

**ENGLISH**  
**ALSO AVAILABLE ONLINE**  
**SAFARICLUB.ORG/CITES**

**PRODUCED BY**  
**SAFARI CLUB INTERNATIONAL AND**  
**SAFARI CLUB INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION**

# **SUSTAINABLE USE GUIDE**

## **SPECIES PROPOSALS AND WORKING DOCUMENTS**

**CITES CoP17**

**Johannesburg, 24 September - 5 October 2016**

CITES CoP17, Johannesburg, South Africa, September 24 to October 5, 2016

## **THE SUSTAINABLE USE GUIDE TO THE SPECIES PROPOSALS AND WORKING DOCUMENTS**

This quick reference guide has been prepared by Safari Club International and Safari Club International Foundation as a service to delegates to CoP17, to provide the sustainable use view on the issues before the Parties.

Safari Club International and the Safari Club International Foundation support the use of hunting as a conservation tool, and support science-based decision-making in wildlife policy, management and conservation. The organizations have a strong base of knowledge and expertise in relation to game species and the recovery of species through sustainable use programs. In relation to species outside our normal areas of expertise, we have taken account of the analysis of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (“IUCN”) and TRAFFIC in formulating our recommendations.

We thank the contributors to this guide, comprising both staff and volunteer biologists and lawyers, together with eminent contractors, including Dr Hank Jenkins, a herpetologist and former chair of the Animals Committee, and Rick Parsons, an international lawyer who was the former chief of the U.S. Management Authority and Chair of the Standing Committee.

## IUCN ADVICE ON TROPHY HUNTING

The IUCN has briefed that legal, well-regulated trophy hunting is important for wildlife conservation, and considers the following four-point test must be satisfied before it is restricted or ended.

“To avoid significant negative impacts on species populations, habitat conservation, poaching levels, and the rights and livelihoods of indigenous and local communities,” Parties must “ensure that any decisions that could restrict or end trophy hunting programmes:

- i. are based on careful and sound analysis and understanding of the particular role that trophy hunting programmes are playing in relation to conservation efforts at all levels in source countries, including their contribution to livelihoods in specific affected communities;
- ii. are based on meaningful and equitable consultation with affected range state governments and indigenous peoples and local communities and do not undermine local approaches to conservation;
- iii. are taken only after exploration of other options to engage with relevant countries to change poor practice and promote improved standards of governance and management of hunting;
- iv. are taken only after identification and implementation of feasible, fully funded and sustainable alternatives to hunting that respect indigenous and local community rights and livelihoods and deliver equal or greater incentives for conservation over the long term.”

“Informing Decisions on Trophy Hunting,” April 2016:

[http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn\\_informingdecisionsontrophyhuntingv1.pdf](http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_informingdecisionsontrophyhuntingv1.pdf).

## SPECIES PROPOSALS VOTING RECOMMENDATIONS - SUMMARY

KEY: ✓ SUPPORT; ✗ REJECT; ✓✗ PART SUPPORT PART REJECT; [✓] QUALIFIED

PROPOSAL	VOTE	PROPOSAL	VOTE	PROPOSAL	VOTE
1. Wood bison	✓	25. Alligator lizards	✓✗	49. Cuban landsnails	✓✗
2. Tur	✗	26. Alligator lizards	✗	50. Ponytail palm, elephant-foot tree	✗
3. Vicuña	✓	27. Pygmy chameleons	✗	51. Maury's tillandsia	✓
4. African lion	✗	28. Pygmy chameleons	✗	52. Fishhook cacti	[✓]
5. Florida puma and eastern puma	✓	29. Psychedelic rock gecko	✓	53. Siamese rosewood	✓
6. Mountain zebra	✓	30. Turquoise dwarf gecko	✓	54. Rosewoods	✓
7. Southern white rhinoceros	[✓]	31. Masobe gecko	✓	55. Rosewoods	✗
8. Indian pangolin	✗	32. Earless monitor lizards	✗	56. Bubingas	✗
9. Indian pangolin	✗	33. Chinese crocodile lizard	✓	57. African rosewood	✗
10. Philippine pangolin	✓	34. Ashe's bush viper	✗	58. Grandidier's baobab	✗
11. Sunda, Chinese pangolins	✓	35. Kenya horned viper	✗	59. Algerian fir	✗
12. African pangolins	✗	36. Flapshell, Soft-shell turtles	✗	60. Agarwoods	✓
13. Barbary macaque	✗	37. Tomato frog	✓	61. Natal ginger	✓
14. African elephant	✓	38. False, Antsouhy tomato frogs	✗	62. Holy wood	✓
15. African elephant	✓	39. Burrowing frogs	✗		
16. African elephant	✗	40. Titicaca water frog	✗		
17. Peregrine falcon	✓	41. Hong Kong warty newt	✗		
18. Helmeted honeyeater	✓	42. Silky shark	✓		
19. African grey parrot	[✓]	43. Thresher sharks	✗		
20. Norfolk island boobook owl	✓	44. Devil rays	✗		
21. American crocodile	✓	45. Ocellate river stingray	✗		
22. Morelet's crocodile	[✓]	46. Banggai cardinalfish	[✓]		
23. Nile crocodile	[✓]	47. Clarion angelfish	✗		
24. Salt-water crocodile	[✓]	48. Nautilus	[✓]		

