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

Seventy-fourth meeting of the Standing Committee
Lyon (France), 7 - 11 March 2022

Interpretation and implementation matters

General compliance and enforcement

Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ANIMALS AND PLANTS COMMITTEES

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.

Background

2. The role and responsibilities of the Standing Committee in conducting the Review of Significant Trade (RST) in specimens of Appendix-II species are described in paragraph 1 k) to p) and paragraph 2 of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18) on *Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species*.

3. In addition to its impact for Parties implementing recommendations in-country, the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the process of the RST. As required by paragraph 1 a) of Resolution 12.8 (Rev. CoP18), the Secretariat commissioned the preparation of a post-CoP18 summary of reported trade in specimens of Appendix-II species of fauna and flora in recent years for consideration at the 31st meeting of the Animals Committee (AC31) and 25th meeting of the Plants Committee (PC25) which had been planned for July 2020. These meetings were postponed and subsequently took place online in June 2021. As a consequence, a regular RST has not been undertaken during the intersessional period between CoP18 and CoP19. The present document therefore concerns species/country combinations selected for review prior to CoP18, but for which the review has not yet been completed.

4. In October 2020, the Secretariat wrote to all Parties currently affected by recommendations of the Animals, Plants or Standing Committees under the RST inviting them to provide any updates regarding implementation of these recommendations. As per paragraphs 2 and 4 of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18), these Parties were also invited to bring to the attention of the Secretariat, any requirements for technical or financial assistance that may be required to implement the recommendations. The Secretariat indicated that it would endeavour to assist Parties to the extent possible and within its means and mandate.

5. At the request of the Chair of the Standing Committee, the Secretariat prepared an interim report on progress with the implementation of the RST as part of a series of short updates about ongoing compliance processes. This interim report was published on the CITES website on 20 November 2020 as information document SC2020 Inf. 11.

6. At PC25, in response to Decision 18.92 b), the Plants Committee agreed to include eight range States of *Pterocarpus erinaceus* in Stage 2 of RST. At AC31, nomenclatural changes concerning *Tridacna* species from Solomon Islands led to the inclusion of two additional species: *Tridacna ningaloo* and *T. noae* under the current recommendation to suspend trade.

7. Details of the 86 species/country combinations from a total of 38 Parties that are currently in the RST are presented in the Annex 1 to this document. Of these cases, 64 relate to fauna and 22 relate to flora.

8. In the current document, the Secretariat reports on actions taken by Parties to implement recommendations made by the Animals, Plants and Standing Committees under the RST to ensure compliance with the obligations of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a) of the Convention. The table in Annex 1 to the present document summarizes these cases and also includes those cases where previously made recommendations have not been implemented and the Standing Committee has decided to recommend a suspension of trade in the specimens of the species concerned from the State involved. Follow-up of cases where recommendations to suspend trade have been in place for more than 2 years are addressed in detail in document SC74 Doc. 30.2. Cases where deadlines for implementation of recommendations have now passed are indicated in the third column of the table in Annex 1 as "Ongoing".

9. As per paragraph 1 l) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18), the Secretariat is hereby informing the Standing Committee of its determination as to whether the recommendations formulated by the Animals or Plants have been implemented by the range State concerned. The cases are summarised below in Section 1 for fauna, Section 2 for flora with detailed recommendations made in Annex 2 and Annex 3 respectively to the present document.

10. In accordance with paragraph 1 m) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18), and based on the present report by the Secretariat, the Standing Committee is to decide on necessary action and make recommendations to the range States concerned, or to all Parties, for each of the 15 cases of fauna and 9 cases of flora respectively covered in Sections 1 and 2 of the present document.

11. In line with paragraph 1 k) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18), the Secretariat is consulting intersessionally with Members of the Animals and Plants Committees on the relevant cases, through their respective Chair, to determine their views on whether the recommendations have been implemented. The views of the Animals and Plants Committee Members will be made available as addenda to this document as soon as they become available.

Section 1 – FAUNA

12. Concerning fauna, there are a total of 64 current species/combinations in RST (21 of which are "ongoing" and 43 of which are subject to a recommendation to suspend trade by the Standing Committee). Three fauna cases selected following CoP15 or CoP16 are reviewed here where a range State has provided some new information. All cases that were selected following CoP17 and retained by the Animals Committee at its 30th meeting (AC30, Geneva, July 2018) are also reviewed in detail below.

Species selected following CoP15 and CoP16

13. Guyana / *Amazona festiva*

Background to the case

a) The Animals Committee selected *Amazona festiva* for RST as a priority species at its 27th meeting (AC27, Veracruz, April 2014). Guyana provided a response to the consultation by the Secretariat, but at its 28th meeting (AC28, Tel Aviv, September 2015), the Animals Committee retained the species/country combination in RST based on concerns over high quotas and the basis for non-detriment findings. At its 29th meeting (AC29, Geneva, July 2017), the Animals Committee determined that "Action is needed" concerning trade in *A. festiva* from Guyana and formulated recommendations.

b) The Secretariat wrote to Guyana on 22 September 2017 and received a response on 23 October 2017, where Guyana notified the Secretariat of a proposed quota of 130 birds for 2018 rather than the quota of 60 birds recommended by the Animals Committee.

c) At its 70th meeting (SC70, Sochi, October 2018), the Standing Committee determined that the proposed quota of 130 birds was not sufficiently conservative and urged Guyana to publish an interim quota of 60 birds per year by 1 December 2018; encouraged Guyana to review the interim quota on the basis of Guyana's planned population studies of psittacines; and urged Guyana to implement all outstanding recommendations by 22 September 2019.

d) The Secretariat wrote to Guyana on 21 November 2018 to inform it of the recommendations from SC70. No response was received from Guyana.

e) At its 71st meeting (SC71, Geneva, August 2019), the Standing Committee requested the Secretariat to publish an interim quota of 60 live specimens of *Amazona festiva* per year; encouraged Guyana to review the interim quota on the basis of the results of the population studies referred to; and further urged Guyana to implement all outstanding recommendations by 22 September 2019.

f) An examination of the CITES trade database reveals that there has been no reported commercial trade in this species from Guyana since 2015.

Response from range State

g) In a letter dated 30 September 2019, Guyana indicated that it did not publish export quotas for 2018 or 2019 and has not permitted trade in this species since the species/country combination was selected for inclusion in RST following AC29. Concerning the long-term action, Guyana informs that fieldwork for the population assessment was completed in June 2019 and that analysis of the data was ongoing. Guyana confirmed that it would maintain its current position of a zero quota of *A. festiva* until the Wildlife Scientific Committee completes its review and submits revised recommendations based on the population assessment.

Determination of implementation

h) The original recommendations by the Animals Committee and any updated information on implementation of these recommendations, and the evaluation thereof by the Secretariat are presented in Section A of Annex 2 to this document.

i) Based on the above, the Secretariat, has determined that Guyana has now implemented recommendation a), but not yet implemented the remaining recommendations of the Animals Committee directed to it.

14. Guyana / *Chelonoidis denticulatus*

Background to the case

a) The Animals Committee selected *Chelonoidis denticulatus* for RST as a priority species at AC27. Suriname did not provide a response to the consultation by the Secretariat, and at AC28, the Animals Committee retained the species/country combination in RST based on concerns over the basis of the setting of quotas. At AC29, the Animals Committee determined that "Action is needed" concerning trade in *C. denticulatus* from Guyana and formulated recommendations.

b) The Secretariat wrote to Guyana on 22 September 2017 and Guyana replied in an e-mail sent 16 May 2018. Guyana notified the Secretariat of a zero quota and indicated that it proposes to establish an interim quota, but no further details were given. The zero quota was published on the CITES website.

c) At SC70, the Standing Committee acknowledged the progress made by Guyana in implementing recommendations a) to c) of the Animals Committee; and encouraged Guyana to finalise the implementation of the remaining recommendations by 22 September 2019.

Response from range State

d) In a letter dated 30 September 2019, Guyana indicated that it did not publish export quotas for 2018 or 2019 and has not permitted trade in this species since the species/country combination was selected for inclusion in RST following AC29.

e) Guyana also highlighted the financial difficulties in undertaking the necessary science-based studies to implement the long-term recommendations. It stated that it was possible to conduct a population assessment at this time as precedence was given to the assessment of psittacines in trade as these species are particularly important to the livelihoods of local and indigenous communities.

f) Guyana indicated that it will publish a zero quota for *C. denticulatus* until the financial resources are available for the field aspects for recommendation e).

g) Concerning recommendation f) Guyana indicated that the framework would be developed using collected information on extraction practices by the third quarter of 2020.

Determination of implementation

h) The original recommendations by the Animals Committee and any previous decisions by the Standing Committee, any updated information on implementation of these recommendations, and the evaluation thereof by the Secretariat are presented in Section A of Annex 2 to this document.

i) Based on the above, the Secretariat, has determined that Guyana has implemented recommendation a) to c) of the Animals Committee. It has not implemented the remainder of the recommendations of the Animals Committee directed to it.

15. Lao People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR)/ *Macaca fascicularis*

Background to the case

a) The Animals Committee selected *Macaca fascicularis* for RST as a priority species at its 25th meeting (AC25, Geneva, July 2011). Lao PDR was one of a number of range States for the species retained by the Animals Committee at its 26th meeting (AC26, Geneva, March 2012). Lao PDR did not provide a response to the consultation by the Secretariat, and at AC27, the Animals Committee retained the species/country combination in RST and classified it as "Urgent Concern". The Animals Committee formulated recommendations that were relayed to Lao PDR in a letter sent on 2 June 2014.

b) At SC66, the Standing Committee recommended that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of *M. fascicularis* from Lao PDR until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Animals Committee.

c) The Secretariat wrote to Lao PDR on 10 February 2016.

Response from range State

d) Lao PDR provided a detailed response to each of the recommendations by the Animals Committee, including a non-detriment finding. Importantly, Lao PDR has confirmed that it will not export wild specimens and has established an export quota of 3,000 live, captive-bred specimens from a single farm (Souk Vannasend Trading Company Ltd). A more detailed version of the response is presented in Section A of Annex 2 to this document.

Determination of implementation

e) The original recommendations by the Animals Committee and any previous decisions by the Standing Committee, any updated information on implementation of these recommendations, and the evaluation thereof by the Secretariat are presented in Section A of Annex 2 to this document.

f) Based on the fact that these recommendations were made on the assumption that Lao PDR was exporting wild specimens of *M. fascicularis* and the confirmation from Lao PDR that it only intends to export captive-bred specimens, many of these recommendations are now redundant or no longer relevant. In this regard, *M. fascicularis* from Lao PDR could be removed from the Review.

g) In the event that Lao PDR should decide in the future that it would like to export wild specimens, it should establish a quota and provide an explanation of the scientific basis by which it was determined that the quota would not be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild and is established in compliance with Article IV, paragraph 2 (a) and 3.

16. Togo/ *Pandinus imperator, Poicephalus fuscicollis, Chamaeleo gracilis, Kinixys homeana and Varanus ornatus*.

Togo has contacted the Secretariat with the terms of reference for a study on the five above-mentioned species. It sets out the objectives of a study, the expected results, a detailed methodology and budget. As Togo has been selected as a priority country for assistance under the Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP), the Secretariat will work with Togo under that programme to address these outstanding compliance cases.

Species selected following CoP17

17. At AC29, the Animals Committee selected 19 taxa for the RST in compliance with paragraphs a) and b) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP17) on *Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species*, which was the relevant version of the Resolution in force at the time of selection [see documents AC29 Doc. 13.3 and AC29 Com 5 (Rev. by Sec.)].

18. At its 30th meeting (AC30, Geneva, July 2018), the Committee reviewed the available information on these taxa, including responses from the range States in accordance with paragraph f) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP17). In instances where the Committee was satisfied that Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a), were correctly implemented, the species were eliminated from the Review with respect to the range State concerned, and these range States were notified accordingly by the Secretariat (see document AC30 Doc. 12.2 and the AC30 Summary Record).

19. The taxa and range States that were selected following CoP17 and retained in the Review following AC30 are shown in table 1 below. AC30 formulated recommendations for each species/country combination as presented in AC30 Com. 11 (Rev. by Sec.).

Table 1. Taxa selected following CoP17 and retained in the review after AC30

Species Name	Range State(s)
Amazona farinosa	**Guyana** and **Suriname**
Ara ararauna	**Guyana** and **Suriname**.
Ara chloropterus	**Guyana** and **Suriname**.
Poicephalus gulielmi	**Democratic Republic of the Congo**.
Uromastyx geyri	**Mali**.
Cuora amboinensis	**Indonesia**.
Anguilla anguilla	**Morocco, Tunisia** and **Algeria**.

20. On 14 November 2018, the Secretariat wrote to all range States retained in the Review following AC30 to inform them that the species/country had been retained in the RST and forward the recommendations made by the Animals Committee. The letter also contained a copy of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP18) and a summary schedule of the conduct of the RST process from CoP17 onwards. The implications of not addressing the recommendations were also made clear.

21. The 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP18, Geneva, 2019) adopted amendments to Appendices I and II of the Convention which, *inter alia*, transferred *Balearica pavonina* from Appendix II to Appendix I, making further activities under the RST no longer relevant for this species.

22. The responses received from the range States are made available in Annex 4, in the language and format as received. Responses to the cases indicated in the table above were received from Algeria, Indonesia, Guyana, Morocco, Suriname, Togo and Tunisia. The responses are summarized below and presented in

the table in Annex 2 along with the Secretariat's assessment of the implementation of the AC recommendations.

23. The table in Section B of Annex 2 provides an overview of the 12 fauna species/country combinations that were selected following CoP17 and retained following AC30, including the relevant recommendations and timelines in the first column, an update on the status of implementation of the recommendations, including a summary of any response from the range State concerned in the second column and the Secretariat's provisional assessment and recommendations to the Standing Committee in the third column.

SECTION 2- FLORA

24. In the case of flora, the current cases total 22 species/country combinations, as follows:

    a) five relate to species/country combinations subject to trade suspensions for more than two years. Further background and recommendations associated to these cases are available in document SC74 Doc. 30.2;

    b) eight relate to the inclusion of the *Pterocarpus erinaceus*/country combinations retained in Stage 2 of the Review process as an exceptional case by the Plants Committee at PC25, in the framework of the implementation of Decision 18.92 paragraph b). Further background and recommendations associated to these cases are available in document SC74 Doc. 35.1.1; and,

    c) the remaining nine cases relate to species/country combinations which were last reported to the Standing Committee at SC70 or SC71, or for which the implementation of recommendations is due to be reported based on the deadlines established by the Plants Committee. These nine flora cases represent the focus of this Section 2 and Annex 3 to the present document. The elements of the range State responses that are directly relevant to the assessment of the implementation of ongoing recommendations for flora are made available in Annex 5 in the language and format as received.

25. Cameroon/ *Prunus africana*

    Background to the case

    a) At its 21st meeting (PC21; Veracruz, May 2014), the Plants Committee selected *Prunus africana* for RST as a priority species following CoP16 (2013). At its 22nd meeting (PC22; Tbilisi, October 2015), the Plants Committee agreed to retain the species/country combination *Prunus africana*/Cameroon in the RST. At its 23rd meeting (PC23; Geneva, July 2017), the Plants Committee determined that "Action is needed" concerning trade in *Prunus africana* from Cameroon and formulated recommendations, as presented in Annex 3 to this document.

    b) Status of the implementation of the Plants Committee recommendations for this case was reported in detail by the Secretariat to the Standing Committee at SC70 and SC71 in documents SC70 Doc. 29.1 and SC71 Doc. 12, respectively. The agreements of the Standing Committee at SC70 and SC71 are summarized in Annex 3 to the present document.

    c) On 16 October 2019 the Secretariat wrote to Cameroon to inform on the outcome of SC71, and again on 2 November 2020 inviting it to provide any updates on the implementation of RST recommendations by 30 November 2020. The response and follow-up from Cameroon, including outcomes of informal conversations with the Secretariat, are summarized below.

    Response from range State

    d) In line with ongoing RST recommendations, since SC71 to date Cameroon has communicated to the Secretariat proposed quotas for *P. africana*. Furthermore, in early 2021, the Secretariat and Cameroon held informal conversations to explore how the implementation of ongoing RST recommendations can be streamlined with the delivery of expected outcomes under the relevant project of the CITES Tree Species Programme (see document SC74 Doc. 14). Updates of these communications are summarized in Annex 3 to this document.

Determination of implementation

e) Recommendations a) to c) of the Plants Committee, and associated recommendations of the Standing Committee, have been complied with.

f) Recommendations d) and e) of the Plants Committee and associated recommendations of the Standing Committee have been partially complied with, and remain ongoing in light of the expected outcomes of the ongoing project under the CITES Tree Species Programme (see document SC74 Doc. 14).

