, during its November 2008 meeting on the poaching of and illegal trade in rhinoceroses, the CITES Rhinoceros Enforcement Task Force had determined that it would be useful to have a common understanding and treatment of 'hunting trophies' under the Convention. The Working Group was also informed that the Secretariat was planning to put forward a definition of 'hunting trophy' when proposing revisions to Resolution Conf. 2.11 (Rev.) on *Trade in hunting trophies of species listed in Appendix I* (see document CoP15 Doc. 18 on *Revision of Resolutions*). The uniform treatment of hunting

trophies was also under consideration by the Working Group on Purpose Codes, in relation to purpose of transaction codes 'H' (hunting trophies) and 'P' (personal) (see document CoP15 Doc. 31 on *Purpose codes on CITES permits and certificates*).

24. One Working Group member thought that the current definition of personal or household effect was sufficient to include hunting trophies that accompanied the hunter or were part of his or her household effects. Other Working Group members had no objection to defining 'hunting trophy' for purposes of the Convention. It was noted that 'trophy', 'hunting trophy', 'sport-hunted trophy' or similar terms were already defined in the national legislation of a number of countries.
25. One member expressed particular concern about whether an item manufactured from a hunting trophy would be covered by the personal or household effects exemption under Article VII, paragraph 3, of the Convention. It contended that items (e.g. jewelry, purses, etc.) fashioned from the horns, hide or any other part of the animal should also qualify as a personal or household effect.
26. A member of the Working Group pointed out that the exemption provided in Article VII, paragraph 3, of the Convention generally meant that no document was required for personal or household effects. For practical purposes, however, a hunter needed to know that he or she may transport a hunting trophy back to his or her State of residence without problem. For this reason, several members considered that it was advisable for exporting States to issue permits for Appendix-II hunting trophies even if it was not specifically required by the Convention, the Resolution or the national legislation of that State. This would enable the trophies to pass through the formalities required for trade with a minimum of delay as there would be written proof of the legal origin of the specimen and the controls being exercised by the exporting State.

*b) Clarify the interpretation of Article VIII, paragraph 3 (b)*

27. In an initial set of questions to the Working Group, the Chair pointed out that Article VII, paragraph 3 (b), of the Convention provided an exemption for any Appendix-II personal or household effect which was acquired in a State where removal from the wild did not occur. The same provision provided an exemption for any Appendix-II personal or household effect which was acquired in a State where removal from the wild occurred and no export permit was required by that State. The Chair suggested that Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) contained a presumption that personal and household effects, which are dead specimens, parts and derivatives of Appendix-II species, were exempted from the Convention unless a Party had advised otherwise.
28. In a follow-up set of questions to the Working Group, the Chair suggested that clarifying the interpretation of Article VII, paragraph 3 (b), of the Convention, could give the Group direction for addressing its other terms of reference. He pointed out that paragraph 3 (b) was written in the double negative and drew particular attention to wording that was not frequently mentioned during consideration of the personal and household effects exemption. The relevant text, with underline added by the Chair, is as follows:

*The provisions of Articles III, IV and V shall not apply to specimens that are personal or household effects. This exemption shall not apply where:*

*(b) in the case of specimens of species included in Appendix II:*

- (i) they were acquired by the owner outside his State of usual residence and in a State where removal from the wild occurred;*
- (ii) they are being imported into the owner's State of usual residence; and*
- (iii) the State where removal from the wild occurred requires the prior grant of export permits before any export of such specimens; unless a Management Authority is satisfied that the specimens were acquired before the provisions of the present Convention applied to such specimens.*

29. One Working Group member felt that the interpretation of Article VII, paragraph 3 (b) provided by Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) was clear and that no changes to the Resolution were therefore necessary. The same member was nevertheless willing to consider proposals from other Working Group members.