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

## SPECIES PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>1. WOOD BISON (<i>Bison bison athabasca</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Canada</b> Delete from Appendix II</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Originally listed on Appendix I in 1973 before listing criteria were adopted; transferred to Appendix II in 1997, so the minimum monitoring period recommended in the Precautionary Measures has been exceeded.</li> <li>• Trade is not a concern for the survival of the species.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis concludes that the subspecies does not satisfy the criteria for listing on Appendix II: the population is increasing, distribution is not limited, and international trade is a negligible factor.</li> <li>• The Secretariat recommends the proposal be adopted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. TUR (<i>Capra caucasica</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: The European Union and Georgia</b> Include <i>Capra caucasica</i> in Appendix II, with a zero quota for wild-taken specimens of the Western (Kuban) Tur (<i>C. caucasica caucasica</i>) exported for commercial purposes or as hunting trophies</p>	<p><b>REJECT, unless supported by range states, in which case remove the zero quota for hunting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the agenda refers to the Western (Kuban) Tur, (<i>C. caucasica caucasica</i>), as drafted the proposal also includes the Eastern or Dagestan Tur (<i>C. caucasica cylindricornis</i>).</li> <li>• Inclusion in Appendix II is supported by one range state, Azerbaijan, but another range state, Russia, has not supported the proposal.</li> <li>• IUCN/TRAFFIC note that the criteria for Appendix II are not met in relation to <i>C. caucasica</i>.</li> <li>• IUCN/TRAFFIC note that inclusion in Appendix II with a zero quota for the subspecies <i>C. caucasica caucasica</i> is equivalent to inclusion in Appendix I, and the Appendix I criteria are not met; legal hunting of that subspecies occurs in Russia.</li> <li>• The Secretariat recommends the proposal be rejected.</li> <li>• If the Proposal is supported by other range states, it should be amended to delete the zero quota for hunting trophies, since legal hunting is not a risk to the species and is an important conservation management tool.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<b>3. VICUÑA (<i>Vicugna vicugna</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: Peru</b> Amendment to the Appendices referring to annotations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the populations in Appendix II so as to include on each vicuña wool product additional information on the origin of the product	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed marking requirements will improve post-export traceability of vicuña wool, assist in controlling illegal trade and strengthen sustainability of commercial management of vicuña.</li> </ul>
<b>4. AFRICAN LION (<i>Panthera leo</i>)</b>	<b>Proponents: Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, the Niger, Nigeria and Togo</b> Transfer all populations from Appendix II to Appendix I	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None of the criteria for Appendix I are met for the population as a whole.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Criterion A – population: The wild population is not small. Estimates of total population have ranged from 20,000 to 37,945. The best available science indicates between 32,000 and 35,000 wild African lions (AC27 Doc. 24.3.3; AC27 Inf. 15).</li> <li>○ Criterion B – distribution: The species does not have a restricted area of distribution. Lions are distributed over a vast area of Africa. This is well supported by science with a distribution area between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 square kilometers.</li> <li>○ Criterion C – status decline: The status of the species has not experienced a marked decline. A recent marked decline occurs when there is a percentage decline of 50% or more in the last 10 years or three generations, whichever is longer. No study, including the IUCN reassessment shows this level of decline. Additionally, Tanzania disputes IUCN’s population decline figures for East Africa.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• IUCN/TRAFFIC states that the African population does not appear to meet the listing criteria for Appendix I as the population does not have a restricted range, is not small, and the rate of overall decline does not meet the criteria.</li> <li>• The Secretariat recommends the proposal be rejected.</li> <li>• The population is increasing in Southern Africa where trophy hunting is carried out.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The hunting industry has responded to research indicating that it is preferable to avoid offtake of pride males by hunting males over five years of age.</li> <li>• Inclusion in Appendix I does not address the key threats to lion populations, identified by range states and the majority of researchers as habitat loss and retaliatory killing.</li> <li>• If approved, the proposal is likely to stimulate stricter domestic measures which will end lion hunting as a conservation tool.</li> <li>• 28 lion range states issued a communiqué following a summit in May 2016 stating that a hunting ban will damage lion conservation.</li> <li>• IUCN published a guidance paper on trophy hunting in April 2016 noting an increase in unscientific attacks on trophy hunting and supporting the value of trophy hunting for wildlife conservation.</li> <li>• The AC has an ongoing review of the status of the lion under the Periodic Review process but completion of the review has been frustrated by the proponents of an Appendix I listing.</li> </ul>
<b>5. FLORIDA PUMA AND EASTERN PUMA (<i>Puma concolor coryi</i> and <i>Puma concolor cougar</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: Canada</b> Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation of the AC, following the Periodic Review for <i>Felidae</i>.</li> <li>• There is no risk from trade – there is no trade in either species.</li> <li>• Listing all cougars in North America in Appendix II will conform with the guidance on split-listing in Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16), which advises against listing a species in more than one appendix.</li> </ul>
<b>6. MOUNTAIN ZEBRA (<i>Equus zebra zebra</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: South Africa</b> Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IUCN/TRAFFIC note that the species does not meet any of the listing criteria for Appendix I and that the Precautionary Measures will be satisfied by establishing a process for setting hunting quotas.</li> <li>• The wild population is increasing at 8-9% per year. 69% occurs in secure state-owned protected areas, 31% on private ranches.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The transfer will enable the setting of a hunting quota to generate economic incentives for private ranchers to invest in conservation based on sustainable use. There are many examples of species the recovery of which is directly attributable to game ranching in South Africa e.g. the bontebok (<i>Damaliscus pygargus pygargus</i>).</li> <li>• IUCN/TRAFFIC note that as 70% of the population are on state land, future population growth depends on expansion onto private land.</li> <li>• The increase in population and distribution on account of sustainable use could mitigate the lack of genetic diversity, which has been noted as a threat.</li> <li>• The Secretariat recommends that the proposal be adopted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>7. SOUTHERN WHITE RHINOCEROS (<i>Ceratotherium simum simum</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Swaziland</b> To alter the existing annotation on the Appendix II listing of Swaziland’s white rhino, adopted at the CoP13 in 2004, so as to permit a limited and regulated trade in white rhino horn: (a) collected in the past from natural deaths, (b) recovered from poached Swazi rhino, (c) horn to be harvested in a non-lethal way from a limited number of white rhino in Swaziland in the future</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT IN PRINCIPLE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal would have no direct effect on rhino populations as the rhino horn to be traded would come from horns acquired from natural mortality, horns seized from poachers, and horns taken from living rhinos through non-lethal means.</li> <li>• The proceeds are estimated at nearly US\$10 million, which would be invested in an endowment fund and the proceeds of the endowment fund would be used for infrastructure, supplies, payment of rangers, and the other costs of protecting rhinos in Swaziland’s national parks.</li> <li>• The sales will be controlled by the Swaziland CITES management authority and will be to a limited number of buyers. Sales will be recorded on a DNA database, national register, and with TRAFFIC.</li> <li>• IUCN/TRAFFIC states that the Parties need more detail on how the trade would be carried out and controlled e.g. how the purchasers will be selected and how and by whom they will be licenced.</li> <li>• Poaching continues to increase in spite of other initiatives, including stockpile destruction, increased criminal penalties, demand reduction and education. Until demand reduction is successful, enforcement and</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>protection are the best answers and this proposal seeks funding for that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat recommends that the proposal be rejected.</li> <li>• The sustainable use of rhino horn stockpile sales deserves serious consideration, but a more comprehensive proposal developed after consultation with rhino range states would be helpful.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. INDIAN PANGOLIN (<i>Manis crassicaudata</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Bangladesh</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is substantial illegal international trade in pangolin parts and derivatives.</li> <li>• Scales are used for medicinal purposes. Meat is consumed locally. Skins have been traded.</li> <li>• A zero quota on international trade has been in place since 2000 for all Asian pangolin species through the Significant Trade Review process.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis concludes that there is insufficient data to meet the listing criteria.</li> </ul>
<p><b>9. INDIAN PANGOLIN (<i>Manis crassicaudata</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: India, Nepal, Sri Lanka and the United States of America</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Virtually the same as Proposal 8. Consider the two proposals together.</li> </ul>
<p><b>10. PHILIPPINE PANGOLIN (<i>Manis culionensis</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Philippines and the United States of America</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is illegal international trade in pangolin parts and derivatives but according to the IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis, populations may have declined as indicated by substantial decline in trade in the past 20-30 years and increased harvesting effort required in some areas.</li> </ul>
<p><b>11. SUNDA PANGOLIN AND CHINESE PANGOLIN (<i>Manis javanica</i> and <i>Manis pentadactyla</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: The United States of America and Vietnam</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Virtually no legal trade has been reported since the imposition of the zero export quota in 2000, but it is believed that substantial illegal international trade in pangolin parts and derivatives continues.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis suggests that although data are scarce</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		populations of some of the Asian species are in decline due to trade and the listing criteria for Appendix I may have been met.
<b>12. GIANT, SOUTH AFRICAN, LONG-TAILED AND WHITE-BELLIED PANGOLIN (<i>Manis gigantea</i>, <i>Manis temminckii</i>, <i>Manis tetradactyla</i>, <i>Manis tricuspis</i>)</b>	<b>Proponents: Angola, Botswana, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Togo and the United States of America</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The zero export quota for Asian pangolin species established in 2000 does not apply to the African species.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis reports there is apparently a substantial and growing illegal international trade in pangolin parts and derivatives to supply the Asian market, possibly in response to declining Asian pangolin populations.</li> <li>• IUCN/TRAFFIC concludes that although there is substantial trade, there is insufficient evidence of population decline and the ranges of the species are not restricted.</li> </ul>
<b>13. BARBARY MACAQUE (<i>Macaca Sylvanus</i>)</b>	<b>Proponents: The European Union and Morocco</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis notes that the population decline is not marked.</li> <li>• Europe has banned import since the 1990's.</li> <li>• There is no evidence of international trade.</li> </ul>
<b>14. AFRICAN ELEPHANT (<i>Loxodonta africana</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: Namibia</b> Amend the annotation to the listing of the elephant population in Appendix II by deleting any reference to Namibia in that annotation. The annotation to the elephant listing only allows commercial trade in government ivory stocks on the basis of a proposal to the CoP that has SC agreement that certain conditions have been met. There is a moratorium on such proposals until	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Namibia's elephant populations and habitat available for elephants are increasing through sound management.</li> <li>• Economic incentives are required to ensure this continues.</li> <li>• During the negotiation of the moratorium on proposals for trade, the Parties agreed to work on a non-political, scientifically-based decision-making mechanism to consider allowing trade ("DMM").</li> <li>• There has been no progress on the DMM.</li> <li>• The proposal would require Namibia to use the funds exclusively for elephant conservation and community development and conservation</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	November, 2017.	<p>programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal should be considered in conjunction with Proposal 15 and CoP17 Doc. 84.3.</li> </ul>
<p><b>15. AFRICAN ELEPHANT</b> <i>(Loxodonta africana)</i></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Namibia and Zimbabwe</b> Amend the Appendix II listing by removing the annotation in respect of the population of Zimbabwe in order to achieve an unqualified Appendix II listing. The annotation to the elephant listing only allows commercial trade in government ivory stocks on the basis of a proposal to the CoP that has SC agreement that certain conditions have been met. There is a moratorium on such proposals until November, 2017.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal is similar to that contained in Proposal 14 in respect of the elephant population in Namibia.</li> <li>Zimbabwe’s elephant populations and habitat available for elephants are increasing through sound management.</li> <li>Economic incentives are required to ensure this continues.</li> <li>During the negotiation of the moratorium on proposals for trade, the Parties agreed to work on a non-political, scientifically-based decision-making mechanism to consider allowing trade (“the DMM”).</li> <li>There has been no substantive progress on the DMM.</li> <li>Zimbabwe would use funds from ivory sale exclusively for elephant conservation and community development and conservation programs.</li> <li>This proposal should be considered in conjunction with Proposal 15 and CoP17 Doc 84.3.</li> </ul>
<p><b>16. AFRICAN ELEPHANT</b> <i>(Loxodonta africana)</i></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Benin, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chad, Ethiopia, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, the Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sri Lanka and Uganda</b> Include all populations in Appendix I by transferring the populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe from Appendix II to Appendix I</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted in the IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis, the biological criteria for transfer to Appendix I are not met – the range is not restricted and the population is not small or undergoing a significant decline.</li> <li>This proposal conflicts with proposals 14 and 15 which are made by range states that have been effective in increasing their elephant populations.</li> <li>Elephant poaching continues to be a problem and must be addressed through improved enforcement. Offers from the Parties for funding and practical assistance would be welcome, and more likely to assist than inclusion in Appendix I.</li> <li>The proponents state that the purpose of their proposal is primarily to</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>“send a message” that elephant ivory trade is illegal. In the absence of the appropriate scientific data, “sending messages” is not within the mandate or competence of CITES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion in Appendix I is likely to make it more difficult to ship elephant hunting trophies due to stricter domestic measures, thus threatening the revenues from trophy hunting, which provides funding for enforcement and elephant management.</li> <li>• The IUCN published a guidance paper in April 2016 noting an increased in unscientific attacks on trophy hunting and supporting the value of trophy hunting for wildlife conservation.</li> <li>• The Secretariat recommends that the proposal be rejected.</li> </ul>
<p><b>17. PEREGRINE FALCON</b> <i>(Falco peregrinus)</i></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Canada</b> Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the biological criteria for Appendix I listing are not met - the species has a circumglobal distribution with an extremely large population that is either stable or increasing; at a global scale, the populations are secure.</li> <li>• The species is bred in captivity in significant numbers and live specimens traded internationally for falconry or to supply stock for breeding operations.</li> <li>• Most of the trade is concentrated among 24 countries in North America, Europe and the Middle East.</li> <li>• Controls are in place for the limited legal international trade, most of which is with captive-bred individuals.</li> <li>• There is low risk of harmful trade related to transfer to Appendix II.</li> <li>• The Secretariat recommends that the proposal be adopted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>18. HELMETED HONEYEATER</b> <i>(Lichenostomus melanops cassidix)</i></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Australia</b> Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal results from a review requested by the AC.</li> <li>• The AC supports the transfer to Appendix II.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The species does not satisfy the criteria for Appendix I as international trade is not a threat.</li> <li>The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis notes that the species has a small population and a limited range, but the international trade is limited to scientific specimens and the species is fully protected under Australian law.</li> </ul>
<b>19. AFRICAN GREY PARROT</b> <i>(Psittacus erithacus)</i>	<b>Proponents: Angola, Chad, the European Union, Gabon, Guinea, Nigeria, Senegal, Togo and the United States of America</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis concludes that it is unclear whether the species meets the criteria for Appendix I but notes sharp population declines in some areas due to collection for international trade with high pre-export mortality.</li> <li>There are many breeding operations for this species but additional support measures are recommended to avoid fraudulent use of source codes to disguise wild specimens as captive specimens.</li> </ul>
<b>20. NORFOLK ISLAND BOOBOOK OWL</b> ( <i>Ninox novaeseelandiae undulata</i> )	<b>Proponent: Australia</b> Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal results from a Periodic Review requested by the AC.</li> <li>The subspecies is believed to be extinct, but the listing criteria require transfer to Appendix II before removal as a precautionary measure.</li> <li>The AC supports the transfer to Appendix II and the IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis notes that the precautionary requirements for the transfer have been met.</li> <li>There is no record of any trade in the subspecies and trade in the parent species is very limited.</li> </ul>
<b>21. AMERICAN CROCODILE</b> <i>(Crocodylus acutus)</i>	<b>Proponent: Colombia</b> Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II the populations of certain regions in Colombia, in accordance with Res. Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) on ranching and trade in ranches specimens	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that although the population is small it appears to be stable or increasing and may be at carrying capacity.</li> <li>The transfer will allow a community-based sustainable use program that will improve the livelihoods of local communities through the harvest of eggs.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is supported by the IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group.</li> <li>• Colombia has agreed, at SC66, to implement measures to prevent the illegal export of ranched or wild origin specimens as captive-bred.</li> </ul>
<b>22. MORELET’S CROCODILE</b> <i>(Crocodylus moreletii)</i>	<b>Proposal: Mexico</b> Delete the zero quota for wild specimens traded for commercial purposes from the Appendix II listing of the population of Mexico	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After the species was transferred to Appendix II with a zero export quota, a monitoring program established a population of about 76,000.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that removal of the zero quota is analogous to a transfer from Appendix I and that the Mexican population does not meet the criteria for Appendix I as its population is not small and has been increasing for at least ten years.</li> <li>• Deleting the zero quota will allow a community-based sustainable use program that will improve the livelihoods of local communities through the harvest of eggs.</li> <li>• The proponent should clarify how the proposed traceability system would operate, to ensure that wild specimens are not fraudulently presented as captive-bred.</li> </ul>
<b>23. NILE CROCODILE</b> <i>(Crocodylus niloticus)</i>	<b>Proponent: Madagascar</b> Maintain the Malagasy population in Appendix II subject to an annotation dealing with wild harvest, captive production and export controls	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is intended to address difficulties in restricting fraudulent use of source codes so as to present wild specimens as captive.</li> <li>• It aims primarily at sustaining and rebuilding the wild population, and better regulating the wild harvest associated with the artisanal industry.</li> <li>• As the IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis indicates, the proposal deals with domestic management measures and is not appropriate as an annotation since it does not address export limitations.</li> <li>• The proponent should clarify the role of ranching, e.g. the supporting statements refer to egg harvesting being a main source of stock for certain ranches.</li> <li>• The proposal refers to no export quota for the next three years, and the</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		proponent should indicate whether it intends to submit a further proposal to CoP18 to set an export quota.
<b>24. SALT-WATER CROCODILE</b> <b>(<i>Crocodylus porosus</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: Malaysia</b> Transfer the population in Malaysia from Appendix I to Appendix II, with wild harvest restricted to the State of Sarawak and a zero quota for wild specimens for the other States of Malaysia (Sabah and Peninsular Malaysia), with no change in the zero quota unless approved by the Parties	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Malaysian population has recovered substantially and no longer satisfies the biological criteria for Appendix I -- current populations are not small, do not have a restricted range, and the population in Sarawak is estimated at 12,000 to 13,500.</li> <li>• There is significant recorded human conflict, including 64 fatal attacks since 1979, which have eroded local support for ongoing conservation efforts.</li> <li>• There are seven captive-breeding facilities in Malaysia, two being in Sarawak.</li> <li>• The transfer to Appendix II will support a ranching program in Sarawak, with international exports from the allowed harvest of less than 500 individuals and less than 2,500 eggs or hatchlings.</li> <li>• The harvest will be subject to adaptive management controls to react to possible changes in the population.</li> <li>• This will provide economic benefits to local communities and will increase support for the conservation efforts.</li> <li>• The proponent should clarify (1) the level of international trade that will be allowed from the wild harvest associated with the ranching program and (2) what measures will be taken to prevent the fraudulent presentation of wild specimens as captive-bred.</li> </ul>
<b>25. ALLIGATOR LIZARDS:</b> <b>ANZUETOI (<i>Abronia anzuetoi</i>); CAMPBELL'S (<i>A. campbelli</i>); FROST'S (<i>A. frosti</i>); MELEDONA (<i>A. meledona</i>); WITHOUT</b>	<b>Proponent: Guatemala</b> Include <i>Abronia anzuetoi</i> , <i>A. campbelli</i> , <i>A. fimbriata</i> , <i>A. frosti</i> and <i>A. meledona</i> (Arboreal Alligator Lizards) in Appendix I; <i>A. aurita</i> , <i>A. gaiophasma</i> , <i>A. montecristoi</i> , <i>A. salvadorensis</i> and <i>A.</i>	<b>PART SUPPORT, PART REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal overlaps with Prop. 26 -- It proposes five species for inclusion in Appendix I and five species for inclusion in Appendix II with a zero quota, whereas Prop. 26 proposes putting the entire genus in Appendix II.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>COMMON NAME (A. <i>fimbriata</i>); COPE'S (A. <i>aurita</i>); BRILLIANT (A. <i>gaiophantasma</i>); MONTE CRISTO (A. <i>montecristoi</i>); SALVADOR (A. <i>salvadorensi</i>); BOCOURT'S (A. <i>vasconcelosii</i>)</b></p>	<p><i>vasconcelosii</i> in Appendix II with the annotation: a) zero export quota for wild specimens; b) zero export quota for specimens bred in non-range countries of the species</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis considers that the listing criteria are met for three of the five species proposed for Appendix I (A. <i>anzuetoi</i>, A. <i>campbelli</i>, A. <i>frosti</i>)— they have small or very small ranges and are in demand for the international exotic pet market.</li> <li>• Reject the listing of the other two species (A. <i>fimbriata</i> and A. <i>meladona</i>) in Appendix I and consider them under Prop. 26, which would list the entire genus in Appendix II.</li> <li>• the IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis concludes that as to those two species there is international trade but due to extensive distribution and lack of information on population levels, they do not meet the biological criteria for Appendix I.</li> <li>• Reject the portion of the proposal relating to listing five species in Appendix II with zero quotas, but consider them under Prop. 26, which would list the entire genus.</li> </ul>
<p><b>26. ALLIGATOR LIZARDS (Abronía spp.)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: The European Union and Mexico</b> Include the genus <i>Abronía</i> (29 species) in Appendix II.</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mexico prepared a draft proposal for listing the genus in Appendix II and asked the AC to comment. The AC noted the document.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis doubts that the biological criteria for listing in Appendix II are met for any <i>Abronía</i> species, but suggests that a look-alike listing might be appropriate if any species are listed in either Appendix.</li> <li>• If the genus is listed in Appendix II, then any species listed in Appendix I under Prop. 25 should be excluded from Appendix II.</li> </ul>
<p><b>27. PYGMY CHAMELEONS (Rhampholeon spp., Rieppeleon spp.)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Central African Republic, Chad, Gabon, Kenya, Nigeria and the United States of America</b> Include the genera <i>Rhampholeon</i> spp. and <i>Rieppeleon</i> spp. in Appendix II</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal and Prop. 28 are virtually identical.</li> <li>• Tanzania is the primary range state and the source of most of the specimens in trade. Its views on this proposal are not known.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that of the three species in trade two are widespread and believed to have large populations and do not meet</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>the biological listing criteria. The third species is widely distributed, locally abundant and not likely to be threatened by trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IUCN/TRAFFIC suggests that these two genera might create look-alike problems for a similar species in another genus that is already listed in Appendix II.</li> </ul>
<p><b>28. PYGMY CHAMELEONS</b> (<i>Rhampholeon</i> spp., <i>Rieppeleon</i> spp.)</p>	<p><b>Proponent: Kenya</b> Include the genera <i>Rhampholeon</i> spp. and <i>Rieppeleon</i> spp. in Appendix II</p>	<p><b>WITHDRAW, in favor of proposal 27</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal is very similar to Proposal 27, except that it proposed to include <i>Rhampholeon nchisiensis</i> in Appendix II on a lookalike basis</li> <li>If not withdrawn, it would be helpful for the proponent to explain the relationship of this proposal to Proposal 27.</li> </ul>
<p><b>29. PSYCHEDELIC ROCK GECKO</b> (<i>Cnemaspis psychedelica</i>)</p>	<p><b>Proponents: The European Union and Viet Nam</b> Include in Appendix I</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfies the biological criteria for Appendix I.</li> <li>The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the species has a limited distribution, very small population, and is affected by trade.</li> </ul>
<p><b>30. TURQUOISE DWARF GECKO</b> (<i>Lygodactylus williamsi</i>)</p>	<p><b>Proponents: The European Union and Tanzania</b> Include in Appendix I</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfies the biological criteria for Appendix I.</li> <li>The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis concludes that the distribution of the species is very limited and the abundance is declining due to habitat loss and possibly trade.</li> </ul>
<p><b>31. MASOBE GECKO</b> (<i>Paroedura masobe</i>)</p>	<p><b>Proponents: The European Union and Madagascar</b> Include in Appendix II</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IUCN/TRAFFIC considers the criteria for Appendix II may be met on the basis that control of trade is needed to avoid inclusion on Appendix I.</li> </ul>
<p><b>32. EARLESS MONITOR LIZARDS</b> (<i>Lanthanotidae</i> spp.)</p>	<p><b>Proponent: Malaysia</b> Include in Appendix I</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not satisfy the criteria for Appendix I; consider for inclusion in Appendix II.</li> <li>Main threats are habitat loss rather than trade.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis notes that there are no population estimates, the species may be locally common, and it may be able to adapt to habitat loss.</li> <li>• It would be helpful if Indonesia, a major range state, could indicate whether or not it supports the proposal.</li> <li>• Vigilance will be required to avoid fraudulent use of source code to present wild specimens as captive.</li> </ul>
<b>33. CHINESE CROCODILE LIZARD (<i>Shinisaurus crocodilurus</i>)</b>	<b>Proponents: China, the European Union, and Viet Nam</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfies the biological criteria for Appendix I.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the species has a restricted and fragmented distribution, a small population with small sub-populations, and has declined.</li> <li>• Vigilance will be required to avoid fraudulent use of source code to present wild specimens as captive.</li> </ul>
<b>34. ASHE'S BUSH VIPER (<i>Atheris desaixi</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: Kenya</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not satisfy the criteria for Appendix II</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the population has a very restricted range, is subject to decline from habitat loss, and is in very limited illegal trade for specialty collectors. Consideration of an Appendix III listing is suggested.</li> <li>• The range state can consider an Appendix III listing to obtain assistance in export controls.</li> </ul>
<b>35. KENYA HORNED VIPER (<i>Bitis worthingtoni</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: Kenya</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not satisfy the criteria for Appendix II.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that there are no population or density estimates.</li> <li>• Include in Appendix III to obtain reciprocity in export controls.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>36. FLAP SHELL TURTLES:</b>  <b>NUBIAN (<i>Cyclanorbis elegans</i>); SENEGAL (<i>C. senegalensis</i>); AUBRY'S (<i>C. aubryi</i>); ZAMBEZI (<i>C. frenatum</i>)</b>  <b>SOFT-SHELL TURTLES:</b>  <b>NILE (<i>Trionyx triunguis</i>) and EUPHRATES (<i>Rafetus euphraticus</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Burkina Faso, Chad, Gabon, Guinea, Liberia, Mauritania, Nigeria, Togo and the United States of America</b>            Include in Appendix II</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not satisfy the criteria for Appendix II.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that there is no indication of widespread decline and there is no evidence of significant international trade; most consumption is domestic.</li> <li>• The proposal is based on speculation that CITES protection for Asian species will lead to a demand for African species and is not supported by data.</li> <li>• The introduction of domestic protection would be more appropriate.</li> </ul>
<p><b>37. TOMATO FROG (<i>Dyscophus antongilii</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Madagascar</b>            Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not satisfy the criteria for Appendix I.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that population has a relatively wide distribution, may reach the hundreds of thousands, and there is no indication of a marked decline.</li> <li>• Establishment and operation of the proposed annual quota may present capacity issues.</li> </ul>
<p><b>38. FALSE TOMATO FROG (<i>Dyscophus guineti</i>) and ANTSOUHY TOMATO FROG (<i>Dyscophus. insularis</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Madagascar</b>            Include in Appendix II</p>	<p><b>WITHDRAW/REJECT, unless further information provided</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is insufficient information on the criteria to support inclusion in Appendix II.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the two species have a wide distribution and are common or locally abundant and do not meet the biological criteria for Appendix II, but that there may be a look-alike issue.</li> <li>• The proponent should be invited to provide further information to support the proposal.</li> </ul>
<p><b>39. BURROWING FROGS:</b>  <b>GREEN BURROWING FROG (<i>Scaphiophryne marmorata</i>);</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Madagascar</b>            Include in Appendix II</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is insufficient information on the criteria to support inclusion in Appendix II.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<b>BURROWING FROG</b> <i>(Scaphiophryne boribory)</i> ; <b>WITHOUT COMMON NAME</b> <i>(Scaphiophryne spinose)</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that all three species have a relatively wide distribution and although there is no overall population data they are thought to be locally abundant; trade is limited, probably to specialist hobbyists.</li> <li>The range state can consider inclusion in Appendix III.</li> </ul>
<b>40. TITICACA WATER FROG</b> <i>(Telmatobius coleus)</i>	<b>Proponents: Bolivia and Peru</b> Include in Appendix I	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The species does not meet the Appendix I listing criteria.</li> <li>The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the species does not have a restricted range and although there are some declines reported in part of the range, it does not have a small population; international trade is quite limited.</li> <li>Support with in-situ management involving local communities.</li> </ul>
<b>41. HONG KONG WARTY NEWT</b> <i>(Paramesotriton hongkongensis)</i>	<b>Proponent: China</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the species is locally abundant and has a relatively wide distribution; the only known trade is with the USA.</li> <li>Importation into the USA has been prohibited from February 28, 2016, due to disease concerns.</li> <li>The proponent can include it in Appendix III until the effect of the US action is known.</li> </ul>
<b>42. SILKY SHARK</b> <i>(Carcharhinus falciformis)</i>	<b>Proponents: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, the Comoros, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, the European Union, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea, Bissau, Maldives, Mauritania, Palau, Panama, Samoa, Senegal, Sri Lanka and Ukraine</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the species meets the Appendix II listing criteria because although it has a global distribution, there are reported declines in many populations, measured mainly by reductions in the Catch Per Unit of Effort (CPUE); the species is traded for many purposes, but primarily for the fin.</li> <li>The most significant threat is incidental catch.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<b>43. THRESHER SHARKS</b> <i>(Alopias spp.)</i>	<b>Proponents: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, the Comoros, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, the European Union, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Maldives, Mauritania, Palau, Panama, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka and Ukraine</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient information on population size and structure.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the overall population size of any of the three species of thresher sharks is not known; changes in populations are inferred from fisheries data but this is admittedly difficult to interpret. It concludes that there is insufficient support for an Appendix II listing.</li> <li>• The primary threat is incidental catch.</li> </ul>
<b>44. DEVIL RAYS</b> <i>(Mobula spp.)</i>	<b>Proponents: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, the Comoros, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, the European Union, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Maldives, Mauritania, Palau, Panama, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka and the United States of America</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the many species of Devil Rays are widely distributed and are taken as incidental catch but primarily in local artisanal fisheries.</li> <li>• Productivity is low and there are reports of declines which are inferred from declining catch despite increased effort in several locations.</li> <li>• International trade is primarily for the gill plates for use in the medicinal market.</li> <li>• IUCN/TRAFFIC concludes that it is possible that some species of Devil Rays may meet Appendix II listing criteria based on low productivity of the species, declining catch and increased market.</li> <li>• The proponents should be asked if this is the case.</li> </ul>
<b>45. OCELLATE RIVER STINGRAY</b> ( <i>Potamotrygon motoro</i> )	<b>Proponent: Bolivia</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>WITHDRAW</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the species has a very wide distribution, and although densities are low in some areas it is abundant in others; overall there is insufficient information to support an Appendix II listing.</li> <li>• The proponent and the range states most involved in the international trade can list the species in Appendix III if trade controls are needed.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<b>46. BANGGAI CARDINALFISH</b> <i>(Pterapogon kauderni)</i>	<b>Proponent: The European Union</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for inclusion in Appendix II are satisfied, but implementation issues are likely to be difficult.</li> <li>• Range state Indonesia disputes the need for inclusion in Appendix II.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the species has a very restricted range, is vulnerable to overexploitation, is traded internationally for the aquarium trade, and meets the Appendix II listing criteria.</li> <li>• Proponent and range state should collaborate to determine how best to support sustainable-use management for benefit of local communities.</li> </ul>
<b>47. CLARION ANGELFISH</b> <i>(Holacanthus clarionensis)</i>	<b>Proponent: Mexico</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harvested population is outside protected area where main population is not subject to harvest.</li> <li>• The limited harvest is controlled by license.</li> <li>• Almost all exports are between USA (California) and Mexico (Baja Sur) and trade is monitored in USA.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the major part of the population occurs in a protected area, is believed to be stable, and the fishery is regulated. It concludes that the Appendix II listing criteria are not met.</li> <li>• Bilateral arrangements could provide necessary support to existing controls.</li> </ul>
<b>48. NAUTILUS (<i>Nautilidae</i> spp.)</b>	<b>Proponents: Fiji, India, Palau and the United States of America</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT, if range states support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the main species in trade has an extensive range, although all nautilus species occur in small, scattered populations and are felt to be vulnerable. It concludes that the genus is likely to meet the criteria for Appendix II listing given the vulnerability to overharvest and the lack of management plans.</li> <li>• Range states, particularly Indonesia and Philippines, have not indicated support of the proposal.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<b>49. CUBAN LANDSNAILS</b> <i>(Polymita spp.)</i>	<b>Proponent: Cuba</b> Include in Appendix I	<b>PART SUPPORT, PART REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The biological criteria for Appendix I are met only in relation to <i>P. sulphurosa</i>.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that <i>sulphurosa</i> has a very limited, fragmented range, in which it is rare; significant declines have been reported; the species is traded internationally. The other species, although in trade, either have wider distributions or large populations.</li> </ul>
<b>50. PONYTAIL PALM, ELEPHANT-FOOT TREE</b> <i>(Beaucarnea spp.)</i>	<b>Proponent: Mexico</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is that <i>B. recurvata</i> meets the scientific listing criteria and that ten other species are look-alikes.</li> <li>• <i>B. recurvata</i> is the principal species in trade but does not meet the Appendix II scientific listing criteria.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that <i>B. recurvata</i> is widely cultivated and its wild populations have a wide distribution, there is no information on total numbers or trends, and cultivated specimens are likely to meet trade demands.</li> </ul>
<b>51. MAURY'S TILLANDSIA</b> <i>(Tillandsia mauryana)</i>	<b>Proponent: Mexico</b> Delete from Appendix II	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal resulted from the PC's Periodic Review process.</li> <li>• IUCN/TRAFFIC notes it does not meet the criteria for continued inclusion in Appendix II and the Precautionary Measures test is satisfied; the plant occurs in the wild in Mexico and no export has been recorded from Mexico since the species was listed in Appendix II; regulation of trade is not required to prevent a threat to the survival of the species.</li> </ul>
<b>52. FISHHOOK CACTI: NEW MEXICO</b> ( <i>Sclerocactus cloverae</i> ); <b>SILER'S</b> ( <i>S. sileri</i> ); <b>BLAINE'S</b> ( <i>S. spinosior blainei</i> )	<b>Proponent: The United States of America</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT, subject to additional information</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal results from a Periodic Review of <i>Sclerocactus</i> spp. in the USA</li> <li>• The PC suggested that the USA propose listing but did not specifically indicate support.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal would be helped by elaboration by proponent, particularly on nomenclature issues.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis concludes that two of the three species may meet the biological criteria for Appendix I listing in that they have limited distributions. <i>S.s. blainei</i> has a very restricted distribution, being known from only three locations; its population size is unknown and there is no information on trends but it may be affected by drought. It is not known to be in trade. <i>S. sileri</i> has a restricted distribution and has undergone declines; there is not enough information to show that it is in trade. <i>S. cloverae</i> has a relatively widespread distribution and does not appear to have a small population.</li> </ul>
<b>53. SIAMESE ROSEWOOD</b> <i>(Dalbergia cochinchinensis)</i>	<b>Proponent: Thailand</b> Amend the listing by changing the Annotation that restricts the listing from Annotation #5 to Annotation #4, thereby enlarging listing to cover additional products	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The species is listed in Appendix II subject to Annotation #5, which limits the listing to logs, sawn wood and veneer sheets.</li> <li>• A review found that trade of this species includes crudely sawn furniture which circumvents the intent of the listing.</li> <li>• The proponents would amend the listing to delete Annotation #5 and instead list the species under Annotation #4, which would include all parts and derivatives except seeds and seedlings or tissue cultures obtained in vitro, in solid or liquid media, transported in sterile containers, and cut flowers of artificially propagated plants.</li> <li>• The proposal is supported by range state Viet Nam and by the International Timber Trade Organization (ITTO).</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis supports the amendment, noting that if Proposal 55 is adopted it would list the entire genus without annotation, meaning that all readily recognizable parts and derivatives would be covered and the purpose of Proposal 53 would be accomplished.</li> </ul>
<b>54. ROSEWOODS</b> ( <i>Dalbergia calderonii, D. calycina, D.</i>	<b>Proponent: Mexico</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>SUPPORT, with annotation to limit listing to the parts and derivatives in trade</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An expert workshop in 2015 in Mexico agreed that all 13 species native to</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<p><i>congestiflora</i>, <i>D. cubilquitzensis</i>, <i>D. glomerata</i>, <i>D. longepedunculata</i>, <i>D. luteola</i>, <i>D. melanocardium</i>, <i>D. modesta</i>, <i>D. palo-escrito</i>, <i>D. rhachifexa</i>, <i>D. ruddae</i>, <i>D. tucurensis</i>)</p>		<p>Central America and Mexico were at risk and satisfied the criteria for Appendix II.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This was endorsed by the 22nd meeting of the Plants Committee (Tbilisi, 2015).</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis concludes that there is insufficient information to show that the 13 species meet the biological listing criteria but points out that the look-alike criteria may be met because there are two species of <i>Dalbergia</i> listed in Appendix II and it is difficult to distinguish the species in trade.</li> <li>• IUCN/TRAFFIC also notes that the proposal would list the species without annotation, meaning that all parts and derivatives are included. This differs from the current Appendix II listing of two species, which includes only those parts and derivatives in the annotations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>55. ROSEWOODS (<i>Dalbergia</i> spp.)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Argentina, Brazil, Guatemala and Kenya</b> Include in Appendix II except for the species included in Appendix I</p>	<p><b>REJECT, in favor of Thailand and Mexico proposals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis concludes that there is little information on the status of species of <i>Dalbergia</i> that produce rosewood, and there is little information of the impact of trade on the genus; therefore there is insufficient information to determine if the biological criteria are met for Appendix II.</li> <li>• IUCN/TRAFFIC states that the look-alike criteria are met for some, but not all, of the species in the genus.</li> <li>• This proposal has no annotation and would therefore cover all recognizable parts and derivatives, including musical instruments made from a <i>Dalbergia</i> species that is not hard to identify.</li> </ul>
<p><b>56. BUBINGAS (<i>Guibortia demeusei</i>, <i>G. pellegriniana</i>, <i>G. tessmannii</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: The European Union and Gabon</b> Include <i>G. tessmannii</i> and <i>G. pellegriniana</i> in Appendix II; include <i>G. demeusei</i> on a lookalike basis with an annotation #4 that</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that information on these species is sparse, with little known about recruitment rates.</li> <li>• <i>G. demeusei</i> is widespread and can be locally abundant. IUCN/TRAFFIC concludes that it does not meet the biological listing criteria.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	would include all plants and derivatives except seeds, seedlings or tissue cultures obtained in vitro and cut flowers of artificially propagated plants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The other two species have a low density, trade is at a low level. IUCN/TRAFFIC states that it is not clear that trade would lead to eligibility for Appendix I, which is one of the biological listing criteria.</li> </ul>
<b>57. AFRICAN ROSEWOOD</b> <i>(Pterocarpus erinaceus)</i>	<b>Proponents: Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, the European Union, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal and Togo</b> Include in Appendix II	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At PC 22, 2015, Senegal's intent to list the species in Appendix III was noted and it was advised to consult with other range states if it decided to propose the species for Appendix II.</li> <li>IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the species is widespread and at least locally abundant, and concludes that it is unlikely that the rate of harvest for trade requires regulation to prevent the species from becoming eligible for Appendix I, which is one of the criteria for Appendix II listing.</li> </ul>
<b>58. GRANDIDIER'S BAOBAB</b> <i>(Adansonia grandidieri)</i>	<b>Proponent: Madagascar</b> Include seeds, fruits, oil and live plants only in Appendix II	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that there is extensive distribution and recent satellite imagery supports an estimate of over 1 million trees; very little evidence of international trade and concludes that the criteria for Appendix II listing are not met.</li> </ul>
<b>59. ALGERIAN FIR</b> ( <i>Abies numidica</i> )	<b>Proponent: Algeria</b> Include in Appendix I	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the species has a restricted range, appears to be declining, but that trade is unlikely to be a factor.</li> </ul>
<b>60. AGARWOODS</b> ( <i>Aquilaria</i> spp., <i>Gyrinops</i> spp.)	<b>Proponent: The United States of America</b> Amend the annotation to the Appendix II listing by adding wood chips to the parts and derivatives included	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Woodchips constitute a significant proportion of the international trade in agarwood.</li> <li>The proposal results from extensive consultations within SC, PC and range and consumer States.</li> <li>The proposal follows guidance in Res. Conf. 11.21 (Rev. CoP16) on <i>Use of Annotations in Appendices I and II</i>.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