26. Congo/ *Pericopsis elata*

Background to the case

a) At PC23, the Plants Committee selected *Pericopsis elata* for RST as a priority species following CoP17 (2016). At its 24th meeting (PC24; Geneva, July 2018), the Plants Committee determined that "Action is needed" concerning trade in *Pericopsis elata* from the Congo and formulated recommendations, as presented in Annex 3 to this document.

b) On 13 November 2018, the Secretariat wrote to the Congo concerning the outcome of PC24 regarding *Pericopsis elata*, and again on 2 November 2020 inviting it to provide any updates of the implementation of RST recommendations by 30 November 2020.

Response from range State

c) Congo replied to the Secretariat's communications regarding *Pericopsis elata* on 1 February 2019 and 12 October 2020, including consultation on the establishment of quotas for the species for consideration by the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee.

d) The content of Congo's responses is further summarized and assessed against the Plants Committee recommendations in Annex 3 to this document.

Determination of implementation

e) Recommendations a) to b) have been partially implementing, with clarifications pending on the quota set for 2019 and 2021.

f) Recommendations c) to f) of the Plants Committee have been partially implemented, noting however significant progress in the development of NDFs in support of the establishment of sustainable harvest and export quotas.

27. Democratic Republic of the Congo/ *Prunus africana*

Background to the case

a) At PC21, the Plants Committee selected *Prunus africana* for RST as a priority species following CoP16 (2013). At PC22, the Plants Committee agreed to retain the species/country combination *Prunus africana*/Democratic Republic of the Congo in the RST. At PC23, the Plants Committee determined that "Action is needed" concerning trade in *Prunus africana* from the Democratic Republic of the Congo and formulated recommendations, as presented in Annex 3 to this document.

b) Status of the implementation of the Plants Committee recommendations for this case was reported in detail by the Secretariat to the Standing Committee at SC70 in documents SC70 Doc. 29.1. The agreements of the Standing Committee at SC70 are summarized in the Annex 3 to the present document.

c) On 24 April 2019, the Secretariat wrote to the Democratic Republic of the Congo to inform on the outcome outcomes of SC70 regarding, *inter alia*, *Prunus africana*, and again on 2 November 2020 inviting it to provide any updates on the implementation of RST recommendations by 30 November 2020.

Response from range State

d) Through a letter dated 13 February 2019, the Democratic Republic of the Congo communicated its proposed 2019 quota exports for fauna and flora, including a 2019 quota for *Prunus africana* of 102 tons of dry bark for consultation with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, which was agreed for publication. In December 2019, an equivalent quota of 102 tons of dry bark was requested for 2020 and published accordingly on the website. At the time of writing, the Democratic Republic of the Congo has not communicated to the Secretariat any quota for 2021 nor for 2022.

e) Outcomes of communications with the Democratic Republic of the Congo in line with ongoing recommendations under the RST process are summarized in Annex 3 to the present document.

Determination of implementation

f) Recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee have been implemented.

g) Recommendations c) and d) of the Plants Committee, and associated recommendations of the Standing Committee, are reaching implementation in light of the upcoming publication of the relevant outcomes under the relevant CITES Tree Species Programme (CTSP) project (see document SC74 Doc. 14).

28. Democratic Republic of the Congo/ *Pericopsis elata*

Background to the case

a) At PC23, the Plants Committee selected *Pericopsis elata* for RST as a priority species following CoP17 (2016). At PC24, the Plants Committee determined that "Action is needed" concerning trade in *Pericopsis elata* from the Democratic Republic of the Congo and formulated recommendations, as presented in Annex 3 to this document.

b) On 13 November 2018, the Secretariat wrote to the Democratic Republic of the Congo concerning the outcome of PC24 regarding *Pericopsis elata*, and again on 2 November 2020 inviting it to provide any updates of the implementation of RST recommendations by 30 November 2020.

Response from range State

c) The Democratic Republic of the Congo replied to the Secretariat's communications regarding *Pericopsis elata* through letters dated 22 November 2018, 13 February 2019 and 26 October 2021, on each occasion with *inter alia* quota requests for consideration of the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, in compliance with relevant recommendations under the RST process.

d) The content of the Democratic Republic of the Congo's responses and outcomes relevant to the publication of quotas requested for the years 2019 to 2021 under the RST process are summarized and assessed against the Plants Committee recommendations in Annex 3 to this document.

Determination of implementation

e) Recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee have been implemented.

f) Recommendations c) to e) of the Plants Committee, and associated recommendations of the Standing Committee, are reaching implementation in light of the upcoming publication of the relevant outcomes under the relevant CITES Tree Species Programme (CTSP) project (see document SC74 Doc. 14).

29. India/ *Pterocarpus santalinus*

Background to the case

a) Trade in *Pterocarpus santalinus* from India was selected for examination under RST at PC22, and based on concerns over *inter alia* its conservation status, levels of illegal harvest and illegal trade reported, clarifications needed in relation to the level of artificial propagation. At PC23, the Plants Committee determined that "Action is needed" for this species/country combination and formulated recommendations.

b) Status of the implementation of the Plants Committee recommendations for this case was reported in detail by the Secretariat to the Standing Committee at SC70 and SC71 in documents SC70 Doc. 29.1 and SC71 Doc. 12, respectively. The agreements of the Standing Committee at SC70 and SC71 are summarized in Annex 3 to the present document.

c) On 4 October 2019, the Secretariat wrote to India to inform on the outcome of SC71, and again on 2 November 2020 inviting it to provide any updates of the implementation of RST recommendations by 30 November 2020. The response and follow up from India since SC71 to date are summarized below.

Response from range State

d) Through a letter dated 1 January 2020, India responded by submitting a non-detriment finding report on *Pterocarpus santalinus* (dated 2019), which is summarized in Annex 3 to this document.

e) Additionally, throughout 2020 and 2021 India consulted the Secretariat regarding the possibility to export 810.1894 tons of *P. santalinus* uprooted by the Cyclone Titli (2018). As it also relates to *P. santalinus*, the Secretariat has also summarized outcomes of these communications in Annex 3 to the present document.

Determination of implementation

f) Recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee and recommendation d) of the Standing Committee have been complied with.

g) Recommendation c) and e) of the Standing Committee has been partially complied with, noting that clarification is needed regarding the remaining stock of the one-time export since 2018 onwards.

30. Nepal/ *Nardostachys grandiflora*

Background to the case

a) At PC21, the Plants Committee selected *Nardostachys grandiflora* for RST as a priority species as part of the list of species for trade reviews following CoP16 (2013). At PC22, the Plants Committee agreed to retain the species/country combination *Nardostachys grandiflora*/Nepal in the RST. At PC23, the Plants Committee determined that "Action is needed" concerning trade in *N. grandiflora* from Nepal and formulated recommendations.

b) Status of the implementation of the Plants Committee recommendations for this case was reported in detail by the Secretariat to the Standing Committee at SC70 and SC71 in documents SC70 Doc. 29.1 and SC71 Doc. 12, respectively. The agreements of the Standing Committee at SC70 and SC71 are summarized in Annex 3 to this document to the present document.

c) On 4 October 2019, the Secretariat wrote to Nepal to inform on the outcome of SC71, and again on 2 November 2020 inviting it to provide any updates of the implementation of RST recommendations by 30 November 2020. The response and follow-up from India since SC71 to date are summarized below.

Response from range State

d) Nepal responded on 22 September and 27 October 2019, and through follow up communications throughout 2020, providing the Secretariat with a comprehensive dossier in support of the establishment of conservative export quotas *N. grandiflora* for 2020 and 2021. Outcomes of consultations by Nepal with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee following consideration of the information provided by Nepal are summarized in Annex 3 to the present document.

Determination of implementation

e) The Secretariat has determined that the recommendations a) to e) of the Plants Committee, and associated recommendations of the Standing Committee, have been complied with.

31. Nicaragua/ *Dalbergia retusa*

Background to the case

a) At PC23, the Plants Committee selected *Dalbergia retusa* for RST as a priority species following CoP17 (2016). At PC24, the Plants Committee determined that "Action is needed" concerning trade in *Dalbergia retusa* from Nicaragua and formulated recommendations, as presented in Annex 3 to this document.

b) On 20 November 2018, the Secretariat wrote to Nicaragua concerning the outcome of PC24 regarding *Dalbergia retusa*, and again on 2 November 2020 inviting it to provide any updates of the implementation of RST recommendations by 30 November 2020.

Response from range State

c) Nicaragua replied to the Secretariat's communications regarding *Dalbergia retusa* on 10 January 2019 and on 18 December 2020, on each occasion with substantial information relevant to progress in the implementation of the Plants Committee recommendations.

d) The content of Nicaragua's responses is further summarized and assessed against the Plants Committee recommendations in Annex 3 to the present document.

Determination of implementation

e) Recommendations a) to c) of the Plants Committee have been implemented.

f) Recommendation d) of the Plants Committee has been partially implemented.

32. Panama/ *Dalbergia retusa*

Background to the case

a) The Plants Committee selected *Dalbergia retusa* for RST as a priority species at PC23 [PC23 Com. 5 (Rev. by Sec.)] as part of the list of species for trade reviews following CoP17 (2016). At PC24, the Plants Committee determined that "Action is needed" concerning trade in *Dalbergia retusa* from Panama and formulated recommendations, as presented in Annex 3 to this document.

b) On 20 November 2018, the Secretariat wrote to Panama concerning the outcome of PC24 regarding *Dalbergia retusa*, and again on 2 November 2020, inviting it to provide any updates on progress in their implementation by 30 November 2020.

Response from range State

c) Since the inclusion of *Dalbergia retusa*/Panama in Stage 2 of the RST process at PC24 to date, no response has been received from Panama on this case.

Determination of implementation

e) None of the recommendations of the Plants Committee [a) to e)] have been implemented.

33. Paraguay/ *Bulnesia sarmientoi*

Background to the case

a) At PC21, the Plants Committee selected *Bulnesia sarmientoi* for the RST as a priority species as part of the list of species for trade reviews following CoP16 (2013). At PC22, the Plants Committee agreed to retain the species/country combination *Bulnesia sarmientoi*/Paraguay in the RST. At PC23, the Plants Committee agreed to categorize *Bulnesia sarmientoi*/Paraguay as "Action is needed" and formulated recommendations.

b) Status of the implementation of the Plants Committee recommendations for this case was last reported in detail by the Secretariat to the Standing Committee at SC70 in document SC70 Doc. 29.1, including a summary of a dossier submitted by Paraguay relating to non-detriment findings and the establishment

of precautionary quotas for *B. sarmientoi*. The agreements of SC70 on this case are summarized in Annex 3 to the present document. At its 71st meeting (SC71, Geneva, August 2019) the Standing Committee considered brief updates on this case through document SC71 Doc. 12; the SC71 agreements on this case are also included in Annex 3 to the present document.

c) On 25 March 2019, the Secretariat wrote to Paraguay to inform on the outcome of SC70. The responses and follow up from Paraguay since SC70 to date are summarized below.

Response from range State

d) On 26 April 2019, Paraguay responded by proposing for consideration by the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee a quota for *B. sarmientoi*. The request was accompanied with a comprehensive non-detriment finding consisting of a dossier of eight files, which is summarized in Annex 3 to the present document. Following careful consideration of the information and request by Paraguay, the Secretariat and the Chair agreed for to the publication of a *B. sarmientoi*/2019 quota of 1,400 tons for wood and 250 tons for extract.

e) On 2 July 2020, Paraguay submitted for consideration by the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee the same *B. sarmientoi* quota volumes as the previous year, with the relevant updated information, which was agreed for publication on the webpage.

f) On 19 October 2021, Paraguay submitted for consideration of the Secretariat of the Chair of the Plants Committee a new *B. sarmientoi* quota with a slight increase from the previous year: 1,600 tons for wood and 270 tons for extract. Based on the supporting information, the quota was considered a precautionary increase, and agreed for publication on the webpage. The supporting information is further summarized in Annex 3 to the present document.

Determination of implementation

g) Recommendations a) to f) of the Plants Committee have been implemented.

h) Recommendations g) to l) of the Standing Committee have also been met.

Recommendations

34. In accordance with paragraph 1 m) of Resolution Conf. 12. (Rev. CoP18) and based on the present report, the Standing Committee is invited to decide on necessary action and make recommendations to the range States concerned, or to all Parties.

SPECIES/COUNTRY COMBINATIONS CURRENTLY
IN THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE
(AS OF JANUARY 2022)

– Countries are shown in the first column, arranged in alphabetical order, with the relevant species in the second column.

– Where a recommendation to suspend trade is in place for a particular species/country combination, this is highlighted in green and the date of validation is indicated in the third column.

– Cases marked (*) refer to exceptional cases, pursuant paragraph 1 c) of the RST process.

– Where information has been received by the Secretariat from the country concerning updates on the implementation of the recommendations of the Animals, Plants or Standing Committees, including the publication of any quotas in line with the recommendations, or reference to another SC74 document where the case will be discussed, this is indicated in the fourth column

Country	Species	Date of validation of recommendation to suspend trade, where relevant (all other cases are ongoing)	Comments
Algeria	*Anguilla*	*Ongoing*	Report received and quota published
Belize	*Myrmecophila tibicinis*	15 June 2010	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
Benin	*Pandinus imperator*	2 May 2013	Zero quota published in 2020
	Chamaeleo gracilis	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Chamaeleo senegalensis	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Kinixys homeana	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Pterocarpus erinaceus	*Ongoing**	Retained at PC25. See document SC74 Doc 35.1.1.
Burkina Faso	*Pterocarpus erinaceus*	*Ongoing**	Retained at PC25. See document SC74 Doc 35.1.1.
Cameroon	*Prunus africana*	*Ongoing*	Reviewed in present document.
	Trioceros quadricornis	15 March 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Trioceros montium	20 January 2020	Letter received 30/11/2018
Congo	*Pericopsis elata*	Ongoing	Reviewed in present document.
Côte d'Ivoire	*Pericopsis elata*	7 September 2012	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
Democratic Republic of the Congo	*Poicephalus fuscicollis*	9 July 2001	
	Poicephalus gulielmi	*Ongoing*	Sent a letter of acknowledgement
	Prunus africana	*Ongoing*	Reviewed in present document.
	Pericopsis elata	*Ongoing*	Reviewed in present document.

Equatorial Guinea	*Prunus africana*	3 February 2009	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Trioceros feae	7 September 2012	
Fiji	*Plerogyra simplex*	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Plerogyra sinuosa	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
Gambia	*Pterocarpus erinaceus*	*Ongoing**	Retained at PC25. See document SC74 Doc 35.1.1.
Ghana	*Pandinus imperator*	12 August 2014	
	Chamaeleo gracilis	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Chamaeleo senegalensis	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Pterocarpus erinaceus	*Ongoing**	Retained at PC25. See document SC74 Doc 35.1.1.
Grenada	*Strombus gigas*	12 May 2006	
Guinea	*Hippocampus algiricus*	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
Guinea Bissau	*Pterocarpus erinaceus*	*Ongoing**	Retained at PC25. See document SC74 Doc 35.1.1.
Guyana	*Amazona festiva*	*Ongoing*	Zero quota published in 2020
	Chelonoidis denticulatus	*Ongoing*	Zero quota published in 2020
	Amazona farinosa	*Ongoing*	Quota published in 2020
	Ara ararauna	*Ongoing*	Report received to support news proposed quota of 760 live specimens
	Ara chloropterus	*Ongoing*	Quota published in 2020
Haiti	*Strombus gigas*	29 September 2003	
India	*Pterocarpus santalinus*	*Ongoing*	Reviewed in present document.
Indonesia	*Malayemys subtrijuga*	*Ongoing*	Quota published
	Notochelys platynota	*Ongoing*	Quota published
	Cuora amboinensis	*Ongoing*	Quota published
Jordan	*Testudo graeca*	*Ongoing*	Letter received 13/11/2018
Lao People's Democratic Republic	*Dendrobium nobile*	3 February 2009	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Macaca fascicularis	3 February 2016	Information received 31/07/2018
Madagascar	*Coracopsis vasa*	20 January 1995	
	Furcifer labordi	20 January 1995	
	Phelsuma borai	20 January 1995	
	Phelsuma gouldi	20 January 1995	
	Phelsuma hoeschi	20 January 1995	
	Phelsuma ravenala	20 January 1995	
Mali	*Uromastyx dispar*	22 August 2008	
	Uromastyx geyeri	*Ongoing*	
	Pterocarpus erinaceus	*Ongoing**	Retained at PC25. See document SC74 Doc 35.1.1.
Morocco	*Anguilla*	*Ongoing*	Report received and quotas published in 2020
Mozambique	*Cycas thouarsii*	6 December 2006	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2