30. Some Working Group members noted that Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) was more restrictive than Article VII, paragraph 3 (b), of the Convention. Two members felt that this was justified by the potential for abuse if personal or household effects could be exported without any permit requirement. One of these members acknowledged that any Appendix-II specimen bought in a country where the specimen was not taken from the wild should be covered by the exemption for personal or household effects, but only if species distribution data maintained by UNEP-WCMC indicated that the relevant species did not occur in the State of re-export.
31. Another member agreed with the Chair that the exemption defined in Article VII, paragraph 3 (b), of the Convention was very difficult for most people to understand because it was written in the double negative form. In his view, the basic exemption itself was very simple – “The provisions of Articles III, IV and V shall not apply to specimens that are personal or household effects.” He contended that this simple statement was then followed by a series of conditions which ‘nullified’ the exemption in certain instances. He suggested that the conditions applicable to a specimen acquired from the wild in a particular State were particularly difficult because they applied only if that State required the issuance of an export permit. The same member noted that the CITES website contained very limited information on whether a State required an export permit for Appendix-II personal or household effects.
- c) *assess whether there are specific species or types of personal or household effects which, in view of conservation concerns, would require different treatment under Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14)*
32. With regard to this issue, the Chair said he understood the quantitative limits for queen conch shells and seahorses, but wondered whether the quantitative limit for specimens of crocodilian species (i.e. up to four specimens per person) was sufficiently clear. He also drew the Working Group’s general attention to the report of the Standing Committee Working Group on Trade in Crocodilian Specimens (see document CoP15 Doc. 34 on *Review of the universal tagging system and trade in small crocodilian leather goods*).
33. One Party member thought that, rather than listing which crocodilian specimens qualified for the quantitative exemption, it might be easier to indicate which types of specimens were excluded (e.g. by establishing a size limit which would exclude whole skins of adult crocodiles). In this connection, the member’s applicable legislation provided an exemption for “dead worked specimens of *Crocodylia* spp., excluding meat and hunting trophies, up to four per person”.
34. At one point, the Chair asked whether labelling requirements, similar to those applicable to caviar, were needed for other items.
35. The Chair drew attention to the *Guidelines for amending the list of personal and household effects of Appendix-II species with quantitative limits* contained in the Annex to Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) and asked whether the Group knew of any Party intending to make an amendment using the guidelines. In this connection, he asked whether any Party had encountered difficulties in following the guidelines. He subsequently advised members that, pursuant to Decision 14.138, agarwood range States might submit a proposal at the present meeting on a quantitative exemption for personal effect specimens of agarwood, which were produced from species listed in Appendix II. At the time of writing, no such proposal had been received.
36. One Working Group member suggested that, as the *Guidelines* had only been recently adopted, an assessment of their operation was premature.
37. The Chair pointed out to the Working Group that Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) provided guidance on the treatment of personal or household effects which were dead specimens, parts and derivatives and referred Parties to Resolution Conf. 10.20 for guidance on the treatment of personal or household effects which were live animals. No guidance was provided, however, on personal or household effects which were live plant specimens.
38. One Working Group member said that he could consider revising Resolution Conf. 10.20 to cover live plants. Another member noted that Parties had never discussed the inclusion of live plants in the Resolution and thought that the Working Group should refrain from doing so. It contended that live plants were not frequently transported across borders and should not be regarded as personal or household effects. In this member’s view, Parties had already decided that the personal and household effects exemption did not apply to live specimens. Nevertheless, it noted that both Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) and Resolution Conf. 10.20 stemmed from Article VII, paragraph 3, of the Convention.