PROPOSAL	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<b>61. NATAL GINGER</b> <i>(Siphonochilus aethiopicus)</i>	<b>Proponent: South Africa</b> Include populations of Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Swaziland and South Africa in Appendix II	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South African population has declined due to local use in traditional remedies, apparently stimulating trade from neighboring countries, with declines occurring in three of those countries.</li> <li>• The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis states that the population in South Africa is seriously depleted by use as a traditional remedy, that it is supplied through informal channels from neighboring countries, populations in Swaziland are remnant, populations in southern Mozambique may be deleted, that there is no information on Zimbabwe, but concludes that there is insufficient information to support the listing.</li> </ul>
<b>62. HOLY WOOD (<i>Bulnesia sarmientoi</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: The United States of America</b> Amend listing Annotation #11 in Appendix II to eliminate finished products containing extracts, including fragrances.	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal would harmonize Annotations #11 and #12.</li> <li>• Those annotations are almost identical (except for the word “powder” in #11). An alternative approach would therefore be to amalgamate them into a single annotation applicable to both species.</li> <li>• The proposal follows guidance in Res. Conf. 11.21 (Rev. CoP16) on <i>Use of Annotations in Appendices I and II</i>.</li> </ul>

## WORKING DOCUMENTS VOTING RECOMMENDATIONS - SUMMARY

KEY: ✓ SUPPORT; ✗ REJECT; ✓✗ PART SUPPORT PART REJECT; [✓] QUALIFIED; WG REFER TO WG

DOCUMENT	VOTE	DOCUMENT	VOTE	DOCUMENT	VOTE
4. Rules of Procedure	✓✗	32. Captive-bred and ranched	✓	60. Asian big cats	✓✗
5. Credentials Committee	—	33. Review of Significant Trade	✗	61. Great apes	note
6. Admission of observers	✓	34. Disposal of confiscated specimens	✓	62. Rosewood timber	✓
7. Finance and budget	✓	35. Reporting requirements	✓	63. African wild dog	✗
8. Sponsored delegates project	✓	36. Introduction from the sea	✓	64. Pangolins	✓
9. CITES Strategic Vision	✓	37. Purpose codes	✓	65. East African sandalwood	[✓]
10. Committee reports	note	38. Elephant and mammoth ivory	✗	66. Tibetan antelope	✓
11. Rules of Procedure	✓	39. Hunting trophies	✓✗	67. African cherry	✗
12. Conflicts of interest	✓	40. Appropriate destinations	✗	68. Rhinoceroses	✗
13. Rural Communities Committee	✓	41. Cetaceans bred/kept in captivity	✗	69. Helmeted hornbill	✓
14. Cooperation with organizations	[✓]	42. Musical Instruments	✓	70. Saiga antelope	✓
15. Capacity building	✓	43. Artificially propagated plants	[✓]	71. Snakes	WG
16. CITES and livelihoods	✓	44. Electronic systems	✓	72. Queen conch	✓
17. Livelihoods and food security	✓	45. Traceability	✓	73. Tortoises and freshwater turtles	✓
18. Demand reduction	✓✗	46. Pilot traceability system for reptiles	✓	74. Totoaba	✓
19. UN World Wildlife Day	✓	47. Stocks and stockpiles	✗	75. Bushmeat	✓
20. CITES and Youth Engagement	note	48. Identification of specimens	✓	76. Neotropical tree species	✓
21. Review - Resolutions & Decisions	✓	49. Cheetahs	[✓]	77. African tree species	[✓]
22. Implementation of CITES	✓	50. Sturgeons and paddlefish	✓	78. Publication of NDFs	✗
23. Compliance matters	[✓]	51. Anguillid eels	✗	79. Implementing Strategic Vision	note
24. National ivory action plans	✓	52. Precious corals	✗	80. CITES Appendix III	✗
25. Enforcement matters	✓	53. Agarwood	[✓]	81. Standard Nomenclature	✓
26. Illegal trade in wildlife	✓	54. Humphead wrasse	✓	82. Periodic review	[✓]
27. Combatting wildlife trafficking	✗	55. Ebonies, palisanders, rosewoods	✓	83. Annotations	WG
28. Prohibiting corruption	✗	56. Sharks and Rays	✓	84. Ivory DMM	✓✗
29. Combatting wildlife cybercrime	✓	57. Elephants	✓✗	85. Extinct/possibly extinct species	[✓]
30. Enforcement support in Africa	[✓]	58. Cycads	✓	86. African elephants panel of experts	✓
31. Implementation – Appendix I	[✓]	59. Hawksbill turtle	✗	87. Freshwater stingrays	[✓]