	Smaug mossambicus	7 September 2012	
	Cordylus tropidosternum	10 August 2001	
	Trioceros melleri	*Ongoing*	Letter received 1 April 2019
Nepal	*Nardostachys grandiflora*	*Ongoing*	Reviewed in present document.
Nicaragua	*Dalbergia retusa*	*Ongoing*	Reviewed in present document.
Niger	*Chamaeleo africanus*	7 September 2012	
Nigeria	*Pterocarpus erinaceus*	*Ongoing**	Retained at PC25. See document SC74 Doc 35.1.1.
Panama	*Dalbergia retusa*	*Ongoing*	Reviewed in present document.
Paraguay	*Bulnesia sarmientoi*	*Ongoing*	Reviewed in present document.
Senegal	*Hippocampus algiricus*	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
Sierra Leone	*Pterocarpus erinaceus*	*Ongoing**	Retained at PC25. See document SC74 Doc 35.1.1.
Solomon Islands	*Corucia zebrata*	9 July 2001	
	Ornithoptera priamus	20 January 1995	
	Ornithoptera victoriae	20 January 1995	
	Tridacna derasa	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Tridacna crocea	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Tridacna gigas	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Tridacna maxima	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Tridacna ningaloo[1]	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Tridacna noae[2]	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Tridacna squamosa	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
Suriname	*Amazona farinosa*	*Ongoing*	Letter received 12/1/2019
	Ara ararauna	*Ongoing*	
	Ara chloropterus	*Ongoing*	
Togo	*Pandinus imperator*	2 May 2013	Letter received 21 Nov 2018. Zero quota published in 2020
	Poicephalus fuscicollis	9 July 2001	Zero quota published
	Chamaeleo gracilis	*Ongoing*	Zero quota published
	Kinixys homeana	*Ongoing*	Zero quota published
	Varanus ornatus	*Ongoing*	Zero quota published.
Tunisia	*Anguilla anguilla*	*Ongoing*	Report received and quota published in 2020
United Republic of Tanzania	*Balearica regulorum*	2 May 2013	
	Kinyongia fischeri	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2
	Kinyongia tavetana	3 February 2016	See document SC74 Doc. 30.2

[1] *Recognized as a new species at CoP17*

[2] *Split from* Tridacna maxima *at CoP17*

A - RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ANIMALS COMMITTEE FOR A SELECTION SPECIES SELECTED FOR THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE FOLLOWING COP15 AND COP16; RESPONSES FROM THE RANGE STATES CONCERNED; AND DETERMINATION OF IMPLEMENTATION BY THE SECRETARIAT

Recommendations of the AC, and previous decisions of the SC where these exist	**Update on implementation of recommendations**	**Determination of implementation**
***Amazona festiva* (Festive parrot)**		
Guyana (GY) <u>Short term action (by 22 October 2017)</u> a) Establish an interim conservative export quota of 60 birds per year within 30 days and communicate the quota to the Secretariat. b) No exports should occur until the quota has been published on the Secretariat's website. c) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Guyana to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of best available scientific information, for their agreement. <u>Long term action (by 22 September 2019)</u> d) Undertake science-based studies, including field studies, on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution)	In a letter date 30 September 2019, Guyana indicated that it did not publish export quotas for 2018 or 2019 and has not permitted trade in this species since the species/country combination was selected for inclusion in RST following AC29. Concerning the long-term action, Guyana informs that fieldwork for the population assessment was completed in June 2019 and that analysis of the data was ongoing. Guyana confirmed that it would maintain its current position of a zero quota of *A. festiva* until the Wildlife Scientific Committee completes its review and submits revised recommendations based on the population assessment.	<u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u> Recommendations a) to c) have been implemented. <u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u> **The Standing Committee is invited to:** **a) request Guyana to share the results of its population study of psittacines; and** **b) urge Guyana to provide information on the implementation of recommendations d) to f) by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.**

including an evaluation of the threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs e) e) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all harvest (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs <u>Final recommendation</u> f) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of Guyana should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions Guyana has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process. <u>Recommendations of the Standing Committee</u> **At SC70,** The Standing Committee urged Guyana to publish an interim quota of 60 birds per year by 1 December 2018; encouraged Guyana to review the interim quota on the basis of Guyana's planned population studies of psittacines; and urged Guyana to implement all outstanding recommendations by 22 September 2019. **At SC71**, the Standing Committee requested the Secretariat to publish an interim quota of 60 live specimens of *Amazona festiva* per year; encouraged Guyana to review the interim quota on the basis of the results of the population studies referred to; and further urged Guyana to implement all outstanding recommendations by 22 September 2019.		

***Chelonoidis denticulatus* (Yellow footed tortoise)**		
GUYANA (GY) <u>Short term action (by 21 December 2017)</u> a) Review and revise, in consultation with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Animals Committee, the export quota for the species and communicate the quota to the Secretariat. The revised quota should be conservative and include a restriction on trade to live individuals with a maximum straight carapace length (SCL) of 10 cm. b) No exports should occur until the quota has been published on the Secretariat's website. c) The export quota (which could include zero allowable exports) should be justified as conservative based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of best available scientific information and clearly demonstrate how the quota is managed considering the variability in status across the country. d) Before making any increases to the interim quota (including increases from a zero export quota), the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of the respective range State to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable offtake that make use of best available scientific information, for their agreement. <u>Long term action (by 22 September 2019)</u> e) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends,	The Secretariat wrote to GY on 22 September 2017. In an e-mail sent 16 May 2018, GY notified the Secretariat of a zero quota and indicated that it proposes to establish an interim quota, but no further details are given. The zero quota was published on the CITES website. In a more recent letter dated 30 September 2019, Guyana indicated that it did not publish export quotas for 2018 or 2019 and has not permitted trade in this species since the species/country combination was selected for inclusion in RST following AC29. Guyana also highlighted the financial difficulties in undertaking the necessary science-based studies to implement the long-term recommendations. It stated that it was possible to conduct a population assessment at this time as precedence was given to the assessment of psittacines in trade as these species are particularly important to the livelihoods of local and indigenous communities. Guyana indicated that it will continue to publish a zero quota for *C. denticulatus* until the financial resources are available for the field aspects for recommendation e). Concerning recommendation f) Guyana indicated that the framework would be developed using collected information on extraction practices by the third quarter of 2020.	<u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u> Recommendations a) to c) have now been implemented through the publication of a zero-export quota. <u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u> **The Standing Committee is invited to:** **a) request the Secretariat to publish a zero-export quota for *C. denticulatus* until Guyana provides information to justify a higher quota to be agreed with the AC Chair; and** **b) urge Guyana to provide an update on the implementation of recommendations d) to f) by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.**

distribution) including an evaluation of the threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs f) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all harvest (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs Final recommendation Recommendations of the Standing Committee **At SC70,** The Standing Committee acknowledged the progress made by Guyana by implementing recommendations a) to c) of the Animals Committee; and encouraged Guyana to finalise the implementation of the remaining recommendations by 22 September 2019.		
Macaca fascicularis (Crab-eating Macaque)		
Lao PDR (LA) (Urgent Concern) Within 90 days (by 31 August 2014) the Management Authority should: a) Immediately establish a zero annual export quota for wild specimens as an interim measure which should be communicated to Parties by the Secretariat b) Provide available information to the Secretariat on the distribution (including extent of distribution in protected areas), abundance and conservation status of the species, and any current management measures in place for *M. fascicularis* in Lao PDR; c) Provide detailed information to the Secretariat for transmission to the Animals Committee for review at its 28th meeting on the extent of breeding in captivity of *M. fascicularis* in the LA, and describe measures taken to ensure that	Concerning recommendation a) Lao PDR has confirmed that it has no intention of exporting any wild-taken specimens of *M. fascicularis* as previously reported and in addressing recommendations a), f), g), and h) of the Animals Committee, it will establish an annual export quota that is approved by government for captive bred specimens of *M. fascicularis* only. In this regard, a quota of 3,000 live, captive bred specimens was published on 9 October 2020. Concerning recommendation b) LA indicates that the population of *M. fascicularis* has mostly lived and spread in the protected areas. The management of its population follow the laws and international conservation organizations, while the animals raised in the farms shall follow the CITES regulations in terms of the species management. LA states that data collected on the population of *M. fascicularis* indicate that about 300 to 500 monkeys are living in the protected areas in the country.	The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations The relevant recommendations have been implemented. Others are no longer relevant as Lao PDR is only exporting captive bred specimens. Actions recommended by the Secretariat **The Standing Committee is invited to note that the species/country combination *Macaca fascicularis*/Lao People's Democratic Republic has been removed from the Review of Significant Trade process.**

there is no detrimental impact on wild populations including, but not limited to, the origin of founder stock, details of the breeding stock, whether the breeding stock is augmented by wild-taken specimens and their origin, annual production for the last 5 years, whether bred to second generation or beyond, and a detailed description of the breeding facilities; d) Provide detailed information to the Secretariat for transmission to the Animals Committee for review at its 28th meeting on the measures to distinguish between wild-taken and captive-bred specimens to ensure that exports of wild specimens are not mis-declared as specimens bred or produced in captivity; e) Provide detailed information to the Secretariat for transmission to the Animals Committee for review at its 28th meeting of the justification for the use of source code R for specimens of *M. fascicularis* exported from LA between 2006 and 2009. <u>Within 2 years,</u> the Management Authority should: f) Conduct a national status assessment, including an evaluation of threats to the species; and advise the Secretariat of any management measures taken, as appropriate, on the basis of this status assessment; g) Establish a revised annual export quota (if appropriate) for wild taken specimens, based on the results of the assessment; and h) Communicate the annual export quota to the Secretariat and provide a justification for, and explanation of, the scientific basis by which it was determined that the quota would not be	LA states that it regulates wildlife management, for example through agreement on standards and strict control of wildlife trade, particularly raising awareness, planning and prevention of illegal fish and wildlife trade. <u>Concerning recommendation c)</u> LA indicates that relevant ministries should report the number of registered farms to the CITES Secretariat. For the Soukvannaseng Farm (which appears to be the only farm still operating in Lao PDR), there are currently 20,950 monkeys with a birth rate of 14% per year and a mortality rate of 4% per year. The first generation at this farm was stocked in 2003. The parental breeding stocks were authorized by the relevant authorities, and the animals were brought from the forests and bought from local communities. LA states that “for the maintenance level of raising monkeys, especially in the Soukvannaseng Farm, it is intended to continue breeding and raising at least by 2025” but it is not really clear if the stock will be subsidised with new wild stock. LA states that the Government considers it important to protect natural resources, including any species listed in List 1 and 2, with the implementation of the international treaties, especially CITES, that the country is Party to. In order to comply with that, in the past, the government has been closely and regularly coordinated with the private sectors that have conducted activities on raising *M. fascicularis*, which has also focused on advising them on compliance with international requirements through outreach and education programs. Moreover, the government has encouraged the private sectors to be compliant with domestic laws, especially the Law on Fisheries and Wildlife. It has also encouraged private sectors to improve the farm standards, educated them, warned the farms to put into systems and suspended activities that cannot fulfil the requirements, from 05 farms to remain now only the Soukvannaseng Farm. During consultations between the government authorities and Souk vannasend Farm, the farm explained the importance of continuing to raise monkeys by keeping and rearing the existing monkeys, and it was agreed with the authority to determine an annual export quota for in	

detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild and is established in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3. Recommendations of the Standing Committee **At SC66,** the Standing Committee recommended that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of *M. fascicularis* from LA until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Animals Committee.	compliance with the CITES principles. Continued rearing is to ensure that there will be no interruption of exporting monkeys from the wildlife or captive breeding (F_1 and F_2) and to exchange for scientific purposes. In order to improve the standard of rearing monkeys and ensure compliance with regulations, the farm is in the process of recruiting foreign experts to assist in the improvement of systems to have a better standard of rearing. Concerning recommendation d) LA states that it appreciates the measures to monitor monkeys by using microchips, but that microchipping would increase cost burdens for the farm. The LA authorities (MA and SA) will closely coordinate with private sectors on this issue microchips can be used for controlling or monitoring to the monkey parents (F_1 and F_2) . Concerning recommendation e) LA indicates that the use of the Source code R (ranched) is based on national laws but does not go into more detail. Concerning recommendations f) and g) LA states that while it has reported its aim to expand the captive breeding programme on *M. fascicularis* to meet the international demand for the species and have indicated the size of the populations in the farms, there is also an acknowledgement that there is a need to also expand its on-going activities to expand information on the distribution, abundance, conservation status and current management measures for the wild population of *M. fascicularis* in Lao PDR. In this regard, LA states that it intends to expand its consultation and assessment with international and local organizations as well as local communities working on conservation of this species in Lao PDR. Concerning recommendation h) LA established an export quota of 3,000 live, captive bred specimens (from Souk Vannasend Trading Company Ltd)	

	Secretariat's assessment The Secretariat notes that these recommendations were made in the assumption that LA is exporting wild specimens of *M. fascicularis.* The publication of a zero-export quota for wild specimens by LA would make many of these recommendations redundant. In the event that Lao PDR should decide in the future that it would like to export wild specimens, it should establish a quota and provide an explanation of the scientific basis by which it was determined that the quota would not be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild and is established in compliance with Article IV, paragraph 2 (a) and 3. Should Lao PDR allow farms to supplement the breeding stock with wild-taken specimens, there would need to be an assessment of the potential impacts on the wild population.	

B - RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ANIMALS COMMITTEE FOR SPECIES SELECTED FOR THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE FOLLOWING COP17; RESPONSES FROM THE RANGE STATES CONCERNED; AND DETERMINATION OF IMPLEMENTATION BY THE SECRETARIAT

<table>
<tr><th>Recommendations by the Animals Committee</th><th>Update on implementation of recommendations</th><th>Determination of implementation</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Amazona farinosa (Mealy parrot)</td></tr>
<tr><td>
Guyana

Short term action

<u>Within 60 days (13 January 2019):</u>

a) Established a reduced quota for 2019 to average trade levels 300 specimens; these quotas should not be amended until a new non-detriment finding, based on survey data (to be provided within 1 year), is submitted and reviewed by the AC.

b) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Guyana to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of best available scientific information, for their agreement.

Long term actions

<u>Within 2 years (14 November 2020):</u>

c) Initiate appropriate harvest measures to ensure sustainability (for example): -
</td>
<td>
The Management Authority of Guyana provided a response to the Secretariat on 30 September 2019 but did not provide any information specifically concerning A. farinosa.

<u>Concerning recommendation a):</u>

- Guyana requested that the Secretariat publish a quota of 300 specimens (published on 26 May 2020)

- An analysis of the CITES trade data (2016 to 2020) shows that Guyana has consistently reported trade levels higher than those reported by importers and has not exceeded its quota
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Speci men</th><th>2016</th><th>2017</th><th>2018</th><th>2019</th><th>2020</th></tr>
<tr><td>Annual report</td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Quota</td><td></td><td>1100</td><td>1100</td><td>In prep</td><td>-</td><td>300</td></tr>
<tr><td>Importer</td><td>Live</td><td>200</td><td>212</td><td>146</td><td>27</td><td>6</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exporter</td><td>Live</td><td>300</td><td>121</td><td>819</td><td>118</td><td>44</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td>
<u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u>

Recommendation a) has been complied with and d) may have been partially compiled with if the study referred to in Guyana's response to Amazona festiva also covered this species.