39. One member suggested that quantitative limitations could be set out for all specimens regarded as 'personal effects' acquired outside the owner's State of usual residence. This would facilitate the work of Customs and the burden of verifying such quantities would be similar to the verification of other types of trade which were claimed to be non-commercial. Another member thought that such a list of quantitative limitations would be very large and that a significant effort would be required to determine and justify such limitations. This member considered that the current system, in which quantitative limits have been set for a few types of specimens in line with conservation purposes identified by the exporting Party, was more practical for law enforcement officers as well as the regulated community.
40. With regard to specific species that might require different treatment under Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14), one member suggested that items associated with the African elephant or white rhinoceros populations transferred to Appendix II might merit attention from the Working Group. This member noted that annotations relevant to the listing of such species in the Appendices referred to the trade in various items for non-commercial purposes (e.g. hunting trophies, trade in elephant leather goods, ivory carvings or certified ekipas, etc.). Another member considered that there was no basis in the text of the Convention for such a suggestion and that normal law enforcement means were available for verifying the legal acquisition of the specimen or the non-commercial use to which it would be put. In its view, there were no species which required different treatment under Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14). This member noted that quotas were already set by exporting States, and sometimes by Resolutions of the Conference of the Parties, to limit where necessary the number of specimens harvested for international trade in a particular year. Such quotas are published on the CITES website.
- d) *collate information about how each Party has implemented Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14), particularly with regard to any requirements for export permits, and assess whether this indicates a need to amend the Resolution*
41. The Chair suggested that members share their knowledge about other Parties' implementation of Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14). He said that the Secretariat could issue another Notification to the Parties calling for relevant information to be submitted by those Parties whose implementing practices were not already reflected in the reference list on the CITES website for personal and household effects. At the same time, he proposed that a regular reporting mechanism be developed to obtain more effectively information from Parties that implemented stricter domestic measures on the control of personal and household effects. Such a mechanism could perhaps make better use of question 5 of the standard biennial report format contained in Notification to the Parties No. 2005/035 of 6 July 2005. A regular reporting mechanism of this kind would allow information to be made available to Parties, traders and other stakeholders.
42. During the resulting discussions, it was pointed out that national and international efforts to obtain complete information on how Parties implemented Article VII, paragraph 3, of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) had been unsuccessful to date. Interest was therefore expressed in possibly making use of the biennial report format, provided that any associated reporting burden was minimized. It was suggested that a separate question on how a Party implemented the Resolution would be more appropriate than a revision of question 5 on stricter domestic measures. The Working Group was advised that the Standing Committee Working Group on Multilateral Measures was considering the possible development of a template for reflecting on the CITES website the stricter domestic measures adopted by Parties, including those related to personal or household effects.
43. Other options identified by the Working Group were to: work in collaboration with the Secretariat to encourage the submission of such information, perhaps through the development of a standard format for such submissions; ask Party members to provide information for themselves and the countries in their region; or propose a revision of Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) which recommended that Parties supply such information to the Secretariat for posting on the CITES website. It was suggested that the imposition of a reporting obligation with a clear time-frame might be accompanied by a 'sanction' for non-compliance.
44. One member of the Working Group considered that the text of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) made it clear that a State must take specific action in order to 'nullify' the personal effects exemption. For example, the Resolution states that "Parties shall...not require export permits...for personal or household effects...except...where they have been advised through a Notification from the Secretariat or in the CITES website that the other Party involved in the trade requires such documents...." According to this member, a State should publish any policy decision taken to reduce or eliminate the exemption so that other Parties and traders have fair notice of the decision. If such decisions were not published, the proper assumption was that the exemption applied to Appendix-II specimens.

45. Another member said that its assumption, where a Party was silent about its implementation of Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP 14), was that an export permit was required for personal and household effects of Appendix-II species. It preferred to maintain a precautionary approach, until more complete information was available, because the trade in personal and household effects could form a substantial part of CITES trade.
46. A member of the Working Group recalled that the Chair had pointed out that the language in the Convention, which describes the exemption for personal and household effects and related trade rules, was difficult to interpret and apply. In this member's view, the imposition of stricter domestic measures by some Parties increased the complexity associated with personal and household effects which affected both compliance with and the effectiveness of the Convention.

*Personal effects which do not accompany the owner or which are not part of a household move*