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

## WORKING DOCUMENTS

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS</b>		
<b>1. Election of Chair, Alternate Chair, Vice-Chairs, Chairs of Committees I and II</b>	<b>NO DOCUMENT</b>	<b>NO COMMENT</b>
<b>2. Adoption of the Agenda</b>	The Agenda lists all the items that will be considered by the CoP. Agenda item numbers and Document numbers are correlated for ease of reference by delegates.	<b>NO COMMENT</b>
<b>3. Adoption of the Working Programme</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> The Working Programme sets a preliminary timetable for the handling of agenda items. It also divides the work between two Committees. Generally, Committee I deals with species listing proposals and related items, and Committee II deals with matters relating to the Convention.	<b>NO COMMENT</b>
<b>4.1 Adoption of the Rules of Procedure – Report of the Secretariat</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> Deals with several issues, including, among other things: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition that not all Parties have ratified the Gaborone Amendment;</li> </ul>	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat amendments regarding the majority needed to amend the Rules of Procedures are the same in effect as the proposal in Doc. 4.2.</li> <li>• As this is the first CoP where the EU is considered a Party in its</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation and voting by a Regional Economic Integration Organization (REIO – for this meeting, the EU);</li> <li>• Codification of the decision by the Plenary at CoP16 that a 2/3 majority vote is required to change the Rules of Procedure;</li> <li>• Rules governing NGO participation.</li> </ul>	<p>own right, the relationship between the EU and its constituent nations that are CITES Parties needs to be spelled out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gaborone Amendment, which came into force recently and through which the EU becomes a Party, states that an REIO has “... a number of votes equal to the number of their Member States which are Parties to the Convention. Such organizations shall not exercise their right to vote if their Member States exercise theirs, and vice versa.”</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.2 Adoption of the Rules of Procedure – Proposal of Botswana and South Africa</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Botswana and South Africa</b> Changes are proposed to the Rules of Procedure to make it clear that a two-thirds majority, rather than a simple majority, is required to change the Rules of Procedure.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is the same as one of the proposals made by the Secretariat in Doc. 4.1, which codifies the decision of the Plenary at CoP16.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.3 (Rev. 1) Adoption of the Rules of Procedure -- Proposal of Israel</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Israel</b> Proposes four changes to the Rules of Procedure: <b>Point 1. Procedure for deciding on proposals for amendment of Appendices I and II (Rule 23, Paragraph 6)</b> - It is proposed to amend the rule to add guidance such that proposals relating to higher taxonomic classifications shall be considered prior to proposals relating to lower taxonomic classifications. It is also proposed to delete the sentence that allows for automatic rejection of a proposal if rejection is implied by adoption of a different proposal.</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <p><b>Point 1 (procedure for Appendices amendment proposals) - REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would fundamentally change the approach towards trade in the Treaty, suggesting a presumption in favor of restrictions on trade.</li> <li>• The proposed amendment would create conflicting procedure within the same rule.</li> <li>• The amendments would allow multiple attempts to consider a proposal that practically has been rejected by the CoP, wasting valuable time and resources (for example, a proposal to list a species on Appendix I and a proposal to list on Appendix II with zero quota would both be considered).</li> <li>• The Secretariat, in Doc. 4.1, suggests that this is a complex matter</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p><b>Point 2. Method of voting (Rule 25, Paragraph 2) -</b> Motions for a secret ballot require ten Parties seconding the motion. The proposal would change this so that a simple majority is required for a secret ballot, and require that the question of whether a vote shall be by secret ballot not be determined by secret ballot.</p> <p><b>Point 3. Majority (Rule 26, Paragraph 1) -</b> Proposal on how to decide whether a matter is procedural.</p>	<p>that should be reviewed and dealt with at CoP18; this is the better solution at this time.</p> <p><b>Point 2 (motions for secret ballot) - REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is inconsistent with the decision of the Plenary at CoP 16, during which some Parties tried to change the Rules of Procedure to make it more difficult to call for a secret ballot.</li> <li>• The secret ballot allows Parties to vote in accordance with the advice of their scientific advisers on emotive issues without concern of reprisals towards individual representatives or their governments.</li> <li>• The secret ballot protects Parties against the inappropriate political pressure brought against them by protectionist organizations.</li> <li>• The use of a secret ballot is the essence of a democratic process and is used in democratic countries worldwide when their citizens elect their leaders.</li> </ul> <p><b>Point 3 (vote needed to amend the Rules of Procedure) - REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The phrasing of the proposed language is confusing in that it refers to approval of a question as to whether a motion is procedural.</li> <li>• The Secretariat’s proposal on this same point is much clearer and is preferable.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.1 Credentials Committee - Establishment of the Credentials Committee</b></p>	<p><b>NO DOCUMENT</b></p>	<p><b>NO COMMENT</b></p>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
5.2 Credentials Committee - Report of the Credentials Committee	NO DOCUMENT	NO COMMENT
6. Admission of observers	NO DOCUMENT	SUPPORT admission of all qualified observers
7. Administration, finance and budget of the Secretariat and of meetings of the Conference of the Parties  7.1 Administration of the Secretariat	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> The report summarizes the number of staff and sources of funding, and notes a proposed small increase in internally-funded staff and administrative reforms. From 2013 to 2015, external funding of around US\$12 million was obtained, and several governments provided personnel support. The Secretariat is seeking in excess of US\$34.5 million in external funding for 2017-2019. As required by CoP16 (Dec. 16.2) it comments on the legal and other implications of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) becoming a financial mechanism for CITES.</p>	NOTE REPORT
7.2 Report of the Executive Director of UNEP on administrative and other matters	<p><b>Proponent: UNEP</b> The report contains detailed summaries of programmatic, administrative and financial support provided for CITES. It also discusses implementation of Resolution 1/3 on illegal trade in wildlife and outcomes of the</p>	NOTE REPORT

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	2013 UNEP-INTERPOL Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Conference.	
<b>7.3 Financial reports for 2014-2016</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> The report and its 10 supporting annexes cover the period 1 January 2014 to 30 June 2016 for the CITES Trust Fund and CITES External Trust Fund.	<b>NOTE REPORTS</b>
<b>7.4 Budget and work programme for 2017 to 2019</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> The proposed activities continue those of 2014-16. The draft programme of work includes three alternative budget scenarios – zero real growth, zero nominal growth and incremental growth. The Secretariat requests approval of the incremental growth budget, given its significantly increased workload.	<b>DEFER TO BUDGET COMMITTEE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While there is no doubt that CITES deals with important topics, many of which have an urgency associated with them, it is hard not to notice the large number of Decisions, each one of which places demands on one or another body within CITES.</li> <li>• While many of these Decisions are conditioned on the availability of external funding, just the need to deal with the possibilities of external funding generates a workload.</li> <li>• Implementation of the Convention might benefit from an effort to take an overview of the situation and to consider methods to prioritize the requirements for action made in the many Decisions that are adopted.</li> </ul>
<b>7.5 Access to Financing, including GEF funding</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> The report details the work done to implement Res. Conf. 16.2 and the related Decisions dealing with the development of sources of funding, including the GEF, which is the funding mechanism established under the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Secretariat also reports its success in raising	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to reliable sources of funding is essential for implementing CITES</li> <li>• Adopting the draft decisions will allow valuable initiatives that are currently in progress to be completed</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>non-GEF external funding for projects managed by the Secretariat and in obtaining secondments from governments to augment its staffing. Seven Decisions are proposed to continue the efforts to secure funding, two dealing with access to the GEF and five dealing with other funding sources.</p>	
<p><b>8. Sponsored delegates project</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: The European Union and Senegal</b> Proposes a new Resolution to give the Sponsored Delegates Project (SDP) a legal basis in a CITES-approved document, with the goal of avoiding the appearance of undue influence through non-SDP financing of delegates.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT, with amendment proposed by the Secretariat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat supports the proposal and recommends an amendment to prevent the SDP funding of a delegate who is also a member of an NGO Observer.</li> </ul>
<p><b>STRATEGIC MATTERS</b></p>		
<p><b>9. Revision of the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2020</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> A draft decision would direct the SC to establish a Strategic Plan WG to develop the strategic vision beyond 2020. It will report to CoP18.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the current plan covers only the period to 2020 and CoP19 will be held in 2022, this must be considered at CoP18.</li> <li>• Parties are encouraged to provide feedback to the WG on their experiences in implementing the Strategic Plan, as requested by the draft decision.</li> </ul>
<p><b>10. Committee reports and recommendations</b>  <b>10.1 Standing Committee</b>  <b>10.1.1 Report of the</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b> Reports summarizing activities of the committees since CoP16 and anticipated activities following CoP17.</p>	<p><b>NOTE REPORTS</b></p>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>Chair</b></p> <p><b>10.1.2 Election of new regional and alternate regional members (no document)</b></p>		
<p><b>10.2 Animals Committee</b></p> <p><b>10.2.1 Report of the Chair</b></p> <p><b>10.2.2 Election of new regional and alternative regional members</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Animals Committee</b>            Reports summarizing activities of the committees since CoP16 and anticipated activities following CoP17.</p>	<p><b>NOTE REPORTS</b></p>
<p><b>10.3 Plants Committee</b></p> <p><b>10.3.1 Report of the Chair</b></p> <p><b>10.3.2 Election of new regional and alternate regional members</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Plants Committee</b>            Reports summarizing activities of the committees since CoP16 and anticipated activities following CoP17.</p>	<p><b>NOTE REPORTS</b></p>
<p><b>11. Rules of Procedure for the CITES bodies</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b>            Seven draft decisions propose a review by the Secretariat to achieve consistency between the Rules of Procedure of the CoP, the SC and AC, and to avoid duplication with Res. Conf. 11.1 (Rev.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	CoP16) on the establishment of committees. The draft decisions define responsibilities and provide information feedback protocols.	
<b>12. Potential conflicts of interest in the Animals and Plants Committees</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> Dec. 16.9 and 16.1 required the Secretariat to review the conflict of interest policy. The Secretariat requests an extension of the decisions until CoP18.	<b>SUPPORT</b>
<b>13. Establishment of the rural communities committee of the Conference of the Parties</b>	<b>Proponents: Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe</b> Propose a new Resolution which would create a permanent Rural Communities Committee of the CoP. Representatives to the Committee would be chosen by the Parties from legally-recognized indigenous people and rural communities and community-based natural resource management organizations. The role of the proposed new permanent committee is primarily advisory to the other bodies of CITES. The provision to allow the committee to draft proposed resolutions and decisions is an important safeguard against marginalization of the proposed committee but it is still up to the Parties whether or not to adopt any such committee proposals.	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Local communities often lack the resources, the skills or the capacity to effectively participate in CITES, yet their impact on conservation is one the most important factors for success or failure.</li> <li>● Importing Parties often introduce stricter domestic measures more in response to their internal politics, which tend to be dominated by pressure groups that are philosophically opposed to the sustainable use of wildlife.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>14. Cooperation with organizations and multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b>  <b>14.1</b> Two draft decisions are proposed: (1) encourage Parties to participate in activities to strengthen synergies at the national level, and (2) direct the SC to explore options to strengthen cooperation, collaboration and synergies.   <b>14.2 through 14.6:</b> reports on various organizations.</p>	<p><b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT draft decisions in 14.1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CITES Parties and Secretariat need to be a participant in the international community in order to better meet the objectives of the Convention, but Secretariat’s resources and those of many Parties are limited.</li> <li>• Additions to the document could be considered requiring Secretariat to publish cost-benefit analyses for such travel to and attendance at meetings of other MEAs.</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE REPORTS in 14.2 through 14.6</b></p>
<p><b>15. Capacity building</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b>  The report summarizes the work undertaken in capacity-building. It references the needs survey that was discussed at SC66.  Several Decisions are proposed to continue the capacity-building effort.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT, but add directive to seek funding for necessary resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The needs survey identified significant shortfalls for developing countries that have “hard” needs, such as lack of equipment.</li> <li>• The Decisions should contain a directive for the SC and the Secretariat to approach funding sources for the resources to begin to close the gap, including scientific training, equipment, and improvement in Internet access.</li> </ul>
<p><b>16. CITES and livelihoods</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b>  The SC’s summary of the efforts to date to create a toolkit and to collect case studies. It recommends continuation of the case studies and seeks funding for their publication on the CITES website.  The Secretariat recommends amending the Resolution on Livelihoods, Conf. 16.6, to incorporate two recent UN texts that call for the support of local communities and livelihoods</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) programs are very important in the sustainable use and conservation of wildlife.</li> <li>• Communities and governments in many range states have long been concerned about attitudes and actions from western, developed countries that appear to them to say that “we know how to manage your natural resources better than you and therefore we will use ‘stricter domestic measures’ to close our markets to you.”</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	through sustainable use of wildlife.	
<b>17. Livelihoods and food security</b>	<p><b>Proponents: Antigua and Barbuda, Ivory Coast and Namibia</b>  Proposes a new Resolution to recognize sustainable use in the context of food security. Its key provision urges the Parties to evaluate “the need for ... the security of livelihoods when making proposed amendments to the Appendices.”</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments on Doc. 16, above.</li> <li>• Despite past objections that CITES cannot consider livelihoods as a factor in the listing process, food security and livelihoods are closely tied to the survival of wildlife and habitat on which it depends.</li> </ul>
<p><b>18. Demand reduction</b></p> <p><b>18.1 Demand reduction strategies to combat illegal trade in CITES-listed species</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: The United States of America</b>  A draft decision asks the Parties to participate in strategies to reduce demand in species traded illegally, engaging all stakeholders</p>	<p><b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiatives to reduce demand for illegal products are to be welcomed</li> <li>• The preamble to the decision refers to damage to rural livelihoods from illegal trade. It should be amended to acknowledge that <i>legal</i> trade can be vital to rural livelihoods, and consequently important to <i>in situ</i> conservation, and that demand reduction campaigns must distinguish between legal and illegal products.</li> </ul>
<b>18.2 Development of CITES demand-reduction guidelines</b>	<p><b>Proponents: Gabon, Guinea, Nigeria, Senegal and Togo</b>  Decisions would require the commissioning of a study on illegal wildlife trade in West and Central Africa, and the development of CITES demand reduction guidelines.</p>	<p><b>PART SUPPORT PART REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents 18.2 and 30 are identical but in two parts, demand reduction and enforcement. The Secretariat proposes the demand reduction section should be dealt with here, and the enforcement proposals should be dealt with under 30.</li> <li>• As drafted, the development of demand reduction guidelines is not restricted to demand from illegal trade. It should be amended to acknowledge that <i>legal</i> trade can be vital to rural livelihoods, and consequently important to <i>in situ</i> conservation, and that demand reduction campaigns must distinguish between</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		legal and illegal products.
<b>19. United Nations World Wildlife Day</b>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b>            As envisaged by Res. Conf. 6.1, in 2013 the General Assembly of the United Nations proclaimed 3 March to be United Nations World Wildlife Day.            A draft resolution and decision directs the Secretariat to promote wider observance, and report on celebrations to the SC and United Nations General Assembly.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is notable from the summary of events for 2014-2016 that most events took place in developed countries.</li> <li>• Care should be taken that celebration themes recognize the relationships between rural communities and species, and are not dominated by only one set of conservation values.</li> </ul>
<b>20. Empowering the next generation: CITES and Youth Engagement – Report of the Youth Forum on People and Wildlife</b>	<p><b>Proponents: South Africa and the United States of America</b>            The International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) and the Disney Conservation Fund have devised a Youth Forum for People and Wildlife, that will be meeting shortly before CoP17. The Parties are urged to note the outcomes.</p>	<p><b>NOTE REPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hopefully the Forum raises awareness of the scientific nature of the CITES convention, and the role of the sustainable use of natural resources in conservation</li> </ul>
<b>INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS – Existing Resolutions and Decisions</b>		
<b>21. Review of Resolutions and Decisions</b>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b>            Review of Resolutions            The Secretariat has identified a number of corrections to be made to three existing</p>	