<u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u>

The Standing Committee is invited to:

a) request Guyana to share the results of its population study of psittacines; and

b) urge Guyana to provide information on the implementation of recommendations c) to k) by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.
</td>
</tr>
</table>

size/selective harvest - open/closed seasons - harvest seasons - harvest maximums - restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day - control of number of harvesters - types and methods of harvest d) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution) including an evaluation of the threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs e) Develop/Implement an ongoing science-based population monitoring program that is used in conjunction with an adaptive management program for the species (see harvest management measures and trade controls, below), for use in making NDFs f) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all harvest (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs -Develop and implement harvest guidelines (or "best practices") describing accepted practices g) Develop and implement local management with clearly defined harvest management measures (e.g., harvest seasons, harvest maximums, restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day, control of number of harvesters, types and methods of harvest) h) Provide information and guidance to persons and organizations involved in the production and export of specimens of the species concerned. i) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all export (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs	Guyana has submitted annual reports for all years 2016 to 2020. <u>Concerning recommendation d):</u> - The letter from Guyana on 30 September 2019 mentions that fieldwork for the population assessment of psittacines concluded in June 2019 and that analysis of the data was ongoing. The letter only made reference to *A. festiva* but it is assumed by the Secretariat that *A. farinosa* would also be covered. However, no information on this study has been made available since then.	

j) Encourage information sharing with Suriname in order to collaborate on making NDFs Final recommendation k) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of Guyana should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions Guyana has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.		
Suriname Short term action Within 60 days (13 January 2019) a) Establish an interim conservative export quota of 200 within 60 days for the species and communicate the quota to the Secretariat. b) No exports should occur until the quota has been published on the Secretariat's website. c) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Suriname to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of best available scientific information, for their agreement. Long term actions	On 12 January 2019 Suriname sent a response to the letter sent by the Secretariat on 14 November 2018. Concerning recommendation a) In the letter the CITES Management Authority of Suriname indicated that starting on 16 January 2019, it would hold consultation sessions with the representatives of the exporters of CITES Appendix-II species, the UID, the National Herbarium and the zoological collection of the University of Suriname regarding the publication of the export quota list for 2019. It noted that the quota of 200 live specimens of *A. farinosa* would be on the agenda of these consultations and a formal report would be sent to the Secretariat. Suriname indicated that as required by Surinamese law it would also be necessary to get the advice of its Nature Conservation Committee. However, the Secretariat has not received any report or request to publish a quota for *A. farinosa* from Suriname. The last published quota was for 450 live specimens in 2017. An analysis of the CITES trade data shows that trade appears to be well below the original quota but that on 4 occasions (2016, 2017, 2018 and 2020) trade reported by importers was higher than that reported by Suriname (noting that Suriname has yet to submit its report for 2020).	The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations None of the recommendations have been complied with. Actions recommended by the Secretariat **The Standing Committee is invited to:** **a) request the Secretariat to publish a zero-export quota for *A. farinosa* until Suriname provides information to justify a higher quota to be agreed with the AC Chair; and** **b) urge Suriname to provide an update on the implementation of recommendations d) to m) by three months before the**

<table>
<tr>
<td>
<u>Within 2 years (14 November 2020):</u>

d) Initiate appropriate harvest measures to ensure sustainability (for example): - size/selective harvest - open/closed seasons - harvest seasons - harvest maximums - restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day - control of number of harvesters - types and methods of harvest

e) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution) including an evaluation of the threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs

f) Develop/Implement an ongoing science-based population monitoring program that is used in conjunction with an adaptive management program for the species (see harvest management measures and trade controls, below), for use in making NDFs

g) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all harvest (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs -Develop and implement harvest guidelines (or “best practices”) describing accepted practices

h) Develop and implement local management with clearly defined harvest management measures (e.g., harvest seasons, harvest maximums, restrictions to harvest frequency,
</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Specimen</th><th>2016</th><th>2017</th><th>2018</th><th>2019</th><th>2020</th></tr>
<tr><td>Annual report</td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Quota</td><td></td><td>450</td><td>450</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Importer</td><td>Live</td><td>161</td><td>20</td><td>125</td><td>60</td><td>18</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exporter</td><td>live</td><td>130</td><td>-</td><td>81</td><td>99</td><td>-</td></tr>
</table>
Suriname has submitted annual reports for all years 2016 to 2019.

<u>Concerning recommendation l)</u>

It appears that Suriname has made some progress towards the designation of CITES authorities, particularly focusing on the scientific authority. Suriname indicated that the Nature Conservation Committee is the first CITES Scientific Authority that Suriname has submitted and that a second SA has been established but new members will need to be appointed. Suriname is consulting with the appropriate representatives of institutions to determine membership of the Scientific Committees, which will be used for advice or collaboration, where needed. In a recent consultancy project financed by the UNDP, the project consultant advised Suriname to provide the CITES Secretariat with a list of all these scientific institutions that have been providing relevant scientific advice and services to the Suriname Management Authority, in order to explore the option that the function of each of these organisations is precisely described and presented to the CITES Secretariat as the list of specialists regularly consulted by the CITES Management Authority. It was suggested that these institutions might very well also be eligible for nomination as other Scientific Authorities of Suriname.
</td>
<td>
documentation deadline for SC77.
</td>
</tr>
</table>

sites or time of day, control of number of harvesters, types and methods of harvest) i) provide information and guidance to persons and organizations involved in the production and export of specimens of the species concerned. j) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all export (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs k) Initiate appropriate harvest measures to ensure sustainability (for example): - size/selective harvest - open/closed seasons - harvest seasons - harvest maximums - restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day - control of number of harvesters - types and methods of harvest. l) Clearly designate CITES authorities - Suriname is encouraged to outline any capacity building needs the party may have to support the implementation of Article IV, and submit to the Secretariat, e.g., providing training for CITES authorities (e.g., CITES Virtual College, NDF workshops in a country or region) - Encourage information sharing with Guyana in order to collaborate on making NDFs -provide training of conservation staff in the range State -provide information and guidance to persons and organizations involved in the production and export of specimens of the species concerned <u>Final recommendation</u> m) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of Suriname should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3		

<table>
<tr><td>and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions Suriname has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Ara ararauna (Blue and Yellow Macaw)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Guyana

Short term actions

<u>Within 60 days (by 13 January 2020):</u>

a) Established a reduced quota for 2019 to average trade levels 660 specimens; these quotas should not be amended until a new non-detriment finding, based on survey data (to be provided within one year), is submitted and reviewed by the AC.

b) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Guyana to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of best available scientific information, for their agreement.

Long term actions

<u>Within two years (14 November 2020):</u>

c) Initiate appropriate harvest measures to ensure sustainability (for example): - size/selective harvest - open/closed seasons - harvest seasons - harvest maximums - restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of</td><td>The Management Authority of Guyana provided a response to the Secretariat on 30 September 2019 but did not provide any information specifically concerning Ara ararauna.

<u>Concerning recommendation a):</u>

- Guyana did not request the Secretariat to publish a quota for 2019 but did request a quota of 760 for 2021. This quota has not yet been published.

- An analysis of the CITES trade data (2016 to 2020) shows that on two occasions in the past 5 years, the volume of specimens reported by the importer was higher than that reported by Guyana.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Specimen</th><th>2016</th><th>2017</th><th>2018</th><th>2019</th><th>2020</th></tr>
<tr><td>Annual report</td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Quota</td><td></td><td>792</td><td>792</td><td>In prep</td><td>In prep</td><td>In prep</td></tr>
<tr><td>Importer</td><td>Live</td><td>781</td><td>313</td><td>762</td><td>194</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Exporter</td><td>Live</td><td>731</td><td>342</td><td>530</td><td>452</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Guyana has submitted annual reports for all years 2016 to 2020.</td><td><u>The Secretariat’s determination regarding implementation of the recommendation.</u>

Recommendation d) may have been partially compiled with if the study referred to in Guyana’s response to Amazona festiva also covered this species.

<u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u>

The Standing Committee is invited to:

a) request Guyana to share the results of its population study of psittacines; and

b) urge Guyana to provide information on the implementation of recommendations c) to k) by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.</td></tr>
</table>

day - control of number of harvesters - types and methods of harvest d) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution) including an evaluation of the threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs e) Develop/Implement an ongoing science-based population monitoring program that is used in conjunction with an adaptive management program for the species (see harvest management measures and trade controls, below), for use in making NDFs f) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all harvest (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs -Develop and implement harvest guidelines (or "best practices") describing accepted practices g) Develop and implement local management with clearly defined harvest management measures (e.g., harvest seasons, harvest maximums, restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day, control of number of harvesters, types and methods of harvest) h) provide information and guidance to persons and organizations involved in the production and export of specimens of the species concerned. i) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all export (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs j) Encourage information sharing with Suriname in order to collaborate on making NDFs.	<u>Concerning recommendation d):</u> - The letter from Guyana on 30 September 2019 mentions that fieldwork for the population assessment of psittacines concluded in June 2019 and that analysis of the data was ongoing. The letter only made reference to *A. festiva,* but it is assumed by the Secretariat that *Ara ararauna* would also be covered. However, no information on this study has been made available since then.	

Final recommendation k) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of Guyana should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions Guyana has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.		
Suriname Short term actions Within 60 days (13 January 2019): a) Establish an interim conservative export quota of 500 within 60 days for the species and communicate the quota to the Secretariat. b) No exports should occur until the quota has been published on the Secretariat's website. c) The export quota (which could include zero allowable exports) should be justified as conservative based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of available scientific information. d) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Suriname to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use	On 12 January 2019 Suriname sent a response to the letter sent by the Secretariat on 14 November 2018. Concerning recommendation a) In the letter the CITES Management Authority of Suriname indicated that starting on 16 January 2019, it would hold consultation sessions with the representatives of the exporters of CITES Appendix-II species, the UID, the National Herbarium and the zoological collection of the University of Suriname regarding the publication of the export quota list for 2019. It noted that the quota of 500 live specimens of *A. ararauna* would be on the agenda of these consultations and a formal report would be sent to the Secretariat. Suriname indicated that as required by Surinamese law it would also be necessary to get the advice of its Nature Conservation Committee. However, the Secretariat has not received any report or request to publish a quota for *A. ararauna* from Suriname. The last published quota was for 650 specimens in 2017. Concerning recommendation b) No exports should have occurred until the quota was published on the website, but an analysis of the CITES trade data shows that trade has continued. The trade appears to be on a declining trend (noting that Suriname has yet to submit its report for 2020). On two occasions (2018 and 2019) trade reported by importing countries exceeds that reported by Suriname.	The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations None of the recommendations have been complied with. Actions recommended by the Secretariat **The Standing Committee is invited to:** **a) request the Secretariat to publish a zero-export quota for *A. ararauna* until Suriname provides information to justify a higher quota to be agreed with the AC Chair; and** **b) urge Suriname to provide an update on the implementation of recommendations d) to m) by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.**

of best available scientific information, for their agreement.

Long term actions

Within 2 years (14 November 2020):

e) Initiate appropriate harvest measures to ensure sustainability (for example): - size/selective harvest - open/closed seasons - harvest seasons - harvest maximums - restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day - control of number of harvesters - types and methods of harvest

f) Initiate measures to ensure the descriptions on all CITES permits are standardized so that export is only permitted at the species level and that it complies with Annex 1 of Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP17) on permits and certificates; trade ceases to be reported or permitted at higher taxon levels.

g) Clarify and standardize the terms and units used in reporting trade. Ensure that appropriate terms and units are recorded on permits for trade. Standardized terms and appropriate units are found in the most recent version of the Guidelines for the preparation and submission of CITES annual reports, which is referenced in Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP17) on national reports and distributed by the Secretariat by notification.

h) Ensure that permits issued for the species clearly and accurately indicate the source of the specimens.

i) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution) including an evaluation of the

	Spec.	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Annual report		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Quota		650	650	-	-	-
Importer	Live	645	249	273	174	107
Exporter	Live	994	306	132	121	

Suriname has submitted annual reports for all years 2016 to 2019.

Concerning recommendation l)

It appears that Suriname has made some progress towards the designation of CITES authorities, particularly focusing on the scientific authority. Suriname indicated that the Nature Conservation Committee is the first CITES Scientific Authority that Suriname has submitted and that a second SA has been established but new members will need to be appointed. Suriname is consulting with the appropriate representatives of institutions to determine membership of the Scientific Committees, which will be used for advice or collaboration, where needed. In a recent consultancy project financed by the UNDP, the project consultant advised Suriname to provide the CITES Secretariat with a list of all these scientific institutions that have been providing relevant scientific advice and services to the Suriname Management Authority, in order to explore the option that the function of each of these organisations is precisely described and presented to the CITES Secretariat as the list of specialists regularly consulted by the CITES Management Authority. It was suggested that these institutions might very well also be eligible for nomination as other Scientific Authorities of Suriname.

threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs or Develop/Implement an ongoing science-based population monitoring program that is used in conjunction with an adaptive management program for the species (see harvest management measures and trade controls, below), for use in making NDFs j) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all harvest (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs -Develop and implement harvest guidelines (or "best practices") describing accepted practices or Develop and implement local management with clearly defined harvest management measures (e.g., harvest seasons, harvest maximums, restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day, control of number of harvesters, types and methods of harvest) or Develop and implement coordinated national and/or local management plans (that include harvest management considerations) with clear monitoring requirements; management is adaptive (regular review of harvest records, of impact of harvesting, adjustment of harvest instructions as necessary), harvest restrictions based on monitoring results k) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all export (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs -initiate measures to ensure that permit information is standardized (e.g., export only at a species level, source of specimens is indicated, consistency of conversion factors, standardized units) Or		

Undertake monitoring of export; any established export limits are precautionary Or Undertake regular quantitative surveys of scale and trend of all export; establish/modify export limits according to quantitative data that is reviewed regularly, for example through an adaptive management program for the species. l) Implement/ improve a system to ensure individuals in captive / ranched / artificially propagated production systems are distinguished from wild if both wild specimens and non-wild specimens are in trade m) clearly designate CITES authorities n) provide training for CITES authorities (e.g., CITES Virtual College, NDF workshops in a country or region) o) develop identification methods and materials p) share information/collaboration with other range States (exchange of NDF information, development and implementation of regional management measures) q) provide training of conservation staff in the range State r) provide information and guidance to persons and organizations involved in the production and export of specimens of the species concerned; s) facilitate information exchange among range States t) provide technical equipment and support.		

<table>
<tr><td><u>Final recommendation</u>

u) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of Suriname should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions Suriname has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Ara chloropterus (Red and green Macaw)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Guyana

Short term actions

<u>Within 60 days (13 January 2019):</u>

a) Established a reduced quota for 2019 to average trade levels 845 specimens; these quotas should not be amended until a new non-detriment finding, based on survey data (to be provided within one year), is submitted and reviewed by the AC.

b) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Guyana to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of best available scientific information, for their agreement.

Long term actions</td><td>The Management Authority of Guyana provided a response to the Secretariat on 30 September 2019 but did not provide any information specifically concerning A. chloropterus.

<u>Concerning recommendation a):</u>

- Guyana requested that the Secretariat publish a quota of 845

- An analysis of the CITES trade data (2016 to 2020) shows that Guyana has consistently reported trade levels higher than those reported by importers and has not exceeded its quota

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Spec.</th><th>2016</th><th>2017</th><th>2018</th><th>2019</th><th>2020</th></tr>
<tr><td>Annual report</td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Quota</td><td></td><td>990</td><td>990</td><td>In prep.</td><td>-</td><td>845</td></tr>
<tr><td>Importer</td><td>Live</td><td>817</td><td>386</td><td>962</td><td>221</td><td>348</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exporter</td><td>Live</td><td>921</td><td>552</td><td>608</td><td>625</td><td>606</td></tr>
</table></td><td><u>The Secretariat’s determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u>.

Recommendation a) has been complied with and recommendation d) may be partially implemented if the study referred to in Guyana’s response to Amazona festiva also covered this species.

<u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u>

The Standing Committee is invited to:

a) note that recommendation a) has been complied with;

b) request Guyana to share the results of its population study of psittacines; and</td></tr>
</table>

Within 2 years (14 November 2020) c) Initiate appropriate harvest measures to ensure sustainability (for example): - size/selective harvest - open/closed seasons - harvest seasons - harvest maximums - restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day - control of number of harvesters - types and methods of harvest. d) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution) including an evaluation of the threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs e) Develop/Implement an ongoing science-based population monitoring program that is used in conjunction with an adaptive management program for the species (see harvest management measures and trade controls, below), for use in making NDFs f) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all harvest (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs -Develop and implement harvest guidelines (or "best practices") describing accepted practices g) Develop and implement local management with clearly defined harvest management measures (e.g., harvest seasons, harvest maximums, restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day, control of number of harvesters, types and methods of harvest) h) provide information and guidance to persons and organizations involved in the production and export of specimens of the species concerned.	Guyana has submitted annual reports for all years 2016 to 2020. Concerning recommendation d): - The letter from Guyana on 30 September 2019 mentions that fieldwork for the population assessment of psittacines concluded in June 2019 and that analysis of the data was ongoing. The letter only made reference to *A. festiva* but it is assumed by the Secretariat that *Ara chloropterus* would also be covered. However, no information on this study has been made available since then.	**c) urge Guyana to provide information on the implementation of recommendations c) to k) by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.**

i) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all export (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs j) Encourage information sharing with Suriname in order to collaborate on making NDFs <u>Final recommendation</u> k) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of Guyana should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions Guyana has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.		
Suriname Short term actions <u>Within 60 days (13 January 2019):</u> a) Establish an interim conservative export quota of 250 within 60 days for the species and communicate the quota to the Secretariat. b) No exports should occur until the quota has been published on the Secretariat's website. c) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Suriname to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use	On 12 January 2019 Suriname sent a response to the letter sent by the Secretariat on 14 November 2018. <u>Concerning recommendation a)</u> In the letter the CITES Management Authority of Suriname indicated that starting on 16 January 2019, it would hold consultation sessions with the representatives of the exporters of CITES Appendix-II species, the UID, the National Herbarium and the zoological collection of the University of Suriname regarding the publication of the export quota list for 2019. It noted that the quota of 500 live specimens of *A. chloropterus* would be on the agenda of these consultations and a formal report would be sent to the Secretariat. Suriname indicated that as required by Surinamese law it would also be necessary to get the advice of its Nature Conservation Committee. However, the Secretariat has not received any report or request to publish a quota for *A. chloropterus* from Suriname since 2018. The last published quota was for 250 specimens in 2017. This same quota had been in place since 2000.	<u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u> None of the recommendations have been complied with. <u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u> **The Standing Committee is invited to:** **a) request the Secretariat to publish a zero-export quota for *A. chloropterus* until Suriname provides information to justify a higher quota to be agreed with the AC Chair; and**

<table>
<tr>
<td>of best available scientific information, for their agreement.