47. The Chair asked Working Group members whether Article VII, paragraph 3, of the Convention might cover personal effects that were sent to another country for repair and then returned to the owner. He said it had been brought to the Secretariat's attention that the definition of 'personal or household effects' in Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) did not provide the same flexibility as the Convention, particularly with regard to personal effects that do not accompany the person who owned or possessed them. This arose because the definition in the Resolution required personal or household effects to be either "worn, carried or included in personal baggage or part of a household move". The Chair asked, if a specimen sent to another country for repair did not qualify as a personal effect, whether it could be treated as a household effect under Article VII, paragraph 3.
48. One Working Group member considered that the Convention clearly required permits for personal effects shipped at a later time and should not be so liberally interpreted as to remove the permit requirement simply because an item – at some previous point in time – had been considered a personal or household effect. In its opinion, the ownership of and the purpose of international trade in specimens could change over time, so that an item once designated as a personal or household effect may not always carry that status.
49. Another member agreed that even though the ownership and trade circumstances may indeed change, this was not a basis for refusing to accord the personal effects exemption to an item which continued to be a personal effect. In his opinion, the re-exporting State should determine on the basis of available evidence whether the purpose of the re-export involved a change in the item's status from a personal effect to an item of commerce. He considered that Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) should be revised to make clear that the personal effects exemption provided under Article VII, paragraph 3, of the Convention applied to the re-export of a personal effect for purposes which did not change the personal nature of the specimen.
50. The same member was of the opinion that Article VII, paragraph 3, of the Convention should cover specimens that were dispatched for repair and then returned to the owner, as either a personal or a household effect. It acknowledged that this interpretation, however, may not be clear from the language of the Article and should be clarified through a revision to Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14). In the view of this member, such an approach was based on common sense and a desire to avoid placing any unnecessary burden on either the owner of such an item or the relevant CITES official.
51. The same member thought that Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) should be revised to clarify that a hunting trophy shipped to the hunter after he left the State from which the trophy was taken was still considered to be a personal effect or even personal baggage. In his view, the Convention did not limit the personal or household effects exemption to items carried on the person or in the personal baggage of the traveller, or included as part of a household move. Rather, these were conditions that had been added by Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14). The same member contended that the later shipment of a hunting trophy, as distinguished from its personal carriage by the owner, did not change the nature of the specimen as a personal effect.
52. A third member said that specimens dispatched for repair and then returned did not qualify as personal or household effects under Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) because the exemption only applied when the specimens were 'worn, carried or included in personal baggage' or 'part of a household move'. This member suggested that specimens ordered via the Internet and imported by post (or personally owned items which travellers sent by post to their State of usual residence) should not qualify as personal or household effects either. In his view, enforcement problems would arise if the exemption were extended to cover items sent to another country for repair (or ordered via the Internet and imported by post or sent by a

traveller by post) because it would be difficult to distinguish legitimate shipments and misuse could not be prevented. This member suggested that such items could be covered by the issuance of retrospective CITES documents under Part XII of Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP14), on a case-by-case basis.

53. One member responded to the previous suggestion by saying that an owner's shipment of a personal effect out of his or her State of residence did not change the nature of the personal effect. It contended that there was nothing in the text of the Convention on which to base a 'secondary permit requirement'. This member also contended that it was illogical under the Convention to require documents based on original import documentation because an exempt specimen would not have been covered by an export permit in the first instance.

#### Conclusions

54. As indicated above, discussions among Working Group members have been thoughtful, but members have not yet reached consensus on any of the issues covered by its terms of reference. Additional discussions are needed in order for the Group to fully implement the terms of reference, particularly to determine whether and how Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) needs to be amended. It therefore seems necessary and appropriate to extend the operation of the Working Group until the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (2013) and to have it report its progress at the 61st and 62nd meetings of the Standing Committee.

#### Recommendations

55. It is recommended that the Conference of the Parties adopt the draft revised Decision 14.64 which is contained in the Annex to this document.



PROPOSED REVISIONS TO DECISION 14.64 OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

NB: Text to be deleted is ~~crossed out~~. Proposed new text is underlined.

***Directed to the Standing Committee***

- 14.64 The Standing Committee shall extend the operation of its Working Group on Personal and Household Effects until the ~~156~~<sup>156</sup>th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP~~156~~<sup>156</sup>) and oversee the Group's work in fulfilling the following terms of reference:
- a) clarify the relationship between 'tourist souvenirs', 'hunting trophies' and 'personal and household effects';
  - b) clarify the interpretation of Article VII, paragraph 3 (b), of the Convention;
  - c) assess whether there are specific species or types of personal or household effects which, in view of conservation concerns, would require different treatment under Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14);
  - d) collate information about how each Party has implemented Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14), particularly with regard to requirements for export permits, and assess whether this indicates the need to amend the Resolution; and
  - e) report at each regular meeting of the Standing Committee until CoP~~156~~<sup>156</sup> and at CoP~~156~~<sup>156</sup>.