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>resolutions:</p> <p><b>Item 1:</b> Res. Conf. 12.6 on <i>Conservation and Management of Sharks</i> – add “Class Chondrichthyes” to the title.</p> <p><b>Item 2:</b> Res. Conf. 12.4 on <i>Co-operation between CITES and CCAMLR regarding trade in toothfish</i> – change “bacalao” to “austromerluza” in the Spanish version.</p> <p><b>Item 3:</b> Res. Conf. 4.6 (Rev. CoP16) on <i>Submission of draft resolutions, draft decisions and other documents for meetings of the Conference of the Parties</i> – correct the omission of “essentiellement complet” from the French version.</p> <p>Review of Decisions:</p> <p><b>Item 4:</b> The deletion of the following decisions is recommended:  16.1 and 16.2 on <i>Credentials Committee</i>; 16.26 and 16.27 on <i>Wildlife Trade Policy Reviews</i>; 16.58 on <i>Physical Inspection of Timber Shipments</i>; 16.76 and 16.77 on <i>Reporting on the implementation of Res. Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP16) on Quotas for leopard hunting trophies and skins for personal use</i>; 14.81 on <i>Great whales</i>; 14.82-85 on <i>Grey Parrot</i>; 16.125-6 on <i>Roti Island Snake-necked</i></p>	<p><b>Item 1 – SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Res. Conf. 12.6: This change, to incorporate FAO terminology, was approved at CoP15 but required a nomenclature change before it could be implemented.</li> </ul> <p><b>Item 2 – SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Res. Conf. 12.4: To use the same Spanish common name for CITES and CCAMLR.</li> </ul> <p><b>Item 3 – SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Res. Conf. 4.6: The English and Spanish texts contain the term “substantially complete” and “sustancialment completa” so this is merely to correct an oversight.</li> </ul> <p><b>Item 4 – QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of these decisions are no longer necessary, but Dec. 16.26-7 on <i>Wildlife Trade Policy Reviews</i>, which encourage the exchange of information, could have continuing value. It seems it is being abandoned due to lack of use and lack of funding to encourage use.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p><i>Turtle.</i></p> <p><b>Item 5:</b> The retention of the following is recommended: Dec. 16.53 on <i>Non-Detriment Findings</i>; Dec. 14.19 on <i>Review of Resolutions</i>.</p>	<p><b>Item 5 – SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dec. 16.53 encourages sharing of experience in making non-detriment findings which assists with capacity-building; Dec. 14.19 directs the Secretariat to provide a valuable service in reviewing and maintaining the CITES resolutions and decisions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS – General Compliance and Enforcement</b></p>		
<p><b>22. National laws for implementation of the Convention</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> Proposes a series of Decisions that would update the existing Decisions. The Decisions add a suggestion that Parties close a loophole found in many Parties’ laws by prohibiting the possession of an illegally traded specimen.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Convention requires Parties to adopt implementing legislation.</li> <li>• The National Legislation project has been in effect for many years to encourage and assist Parties in meeting this obligation.</li> <li>• Currently, approximately 50% of the Parties have legislation that is fully compliant.</li> <li>• Enforcement of the Convention is not possible without appropriate legislation in all the Parties.</li> </ul>
<p><b>23. CITES compliance matters</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> This document considers all existing CITES compliance procedures, and identifies areas where improvements could be made, including regarding legal acquisition findings made by</p>	<p><b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work on legal acquisition finding should concentrate on high risk or difficult areas, and should not present unnecessary bureaucracy for low risk legal trade</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>exporting countries.</p> <p>A draft decision requests suggestions from the parties and a workshop on making legal acquisition findings, and directs the SC to consider compliance improvements, including whether a Compliance Assistance Programme should be established.</p>	
<p><b>24. National ivory action plans process</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: The Secretariat, on behalf of the Standing Committee</b></p> <p>Recommends amendment of Res. Conf. 10.10 to provide a basis for National Ivory Action Plans (NIAPs).</p> <p>The Secretariat also proposes several decisions to move forward with implementation of existing NIAPS.</p> <p>NIAPs implement the objectives of Res. Conf. 10.10 bring in all Parties in the chain of illegal trade in ivory and get their commitments to strengthen their internal mechanisms to combat the illegal trade.</p> <p>One of the two proposed decisions includes a detailed annex to establish a compliance system that is consistent with the general compliance activity of the SC; it prescribes a series of actions for non-compliance beginning with a written caution and extending to a SC recommendation for suspension of trade with a Party under Article XIII of the Convention.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The document reports that elephant poaching and illegal ivory trade have slowed and are beginning to decline; based on the ETIS report, part of the success in achieving this result is ascribed to the development and implementation of NIAPs.</li> <li>• A NIAP is a plan developed by the concerned Party that outlines the measures that it commits to deliver –including legislative, enforcement and public awareness actions, as required –along with specified timeframes and milestones for implementation</li> <li>• The NIAP process recognizes that all Parties involved in the chain of illegal trade must participate in bringing that trade to a halt, and with it the illegal killing of elephants that supplies the illicit commerce.</li> <li>• The proposed amendments to Res. Conf. 10.10 will provide a legal basis for NIAPs in the record of the CoP.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>25. Enforcement matters</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Secretariat and Standing Committee</b></p> <p><b>Item 1:</b> A wide-ranging report from the Secretariat on enforcement matters since CoP16.</p> <p><b>Item 2:</b> A draft decision is proposed to approve the development of integrity policy guidelines to mitigate the risk of corruption in the trade chain for CITES specimens, and to commission a report on best practices in demand reduction or anti-trafficking programmes.</p> <p><b>Item 3:</b> Amendments are suggested to Res. Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP16) to take into account the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC) Indicator framework for wildlife and forest crime, the UN General Assembly Resolution on Tackling Illicit Trafficking in Wildlife, Wildlife Incident Support Teams, wildlife forensic technology, national anti-money laundering and other supporting legislation.</p>	<p><b>Item 1 – NOTE REPORT</b></p> <p><b>Item 2 – SUPPORT</b> Consideration should be given to coordinating the various demand reduction initiatives before the CoP (see Doc. 18.2) to avoid duplication.</p> <p><b>Item 3 – SUPPORT</b> The amendments are largely to reflect events since CoP16 that are discussed in the Secretariat’s report.</p>
<p><b>26. Illegal international trade in wildlife</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: South Africa</b></p> <p>Proposes a new Resolution and two Decisions to enhance international cooperation to deal with illegal international trade.</p> <p>Two important principles set forth in the document are that the work is adequately funded and that there are measures to protect community livelihoods and economic</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed Resolution focuses on use of the data from annual reports on illegal international trade, information sharing, consultation with ICCWC to assure that the needs of the Parties are met, and maintenance of the dedicated ICCWC portal on the CITES website.</li> <li>• The Resolution also contains a section dealing with the needs of local communities and how best to engage them in protecting</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	opportunities.	<p>their own resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been nearly universal agreement that the answer to increased poaching of elephants and rhinos and the entry of organized crime into wildlife trade is for greater coordination and cooperation in wildlife law enforcement.</li> <li>• The UN has endorsed this concept in several resolutions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>27. Actions to combat wildlife trafficking</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: The United States of America</b>  Proposes amendments to Res. Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP16) on trade in elephant specimens, including hunting trophies, to essentially eliminate domestic markets and trophy importation.  Calls for the elimination of local markets for elephant ivory.  This includes ivory that is imported legally as hunting trophies and domestic markets that deal in wildlife that is never subject to international trade.</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recommendations in Doc. 27 intrude into the internal affairs of the Parties and are not the mandate of CITES.</li> <li>• The document deals with legally imported and owned hunting trophies and with purely domestic trade.</li> <li>• The document appears to be related to Doc. 57.3, which calls for the destruction of ivory stockpiles. As with Doc 57.3, there is an inappropriate presumption that interfering with legal trade and ownership will solve the problem of poaching.</li> <li>• The better approach is the solution proposed by South Africa in Doc. 26, which involves the local communities in protection of their wildlife resources.</li> </ul>
<p><b>28. Prohibiting, preventing and countering corruption facilitating activities conducted in violation of the Convention</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: The European Union and Senegal</b>  Propose a new Resolution to deal with the issue of corruption in the exploitation of wildlife.  The proposed Resolution is a general call for Parties to focus on corruption. It draws attention to wildlife permitting and licensing processes.</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CITES already contains sufficient direction to Parties in Article VIII, Section 1, which requires Parties to “take appropriate measures to enforce the provisions of the present Convention.”</li> <li>• It would be sufficient for the EU and Senegal to provide an information paper about the work of the two UN treaties on corruption and how they might relate to enhancing the enforcement of CITES.</li> <li>• Res. Conf. 14.3 already contains guidelines on dealing with issues</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		in implementation of the Convention and authorizes the SC to recommend wildlife trade bans against Parties that are out of compliance.
<b>29. Combating wildlife cybercrime</b>	<b>Proponent: Kenya</b> A draft decision requiring the Secretariat to liaise with the ICCWC regarding best practice and model domestic measures for addressing illegal e-commerce, provide assistance and expertise in enforcement and investigations in this area, the Parties to provide best practice models and updates on domestic legislation in this area, and the SC to establish a WG on wildlife cybercrime.	<b>SUPPORT, with changes proposed by the Secretariat</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat recommends that this be considered in conjunction with Doc. 49 on <i>Illegal Trade in Cheetahs (Acinonyx jubatus)</i> as there are overlapping issues and decisions in the two documents.</li> <li>• The Secretariat notes that the draft decision duplicates a number of existing resolutions, decisions and initiatives, and could place an unnecessary burden on the limited resources of the Parties and the Secretariat. It therefore recommends an amended decision directing it to obtain support for the Parties from INTERPOL.</li> </ul>
<b>30. Wildlife crime enforcement support in West and Central Africa</b>	<b>Proponents: Gabon, Guinea, Nigeria, Senegal, Togo</b> Proposed Decisions would require the commissioning of a study on illegal wildlife trade in West and Central Africa, and the development of CITES demand reduction guidelines.	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT, in line with the comments of the Secretariat</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents 18.2 and 30 are identical but in two parts, demand reduction and enforcement. The Secretariat proposes the demand reduction section should be dealt with under 18.2, and the enforcement proposals should be dealt with here.</li> <li>• The Secretariat supports some of the proposed Decisions, does not support others, and makes a number of amendments to take into account existing activities.</li> </ul>
<b>31. Implementation and enforcement of the Convention as it relates to the trade in species</b>	<b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b> The SC proposes amendments to resolutions to enhance enforcement related to App. I species. One adds language to the preamble of Res. Conf.	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat supports both amendments.</li> <li>• It is noted that the term “major” is not defined in Res. Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP16).</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
listed in Appendix I	12.8 (Rev. CoP13), Significant Trade, from an existing resolution to urge Parties taking reservations to App. I listings to treat the species as listed on App II. The other, to Res. Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP16), Compliance and Enforcement, urges expeditious handling of compliance procedures when dealing with a major compliance matter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledging the need to enforce the Convention strictly in relation to Appendix I species, due regard should be taken of capacity, livelihoods and other factors when applying compliance procedures.</li> </ul>
<b>32. Implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens</b>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b></p> <p>Pursuant to Dec. 16.63-66, four draft decisions and a draft resolution are proposed to provide a review process for trade in specimens that are claimed to be captive-bred. The CITES trade database would be used to identify species-country combinations for review, using criteria that may indicate concerns regarding the implementation of the convention.</p> <p>The Secretariat is to report on identified concerns regarding species claimed to be captive-bred including the clarity of resolutions, insufficient legal checks on the origins of breeding stock, and the establishment of breeding facilities outside the country of origin, and to assist with capacity-building. The AC is to examine non-detriment findings in relation to captive-bred species.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT, with Secretariat drafting amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action is necessary to prevent fraud in connection with specimens claimed to be from captive facilities</li> <li>The Secretariat raises concerns regarding resources required for implementation of the wide-ranging and ambitious draft resolution. It suggests that this initiative could be initially limited to Appendix I species to reduce the resource requirement but deal with the species most at risk, to be extended to Appendix II or III species at a later point.</li> </ul>
<b>33. Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade</b>	<p><b>Proponents: Animals Committee and Plants Committee</b></p> <p>Document summarizes the long evaluation</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Significant Trade process is a detailed regulatory regime that extends the reach of CITES into the internal affairs of Parties in</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>process that has been underway since 2012. The evaluation had three goals: assessment of the review process, case studies, and evaluation of the effectiveness of the review process. Proposes amendments to Res. Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) and four Decisions.</p>	<p>the management of wildlife and plants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AC and PC are recommending changes to the process but have not completed the required assessment of the effectiveness of the process.</li> <li>• The amendments would extend even further into range state management by additional recommendations that zero-export quotas may not be changed by range states without coming back to the AC or PC.</li> <li>• The recommended amendments would cost an additional US\$100,000 to implement.</li> <li>• The standards for determining that a species should be entered into the review process are completely subjective.</li> <li>• The process goes beyond the mandate of CITES and dictates natural resource management policy and practice.</li> </ul>
<p><b>34. Disposal of illegally-traded and confiscated specimens of Appendix-I, -II, and -III species</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Switzerland, on behalf of the Standing Committee</b>  Proposes consolidation of three Resolutions dealing with the disposal of confiscated specimens.  Recommends two Decisions to carry on the WG.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT, with changes recommended by the Secretariat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat supports the merger of portions of the three Resolutions.</li> <li>• It recommends retaining the reference to assessing costs against the “person” responsible for the confiscation, as opposed to substituting the word “Party.”</li> <li>• In relation to Paragraph a)ii under the first Recommends in the consolidated Resolution, the language is incorporated from Res. Conf. 9.9 that states that generally it is preferable to seize an offending shipment than to refuse importation, it should be kept in mind that Management Authorities should exercise flexibility when the issue is minor, is outside the control of the shipper, and relates to non-living specimens.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<b>INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS – Reporting</b>		
<p><b>35. Review of reporting requirements</b></p> <p><b>35.1 Report of the Standing Committee</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b></p> <p>The SC reviews its work on all the Decisions regarding biennial and special reporting. The SC recommends amendment of four resolutions to update the reporting requirements. It also proposes two Decisions, one directing the Secretariat to compile all the reporting requirements, the other to analyze progress, with a regional breakdown if feasible, toward the CITES Strategic Vision as indicated by reports.</p> <p>The Secretariat makes several recommendations to amend the proposals of the SC for amendments to the four Resolutions. It also proposes two additional Decisions, related to investigating a means of storing and managing the data from the reports.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT amendment of the Resolutions, with amendments recommended by the Secretariat</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT all proposed Decisions.</b></p>
<p><b>35.2 Report of the Secretariat</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b></p> <p>Two draft decisions are proposed to allow the Secretariat to continue to develop harmonized information management systems and to secure funds for work on indicators for implementation of the Strategic Vision.</p>	<p><b>NOTE REPORT AND SUPPORT DRAFT DECISIONS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subject to funding, it may be appropriate to appoint an external consultant to review IT systems currently in use and whether they can be adapted to meet reporting requirements.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<b>INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS – Trade control and traceability</b>		
<b>36. Introduction from the sea</b>	<p><b>Proponents: Standing Committee and Secretariat</b>  Implementing the chartering provisions of Res. Conf. 14.6 (Rev. CoP16) and Dec. 16.48 to 16.51 is complex and has proved problematic. The SC is requesting that the decisions are extended to CoP18 and amended to allow the Secretariat to approach Parties bilaterally.  An additional draft decision would direct the Secretariat to monitor UNCLOS (UN Convention on the Law of the Sea) developments regarding a legally-binding instrument on marine biodiversity.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A bilateral approach is appropriate given only 3 responses were received to a Notification from the Secretariat.</li> <li>• The application of Article VII exemptions should be considered to address significant delays experienced by some Parties regarding biological samples of sharks and rays for fisheries management research.</li> </ul>
<b>37. Purpose codes on CITES permits and certificates</b>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b>  Dec. 14.54 (Rev. CoP16) directed the SC to more clearly define purpose-of-transaction codes to encourage consistent use. The SC requests that the decision remain in effect until CoP18.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although there was a lack of progress with the previous efforts to deal with this issue, the use of purpose codes affects the recording and tracking of data on shipments. One more effort should be made to grapple with the issue.</li> </ul>
<b>38. Identification of elephant and mammoth ivory in trade</b>	<p><b>Proponent: Israel</b>  A new resolution and two decisions are proposed. Parties are urged to enact legislation and take other steps to require evidence that purported mammoth ivory is correctly identified and otherwise to seize it.</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proponent raises a concern that trade in ivory from the extinct woolly mammoth may be used as a ruse to trade in elephant ivory incorrectly claimed to be mammoth ivory.</li> <li>• The proponent states that it is difficult to identify mammoth ivory.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NIAP process (see Doc. 24) provides a more appropriate avenue for dealing with this issue than a new Resolution.</li> </ul>
<p><b>39. Hunting trophies</b></p> <p><b>39.1 Hunting trophies of species listed in Appendix I or II</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: The European Union</b></p> <p><b>Item 1:</b> A new resolution is proposed which would eliminate the personal effects exemption for all hunting trophies. It would change the non-detriment standard for the issuance of the export permits for Appendix I to a standard of producing “tangible conservation benefits”.</p>	<p><b>Item 1: REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The “tangible conservation benefits” test in the EU proposed Resolution introduces a concept that goes beyond the scope of the provisions in Article III for trade in Appendix I species that export “not be detrimental to the survival of the species concerned”.</li> <li>It is questionable whether this language should, or could, be considered by the CoP because it is contrary to the text of the Convention.</li> <li>The introduction of this concept might set a precedent for trade in specimens other than hunting trophies of species included in Appendix I.</li> <li>Sport hunting is a highly regulated activity that generates revenues that are important, if not critical, for conservation.</li> <li>Res. Conf. 16.7 on Non-detriment Findings already covers much of the matter discussed in the EU proposal; it was adopted after a process that began in 2008 and involved most of the Parties.</li> <li>The EU proposal is a repugnant example of “eco-imperialism” in which western developed countries tell developing countries that they are not competent to do the work necessary, or are too corrupt, to manage their own wildlife resources.</li> <li>This characterization of the proposal comes from a recent high-level panel of African government officials who labeled it as a form of latter-day colonialism.</li> <li>The result of the EU proposal would be to deny the benefits of the</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p><b>Item 2:</b> Proposes amendments to Res. Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP16) that would remove all hunting trophies from the personal and household effects exemption.</p> <p><b>Item 3:</b> Proposes a decision to review the export quotas for leopard hunting trophies and possibly hunting trophy quotas for other Appendix I species.</p> <p><b>Item 4:</b> Proposes a decision to establish guidance for non-detriment findings for the harvest and export of hunting trophies of African lion.</p>	<p>sustainable use of wildlife to the range states and their people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doc 39.1 contains vague and open-ended language that encourages the imposition of importing-country bans on trophy shipments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Item 2: REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal presents a solution to a problem that does not exist. No evidence exists that the current application of the personal and household effects exemption to hunting trophies is detrimental to wildlife conservation or other CITES efforts.</li> </ul> <p><b>Item 3: SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of the current leopard trophy hunting quotas will ensure that the quotas are scientifically based and sustainable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Item 4: REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A decision regarding the development of non-detriment guidance for an individual species is not necessary or advisable.</li> <li>• However, a process should be set for the Animals Committee to complete the Periodic Review of lion and range states should continue to adapt management programs as necessary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>39.2 Trade in hunting trophies of species listed on Appendix II</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: South Africa</b> Proposes a new resolution confirming the primacy of the exporting Party for Appendix II export permits.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The offtake of animals represented by sport hunting is minimal.</li> <li>• Trophy hunting revenue is estimated to be US\$217 million per year in Africa.</li> <li>• Hunting gives large areas of land 'conservation value' - a minimum of 1.3 million km<sup>2</sup> in sub-Saharan Africa, which exceeds</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>the area encompassed by national parks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trophy hunting has led to the recovery of the blesbok in South Africa (population lows of less than 2,000 animals in the early 1900's to more than 250,000 today). Similarly, the sustainable hunting of White Rhinos has enabled their recovery from a mere handful in 1900 to more than 20,000 today.</li> <li>• The CITES Parties have recognized the value of hunting in conservation and have agreed to specific quotas for trophy shipments from a number of Appendix I species (leopard, black rhino, cheetah, markhor).</li> <li>• WWF agrees that under certain circumstances trophy hunting benefits the conservation of wildlife.</li> <li>• The IUCN published a paper in April, 2016, supporting the conservation value of trophy hunting (<a href="http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_informingdecisionson trophyhuntingv1.pdf">http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_informingdecisionson trophyhuntingv1.pdf</a>.)</li> </ul> <p>Points from the IUCN paper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Trophy hunting is currently the subject of intense debate, with political moves at various levels to end or restrict it, including through bans on carriage or import of trophies.</li> <li>○ Well managed trophy hunting, which takes place in many parts of the world, can and does generate critically needed incentives and revenue for government, private and community landowners to maintain and restore wildlife as a land use and to carry out conservation actions (including anti-poaching interventions).</li> <li>○ It can return much needed income, jobs, and other important economic and social benefits to indigenous and local communities in places where these benefits are</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>often scarce.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In many parts of the world indigenous and local communities have chosen to use trophy hunting as a strategy for conservation of their wildlife and to improve sustainable livelihoods.</li> </ul>
<p><b>40. International trade in live Appendix-II animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: The United States of America</b>            The annotation in Appendix II regarding live exports of certain populations of southern white rhinos and African elephants requires that the destinations be “acceptable and appropriate” as defined in Res. Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP16). The proposed amendments to that resolution would require additional conditions on a permit, including a prohibition on the horn or ivory of those animals entering commercial trade and a prohibition on those animals or their offspring being used for trophy hunting.</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There is no evidence linking legal trade in live animals with poaching and illegal trade in elephant ivory and rhino horn</li> <li>● The proposed condition in a permit that the offspring would not be used for trophy hunting may have a significant negative impact on rhino conservation in particular, as it removes incentives for landowners to maintain rhinos and may prevent cross-border restocking from areas where there are surplus rhinos</li> </ul>
<p><b>41. Identification of origin of cetaceans bred or kept in captivity</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Ukraine</b>            To reduce the risk of wild specimens of the bottlenose dolphin, <i>Tursiops truncatus</i>, being used as substitutes for captive dolphins, the draft decision recommends that Parties use genetic markers to identify captive bred specimens, establish banks of genetic identification data available online and cooperate on methodologies for genetic analyses.</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A zero quota for the Black Sea population of <i>Tursiops truncatus</i> removed from the wild and traded for primarily commercial purposes was established under CITES in 2002.</li> <li>● There is no evidence of wild caught dolphins being substituted for animals already in captivity.</li> <li>● Determination of origin and parentage for any bottlenose dolphin by DNA sampling is relatively inexpensive and can be conducted on an individual basis should questions of origin arise.</li> <li>● No source of funding for the proposed database has been</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		identified – estimated at 30-50,000 USD.
<b>42. Draft revision of Resolution Conf. 16.8 on Frequent cross-border non-commercial movements of musical instruments</b>	<b>Proponent: The European Union</b> Res. Conf. 16.8 facilitates the cross-border movement of musical instruments which are made from CITES-controlled species. This decision removes the reference to “personally owned” as many musicians use loaned instruments.	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The WG at CoP16 had intended “personally owned” to be removed but this was not done in the in-session document.</li> <li>• Regulation should be proportionate to the potential conservation benefits.</li> <li>• Musicians have faced problems on account of a lack of awareness of this exemption on the part of Customs officials, stricter domestic measures and mandatory validation of certificates at borders. This is disproportionate to the benefit from restricting the movement of these items.</li> </ul>
<b>43. Review of the definition of ‘artificially propagated’ for plants</b>	<b>Proponents: China, Georgia, Indonesia and Kuwait</b> Draft decisions direct the PC to review production systems and assess the appropriateness of the definitions of “artificial propagation” and “controlled conditions” in Res. Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15). The PC is to report to CoP18 on the amendments required, and the required guidance, training and capacity-building.	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The core elements of the definitions date back to Res. Conf. 2.12, and the current definitions do not adequately reflect the range and complexity of current cultivation mechanisms.</li> <li>• The draft resolution should be amended to clarify what is to be undertaken and to ensure there is no duplication of activities if Dec. 16.156 is extended to CoP18 (see CoP17 Doc. 53.1).</li> </ul>
<b>44. Electronic Systems and Information Technologies</b>	<b>Proponents: Secretariat and Switzerland (WG chair)</b> Dec. 16.54 extended the mandate of the SC WG on Information Technologies and Electronic Systems in order for it to collaborate further with various organizations to develop e-permitting systems.	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It may be appropriate to broaden the mandate of the WG to incorporate the tasks identified in CoP17 Doc. 45 on <i>Traceability</i>, to ensure links between CITES permits and certificates and traceability identifiers.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>They have also collaborated on electronic systems to manage permits, certificates and associated data.</p> <p>A draft decision is requested to renew the mandate.</p>	
<p><b>45. Traceability</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b>            Report on the implementation of Decisions from CoP16 to improve traceability by using taxonomic serial numbers.            Proposes Decisions to continue the work on traceability, with Secretariat suggesting that it be the central point rather than a WG.</p>	<p><b>NOTE THE REPORT, SUPPORT DECISIONS as amended by the Secretariat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work on this highly technical feature of data management will assist the Parties in implementation of the Convention.</li> <li>• Incorporate the information and views presented in Doc. 46.</li> </ul>
<p><b>46. Pilot testing of a global traceability information system for reptile skins</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Mexico</b>            A detailed report on the development of a traceability system for snakeskins.            The system utilizes mobile phone technology to capture unique patterns on snakeskins analogous to fingerprints. The identifier is carried through the entire trade chain.            Amendments to draft Decisions are proposed</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT, but consider this Document and Document 45 together, along with the views of the Secretariat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The growing interest in enhancing the traceability of CITES specimens in trade has led to several pilot efforts.</li> <li>• In Doc. 45, the Secretariat has proposed a universal approach toward continuing development of these systems, and in this Document notes that there are two different approaches – tagging and biometric identification – and that both may be useful in different situations but that coherence in the overall development of systems is desirable.</li> </ul>
<p><b>47. Stocks and stockpiles of specimens of CITES-listed species</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b>            The Secretariat raises the question of whether privately-held specimens (such as hunting trophies) should be considered part of a countries</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is completely outside the mandate of CITES because it deals with issues of private property and it intrudes on the internal management of wildlife by Parties.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>stock (or stockpile). It recommends a Decision to direct the SC to review the issue of stocks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The international trade in privately held wildlife is already governed by CITES for listed species.</li> </ul>
<p><b>48. Identification of specimens in trade</b>  <b>48.1 Timber Identification</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> The document summarizes ongoing work by UN Office on Drugs and Crime to strengthen the development and use of forensic tools and technologies to address illicit trafficking of timber. Decisions are proposed to encourage the creation and sharing of national scientific reference collections for forensic identification of tree species.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT, with Secretariat recommendations and with due notice of the traceability discussions in Docs. 45 and 46</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There may be similarities between the work regarding traceability of animal specimens, which requires identification, and the development and sharing of reference collections for identification of tree species.</li> <li>The CoP should consider addition of language to ensure proper training of customs officers.</li> </ul>
<p><b>48.2 Identification Manual</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Chairs, Animals and Plants Committees</b> Report of work done through a WG on Decisions at CoP16 to assess and review the status of identification materials. Recommends a series of Decisions, one of which is the establishment of a WG on capacity-building and identification materials.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the relationship between identification and traceability, and discuss Docs. 45, 46, 48.1 and 48.2 together.</li> <li>Identification is a cornerstone of enforcement of the Convention.</li> <li>New technologies, such as the snakeskin “fingerprinting” discussed in Doc. 46, which is aimed at specimen tracking as opposed to species identification, nevertheless may greatly enhance identification.</li> <li>The CoP should aim for a comprehensive approach.</li> </ul>
<p><b>SPECIES SPECIFIC MATTERS</b></p>		
<p><b>49. Illegal trade in cheetahs (<i>Acinonyx</i></b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b> Report from the SC on the outcome of an</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT, but oppose Secretariat suggestion to broaden the social media work to all CITES species</b></p>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<i>jubaltus</i> )	intersessional WG to consider the source and trade routes for illegal trade in cheetahs. The core of the recommended Decisions is the commissioning of a CITES cheetah trade resource kit, with external funding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been a lot of effort since CoP16 to deal with illegal international trade in cheetahs, involving an independent consultant, two rounds of input from Parties, an intersessional WG and a workshop.</li> <li>• SC66 endorsed the proposals that led to draft Decisions 17A through 17G.</li> <li>• The Secretariat is correct to point out that work under CITES should be limited to issues that fall within the CITES mandate.</li> <li>• The Secretariat’s recommendation to broaden the contact with social media to cover all CITES species waters down the Decisions and moves the focus away from cheetahs.</li> </ul>
<b>50. Sturgeons and paddlefish (<i>Acipenseriformes</i> spp.)</b>	<b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b> Proposes revisions to Res. Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP16) on <i>Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish</i> . Requests that the CoP consider whether to delete or extend Decisions 16.136 to 16.138.	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat supports adoption of the revisions to Res. Conf. 12.7, with minor editorial corrections.</li> <li>• The Secretariat also supports extension of Decisions 16.136 to 16.138 until CoP18.</li> </ul>
<b>51. Conservation of and trade in Anguillid eels (<i>Anguilla</i> spp.)</b>	<b>Proponent: The European Union</b> Proposals for a process to gather information on population and exploitation of Anguillid eels ( <i>Anguilla</i> spp.) and to facilitate development of recommendations for sustainable trade.	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal offers insufficient evidence of the need to consolidate data on trade and management of this species</li> </ul>
<b>52. Review of precious corals in international trade (Order <i>Antipatharia</i>/family <i>Corallidae</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: The United States of America</b> Proposes several Decisions for a review of all precious corals to determine whether the Appendix II listing (at CoP3, in 1981) has been effectively implemented, and whether additional	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal disregards management measures already in place in the Mediterranean Sea. Following a proposal at CoP15 to include <i>Corallidae</i> spp. in Appendix II, the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean introduced a regional harvest</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	actions are necessary.	limit for red coral ( <i>Corallium rubrum</i> ). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will duplicate the Significant Trade Review process which has been underway for <i>Antipatharia</i> spp. since 2011, and which is ongoing for Taiwan.</li> </ul>
<b>53. Agarwood-producing taxa (<i>Aquilaria</i> spp. and <i>Gyrinos</i> spp.)</b>  <b>53.1 Implementation of the Convention for agarwood-producing taxa</b>	<b>Proponent: Plants Committee</b> A revised Glossary of Agarwood Products was produced pursuant to Dec. 16.155. The PC wants Parties to provide additional information and comments to improve the Glossary, and requests reauthorization of Dec. 16.156.	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-ordination is required between CoP17 Dec. 43 and the possible reauthorization of Dec. 16.156, as they both appear to deal with the definition of “artificial propagation” as it relates to agarwood-producing taxa.</li> </ul>
<b>53.2 Sustainable production of agarwood-producing taxa (<i>Aquilaria</i> spp. and <i>Gyrinops</i> spp.)</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> Proposals to continue the work of an Asian regional workshop (Guwahati, Assam, January 2015) on the management of wild and planted agarwood taxa.	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A follow-up workshop is proposed, with the emphasis on co-operative arrangements to ensure the survival of agarwood-producing taxa in the wild through integrated agarwood plantation and forest recovery programs.</li> </ul>
<b>54. Humphead wrasse (<i>Cheilinus undulates</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b> The SC requests extension of the work on improving implementation of the Appendix II listing of the species. It seeks reauthorization of the three existing decisions on this species until CoP18. The Secretariat proposes two additional decisions, directing the Secretariat to collaborate with FAO in undertaking its project to support the Indonesian	<b>SUPPORT but suggest additional considerations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since 2012, Indonesia has established an annual export quota of 2000 live specimens, and only allows specimens of humphead wrasse to be exported by air transport.</li> <li>In addition to these exports there some ranching enterprises on two islands that capture small, newly-hatched fish and growing them out in nets over several years, when they are transported by boat to Hong Kong</li> <li>In December 2015, there were ~300,000 specimens in capture</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	fishery.	<p>based aquaculture on these islands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The production systems appear to be a sustainable fishery and are clearly socioeconomically important for the two islands and Indonesia.</li> <li>• It may be preferable to adapt CITES requirements to the production system, which has adapted to prevailing social and economic conditions; for example, it may not be possible (or practical) to require specimens be transported by air.</li> </ul>
<p><b>55. Ebonies (<i>Diospyros</i> spp.) and palisanders and rosewoods (<i>Dalbergia</i> spp)</b></p> <p><b>55.1 Action plan for <i>Diospyros</i> spp. and <i>Dalbergia</i> spp.: report from Madagascar</b></p>	NO DOCUMENT	NO COMMENT
<p><b>55.2 Implementation of the Convention for trade in Malagasy ebonies (<i>Diospyros</i> spp.) and palisanders and rosewoods (<i>Dalbergia</i> spp.)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b></p> <p>Reports on work under the action plan for valuable tree species from Madagascar. Malagasy populations of <i>Dalbergia</i> and <i>Dispyros</i> were included in Appendix II at CoP16. Madagascar was to administer exports in accordance with an action plan approved by the CoP. It has failed to submit a progress report. At SC66, the SC recommended suspension of trade pending evaluation of enforcement standards and</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further work is needed on the management of exports of valuable timber species from Madagascar in order to fully implement the action plan approved at CoP16.</li> <li>• The decisions will provide better guidance to Madagascar, Parties, SC and PC and the Secretariat on measures needed to improve implementation of CITES in relation to these species by Madagascar.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	stockpile audits. A series of draft decisions refine the action plan and give further guidance.	