Long term actions

<u>Within 2 years (14 November 2020):</u>

d) Initiate appropriate harvest measures to ensure sustainability (for example): - size/selective harvest - open/closed seasons - harvest seasons - harvest maximums - restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day - control of number of harvesters - types and methods of harvest

e) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution) including an evaluation of the threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs

f) Develop/Implement an ongoing science-based population monitoring program that is used in conjunction with an adaptive management program for the species (see harvest management measures and trade controls, below), for use in making NDFs

g) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all harvest (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs -Develop and implement harvest guidelines (or “best practices”) describing accepted practices

h) Develop and implement local management with clearly defined harvest management measures (e.g., harvest seasons, harvest maximums, restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day, control of number of harvesters, types and methods of harvest)</td>
<td><u>Concerning recommendation b)</u>

No exports should have occurred until the quota was published on the website, but an analysis of the CITES trade data shows that trade has continued. It appears to be on a declining trend (noting that Suriname has yet to submit its report for 2020). On two occasions (2018 and 2019) trade reported by importing countries exceeds that reported by Suriname. All trade is below the proposed quota of 250 live specimens.
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Spec.</th><th>2016</th><th>2017</th><th>2018</th><th>2019</th><th>2020</th></tr>
<tr><td>Annual report</td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Quota</td><td></td><td>250</td><td>250</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Importer</td><td>Live</td><td>134</td><td>76</td><td>82</td><td>68</td><td>48</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exporter</td><td>Live</td><td>138</td><td>95</td><td>31</td><td>44</td><td></td></tr>
</table>
Suriname has submitted annual reports for all years 2016 to 2019.

Concerning recommendation l)

It appears that Suriname has made some progress towards the designation of CITES authorities, particularly focusing on the scientific authority. Suriname indicated that the Nature Conservation Committee is the first CITES Scientific Authority that Suriname has submitted and that a second SA has been established but new members will need to be appointed. Suriname is consulting with the appropriate representatives of institutions to determine membership of the Scientific Committees, which will be used for advice or collaboration, where needed. In a recent consultancy project financed by the UNDP, the project consultant advised Suriname to provide the CITES Secretariat with a list of all these scientific institutions that have been providing relevant scientific advice and services to the Suriname Management Authority, in order to explore the option that the function of each of these organisations is precisely described and presented to the CITES Secretariat as the list of specialists regularly consulted by the CITES Management Authority. It was suggested that these institutions</td>
<td>b) urge Suriname to provide an update on the implementation of recommendations d) to m) by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.</td>
</tr>
</table>

i) provide information and guidance to persons and organizations involved in the production and export of specimens of the species concerned. j) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all export (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs k) Initiate appropriate harvest measures to ensure sustainability (for example): - size/selective harvest - open/closed seasons - harvest seasons - harvest maximums - restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day - control of number of harvesters - types and methods of harvest l) Clearly designate CITES authorities - Suriname is encouraged to outline any capacity building needs the party may have to support the implementation of Article IV, and submit to the Secretariat, e.g., providing training for CITES authorities (e.g., CITES Virtual College, NDF workshops in a country or region) m) Encourage information sharing with Guyana in order to collaborate on making NDFs n) provide training of conservation staff in the range State o) provide information and guidance to persons and organizations involved in the production and export of specimens of the species concerned <u>Final recommendation</u> p) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of Suriname should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the species and	might very well also be eligible for nomination as other Scientific Authorities of Suriname.	

<table>
<tr><td>are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions Suriname has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Poicephalus gulielmi (Red-fronted parrot)</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

Short term action

<u>Within 60 days (13 January 2019):</u>

a) No additional export permit should be established for 2018 as of 19 July 2018, noting that permits for 1,870 specimens have been issued as of 19 July 2018. Establish an interim conservative export quota not to exceed the average trade level during recent years for which Annual Reports are available (450 specimens for 2019) within 60 days for the species, and communicate the quota to the Secretariat.

b) No exports should occur until the quota has been published on the Secretariat's website.

c) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of best available scientific information, for their agreement.

Long term action

<u>Within 2 years (14 November 2020):</u>

</td><td>

<u>Concerning recommendation a)</u>

It appears from the CITES trade database that DRC did not exceed the 1,870 permits that are referred to in the recommendation. It was then to notify the Secretariat of a quota of 450 specimens for 2019, which was duly published. DRC has not exceeded this new quota since its publication.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Spec.</th><th>2016</th><th>2017</th><th>2018</th><th>2019</th><th>2020</th></tr>
<tr><td>Annual report</td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Quota</td><td></td><td>3,000</td><td>3,000</td><td>2,500</td><td>450*</td><td>450</td></tr>
<tr><td>Importer</td><td>Live</td><td>400</td><td>350</td><td>600</td><td>100</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exporter</td><td>live</td><td>2,850</td><td>2,150</td><td>1,870</td><td>250</td><td>70</td></tr>
</table>

* AC recommendation

No response was received from DRC concerning the implementation of the other recommendations.

</td><td>

<u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u>

Recommendations a) and b) have been completed. The outstanding recommendations c) and d) have been complied with.

<u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u>

The Standing Committee is invited to:

a) commend the Democratic Republic of the Congo for implementing recommendations a) and b) in a timely manner; and

b) urge the Democratic Republic of the Congo to implement the remaining recommendations d) to g) by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.

</td></tr>
</table>

d) Initiate appropriate harvest measures to ensure sustainability (for example): - size/selective harvest - open/closed seasons - harvest seasons - harvest maximums - restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day - control of number of harvesters - types and methods of harvest e) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution) including an evaluation of the threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs f) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all harvest (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs -Develop and implement coordinated national and/or local management plans (that include harvest management considerations) with clear monitoring requirements; management is adaptive (regular review of harvest records, of impact of harvesting, adjustment of harvest instructions as necessary), harvest restrictions based on monitoring results <u>Final recommendation</u> g) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of DRC should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions DRC has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.		

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">*Uromastyx geyri* (Saharan Spiny-tailed Lizard)</th></tr>
<tr>
<td>

Mali

Short term actions

<u>Within 30 days (13 December 2018):</u>

a) Establish an interim zero export quota for within 30 days for the species and communicate the quota to the Secretariat.

b) No exports should occur until the zero quota has been published on the Secretariat's website.

c) Before making any increases to the interim zero quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Mali to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of best available scientific information, for their agreement.

Long term actions

<u>Within 2 years (14 November 2020):</u>

d) Ensure that permits, issued for live specimens of the species under any future conservative, NDF-based quota, clearly and accurately indicate the source of the specimens.

e) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution) including an evaluation of the threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs

</td>
<td>

No response was received from Mali.

An analysis of the CITES trade database indicates that trade in specimens of *U. geyri* has been reported every year from 2016 by an importing country, without Mali reporting any corresponding exports in its annual reports from 2016 to 2020 (which have all been submitted).

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Specimen</th><th>2016</th><th>2017</th><th>2018</th><th>2019</th><th>2020</th></tr>
<tr><td>Annual report</td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Quota</td><td></td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Importer</td><td>Live W</td><td>400</td><td>1,500</td><td>675</td><td>750</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exporter</td><td>Live W</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Importer</td><td>Live F</td><td>32</td><td>5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Exporter</td><td>Live F</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Importer</td><td>Live C</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>500</td><td>250</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exporter</td><td>Live C</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
</table>

</td>
<td>

<u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u>

Mali has not implemented any of the recommendations of the Animals Committee

<u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u>

The Standing Committee is invited to:

a) request the Secretariat to publish an interim zero export quota for *Utomastyx geyri* from Mali;

b) request Mali to explain the discrepancies in the trade data; and

c) urge Mali to implement recommendations d) to j) by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

f) Develop/Implement an ongoing science-based population monitoring program that is used in conjunction with an adaptive management program for the species (see harvest management measures and trade controls, below), for use in making NDFs g) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all harvest (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs -Develop and implement local management with clearly defined harvest management measures (e.g., harvest seasons, harvest maximums, restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day, control of number of harvesters, types and methods of harvest) h) Undertake monitoring of export; any established export limits are precautionary i) Implement/ improve a system to ensure individuals in captive production systems are distinguished from wild if both wild specimens and non-wild specimens are in trade <u>Final recommendation</u> j) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of Mali should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions Mali has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process		

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">*Cuora ambionensis* (Asian Box Turtle)</th></tr>
<tr>
<td>

Indonesia

Short term actions

<u>Within 60 days (13 January 2019):</u>

a) Establish an interim conservative export quota for the species of 12,000 specimens for 2019, within 60 days and communicate the quota to the Secretariat.

b) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Indonesia to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take, taking into consideration the findings of population studies, the issues of domestic consumption and illegal trade, and the possible use of size limits, that make use of best available scientific information, for their agreement.

Long term actions

<u>Within 2 years (14 November 2020):</u>

c) Initiate appropriate harvest measures to ensure sustainability (for example:

- size limits/selective harvest
- open/closed seasons
- harvest seasons
- harvest maximums
- restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day
- control of number of harvesters

</td>
<td>

<u>Concerning recommendation a)</u>

Indonesia notified the Secretariat of a quota of 12,000 specimens for 2019, which was duly published.

An analysis of the CITES trade data shows that since 2018 trade reported by importing countries has not exceeded that reported by Indonesia and was within the revised quota.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Specimen</th><th>2016</th><th>2017</th><th>2018</th><th>2019</th><th>2020</th></tr>
<tr><td>Annual report</td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Quota</td><td>Live W</td><td>5,490</td><td>18,000</td><td>18,000</td><td>12,000</td><td>12,000</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Skins</td><td>12,510</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Importer</td><td>Live -W</td><td>22,384</td><td>20,534</td><td>17,762</td><td>8,323</td><td>238</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exporter</td><td>Live -W</td><td>18,000</td><td>15,900</td><td>19,085</td><td>8,978</td><td>2,980</td></tr>
<tr><td>Importer</td><td>Live - F</td><td>678</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exporter</td><td>Live - F</td><td>1,298</td><td>490</td><td>1,200</td><td>2,330</td><td>1,421</td></tr>
</table>

No information has been received from Indonesia concerning the implementation of recommendations c) to k).

</td>
<td>

<u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u>

Recommendation a) has been completed. Recommendations c) to k) remain outstanding.

<u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u>

The Standing Committee is invited to:

a) note that recommendation a) has been complied with, and

b) urge Indonesia to provide an update on the implementation of recommendations c) to k) by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

- types and methods of harvest) d) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution) including an evaluation of the threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs e) Develop/Implement an ongoing science-based population monitoring program that is used in conjunction with an adaptive management program for the species (see harvest management measures and trade controls, below), for use in making NDFs f) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all harvest (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs g) Develop and implement harvest guidelines (or "best practices") describing accepted practices h) Develop and implement local management with clearly defined harvest management measures (e.g., harvest seasons, harvest maximums, restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day, control of number of harvesters, types and methods of harvest) i) Undertake qualitative monitoring of the scale and trends of all export (increasing, stable or decreasing) for use in making NDFs j) Implement/ improve a system to ensure individuals in captive production systems are distinguished from wild if both wild specimens and non-wild specimens are in trade <u>Final recommendation</u>		

k) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of Indonesia should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions Indonesia has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.		
***Anguilla anguilla* (European eel)**		
Algeria Short term actions <u>Within 90 days (12 February 2019):</u> a) Establish interim conservative export quotas (suggested to be reduced to 67 percent of present trade and a zero quota for live glass eels) within 60 days for each category of specimens in trade (such as fingerlings/elvers, live, and meat), and communicate the quotas to the Secretariat for publication on the website. b) No exports should occur until the quota has been published on the Secretariat's website. c) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of best available scientific information, for their agreement.	Algeria initially responded on 21 August 2019 with a report entitled "*l'exploitation d'anguille en Algérie*", including a report dated May 2020. **On 13 April 2021, Algeria also submitted a copy of its national annual report on European eel and a note verbal on 6 September 2021 seeking an increase in the quota.** <u>Concerning recommendations a) and b):</u> Algeria established a provisional export quota of 8 tonnes of wild-taken adult eels, which represents a reduction to 67 percent. The quotas were published 17 August 2020. * AC recommendation <u>Concerning recommendation d):</u> Algeria indicated that aquaculture facilities must be established by an Algerian national, in exchange for a payment of an annual fee for a period of 25 years renewable by tacit agreement, in accordance with the provisions of Executive Decree No. 04-373 of 21 November 2004. Aquaculture farming is subject to obtaining an authorization (allowing the creation and operation of an aquaculture establishment in accordance with the provisions of Executive Decree No. 07-208 of 30 June 2007). The relevant executive decree lays down the conditions for exercising the farming and aquaculture activity, the different types of establishments, the conditions for their creation and the rules for their exploitation. Other management measures are set by regulation in accordance with the provisions of Executive Decree No. 06-	<u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u> Algeria complied with recommendations a) and b) by establishing the revised interim quota. It has made some progress towards the implementation of the remaining recommendations, but they have yet to be implemented fully. <u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u> **The Standing Committee is invited to:** **a) note that recommendations a) and b) have been complied with;**

Long term actions <u>Within 2 years (14 November 2020):</u> d) Evaluate current harvest management measures and implement harvest measures to ensure sustainability (for example: - size/selective harvest - open/closed seasons - harvest seasons - harvest maximums - restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day - control of number of harvesters - types and methods of harvest) e) Clarify and standardize the terms and units used in reporting trade. Ensure that appropriate terms and units are recorded on permits for trade. Standardized terms and appropriate units are found in the most recent version of the Guidelines for the preparation and submission of CITES annual reports, which is referenced in Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP17) on *national reports*, and distributed by the Secretariat by notification. f) Ensure that permits issued for the species clearly and accurately indicate the source of the specimens. g) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution) including an evaluation of the threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs h) Develop/Implement an ongoing science-based population monitoring program that is	372 of 19 October 2006 which sets out the standard specifications for the exploitation of eels. Amongst the specific provisions are the following: ▪ the use of devices provided for by the regulations in force, in particular Executive Decree No. 03-481 of 13 December 2003, which sets out the conditions for fishing and Article 5 of the specifications relating to the exploitation of eels; ▪ the use of boats whose number and technical characteristics are defined by the specifications, in order to preserve the sites to be operated; ▪ compliance with the minimum market size when catching the eel in accordance with the provisions of Executive Decree No. 04-86 of 18 March 2004 setting the minimum market sizes of biological resources; ▪ the prohibition of the capture of individuals (elvers, eels) not having the minimum marketable size with the exception of those intended for breeding whose capture is subject to the authorization provided by the administration in accordance with the provisions Executive Decree No. 04-188 of 7 July 2004 (which establishes the methods of capture, transport, marketing and introduction into the aquatic environment of broodstock, larvae, fry and spat as well as the methods of capture, transport, storage, import and marketing of fishery and aquaculture products that have not reached the minimum regulatory size intended for breeding, cultivation or scientific research). ▪ Respect for the periods of capture of eels, glass eels and eels (art 6 of the specifications). **<u>Concerning recommendations e) and f):</u>** Algeria states that export authorization for European eel is subject to a waiver issued by the competent veterinary services as well as a certificate of origin, required by the Customs Administration. The certificate of origin certifies the compliance of the criteria, established on forms approved by the Administration. The health certificate is established after a health check in accordance with the provisions of Executive Decree No. 95-363 establishing the procedures for veterinary inspection of live animals and animal or animal products intended for consumption, to the provisions of the Executive Decree n ° 04-82 of 18 March	**b) invite Algeria to submit the scientific justification for the proposed increase in the quota;** **c) commend Algeria for the progress made to-date in implementing the remaining recommendations d) to l); and** **d) invite Algeria to provide an update on the implementation of the outstanding recommendations by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.**