<b>56. Sharks and Rays</b> <i>(Elasmobranchii spp.)</i>  <b>56.1 Report from the Secretariat</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> As required by Res. Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP16), the Secretariat has provided a detailed report of its activities and those of the AC since CoP16, concentrating in particular on the implementation of the inclusion of seven species of commercially-exploited sharks and rays in Appendix II. Draft decisions relate to further implementation of the Appendix II listings, continued collaboration with the FAO, and maintaining the dedicated marine officer position in the Secretariat.	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft decisions are based on recommendations made by the AC and would continue and complete the extensive range of tasks undertaken to implement fully the Appendix II listings of CoP16.</li> </ul>
<b>56.2 Report from the Animals Committee</b>	<b>Proponent: Animals Committee</b> This report discusses co-operation with relevant organizations, but the detailed report on AC activity since CoP16 is included in the report of the Secretariat in document 56.1.	<b>NOTE THE REPORT</b>
<b>57. Elephants</b> <i>(Elephantidae spp.)</i>  <b>57.1 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP16) on Trade in elephant specimens</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> The document is primarily a report that reviews actions taken by the Parties to implement Res. Conf. 10.10. The report also summarizes the actions decided and determinations made by the SC regarding Dec. 14.78 (Rev. CoP16), 16.78, 16.81, 16.82 and 16.83 at its 64th, 65th and 66th meetings.	<b>NOTE THE REPORT</b>  <b>SUPPORT the proposed decisions and amendments to Res. Conf. 10.10</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Doc. 57.1 should be read in conjunction with Doc.24, dealing with NIAPs. Together they cover a large complex of actions that are being taken by CITES and the Parties to deal with elephant conservation, poaching, and illegal ivory trade.</li> <li>One proposed decision calls on Asian range states to investigate</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>The Secretariat recommends the adoption of two decisions. One calls on Asian range states to investigate illegal trade in live Asian elephants. The other renews the directive to the Secretariat to seek external funding in order to produce practical guidance on the management of elephant ivory stockpiles. It also recommends amendments to Res. Conf. 10.10.</p>	<p>illegal trade in live Asian elephants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The other proposed decision renews the directive to the Secretariat to seek external funding in order to produce practical guidance on the management of elephant ivory stockpiles.</li> <li>• The proposed amendments to Res. Conf. 10.10 update the Resolution by more fully integrating the MIKE program and the ETIS program, clarifying the NIAP process, and dealing with the collection of forensic information from seized ivory into the Resolution.</li> </ul>
<p><b>57.2 Closure of domestic markets for elephant ivory</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Angola, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Kenya, Niger and Senegal</b></p> <p>The document proposes a Resolution calling on all Parties to close their domestic ivory markets.</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed resolution is part of a movement to seek the complete elimination of ivory in commerce as a solution to the elephant poaching problem.</li> <li>• It is similar in approach to Doc. 84.2 which would terminate all work on a Decision-making Mechanism (DMM) for ivory sales and Doc. 57.3, below, which are intended to send signals that all possibility of legal ivory use is dead.</li> <li>• It is contrary to the reports from the MIKE and ETIS programs that indicate that domestic markets for ivory for personal use are declining and that there is no correlation between CITES-approved ivory sales and the illicit trade.</li> <li>• It, along with its companion pieces, seeks to foreclose any possibility of sustainable use of elephant ivory and the consequential benefits to local communities and to elephant conservation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>57.3 Ivory stockpiles: proposed revision of</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Kenya, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Niger, Nigeria, and Senegal</b></p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recommendation is an attempt to revive an effort that failed</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>Resolution Conf. 10.10 (CoP16) on Trade in elephant specimens</b></p>	<p>Recommends inventory and destruction of elephant ivory stockpiles. The document proposes a revision to Res. Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP16).</p>	<p>at the last two meetings of the SC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That effort resulted only in the SC agreeing to “note” the fact that some Parties had elected to destroy their stockpiles.</li> <li>• The mandate of CITES is to regulate the international trade in wildlife and plants to prevent that from contributing to the extinction of wild species, not to govern the internal decisions and actions of Parties.</li> <li>• The document cites the enormous estimated size of ivory stockpiles and their possible value, but ignores the potential benefit of utilizing that value for wildlife conservation and to meet the needs of local communities in order to give them incentives to support wildlife conservation.</li> <li>• It appears to rely on the questionable strategy of “sending messages” by ivory stockpile destructions without providing evidence that such destruction will achieve the goal that it claims.</li> <li>• “Sending messages” is an inappropriate and unauthorized purpose for action under CITES.</li> <li>• At best, the proposed Resolution is untimely and inappropriate in the light of all the other work proceeding through the African Elephant Action Plan and NIAPs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>57.4 Trade in live elephants: Proposed revision of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP16) on Trade in elephant specimens</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chad, Kenya, Mali, Niger and Senegal</b> Proposes amendments to Res. Conf. 10.10 to call on Parties to adopt legislation requiring proper treatment of live elephants in trade and to prohibit any live capture of elephants except for <i>in situ</i> conservation programs.</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Animal welfare regulation is an internal matter for CITES Parties and does not come within the competence of the Convention, but may be appropriate for other forums.</li> <li>• The protection of live animals from harmful treatment in relation to international trade is dealt with in Res. Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP16).</li> <li>• There is no conservation rationale offered for a limitation of</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		capture for the purpose of <i>in situ</i> conservation activities and a prohibition on any <i>ex situ</i> conservation activities.
<b>57.5 Report on monitoring the illegal killing of elephants (MIKE)</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> The document describes the MIKE system and summarizes recent results.	<b>NOTE THE REPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The data indicate, overall and on the average, a peaking of elephant poaching in Africa in 2011 followed by a leveling off and a gradual decline through 2015.</li> <li>• The report states, paragraph 58, that “the MIKE program has found no evidence that levels of elephant poaching increased or decreased as a direct result of CITES decisions [i.e., the one-off ivory sales or the nine-year moratorium] concerning the trade in elephant ivory.”</li> <li>• The report did find correlations between poaching and the quality of human livelihoods, the quality of governance and the global demand for ivory.</li> </ul>
<b>57.6 Report on the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS)</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> The ETIS program collects and analyzes data on elephants and illicit ivory trade, primarily through data on ivory seizures, in order to help the Parties determine whether observed trends are related to CITES measures under Res. Conf. 10.10, listing actions, or legal ivory sales. The report is produced by TRAFFIC. Due to data deficiency for 2015, the report covers the period 2007-2014.	<b>NOTE THE REPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The data show a peak of illicit trade in 2012.</li> <li>• Continuing movement of large-scale shipments points to the involvement of transnational crime syndicates.</li> <li>• A complex cluster analysis is used to find groups of countries most active in different aspects of the illicit trade, helping to guide corrective efforts through the use of the NIAPs – see Doc. 24.</li> </ul>
<b>58. International trade in cycads (<i>Encephalartos</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: South Africa</b> A draft decision requests co-operation from the	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These measures will assist in obtaining information on the illegal</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
spp.)	Parties regarding seizures of illegal specimens, the development of a manual for forensic technology for plant material, and a report on illegal trade in cycads ( <i>Encephelartos</i> ) species.	trade in cycads ( <i>Encephelartos</i> ) not only from South Africa but all range states, and improve co-ordination on investigations and information sharing.
<b>59. Hawksbill Turtle</b> <b>(<i>Eretmochelys imbricate</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> In relation to this species, which is included in Appendix I, Decision 16.127 required the Secretariat to collaborate to encourage implementation of outstanding recommendations from the 2009 regional workshop on the Hawksbill turtle in the wider Caribbean and western Atlantic region. A report details how this has been implemented. Draft decisions require the Secretariat to collaborate to undertake a study on both legal and illegal trade in marine turtles and identify where immediate action may be required, and to encourage relevant organizations to address recommendations from a 2014 study by the Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles.	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies have already been developed to better understand the illegal take of marine turtles, so as to formulate conservation and management options, in Cuba and the Solomon Islands (with Cuba’s Fisheries Research Centre (CIP) and The Nature Conservancy, under the 2014-18 project “Minimizing the Illegal Killing of Elephants and other Endangered Species”)</li> <li>• The relationship between the requested study and these studies should be explained.</li> </ul>
<b>60. Asian Big cats</b> <b>(<i>Felidae</i> spp.)</b>  <b>60.1 Report of the Standing Committee</b>	<b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b> The document reports on the status of Asian big cats in the wild, their conservation and trade controls in place. A series of Decisions are proposed regarding inspections of Asian big cat facilities and the	<b>NOTE REPORT</b>  <b>SUPPORT, with the amendments proposed by the Secretariat</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The drafting changes requested by the Secretariat are helpful in clarifying the SC decisions.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	provision of financial and technical support, along with amendments recommended by the Secretariat.	
<b>60.2 Proposal of India</b>	<p><b>Proponent: India</b> A draft decision is proposed to supplement those agreed by the SC at SC66 and referred to in connection with 61.1 above, to encourage the Parties to keep photographic identification databases of tiger skins to facilitate the identification of the origin of illegal specimens.</p>	<p><b>REJECT, subject to further information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would greatly assist the Parties in considering the proposal to understand the status of the methodology for identifying the origin of the specimen from photographs of the skin.</li> </ul>
<b>61. Great apes (<i>Hominidae</i> spp.)</b>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b> Decision 16.67 required the review of Res. Conf. 13.5 (Rev. CoP16) on <i>Conservation of and trade in great apes</i> and the establishment of an illegal trade reporting mechanism. Illegal trade in great apes remains limited, but there is little data available. The Secretariat in its commentary recommends a draft decision to allow it to collaborate with the IUCN, GRASP and others to produce a report on the status of great apes and the impact of illegal trade and other pressures, to be presented to CoP18.</p>	<p><b>NOTE REPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The report is considered desirable by the SC.</li> <li>However, given limited funding, priority must be given to species where international trade is a risk to the species, and the SC seems to agree that international trade is not a risk to the species.</li> <li>Interested organizations should seek funding for this initiative externally or from another forum.</li> </ul>
<b>62. International trade in rosewood timber species [LEGUMINOSAE]</b>	<p><b>Proponents: Mexico and the European Union</b> Summarizes the background to the present listings of <i>Dalbergia</i> spp. and <i>Pterocarpus</i> spp.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT, coordinate with work of other organizations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data on the biology, current status of wild populations, and the extent of trade in a number of rosewood timber species are</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
(Fabaceae)]	They propose a series of draft decisions to obtain data on wild populations and international trade in rosewood timber species that will facilitate the development of recommendations to ensure that international trade in rosewood timber species is legal and sustainable.	<p>lacking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no international species-specific Harmonized System codes for rosewood species.</li> <li>• Species identification, look-alike problems and lack of information needed to prepare non-detriment findings are major challenges.</li> <li>• Some of the issues are being worked on by other entities, such as UNODC and ICCWC (see Document CoP17 Doc. 48.1 on Timber Identification).</li> </ul>
<b>63. Guidelines to determine the possible impact of trade in African wild dogs (<i>Lycaon pictus</i>) on the conservation of the species</b>	<p><b>Proponent: Burkina Faso</b></p> <p>The species has declined in numbers and it is absent from a large part of its original range on account of habitat fragmentation, human-wildlife conflict and disease. There are no data on international trade. Draft decisions require the AC to investigate trade in the species and the impact it has on the conservation of the species, and recommend action.</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation measures may be required, and it is laudable that the proponent wishes to take steps in that direction.</li> <li>• However, there appears to be no evidence of international trade in the species, so it is difficult to view CITES as the appropriate forum.</li> </ul>
<b>64. Pangolins (<i>Manis</i> spp.)</b>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b></p> <p>The SC proposes a resolution and several decisions on pangolins.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pangolin range states met in 2015 and advised that all pangolin species meet the criteria for listing in Appendix I.</li> <li>• The report from the range state meeting prompted the proposed resolution and decisions from the SC.</li> <li>• If the proposals for inclusion in Appendix I are successful, the resolution and decisions may still be adopted with consequential amendments.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>65. Conservation of and trade in East African sandalwood (<i>Osyris lanceolata</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Kenya</b>            The species was included in Appendix II at CoP16, and Decisions 16.153-4 directed the range states and the Secretariat to gather information on the conservation status of and trade in the species and other populations which are not included in the Appendices, and data and capacity-building mechanisms for non-detriment findings. The proponent requests continuance of the decisions to CoP18, with amendments so that that this species be considered a priority species, impact on look-alike species is investigated, and a consultative meeting of range states is considered.</p>	<p><b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work has not been completed due to funding restraints</li> <li>• It would be very helpful if the Proponent could provide further information to support the case for priority funding.</li> </ul>
<p><b>66. Tibetan antelope (<i>Pantholops hodgsonii</i>): enforcement measures</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b>            A recommendation to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) retain a portion of Res. Conf. 11.8 (Rev. CoP13) on <i>Conservation of and control of trade in the Tibetan Antelope</i> so that the SC continues to review enforcement measures relating to Tibetan antelope wool and products;</li> <li>ii) incorporate Dec. 16.93 into that resolution. That decision requires the Parties to bring seizures of illegal Tibetan antelope wool and products to the attention of relevant Parties and the Secretariat;</li> <li>iii) Approve a new decision directed to India to review its implementation of Res. Conf. 11.8</li> </ol>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued review is justified given that the changing nature of the illegal trade (towards cheaper impure products) may introduce the products to a wider marketplace.</li> <li>• The Secretariat reports that India, which is the primary country of origin of illegal shatoosh shawls, has not provided reports due by 1 March 2016 on investigations following information provided by Switzerland on the changing nature of the illegal shahtoosh trade.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	(Rev. CoP13).	
<b>67. Harvesting of and trade in African cherry (<i>prunus Africana</i>)</b>	<b>Proponent: Plants Committee</b> The EU produced a report on harvesting of and trade in the African cherry, which is used in the EU pharmaceutical industry. The PC adopted its recommendations in 2015, which included submitting draft decisions to CoP17.	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat has commented that the proposed workshop is unlikely to benefit the Significant Trade Review Process and may conflict with it and cause confusion regarding whether it is a separate and parallel process to the Significant Trade Review process.</li> <li>• This may change depending on the outcome of CoP17 Doc. 33 <i>Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade</i>.</li> <li>• It would be helpful for PC to clarify how the workshop would be integrated into the Significant Trade Review Process.</li> </ul>
<b>68. Rhinoceroses (<i>Rhinocerotidae</i> spp.)</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> Proposal to amend Res. Conf. 9.14 to, among other things, recommend domestic measures to “ensure that rhinoceros horns acquired as legal hunting trophies remain in lawful possession...” and “identify, mark, register and secure ... [rhinoceros horn] stocks....”	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This could apply to privately held rhino horn hunting trophies depending on the interpretation of “stocks.”</li> <li>• The proposal is duplicative and unnecessary.</li> <li>• The Party into which a rhino horn hunting trophy is imported will already have a record of the importation, including the information on the sportsman doing the importation.</li> <li>• Any further paperwork requirements will be a costly and time-consuming burden on both government and the individual, and will not add substantially to the information already in hand.</li> <li>• Most sport hunted rhino horn trophies are imported into the U.S. and that country already has laws that prevent putting the horn into the commercial trade.</li> </ul>
<b>69. Illegal trade in the helmeted hornbill</b>	<b>Proponent: Indonesia</b> Proposes a new resolution to deal with increasing	<b>SUPPORT, but the draft Resolution should be reworked to be consistent with accepted CITES style, content</b>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<i>(Rhinoplax vigil)</i>	threats from poaching for the “ivory” from its bill, and from habitat loss.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The solid casque on the bill, the front section of which is solid keratin can be finely carved.</li> <li>• The species has been included in Appendix I since the Convention entered into force in 1975.</li> <li>• In addition to the poaching crisis, which has escalated since 2011, conversion of the species' habitat to oil palm plantations and other uses threatens its long-term survival.</li> <li>• The draft resolution requires amendments regarding substance and procedure.</li> </ul>
<b>70. Saiga antelope (<i>Saiga tatarica</i>)</b>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b></p> <p>A draft decision requests that the range states and important consumer and trading Parties fully implement and report on a new <i>Medium-Term International Work Programme for the Saiga Antelope</i> for 2016 to 2020, and take specific measures to address illegal trade.</p> <p>The Secretariat requests a decision to direct it to remind the Parties of Res. Conf. 12.13 (Rev. CoP16) on <i>Permits and Certificates</i> which provides a simplified procedure to facilitate the movement of emergency diagnostic specimens</p> <p>The nine decisions adopted at CoP16 are to be deleted.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT, with Secretariat amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Saiga Antelope remains at threat from illegal trade.</li> <li>• During the mass die-off of Saiga antelopes in 2015, permits for emergency diagnostic specimens were delayed. This can be avoided if awareness is raised of the simplified procedure.</li> </ul>
<b>71. Snake trade and conservation management (<i>Serpentes</i> spp.)</b>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b></p> <p>Decisions 16.102-108 required a large number of wide-ranging actions. This has resulted in the proposal of a new resolution dealing with non-</p>	<p><b>REFER TO WG</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat notes that the draft resolution would benefit from reorganization and a significant number of amendments, and that it should be examined by a WG at the CoP.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>detriment findings, management of wild populations, monitoring and trade controls and traceability systems, and draft decisions directed at Southeast Asian Parties, Benin, Ghana, Honduras, Indonesia and Togo specifically, and more widely applicable decisions encouraging assessments, proposals for inclusion in the Appendices, precautionary management measures, and the elimination of illegal trade.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft resolution and decisions are very comprehensive, and it may be appropriate for a technically qualified and pragmatic WG to identify which elements are essential, rather than merely desirable, and for the draft resolutions and decisions presented to the CoP by the WG to concentrate on those aspects.</li> <li>• Due regard should be taken of existing resolutions and other actions at this CoP that cover some of the considerations taken up here.</li> </ul>
<p><b>72. Regional cooperation on the management of and trade in the queen conch (<i>Strombus gigas</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b>            Decisions 16.141-148 required actions to achieve regional co-operation in the management of and trade in the Queen Conch. The report indicates that much has been achieved, including the endorsement of the Regional Queen Conch Fisheries Management and Conservation Plan by all range states. Draft decisions require continued collaborative actions to implement the Plan, including building capacity and public awareness, and further research on non-detriment findings and traceability and collection of data on conversion factors.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b>            Ongoing involvement of FAO and the Secretariat are essential to ensure the effectiveness of the Convention in relation to heavily-traded fisheries species in Appendix II.</p>
<p><b>73. Tortoises and freshwater turtles (<i>Testudines</i> spp.)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Secretariat</b>            The Secretariat reports on work done since CoP16 further to a large and diverse series of Decisions (16.109-24), which addressed a wide range of issues: studies on making non-detriment findings,</p>	<p><b>NOTE REPORTS AND SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive summaries of the reports are available at Annexes 1 and 3.</li> <li>• The decisions are based on the recommendations in the IUCN report in Annex 4.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>illegal trade, identification materials, collection of data on seizures and confiscations, capacity-building, enforcement, establishment of a Task Force, and the Periodic Review of the Appendices. Detailed reports are available in Annexes 2 and 4.</p>	
<p><b>74. Totoaba- <i>Totoaba Macdonaldi</i> – Opportunities for international collaboration within the CITES framework</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Mexico</b>  A report on measures to address the conservation status of the Totoaba, and the threat from illegal international trade in its swim bladder for culinary and traditional medicine purposes. The paper recommends that the Parties take steps to assist, including publicising forensic progress, confiscating and sharing information on illegal shipments of the species, supporting the development of technical capabilities for sustainable fishing and the recovery of wild populations and prepare recommendations on how to facilitate the implementation of CITES provisions relating to the Totoaba.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This species, which has been included in Appendix I since 1977, is clearly in need of support as illegal international trade is a severe threat to its survival. Raising awareness can only be helpful.</li> <li>• The proponent has not put forward a draft decision and it may wish to establish a drafting group at the CoP to consider if some of its recommendations can be put into the form of a decision directed at the Parties and the Secretariat or a new Notification to the Parties.</li> </ul>
<p><b>75. Bushmeat</b>   <b>75.1 Review of Resolution Conf. 13.11 on <i>Bushmeat</i></b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b>  Decision 16.149 required the SC to review Res. Conf. 13.11 on <i>Bushmeat</i>, particularly to take account of guidance developed by Convention on Biological Diversity. The result is a major reworking of the resolution. It has been reorganized to clarify the international nature of the CITES mandate in this area, and to encourage</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Synergy with other organizations working on bushmeat is to be welcomed</li> <li>• Recognition of the importance of addressing livelihood and food security concerns in achieving sustainable offtakes is welcome, but given the bushmeat trade is typically national rather than international, it may be difficult for CITES to influence this</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	collaboration and information sharing. A draft decision directs the Secretariat to develop guidance materials activities and tools to enhance capacity in this area.	
<b>75.2 Report of the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group</b>	<b>Proponent: Secretariat</b> The Central African Bushmeat WG was established at CoP14, but has not moved forward. The Secretariat therefore suggests, given the new framework for bushmeat under 75.1, Decisions 14.73-4 providing the mandate for this WG be deleted.	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The WG had not been active since establishment.</li> </ul>
<b>76. Neotropical tree species</b>	<b>Proponent: Plants Committee</b> A report on the work of the Neotropical Tree Species WG, established at CoP16 (Decisions 16.159-160). A draft decision would continue the WG to report at CoP18.	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Secretariat notes that this WG has worked very effectively by electronic means and consequently reduced costs. This is commendable and should be adopted where at all possible by WGs.</li> </ul>
<b>77. International trade in African tree species</b>	<b>Proponent: Kenya (as chair of WG)</b> The AC established an intercessional WG on African tree species, but is at a preliminary stage only. A draft decision would authorize it to continue and report at CoP18. The terms of reference include exchanging experiences on the sustainable use and management of CITES-listed African tree species, identifying capacity weaknesses, examining processes used to develop export quotas and conversion factors, and to	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed new terms of reference are largely the same as those established by the PC, but would also include the vague and open-ended statement, “any other terms it deems appropriate.” It is preferable to delete this statement.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	identify African tree species that would benefit from inclusion in the Appendices.	
<b>78. Sharing existing written science-based rationales and scientific information for non-detriment findings made for trade in CITES-listed species</b>	<b>Proponent: Australia</b> Proposes modification of Res. Conf. 16.7 on Non-detriment Findings, to strengthen the provision which encourages Parties to maintain written scientific bases for their non-detriment findings.	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Res. Conf. 16.7 was carefully crafted to reach a compromise between the pressure from importing Parties to require written NDFs and the resistance of many range states to such a requirement.</li> <li>• It is far too early to begin modifying it.</li> <li>• No external funds have become available to implement Decision 16.31(a) to do a regular assessment of the technological, logistical and equipment needs of all Parties to implement the Convention (see paragraph 22 of Doc. 15).</li> </ul>
<b>79. Implementation of the CITES Strategic Vision 2008-2020</b>	<b>Proponent: Brazil</b> A draft decision requests that the Parties provide information on the status of measures adopted for Appendix I species by July 2017, and that the Secretariat seeks funds for the recovery of species most at risk where no funding is currently available.	<b>NOTE DOCUMENT/WITHDRAW, in favor of other measures</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aim of satisfying Target 12 on the Aichi Targets – that By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained - is laudable, but is best achieved within the existing CITES framework.</li> </ul>
<b>80. CITES Appendix III-an added-value for the conservation of threatened wildlife with restricted distribution</b>	<b>Proponent: The European Union</b> A draft decision to commission a report recommending species for inclusion on Appendix III and the preparation of guidance for “correct and reasonable use” of Appendix III.	<b>REJECT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of Appendix III is to enable a range state to REQUEST the assistance of Parties in relation to a species which it regulates. It is therefore inappropriate to suggest guidelines, which would reduce the discretion of a Party as to when to use it.</li> <li>• The proposal acknowledges that it intends to encourage wider use of Appendix III, e.g. by non-range states to require CITES</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		permits for certain species for which they have legislated extra-territorially. This would encourage and facilitate the use of Appendix III as a disguised stricter domestic measure to disrupt the normal operation of the CITES Appendices.
<b>SPECIES-SPECIFIC MATTERS – Maintenance of the Appendices</b>		
<b>81. Standard Nomenclature</b>  <b>81.1 Standard nomenclature: Report of the Animals and Plants Committees</b>	<b>Proponents: Animals Committee, Plants Committee</b> A report on the work of the PC and AC since CoP16. Annexes 1 and 2 contain recommended revisions to the nomenclature references within Res. Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP16) on <i>Standard Nomenclature</i> , and a change to tabular presentation for ease of use. Draft decisions set out continuing nomenclature tasks regarding corals, time-specific versions of online databases and bird family and order names.	<b>SUPPORT, with Secretariat amendments</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Secretariat would like more flexibility with regard to the deadlines for its tasks.</li> </ul>
<b>81.2 Standard nomenclature for <i>Hippocampus</i> spp.</b>	<b>Proponent: Australia</b> The Parties are requested to accept <i>H. dahli</i> and <i>H. planifrons</i> as distinct species, and to remove Australia as a range state for <i>H. trimaculatus</i> , <i>H. Kelloggi</i> and <i>H. spinosissimus</i> .	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proponent has noted inconsistencies between the species database and the list of standard references annexed to Res. Conf. 12.11.</li> </ul>
<b>82. Periodic review of the Appendices</b>	<b>Proponents: Animals Committee and Plants Committee</b>	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT, with Secretariat’s amendments</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendments provide welcome clarity on the procedures</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<b>82.1 Revision of the Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP16) on Periodic Review of Species included in appendices I and II</b>	Amendments are proposed to Res. Conf. 14.8 (Rev. CoP16) on <i>Periodic Review of Species Included in Appendices I and II</i> . The intention is to acknowledge the advisory role of the Scientific Committees, to clarify the procedural steps and to allow the AC or PC to submit a proposal to the CoP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the Secretariat notes, they will not speed up reviews, and may decrease the frequency of reviews</li> <li>In the interests of obtaining objective science-based information, the proposed amendment under ENCOURAGES at (c) should omit the words “organizations (e.g. IUCN, Birdlife, etc). IUCN is already included under (b).</li> </ul>
<b>82.2 Review of the Appendices: Felidae spp</b>	<b>Proponent: Animals Committee</b> A Review of the Appendices for <i>Felidae</i> was directed by Res. Conf. 13.93 (Rev. CoP16). Of the species remaining after CoP16, a review of the Florida Puma and Eastern Puma ( <i>Puma concolor cougar and P.c. coryi</i> ) has been concluded and has resulted in Proposal 5. The review of Lion ( <i>panthera leo</i> ) is ongoing and a draft decision requests continuance and reporting at CoP18.	<b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the Secretariat notes, this decision will not be necessary if the CoP makes a decision on Proposal 4 on Lion as that would preclude further consideration of the remaining species in the <i>Felidae</i> review.</li> <li>In the event Proposal 4 is withdrawn, the review should be completed.</li> </ul>
<b>83. Annotations</b>  <b>83.1 Report of the Standing Committee</b>	<b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b> Decisions 16.161-163 established a WG on annotations with wide-ranging terms of reference, including examining how annotations are used, drafting and interpretation issues and implementation challenges. A draft decision requests continuance of the WG, and amendments to four resolutions are suggested.	<b>REJECT, refer to WG</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Secretariat considers that the Parties will need more time to consider the proposed amendments to resolutions, and their practical effect on trade. It therefore suggests instead of adoption, the Parties authorize continuance of the WG</li> <li>If the Parties do wish to adopt what is proposed, it may be appropriate for the proposals to be refined first in a WG at the CoP.</li> <li>The Secretariat recommends that if the proposals are adopted as presented, the WG is authorized to continue with extended terms of reference e.g. identifying implications of the amendments, and</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		crafting annotations in a more consistent and streamlined manner.
<b>83.2 Annotations for species listed in the CITES Appendices: Report of the working group</b>	<b>Proponent: The United States of America (as chair of the WG)</b> This document contains the report of the WG, noting that recommendations for revisions to Annotations #11 and #14 are contained in proposals CoP17 Prop. 60 and CoP17 Prop. 62.	<b>SUPPORT, refer to WG</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat suggests that this document should be considered in conjunction with document 83.1.</li> </ul>
<b>83.3 Annotations for Appendix II orchids</b>	<b>Proponent: Canada</b> PC established an intersessional WG to consider amendment of the annotation for Appendix II orchids. However, it has not been able to complete formation and begin discussions. A draft decision requests continuation of the WG and sets out terms of reference, including developing a questionnaire to the Parties on trade in orchids, considering the conservation impact of exemptions for orchids, and identifying knowledge gaps.	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The terms of reference include those agreed by the PC.</li> </ul>
<b>84. Decision-making mechanism (DMM) for a process of trade in ivory</b>  <b>84.1 Report of the Standing Committee</b>	<b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b> Invites a decision by the CoP whether to extend the mandate of the SC to develop a proposal for a DMM.	<b>EXTEND THE MANDATE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dec. 16.55 directed the SC to develop a proposal for a DMM for consideration at CoP17.</li> <li>• The DMM was part of the bargain that went into the agreement for a moratorium on proposals for legal sales of ivory.</li> <li>• The moratorium comes to end next year.</li> <li>• Elephant range states that wish to have legal ivory sales have</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>voiced concern that the process to develop a DMM has been stalled since the time of the agreement on the moratorium.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dec. 16.55 was a step towards fulfilling the agreement to consider a DMM.</li> <li>• The SC formed a WG but that group has not yet produced a proposal for a DMM.</li> <li>• At SC66, Kenya, Ethiopia, Benin and Burkina Faso proposed that the SC should stop work on the DMM and should recommend to the CoP that the mandate be rescinded because they believed that it was necessary to send a signal that there would be no legal trade, in order to stem the poaching crisis (see SC66 Doc. 47.4.2)</li> <li>• As reported by MIKE, elephant poaching appears to have peaked in 2011 and is now in decline.</li> <li>• The MIKE report to this CoP notes that it finds no correlation between actions by the Parties or the legal sale of ivory and the level of poaching.</li> <li>• It would be a violation of the agreement on which the moratorium is based to refuse to even consider the development of a DMM.</li> </ul>
<p><b>84.2 Proposal of Benin, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chad, Ethiopia, Kenya, Niger, and Senegal</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: (see title, to left)</b> Propose a decision to terminate the efforts to develop a DMM.</p>	<p><b>REJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proponents call for the Parties to send a message that CITES is forever closed to the idea of a legal ivory trade.</li> <li>• The proposal violates the bargain made in 2007 for a nine-year moratorium on requests for legal ivory sales.</li> <li>• It prevents any consideration of the option of sustainable use.</li> <li>• It is not within the CITES mandate to “send messages.”</li> <li>• It is not necessary for the CoP to decide not to do something.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>84.3 Proposal of Namibia, South Africa, and Zimbabwe</b></p>	<p><b>Proponents: (see title, to left)</b> Amendments are proposed to Res. Conf. 10.10 to establish a DMM for the legal sale of ivory.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The document sets out a detailed history of the effort to develop a proposal for a DMM.</li> <li>• It notes that development of a DMM does not mean that a decision has been made to resume legal ivory sales, but only that a mechanism has been agreed should there be a decision to allow legal sales.</li> <li>• The proposed DMM sets criteria for the exporting and importing Parties.</li> <li>• Exporting Parties are required to have a national management plan for their Appendix II elephant populations, to support the African Elephant Action Plan, and to assure that proceeds will go exclusively to elephant conservation and community conservation and development work.</li> <li>• A system for marking, traceability and the other mechanics of trade are set forth.</li> <li>• Importing Parties are required to have complete legislative and regulatory systems, to participate in CITES efforts dealing with elephants, and to contribute to the African Elephant Action Plan and the work of the Secretariat regarding elephants.</li> <li>• Approval of these amendments would fulfill the terms of the deal that was struck for the moratorium on proposals for ivory sales.</li> </ul>
<p><b>85. Extinct or possibly extinct species</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b> Decisions 16.164-5 required a review of the amendment of the Appendices for extinction. Amendments are proposed to Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16) on <i>Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II</i>. They adopt the IUCN Red List</p>	<p><b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The use of terms and definitions for extinct species by CITES and IUCN should be consistent.</li> <li>• It would be helpful if some clarification could be given on how the abandonment of the waiting requirement interacts with retention according to precautionary criteria, as these appear contradictory.</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>category and definition of “extinct” rather than the current term and annotation “possibly extinct”, provide that extinct species should not normally be proposed for inclusion in the Appendices, allow the delisting of extinct species in Appendix I without the need for retention in Appendix II for two intersessional periods, and provide that extinct species should not be removed from the Appendices if they meet precautionary criteria for retention.</p>	
<p><b>86. Review of Resolution Conf. 10.9 on <i>Consideration of proposals for the transfer of African elephant populations from Appendix I to Appendix II</i></b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Standing Committee</b>            The SC recommends an extension to CoP of its mandate to review Res. Conf. 10.9.            Res. Conf. 10.9 requires that a panel of experts review any proposal to move an elephant population from Appendix I to Appendix II before the Parties consider the proposal.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT, or repeal Res. Conf. 10.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SC appointed a WG to review Res. Conf. 10.9 in the light of CoP16 Doc. 73 (Rev. 1).</li> <li>• The WG reported to SC66 that it was unable to complete the task due to resource constraints and difficulties with translations.</li> <li>• CoP16 Doc. 73 (Rev. 1) was submitted by Côte d’Ivoire, Liberia, Mali<sup>1</sup> and Sierra Leone, and raised issues with the late production of the Panel of Experts reports, particularly the translations into French and Spanish. The document recommended that the responsibility and the cost for the Panel of Experts report should be borne by the proponent for a downlisting.</li> <li>• The Secretariat commented on CoP16 Doc.73 (Rev. 1), questioning the necessity for a panel of experts and noting that this is the only species for which such an additional requirement exists. It also questioned the fairness of putting the financial burden on the proponent when the requirement for a panel of experts was imposed by the CoP. The Secretariat recommended a broader review of Res. Conf. 10.9 by the SC, posing a number of</li> </ul>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

DOCUMENT	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>specific questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dec. 16.160 directed the SC to establish a WG to review Res. Conf. 10.9 as appropriate and to work in English and French to the extent possible.</li> <li>• The SC should be given the opportunity to regroup and to address the issue.</li> <li>• An alternative is for the CoP to simply repeal Res. Conf. 10.9, and to rely instead on listing criteria in Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16).</li> </ul>
<p><b>87. Freshwater stingrays (<i>Potamotrygonidae</i> spp.)</b></p>	<p><b>Proponent: Animals Committee</b>            Decisions 16.130-135 required investigation of the status of this species, including an expert workshop. The result is three draft decisions on the continuing exchange of information, the inclusion of species identified by the AC in Appendix III, consideration of species for Appendix II, research on captive breeding, mathematical modelling of population trends. The recommendations of an Expert Workshop in Bogotá, Colombia in 2014 are annexed to this document.</p>	<p><b>QUALIFIED SUPPORT, with Secretariat amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat recommends an amendment to the decision to encourage collaboration between Parties with ex situ breeding operations and those with in situ conservation programmes.</li> <li>• Five species have been identified by the AC as of priority concern for Appendix III.</li> <li>• Draft decision 17DD (directing the Secretariat to assist range states in the mathematical modelling of population trends) should be deleted, as this support would be better provided by the FAO.</li> </ul>
<p><b>SPECIES-SPECIFIC MATTERS – Amendment of the Appendices</b></p>		
<p><b>88. Proposals to amend Appendices I and II</b></p>	<p>Doc. 88.1 lists the 62 proposals to add, delete or change the status of species in Appendix I and Appendix II.</p>	<p><b>See the section of this Voting Guide dealing with each of the 62 proposals.</b></p>