used in conjunction with an adaptive management program for the species (see harvest management measures and trade controls, below), for use in making NDFs i) Develop and implement coordinated national and/or local management plans (that include harvest management considerations) with aims to achieve, within defined time limits, escapement targets as a contribution to stock recovery; clear monitoring requirements; management is adaptive (regular review of harvest records, of impact of harvesting, adjustment of harvest instructions as necessary), harvest restrictions based on monitoring results; management plans should be submitted for independent peer review by a suitable external body (e.g., WGEEL) j) Initiate robust monitoring programs, with input from WGEEL, to provide time series population data and/or recruitment and escapement indices to support development and implementation of the management plans and to inform NDF assessments k) Algeria / Morocco / Tunisia are encouraged to outline any capacity building needs the party may have to support the implementation of Article IV, and submit to the Secretariat, e.g., providing training for CITES authorities (e.g., CITES Virtual College, NDF workshops in a country or region) <u>Final recommendation</u> l) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the	2004 (which fixes the conditions and modalities of sanitary approval of infrastructures whose activity is linked to animals, animal products and animal origin as well as their transport) and the provisions of executive decree n ° 04-189 of 7 July 2004 (which lays down the hygiene and health measures applicable to fishery and aquaculture products). Algeria doesn't provide information on the terms and units used on permits and in reporting trade to CITES. However, from the reported trade it appears that all specimens are recorded as Wild. There is some overlap between the terms Meat (M) and bodies (B). <u>Concerning the remaining recommendations c) to m) (should be c) to l)</u> The administrative management measures are reinforced by a scientific monitoring program for exploitable eel populations, which has been established by the fisheries administration. This consists of establishing a census of the sites of eel exploitation, based on an analysis of historical data, and is still in progress. The first results of this analysis (between 2011 and 2018) reveal that the European eel is caught both in the marine environment and in the continental environment. In the marine environment, this species is reported at the site of El Djamila in the wilaya of Algiers, in Ténès in the wilaya of Chlef as well as in Mostaganem. Catches show a continuous increase between 2011 and 2017 and a decrease in the quantities caught in 2018. In continental areas, the largest quantities are well recorded at the El Kala sites (the El Mellah lagoon, Lake Oubeira, Lake Tounga / Messida and that of the El Mafragh wadi). However, this species is also exploited in the Crater of Dzioua in the commune Ain Tolba (wilaya of Ain Temouchent), Oued El Kebir in the commune of La Marsa (wilaya of Skikda), Oued Amara in the commune of Cap Djinet (wilaya of Boumerdes) and in the Boukerdene dam in the Tipaza wilaya. The catches made in the continental environment are less important than those in the marine environment. In addition, data relating to the quantities of eels exported was established by type of product and by country of destination. Data on catches by site of exploitation as well as those relating to exports will be transmitted in September 2020 in the technical report. As for the study relating to indices of biology, biomass, recruitment and the estimation of the escape rate, the existing work only provides data on the	

species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.	demographic structure of the populations of eels existing in Algeria. We cite those of Boudjadi et al., 2010 carried out in the Mafragh estuary and at Lake Oubeira, those of Youbi et al., 2012 in the Mellah lagoon and those of Djouahra et al., 2017 in Lake Tonga. However, these 4 sites belonging to the El Kala wetland alone cannot provide consistent elements from which management measures can be established. For this, a study project was initiated by the National Center for Research and Development of Fisheries and Aquaculture "CNRDPA", bearing "Element for the development of a management plan for the exploitation of the species *Anguilla anguilla* in the Eastern region of Algeria." This study has been validated by the Intersectoral Committee for Scientific Research and the financial evaluation procedures are underway at the level of the Directorate General of Scientific Research and Technological Development of the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. The specific objectives are aimed at: - the census and delimitation of the hydrographic basins constituting the natural habitat of the eel; - description and analysis of the current situation of eel populations; - an estimate of the biomass of the eel at its different stages (glass eel, yellow eel and silver eel); - the development of a management plan, in particular, the establishment of catch quotas and catch periods per identified operating site; - the revision of the regulations relating to the exploitation of eels in Algeria. Also, the Ministry of Fisheries and Fisheries Production has submitted a request for technical assistance to the office of FAO Algeria for the realization of a study determining the eel biomass and the development of a plan for its management. A favorable prior agreement has been expressed by the FAO and an official response is expected in the coming days. The study project concerns nine wilayas and seventeen potential sites, the expected results of which complement the specific objectives set in the study project on "Element for the development of a management plan for the exploitation of the *Anguilla anguilla* species in the Eastern region of Algeria." It is also important to mention the recent engagement of Algeria for the execution of the research program of the General Fisheries Commission for the	

Mediterranean "CGPM" on eel, including the first work relating to phase 0 (collection of information and data on catches and international trade) are fixed for the period May-August 2020.

Algeria indicated that a technical document was planned for September 2020, in which detailed data will be presented.

On 6 September 2021, a note verbal was received from the Algerian permanent mission. This note outlined according to the study on potential aquaculture opportunities in Algeria, which is one of the main points in the development of the master plan for fishing and aquaculture activities by 2025, Algeria has identified 13 suitable sites for the expansion of eel production. Algeria points out that among these potential sites, eel exploitation was carried out at five natural water bodies in the eastern region of the country, “following a coherent and precise regulatory framework, allowing a rational and sustainable fishing of the eel.”

Since the protection status of the European eel has been strengthened, Algeria indicates that it has adopted additional management measures, in the form of annual fishing quotas.

Algeria states that of the CITES export permits issued during the last decade, most have been cancelled with the exception of two of a quantity of 3 tonnes and 120 kg in 2016. Furthermore, Algeria claims that as a precautionary measure, there has been a temporary freezing of export authorizations of this species between 2018 and 2020. The CITES trade data supports this as follows:

	Spec.	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Annual report		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Quota	Adult W	-	-	-	8,000*	8,000*
	Glass	-	-	-	0	0
Importer	Live – W	120	2,000	-	-	-
Exporter	Live - W	3,120	-	-	-	-

	Algeria states that it has undertaken certain efforts, in particular through the implementation of a partial management plan, consisting of the introduction of a partial follow-up programme; the ongoing launch of the study of the assessment of exploitable biomass; the establishment of a mechanism to guarantee the traceability at national/international level of the product; the existence of a regulation for the taking of strict measures to restore the catch and/or trade in eels. In addition, efforts have been agreed to strengthen the system of statistical information processing for the collection of capture data and Algeria is engaged with the FAO/GFCM project on eels. Algeria states that in view of the measures outlined and the existing natural potential, it is seeking a revision to the annual export quota for *A. anguilla* to increase it from 8 tonnes (8,000kg) to 20 tonnes (20,000kg). Algeria concludes by seeking technical and financial support from the CITES Secretariat and the Animals Committee in the preparation and implementation of the eel management plan at national level. It is the view of the Secretariat that Algeria has argued that there is good potential for additional eel fisheries, but it has not demonstrated that the proposed increase in the export quota is sustainable.	
Morocco Short term actions <u>Within 90 days (12 February 2019):</u> a) Establish interim conservative export quotas (suggested to be reduced to 67 percent of present trade and a zero quota for live glass eels) within 60 days for each category of specimens in trade (such as fingerlings/elvers, live, and meat), and communicate the quotas to the Secretariat for publication on the website. b) No exports should occur until the quota has been published on the Secretariat's website.	Morocco replied on 22 February 2019 with a very detailed response to the recommendations of the Animals Committee, the main points of which are summarised below: <u>Concerning recommendations a) and b)</u> In this regard, Morocco wanted to highlight the different situation compared with other exporting range States like Algeria and Tunisia. Morocco outlined following: • The national eel stock assessment study conducted in 2013 made it possible to estimate the catch quotas likely to be exploited in Moroccan fisheries while ensuring a sustainability of the resource based on the strict respect of different rates of escape and recruitment worldwide, especially at the European Union level. These annual quotas have been calculated using an approach based largely on the precautionary principle and concern four fisheries and amount to 6 tonnes of glass eels and 8 tonnes of adult eels.	<u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u> Recommendations a) and b) have been completed. The remaining recommendations are either implemented or not relevant in light of the production method used in Morocco. <u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u> **The Standing Committee is invited to:**

c) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of best available scientific information, for their agreement.

Long term actions

Within 2 years (14 November 2020):

d) Evaluate current harvest management measures and implement harvest measures to ensure sustainability

(for example:

- size/selective harvest
- open/closed seasons
- harvest seasons
- harvest maximums
- restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day
- control of number of harvesters
- types and methods of harvest)

e) Clarify and standardize the terms and units used in reporting trade. Ensure that appropriate terms and units are recorded on permits for trade. Standardized terms and appropriate units are found in the most recent version of the Guidelines for the preparation and submission of CITES annual reports, which is referenced in Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP17) on *national reports*, and distributed by the Secretariat by notification.

- However, and in consideration of the same precautionary principles, Morocco, through the Office of the High Commissioner for Water and Forests and the Fight against Desertification, as the administration in charge of this mission, did not implement only one fishery (Oued Sebou, located on the Atlantic coast) authorized a quota of 2,000 kg of glass eel for breeding purposes and 7 tonnes of adult eel.
- Since 2012, Morocco has never allowed the export of elvers, whether live or dead. As a result, there is no set quota for glass eel exports.
- 99% of Morocco's exports are eels from aquaculture and not from fishing. Indeed, the current fishing quota is 2000 kg of glass eel and 7 tonnes of wild eel.
- The companies authorized to fish glass eels each have intensive closed-circuit aquaculture. Thus, the 2000 kg of captured glass eel allows them to produce after 16 to 24 months of breeding up to 400 tons of eel. Thus, and during the last five years, the exports of these aquaculture units amount to an average of 300 tons per year.
- In accordance with the specifications for this activity, part of the elvers caught (10%) is used for restocking.

It should be noted that following discussions with the AC Chair, taking into consideration the different production method the following quotas were agreed for 2019:

	Specimen	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Quota	Adult W	-	-	-	5,500	5,500
	Aquacul				500,000 +	500,000
	Glass	-	-	-	0	0

+ = 500000kg Adult eel [raised in aquaculture based on a harvest of 2t on glass eels]

These quotas were published for 2019 and an analysis of the CITES trade data shows that Morocco has not exceeded the quotas since their publication. Exports appear to have increased somewhat but this can be explained by changes in the production methods (e.g. lower mortality rates and outgrowing for a longer period for the eels to reach a large size).

a) acknowledge that the situation for production of *A. anguilla* in Morocco is different from that of Algeria and Tunisia;

b) commend Morocco for the detailed response it has provided and the measures it has put in place to manage the species and ensure a strong traceability system is in place; and

c) consider removing Morocco from the Review of Significant Trade process

f) Ensure that permits issued for the species clearly and accurately indicate the source of the specimens.

g) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution) including an evaluation of the threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs

h) Develop/Implement an ongoing science-based population monitoring program that is used in conjunction with an adaptive management program for the species (see harvest management measures and trade controls, below), for use in making NDFs

i) Develop and implement coordinated national and/or local management plans (that include harvest management considerations) with aims to achieve, within defined time limits, escapement targets as a contribution to stock recovery; clear monitoring requirements; management is adaptive (regular review of harvest records, of impact of harvesting, adjustment of harvest instructions as necessary), harvest restrictions based on monitoring results; management plans should be submitted for independent peer review by a suitable external body (e.g., WGEEL)

j) Initiate robust monitoring programs, with input from WGEEL, to provide time series population data and/or recruitment and escapement indices to support development and implementation of the management plans and to inform NDF assessments

k) Algeria / Morocco / Tunisia are encouraged to outline any capacity building needs the party may have to support the implementation of

		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Annual report		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Quota	Adult W	-	-	-	5,500	5,500
	Aquacul				500,000	500,000
	Glass	-	-	-	0	0
Importer	Live	233,908	4,960	171,350	210,519	241,000
Exporter	live	201,619	238,147	171,720	423,546	213,180
Importer	M/B		-	25,240	27,500	25,300
Exporter	M/B		25,240	25,000	30,000	50,640

It should be noted that the Animals Committee will propose a decision to CoP19 on eels seeking a mandate to continue consideration of the use of source code R for eels.

Concerning the making of NDFs for eel in Morocco

Morocco states that it has put in place measures for the sustainable management of eels which take into account the status of the species and allow to respond to all the necessary technical and regulatory requirements to ensure sustainable exploitation of the species, in accordance with the country's commitments to international conventions and national legislation.

Thus, from the technical point of view, and since the listing of eels in CITES Appendix II, the scientific approach adopted by Morocco has imposed, *inter alia*, the following restrictions:

- The introduction of fishing quotas
- The ban on the export of glass eels. All the elvers caught under the fixed quotas are intended exclusively for aquaculture.
- The strong ban on the fishing of glass eel at the level of the Mediterranean coast;

Article IV, and submit to the Secretariat, e.g., providing training for CITES authorities (e.g., CITES Virtual College, NDF workshops in a country or region) <u>Final recommendation</u> l) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.	• The establishment of an annual restocking program; • The fight against poaching and the illegal traffic of eels. At the legislative and regulatory level, in 2015, Morocco implemented Law 29-05 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora covered by the CITES Appendices, including eels. The objective is to introduce wildlife trade control provisions to ensure the traceability and legal origin of exported products when establishing their CITES permits. At the operational level, the declination of the guidelines mentioned above has enabled Morocco to take the following measures: a. Since 2013, and as a precautionary principle, Morocco has only allowed the exploitation of an elver catch quota of 2 tonnes per season at level of the sebou river fishery. Other fisheries have been classified as a biological reserve where eel fishing is prohibited b. Commercial fishing for glass eels is only allowed in Wadi Sebou and its tributaries according to a catch quota of 2 tonnes of glass eel and 7 tonnes. These catch quotas are divided into sub-quotas between two beneficiaries of the fishing rights of this species at the level of the aforementioned wadi (two aquaculture companies). c. Prohibition of trade and export of elvers and eels not exceeding 10 cm. All quantities of elvers fished must be intended exclusively for growth in an approved breeding facility. d. Prohibition of trade and export of wild eel less than 30 centimetres. e. Pursuant to the provisions of Law 29-05, which classifies the species *Anguilla anguilla* in category II, the taking of specimens of this species from the wild is subject to obtaining authorization from the Office of the High Commissioner for Waters and Forests and the fight against desertification, after consultation with relevant agencies and institutions (Art. 39). This opinion is generally collected during the examination of the records of the granting of the lease of fishing rights for eels and eels, which recommends, among other things, the operating conditions, in particular the weight and sizes of eels. authorized for the trade, the fishing period, the quotas of the authorized levies in each leased batch. f. The elvers export quota is 0, the national legislation prohibits the marketing of glass eels. All the quantities fished must be intended for growth in the breeding stations. The authorized size for obtaining the CITES permit for the marketing of livestock products was set at more than 10 cm. From March 2018 and following the meeting, held on 14/12/2017, with the CITES National Scientific Authority, it was decided	

	to set the authorized size for obtaining the CITES permit for the export of eel reared more than 30 cm. g. As part of the implementation, in 2015, of Law 29-05 on the Protection of Species of Wild Fauna and Flora Concerned by the CITES Appendices, of which eel is a part and with the objective of establish provisions for the control of wildlife trade to ensure the traceability and legal origin of exported products when establishing their CITES permits, a broad awareness on the content of this law among various stakeholders (Royal Gendarmerie, Police Department, Environmental Police, Customs Service and provincial and local authorities responsible for the fisheries in question and many others) were provided. In the same way the necessary trainings were assured. h. In order to monitor the traceability of fish caught and reared in aquaculture stations, a detailed procedure for the establishment of a traceability system has been developed which allows the companies to lease of the right to fish to keep records ensuring the complete accounting of the inflow and outflow of all eel or fished products. i. A specific preventive mechanism for controlling fishing and illegal trade in this species has been set up, integrating the various legal provisions, the organization of fishermen and their integration into the eel aquaculture sector; the creation of a fishing brigade dedicated exclusively to the control of fishing and eel aquaculture activities; coordinating the skills and resources of the State services concerned (HCEFLCD, provincial authorities, Royal Gendarmerie, Civil Protection, etc.) to strengthen control at the watercourse level; the establishment of a shipping control procedure for aquaculture companies involving customs agents and forest agents to monitor the traceability of exported products. From the technical point of view, stopping exports would have detrimental consequences for the leasing companies for the following reasons: – current exports mainly concern farmed eels from glass eel catches made in particular between 2017 and 2018. – the companies have a monthly program for the sale of their stock on the market which is in line with the size of the infrastructures of their aquaculture units; – all production of aquaculture units in farmed eel is entirely for export in the absence of a local market unlike what happens in the European Union where the product is appreciated for consumption;	

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>

– The cessation of exports would cause irreparable damage to these companies as the increase in stocking densities in their aquaculture units constitutes a danger to the operation of their closed circuits and consequently can lead to a massive mortality of their stock Breeding because

Morocco is of the view that harvesting in the wild according to pre-established quotas has no negative impact on the sustainability of the resource. On the contrary, according to analyses recognized by the entire scientific community, it avoids mortality. It's view is that 75% of natural fry die in nature due to pollution, dams, power plants, cannibalism, and poor growth due to lack of food.