**Key: CoP = Conference of the Parties; AC = Animals Committee; EU = European Union; IUCN = International Union for the Conservation of Nature; PC = Plants Committee; SC = Standing Committee; TRAFFIC = Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce; WG = Working Group.**

<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
<b>88.1 List of proposals received to amend Appendices I and II</b>		
<b>88.2 Comments from the Parties and comments and recommendations from the Secretariat</b>	<b>NO DOCUMENT</b>	<b>NO COMMENT</b>
<b>88.3 Comments from statutory consultees</b>	<b>NO DOCUMENT AT THIS TIME</b>	<b>NO COMMENT</b>
<b>CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING</b>		
<b>89. Determination of the time and venue of the next regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties</b>	<b>NO DOCUMENT</b>	<b>NO COMMENT</b>
<b>90. Closing remarks (Observers, Parties, CITES Secretary General, Host Government)</b>	<b>NO DOCUMENT</b>	<b>NO COMMENT</b>

**Safari Club International and Safari Club International Foundation promote sustainable use of natural resources and advocate the use of science-based information in wildlife policy, management and conservation. Practicing the principles of sustainable use, hunter-conservationists increase the value of wildlife resources and create economic incentives for humans to conserve these resources. We recognize that the well-being of both humans and wildlife depends on the sustainable use of natural resources and the conservation of biodiversity worldwide.**