Morocco is therefore requesting to review these recommendations and seeks to increase its harvest of glass eels for aquaculture purposes from 2 tonnes to 4 tonnes (10% will be reserved for restocking) and corresponding to 600 tonnes of farmed eel to be exported, and 5.5 tonnes for wild eels.

</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>

Tunisia

Short term actions

<u>Within 90 days (12 February 2019):</u>

a) Establish interim conservative export quotas (suggested to be reduced to 67 percent of present trade and a zero quota for live glass eels) within 60 days for each category of specimens in trade (such as fingerlings/elvers, live, and meat), and communicate the quotas to the Secretariat for publication on the website.

b) No exports should occur until the quota has been published on the Secretariat's website.

c) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia to the Secretariat and Chair of the Animals Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that

</td>
<td>

Tunisia provided a detailed response on 1 April 2020 that included a management plan from 2010, a preliminary stock assessment from 2017; details of a 4-year research project with GCFM; details on permit applications and its non-detriment finding for eel.

Concerning recommendations a) and b)

Tunisia established a provisional export quota of 90 tonnes of adult wild-taken eels, which represents a reduction to 67 percent, and a zero-export quota for glass eels. These quotas were published on 28 February 2019.

It is clear from the CITES trade data (note all figures in the table below are kg) that Tunisia has consistently stayed within this quota.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>2016</td><td>2017</td><td>2018</td><td>2019</td><td>2020</td></tr>
<tr><td>Annual report</td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Quota</td><td>Adult W</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>90,000</td><td>90,000</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Glass</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>

</td>
<td>

<u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u>

Recommendations a) and b) have been complied with. Recommendations c) to l) have been partially complied with.

<u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u>

The Standing Committee is invited to:

a) note that recommendations a) and b) have been complied with;

b) commend Tunisia for the progress made to-date in implementing the remaining recommendations d) to l); and

</td>
</tr>
</table>

make use of best available scientific information, for their agreement.

Long term actions

Within 2 years (14 November 2020):

d) Evaluate current harvest management measures and implement harvest measures to ensure sustainability

(for example:
- size/selective harvest
- open/closed seasons
- harvest seasons
- harvest maximums
- restrictions to harvest frequency, sites or time of day
- control of number of harvesters
- types and methods of harvest)

e) Clarify and standardize the terms and units used in reporting trade. Ensure that appropriate terms and units are recorded on permits for trade. Standardized terms and appropriate units are found in the most recent version of the Guidelines for the preparation and submission of CITES annual reports, which is referenced in Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP17) on *national reports* and distributed by the Secretariat by notification.

f) Ensure that permits issued for the species clearly and accurately indicate the source of the specimens.

g) Undertake science-based studies on status of the species (e.g. population size/density, trends, distribution) including an evaluation of the

Importer	Live	41,814	-	40,242	21,092	39,616
Exporter	live	92,321	65,268	51,190	26,246	53,770
Importer	M/B	27,000	-	140	5,000	660
Exporter	M/B	39,795	78,547	22,139	19,645	19,733

Concerning long term recommendations d to l

Eel fishing in Tunisia takes place in three different environments: the continental environment, the lagoon environment and the coastal environment.

i. In lagoon environments: eel fishing is targeted, often using two fishing techniques:

* The bordigues

* Traps or "capechades"

i. In the continental environment (non-targeted fishing): fishing in dam reservoirs is practiced at the rate of 2 fishermen per boat without engine, as stipulated in the regulations in force. The eel is caught either by traps or by bottom longlines but always in small quantities.

i. In the coastal zone: eel fishing is not targeted. Catches are common with those of coastal fishing and the gear of capture is not specific (gillnets, trammel nets, longlines, etc.).

Catch and marketing traceability measures are ensured:

To monitor the catch, production sheets are used at the level of the fishing stage (sampling) which show the fishing zone, the quantity landed, the date of catch, the gear used and the name of the vessel/participant. These records are signed by officials of the competent authority after verifying the veracity of the information mentioned and checking the size of the eels caught which must comply with the size fixed by the regulations in force. However, the catch data is not presented here. While the export quota is presented it is not clear if there is a larger harvest quota (or if all catch is exported). Tunisia indicates that it is following the recommendation CGPM/42/2018/ to reduce the fishing effort of the

c) invite Tunisia to provide an update on the implementation of the outstanding recommendations by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.

threats to the species for use as the basis for NDFs h) Develop/Implement an ongoing science-based population monitoring program that is used in conjunction with an adaptive management program for the species (see harvest management measures and trade controls, below), for use in making NDFs i) Develop and implement coordinated national and/or local management plans (that include harvest management considerations) with aims to achieve, within defined time limits, escapement targets as a contribution to stock recovery; clear monitoring requirements; management is adaptive (regular review of harvest records, of impact of harvesting, adjustment of harvest instructions as necessary), harvest restrictions based on monitoring results; management plans should be submitted for independent peer review by a suitable external body (e.g., WGEEL) j) Initiate robust monitoring programs, with input from WGEEL, to provide time series population data and/or recruitment and escapement indices to support development and implementation of the management plans and to inform NDF assessments k) Algeria / Morocco / Tunisia are encouraged to outline any capacity building needs the party may have to support the implementation of Article IV, and submit to the Secretariat, e.g.,	eel in the Mediterranean by 30% over 3 years from 2019 or 10% in 2019, 10% in 2020 and 10% in 2021. <u>Concerning recommendation f), analysis of the CITES trade database indicates that Tunisia consistently indicates the source of specimens as wild (W).</u> <u>Concerning recommendation g)</u> <u>Tunisia has provided details on the species distribution and population estimates based on modelling.</u> It states that local stock assessments were carried out taking into account specific habitat typologies (lakes, lagoons, rivers and river estuaries), using a demographic model adjusted on the available annual catch data. The ESAM (Eel Stock Assessment Model) developed by Schiavina *et al*. 2015[1] was selected for this purpose because it is adaptable to case studies <u>poor in historical data</u> and it was <u>developed specifically for lagoons</u> that represent most of the total suitable habitat for eels in Tunisia. However, no further information is provided on this modelling or its results. <u>Concerning recommendation h) to l)</u> Tunisia has submitted a management plan dated 2010 and through the GFCM project on eel, Tunisia is collecting data that will be useful in the production of more accurate stock assessments (and presumably recruitment and escapement data). Tunisia has submitted a copy of its Non-Detriment Finding for future trade in European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*), noting that it will be reviewed every three years and quotas submitted annually. However, while many elements of an NDF are present, the information does not seem to justify the quota, as the recruitment and escapement levels appear to be missing and therefore it is difficult to determine the population or demonstrate sustainability. In addition, it appears that catch data is collected but it is not presented in this report. However, the	

[1] **Schiavina M., Bevacqua D., Melia P., Crivelli A. J., Gatto M. and De Leo G., 2015**. A user-friendly tool to assess management plans for European eel fishery and conservation. Environmental Modeling & Software 64: 9-17

providing training for CITES authorities (e.g., CITES Virtual College, NDF workshops in a country or region) <u>Final recommendation</u> l) Upon completion of other recommendations, the Management Authority of Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia should provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports from their country are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia has taken or will take address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.	data collected for the GFCM project should assist Tunisia in developing more accurate modelling predictions in the future.	

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE FOR ALL ONGOING CASES OF FLORA SELECTED FOR THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE FOLLOWING COP16 AND COP17; RESPONSES FROM THE RANGE STATES CONCERNED; AND DETERMINATION OF IMPLEMENTATION BY THE SECRETARIAT

<table>
<tr><th>Species/country combination</th><th>Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist</th><th>Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)</th><th>Determination of implementation and actions recommended</th></tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon (CM): Prunus africana</td>
<td><u>Short-term Action (by 21 December 2017)</u>

a) Establish a zero-export quota for the North West region of Cameroon.
b) Establish an interim quota of not more than 50% of the country's current total export quota (as of 26 July 2017, the current quota for 2017 is 908,743 kg of dry bark (ref: National export quotas on CITES website)). This quota should cover all material that is exported. No exports of any material should occur until this revised quota has been published on the Secretariat's website.
c) Before making any increases to the interim quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Cameroon to the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of available scientific information, for their agreement.

<u>Long-term Action (by 22 March 2019)</u>
d) Develop and implement subregional management with clearly defined harvest management</td>
<td><u>Concerning recommendations a) to c) of the Plants Committee, and recommendation h) of the Standing Committee</u>

Regarding the establishment of export quotas submitted for consideration of the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, the following table summarizes those published since 2018 onwards:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Export quotas
Cameroon/Prunus Africana</th></tr>
<tr><th>Year</th><th>Quota/Unit</th><th>Specimens</th></tr>
<tr><td>2018</td><td>0</td><td>[All]</td></tr>
<tr><td>2019</td><td>455,000</td><td>dry bark [Note: Excluding specimens from the North West region of Cameroon]</td></tr>
<tr><td>2020</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>2021</td><td>0</td><td>All specimens from the wild</td></tr>
</table>

<u>Concerning recommendations d) to e) of the Plants Committee, and other associated recommendations of the Standing Committee</u>

Since SC71 and over the course of the informal conversations that took place early 2021 between Cameroon and the Secretariat, the former has highlighted that the implementation of these</td>
<td><u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u>

Recommendations a) to c) of the Plants Committee, and associated recommendations of the Standing Committee, have been complied with.

Recommendations d) and e) of the Plants Committee and associated recommendations of the Standing Committee have been partially complied with, and remain ongoing in light of the expected outcomes of the ongoing project under the CITES Tree Species Programme (see SC74 Doc. 14).

<u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u>

The Standing Committee is invited to:</td>
</tr>
</table>

Species/country combination	Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist	Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
	measures (e.g., minimum rotation periods, minimum DBH, good harvesting techniques, impact of harvest on the targeted trees). e) undertake monitoring of the impact of harvest and implement harvest and export restrictions based on monitoring results. **<u>Outcome of SC70</u>** The Standing Committee, at its 70th meeting: f) requested Cameroon to comply with recommendation a) by establishing by 1 December 2018 a zero-export quota for the North west region of Cameroon for 2019; g) requested Cameroon to clarify the situation concerning the published quotas for *P. africana* for 2017; h) requested Cameroon to establish an interim quota of not more than 455 tons of dry bark for 2018 and 2019; and i) encouraged Cameroon to finalize the implementation of recommendations c), d) and e) by 22 March 2019. **<u>Outcome of SC71</u>** The Standing Committee, at its 71st meeting: j) acknowledged the progress made by Cameroon in the implementation of recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee; k) acknowledged the progress made by Cameroon in developing non-detriment findings for *Prunus africana* and making	recommendations requires elements of a scientific order, and noted that these could be addressed through the implementation of the expected outcomes of the ongoing project under the CITES Tree Species Programme (see SC74 Doc. 14).	**a) note that Cameroon has complied with recommendations a) to c) of the Plants Committee and associated recommendations of the Standing Committee; and,** b) **encourage Cameroon to continue the implementation of remaining recommendations d) and e) of the Plants Committee by consolidating the information it has accrued on non-detriment findings, as well as through the implementation of the relevant project under the CITES Tree Species Programme.**

<table>
<tr><th>Species/country combination</th><th>Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist</th><th>Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)</th><th>Determination of implementation and actions recommended</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>them publicly available on the CITES website;
l) encouraged Cameroon to continue the implementation of remaining recommendations c) to e) by consolidating the information it has accrued on non-detriment findings, as well as through the implementation of the relevant project under the CITES tree Species Programme; and,
m) encouraged Cameroon to report on the implementation of remaining recommendations c) to e) and any planned increases to the interim quota in accordance with recommendation c) in time for the matter to be considered at SC73.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Congo (CG): Pericopsis elata</td><td><u>Short-term Action (by 13 December 2018)</u>

a) Establish a conservative export quota in consultation with the CITES Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee and inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota so that it can be included in the national export quota section on the CITES website.

b) Before making any increases to this quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the range State to the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of available scientific information, for their agreement.

<u>Long-term Action (by 13 December 2020)</u></td><td><u>Concerning recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee</u>

Through a letter dated 1 February 2019, Congo requested the publication of the following quota:

<table><tr><td>Specimens</td><td>Total</td></tr><tr><td>Sawn wood</td><td>4,195.64 m^3</td></tr><tr><td>Logs</td><td>1, 851.40 m^3</td></tr></table>
This proposed 2019 quota was to be distributed amongst two forestry concession (SEFYD and IFO), however only the proposed export for the SEFYD concession was provided. However, The Secretariat requested clarification on the pending supporting NDFs, however this remained to be clarified, and no quota for 2019 has to the date been published. At the moment, and as communicated by the Secretariat through a letter dated 28 September 2020, the 2019 quota remains published as “in prep.”.</td><td><u>The Secretariat’s determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u>

Recommendations a) to b) have been partially implementing, with clarifications pending on the quota set for 2019 and 2021.

Recommendations c) to f) of the Plants Committee have been partially implemented, noting however significant progress in the development of NDFs in support of the establishment of sustainable harvest and export quotas.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Species/country combination</th><th>Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist</th><th>Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)</th><th>Determination of implementation and actions recommended</th></tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Develop and implement coordinated national and/or local management plans (that include harvest management considerations) with clear monitoring requirements: management is adaptive (regular review of harvest records, of impact of harvesting, adjustment of harvesting instructions as necessary), harvest restrictions based on monitoring results.

d) Overall, the review should aim to ensure an effective NDF process with clearly defined harvest management measures (e.g., minimum rotation periods, minimum DBH, good harvesting techniques, impact of harvest) with a locally- appropriate and effective monitoring system.

e) Undertake monitoring of the impact of harvest and implement harvest and export restrictions based on monitoring results.

f) Upon completion of other recommendations, provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions the range State has taken, or will take, address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.</td>
<td>Through a letter dated 12 October 2020, and following a series of correspondence of clarifications requested from the Secretariat, Congo confirmed the total requested quota for P. elata for 2020 would be as follows:
<table>
<tr><th>Forestry concessions</th><th>Logs (m^3)</th><th>Sawn logs (m^3)</th><th>Total per forestry concession (m^3)</th></tr>
<tr><td>SEFYD</td><td>1,690</td><td>200</td><td>1,890</td></tr>
<tr><td>SIFCO</td><td>293</td><td>665.121</td><td>958.557</td></tr>
<tr><td>CDWI</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>IFO</td><td>562</td><td>-</td><td>562</td></tr>
<tr><td>BOIS KASSA</td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sub-total</td><td>2,545.436</td><td>865.121</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td colspan="3">3,410.557 m^3</td></tr>
</table>
Congo also provided the Secretariat with the NDFs associated to all five of the forestry concessions listed above, which are aligned with the volumes proposed for export.

As a summary, below a table on the quotas for Congo/Pericopsis elata since the case was included in Stage-2 of the RST process following PC24:
<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Export quotas
Congo/Pericopsis elata</th></tr>
<tr><th>Year</th><th>Quota/Unit</th><th>Specimens</th></tr>
<tr><td>2019</td><td>In prep.</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">2020</td><td>2,545.436 m^3</td><td>Logs</td></tr>
<tr><td>865.121</td><td>Sawn logs</td></tr>
</table>
<u>Concerning recommendations c) to f) of the Plants Committee</u></td>
<td><u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u>

The Standing Committee is invited to:

a) commend the Congo in the progress achieved in the implementation of recommendations a) to f) of the Plants Committee;
b) encourage the Congo to finalize implementation of recommendations a) and b) by clarifying pending aspects relating to the quotas for 2019 and 2021 onwards; and,
c) encourage the Congo to submit updated non-detriment findings in support of the implementation of decisions c) to f) of the Plants Committee.</td>
</tr>
</table>

Species/country combination	Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist	Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		In its letter dated 12 October 2020, Congo provided three NDF studies for the five forestry concessions that are subject to sustainable harvest of *P. elata*, and from which the 2020 quota would be sourced form. It is unclear however, if new NDFs have been produced or updated since, in support of the establishment of export quotas from 2021 onwards.	
Democratic Republic of the Congo (CD): *Prunus africana*	<u>Short-term Action (by 22 March 2018)</u> a) Review and revise if appropriate, in consultation with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, the export quota for the species and communicate the quota to the Secretariat. The quota should be conservative. b) Before making any increases to this quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the range State to the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of available scientific information, for their agreement. <u>Long-term Action (by 22 September 2019)</u> c) Develop and implement subregional management with clearly defined harvest management measures (e.g., minimum rotation periods, minimum DBH, good harvesting techniques, impact of harvest on the targeted trees)	<u>Concerning recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee</u> In document SC70 Doc. 29.1 the Secretariat provides context on the establishment of the 2018 quota for *P. africana,* agreed in consultation with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, which was deemed conservative on the basis of the information contained in the supporting dossier (also summarized in document SC70 Doc. 29.1). In a letter dated 13 February 2019, CD communicated its proposed 2019 quota exports for fauna and flora, including a 2019 quota for *P. africana* of 102 tons of dry bark. An equivalent quota for *P. africana* of 102 tons of dry bark was published for 2020. The above quotas were agreed for publication in consultation with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, as they remained the same as the 2018 conservative quota. At the time of writing, CD has not communicated to the Secretariat any quota for 2021 nor for 2022.	<u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u> Recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee have been implemented. Recommendations c) and d) of the Plants Committee, and associated recommendations of the Standing Committee, are reaching implementation in light of the upcoming publication of the relevant outcomes under the relevant CITES Tree Species Programme (CTSP) project (see SC74 Doc. 14). <u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u> **The Standing Committee is invited to:** **a) acknowledge that the Democratic Republic of**

Species/country combination	Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist	Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
	d) Undertake monitoring of the impact of harvest and implement harvest and export restrictions based on monitoring results. **<u>Outcome of SC70</u>** The Standing Committee, at its 70th meeting: e) acknowledged the progress made by the Democratic Republic of the Congo by implementing recommendations a) of the Plants Committee; and f) encouraged Democratic Republic of the Congo to finalize the implementation of the remaining recommendations by 22 September 2019, *inter alia* by developing and implementing management plans for the four provinces in the country where *P. africana* occurs and monitoring the impacts of the agreed export quotas.	<u>Concerning recommendations c) and d) of the Plants Committee and associated recommendations of the Standing Committee</u> The Democratic Republic of the Congo is beneficiary to an ongoing project under the CITES Tree Species Programme titled "Non detriment findings for *Pericopsis elata*, *Guibourtia demeusei, Prunus africana* in the Democratic Republic of Congo". As reported by the Secretariat in document (see SC74 Doc. 14), outputs thus far relevant to *P. africana* include: 1. a detailed state of the art on research, management, harvesting, processing, control and monitoring well established for each tree species; 2. simple management plans for *Prunus africana* developed for the Luenge forest massif, Butembo, North Kivu well developed; 3. simple management plans for *Prunus africana* in the Walikalé zone updated; and, 4. NDF for *Prunus africana.* The above outcomes will be made available in the relevant country page of the CTSP website [www.cites-tsp.org.](http://www.cites-tsp.org)	**the Congo has complied with recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee;** **b) acknowledge the progress made by the Democratic Republic of the Congo in the implementation of recommendations c) and d) of the Plants Committee, in light of the outcomes of the relevant project under the CITES Tree Species Programme (CTSP); and,** **c) recommend the Democratic Republic of the Congo to present monitoring information on the impacts of the agreed annual export quotas for 2019 and 2020 on the population status of *P. africana* in harvested regions.**
Democratic Republic of the Congo (CD): *Pericopsis elata*	<u>Short-term action (by 13 May 2019)</u> a) Review and revise, if appropriate, in consultation with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, the export quota for the species and communicate the quota to the Secretariat. b) Before making any increases to this quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the range State to the	<u>Concerning recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee</u> The 2018 quota (54,494 m^3 of logs, sawn timber and veneer sheets), was set in place before the selection of this species/country combination in Stage-2 of the RST process at PC24. Since PC24, the Democratic Republic of the Congo has, in line with relevant recommendations, requested annual quotas for *P. elata* and provided supporting information	<u>The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u> Recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee have been implemented. Recommendations c) to e) of the Plants Committee, and

<table>
<tr><th>Species/country combination</th><th>Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist</th><th>Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)</th><th>Determination of implementation and actions recommended</th></tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of available scientific information, for their agreement.

c) Outline how conversion rates (of volumes of processed products into round wood equivalent volumes), based on sounds scientific studies, are calculated and provide associated information.

d) Supply information on the level and management (including cross border controls) of artisanal harvest, and its consideration in the NDF.

e) Upon completion of other recommendations, provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions the range State has taken, or will take, address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.</td>
<td>(including non-detriment findings) for the years 2019 to 2021.
These quotas have been carefully considered by the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, all of which have been agreed for publication as follows:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Export quotas
Democratic Republic of the Congo/Pericopsis elata</th></tr>
<tr><th>Year</th><th>Quota/Unit</th><th>Specimens</th></tr>
<tr><td>2019</td><td>54 494 m^3</td><td>Logs, sawn timber and veneer sheets</td></tr>
<tr><td>2020</td><td>54,747 m^3</td><td>Logs, sawn timber and veneer sheets</td></tr>
<tr><td>2021</td><td>98,317 m^3</td><td>Logs, sawn timber and veneer sheets</td></tr>
</table>

The agreed quotas for 2019 and 2020 represent a moderate that of 2018, and it is supported by the NDFs provided by CD, including updates on revisions to sub-national quota distributions for relevant forestry concessions.

In the case of the 2021 quota, the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee noted that it represented a significant increase to that of 2019 and 2020. However, the quota is supported by the findings of the outcomes thus far produced under the relevant project under the CITES Tree Species Programme (further details ahead). Following consultations with the relevant regional coordinator of the project, the quota was deemed justified by: the available parameters of all forest concessions associated to the quota; forestry inventories that have been completed; and, a 40% reduction of harvest of the sustainable exportable stock.</td>
<td>associated recommendations of the Standing Committee, are reaching implementation in light of the upcoming publication of the relevant outcomes under the relevant CITES Tree Species Programme (CTSP) project (see SC74 Doc. 14).

<u>Actions recommended by the Secretariat</u>

The Standing Committee is invited to:

a) acknowledge that the Democratic Republic of the Congo has complied with recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee;
b) acknowledge the progress made by the Democratic Republic of the Congo in the implementation of recommendations c) and d) of the Plants Committee, in light of the outcomes of the relevant project under the CITES Tree Species Programme (CTSP); and,
c) recommend the Democratic Republic of the Congo to continue to</td>
</tr>
</table>

Species/country combination	Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist	Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		Concerning recommendations c) to e) of the Plants Committee The Democratic Republic of the Congo is beneficiary to an ongoing project under the CITES Tree Species Programme titled "Non detriment findings for *Pericopsis elata*, *Guibourtia demeusei, Prunus africana* in the Democratic Republic of Congo". As reported by the Secretariat in document (see SC74 Doc. 14), outputs thus far relevant to *P. elata* include: 1. a detailed the state-of-the-art on research, ecological dynamic, conservation status, management, harvesting, processing, traceability and trade of each tree species; 2. socioeconomic studies for each tree species; and, 3. analyzing data of management plans for *Pericopsis elata and Guibourtia tessmanii*. The above outcomes will be made available in the relevant country page of the CTSP website www.cites-tsp.org.	**consult with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee conservative *P. elata* quotas for 2022 onwards, supported by relevant findings of upcoming outcomes under the CTSP project**.
India (IN): *Pterocarpus santalinus*	a) Any future amendment of the quota does not take place until the Standing Committee has an opportunity to review the situation and advice the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee on the results of their work, in particular in relation to the confiscated materials. By 22 June 2018 b) Clarify, to the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, the status of material exported from plantations, and provide data to support the case that these stocks meet the provisions of Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17) for artificially	Concerning recommendation a) of the Plants Committee In its report to the Standing Committee at its 71st meeting (SC71 Doc. 12), the Secretariat determined that recommendation a) had been complied with. Concerning recommendation b) of the Plants Committee Through a letter dated 1 January 2020, India responded by submitting a non-detriment finding report on *Pterocarpus santalinus* (dated 2019), and informing that Management Authority of India, who confirmed no harvesting of wild specimens of *P. santalinus* would be allowed for the next five years (2020 onwards). The NDF report presents a comprehensive overview of the status of plantations in the country (source code A),	Recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee and recommendation d) of the Standing Committee have been complied with. Recommendation c) and e) of the Standing Committee has been partially complied with, noting that clarification is needed regarding the remaining stock of the one-time export since 2018 onwards. Actions recommended by the Secretariat

Species/country combination	Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist	Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
	propagated specimens and assess the possible impact on wild populations. **<u>Outcome of SC70</u>** The Standing Committee, at its 70th meeting: c) encouraged India to continue to provide regular updates on the amount of confiscated stock that is remaining to the Secretariat; and, d) urged India to implement recommendation b) before 1 February 2019 so that the matter can be considered at SC71. **<u>Outcome of SC71</u>** The Standing Committee, at its 71st meeting: e) encouraged India to continue to provide regular annual updates to the Secretariat on the amount of confiscated *Pterocarpus santalinus* that remains in stock; and f) urged India to implement recommendation b) by 31 December 2019 at the latest.	with focus on those occurring in six States. Based on the findings of the 2019 NDF report, it concludes that the national annual quota for specimens sourced from plantations (source code A) *Pterocarpus santalinus* may be fixed at 1,190 tons of logs. <u>Concerning recommendation c) of the Standing Committee</u> The one-time export of *Pterocarpus santalinus* from confiscated specimens (source code "I") was last reported at 4,393.93 metric tons, as per the last quota published in 2018. However since, no further updates have been provided by India regarding the remaining stock. In addition to this, the NDF report dated 2019 reports on an additional existing confiscated stock of 12,565.723 metric tons. This confiscated sock is distributed throughout seven states in the country. <u>Concerning consultations by India on the export of *P. santalinus* specimens uprooted by the Cyclone Titli</u> Throughout 2020 and 2021 India consulted the Secretariat regarding the possibility to export 810.1894 tons of *P. santalinus* uprooted by the Cyclone Titli (2018). The Secretariat consistently advised India that noting that Notification to the Parties No. 2018/031 remains in effect, and that should the uprooted specimens qualify as wild, they would be affected or covered by the ban mentioned in the Notification. The Secretariat further pointed India to relevant provisions relating to salvaged plant specimens, notably paragraph 12 of Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP18) on *Regulation of trade in plants*.	**The Standing Committee is invited to:** **a) note that recommendations a) and b) of the Plants Committee have been complied with; and,** **b) encourage India to provide an update of the remaining stock of the one-time export of confiscated specimens from 2019 onwards, in order to complete implementation of recommendations c) and d) of the Standing Committee.**

Species/country combination	Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist	Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		In response to the Secretariat's recommendations regarding the uprooted specimens of *P. santalinus*, India submitted to the Secretariat a report titled "*Assessment of Cyclone affected Red Sanders (Pterocarpus santalinus L.f.) plantations in Paralakhemundi Forest Division, Odisha*" (dated 2020). The report suggests that the uprooted specimens concerned fall under the definition of artificially propagated. However, in comparing the 2019 and 2020 reports by India, the Secretariat identified inconsistencies regarding the origin of the uprooted specimens proposed for export and communicated this to India. At the time of writing, the Secretariat has received no further information on India's decision regarding the export of the uprooted specimens of *P. santalinus*.	
Nepal (NP): *Nardostachys grandiflora*	Short-term Action (by 21 December 2017) a) Establish a zero-export quota for wild specimens and communicate the quota to the Secretariat. No exports should occur until the quota has been published on the Secretariat's website. b) Before making any increases to the zero export quota, the planned changes should be communicated by the Management Authority of Nepal to the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee along with a justification of how the change is conservative, based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of available scientific information, for their agreement. c) Clarify the current legislation with regard to trade in this Appendix II listed species.	Concerning recommendation a) to c) of the Plants Committee On 22 September and 27 October 2019, Nepal responded with a dossier consisting of eight substantial documents, and an official letter requesting a precautionary export quota of 382.7 metric tons rhizomes for 2020, jointly with an associated NDF and a management plan for the Humla district, in which the majority of harvest was anticipated to take place. Nepal specified that equivalent management plans had been elaborated for all other provinces with lesser volumes of *N. grandiflora* harvest, even though those were not available in English. The descriptions and calculations used in the NDF are consistent with the management plan for the Humla district. The proposed quota for 2020 assumes a five-year rotation period, and annual harvest in each district equaling 10% of the total growing stock. Nepal states that these assumptions are precautionary, since annual allowable harvest would be equivalent to a larger harvest	The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations The Secretariat has determined that the recommendations a) to e) of the Plants Committee, and associated recommendations of the Standing Committee, have been complied with. Actions recommended by the Secretariat **The Standing Committee is invited to:** **a) note that the species/country combination**

Species/country combination	Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist	Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
	Long-term Action (within 22 March 2019) d) The Management Authority should report to the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee its actions to implement the provisions of Article IV, and how the Scientific Authority determines that levels of export are not detrimental to the populations concerned, including the scientific basis for allowable harvest rates, and how legal domestic harvest and illegal harvest are taken into account when making NDFs. e) Develop and implement coordinated national and/or local management plans (that include harvest management considerations) with clear monitoring requirements with adaptive management (regular review of harvest records, of impact of harvesting, adjustment of harvest instructions as necessary), to ensure harvest restrictions are based on monitoring results. **Outcome of SC70** The Standing Committee at its 70th meeting: f) urged Nepal to implement recommendation a) by 1 December 2018. If Nepal fails to meet that deadline, the Standing Committee requested the Secretariat to publish a zero-export quota as an interim measure; g) encouraged Nepal to implement recommendations b) and c) by 1 February	volume assuming a three-year rotation period and annual harvest in each district of 10-55% of the total growing stock. Nepal also attached an analysis of how it complies with all SC recommendations. These documents, and additional bilateral follow-up discussions clarify the following: a) that Nepal banned the collection, domestic use and export of *N. grandiflora* since May 2017, until the 2020 export quota was published on the website of the CITES Secretariat; b) that the proposed export quota of 382,700 kg a year is conservative and based on estimates of sustainable off-take that make use of available scientific information; c) legislative and administrative measures related to the management of the species in great detail; d) actions to implement the provisions of Article IV, and how the Scientific Authority determines that levels of export are not detrimental to the populations concerned; e) National and district-level management plans and coordination, including monitoring processes and provisions for adaptive management. The proposed export quota of rhizomes for 2020 was approved for publication in consultation with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee and published on the CITES website on 18 September 2020. Nepal requested an export quota for 2021 that is equivalent in terms of harvest volume to the approved quota for 2020. In order for it to be published in trade specimens as they first enter international trade, the quota was published as oil and derivatives, based on conversion factors that are justified in the NDF that Nepal	***Nardostachys grandiflora*/Nepal has been removed from the Review of Significant Trade process; and,** **b) commend Nepal in its commitment to establish precautionary export quotas for *Nardostachys grandiflora*.**

<table>
<tr><th>Species/country combination</th><th>Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist</th><th>Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)</th><th>Determination of implementation and actions recommended</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>2019 so that the matter can be discussed again at SC71; and,

h) urged Nepal to implement all outstanding recommendations by 22 September 2019.

<u>Outcome of SC71</u>

The Standing Committee, at its 71st meeting:

i) acknowledged progress made by Nepal to implement the recommendations thus far;
j) requested Nepal to communicate to the Secretariat a revised precautionary export quota for 2019, along with a scientific justification, in line with recommendation b) of the Plants Committee; and,
k) further requested Nepal to report on the implementation of recommendations d) and e), in time for the matter to be reviewed by the Plants Committee and considered at SC73.

It also requested the Secretariat to publish as soon as possible a zero quota for wild specimens and to include the Plants Committee’s comments in Addendum 2 to document SC71 Doc. 12 in its letter to Nepal.</td><td>provided. The quota was approved and published on 2 November 2021.
As a summary, below a table on the quotas published for Nepal/Nardostachys grandiflora since the case was last discussed at SC71, in line with relevant recommendations under the RST process:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Export quotas
Nepal/Nardostachys grandiflora</th></tr>
<tr><th>Year</th><th>Quota/Unit</th><th>Specimens</th></tr>
<tr><td>2019</td><td>0</td><td>[All]</td></tr>
<tr><td>2020</td><td>382,700 kg</td><td>rhizomes</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">2021</td><td>5,782 L</td><td>oil. wild specimen for commercial purposes.</td></tr>
<tr><td>376,800 kg</td><td>derivatives (root pith). wild specimen for commercial purposes.</td></tr>
</table>

<u>Regarding recommendations d) and e) of the Plants Committee and associated recommendations of the Standing Committee</u>

The documents and subsequent clarifications submitted by Nepal are reasonably transparent and consistent. They contain a high level of detail on legislative measures with regard to trade in this species, and species management plans and monitoring processes on national and district levels. The process of making the NDF can be reasonably well understood, even though there is little dedicated discussion of harvest for national consumption and none for illegal harvest.</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Species/country combination	Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist	Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
Nicaragua (NI): *Dalbergia retusa*	Short term action (by 20 December 2018) a) Provide information on the location and extent of the areas under harvest management for export. b) Submit management plans including any available information on inventories and monitoring systems currently in place. Long term actions (by 20 November 2020) c) Develop an analysis of the status of the population at the national level, based on existing national forest inventories and forest inventories under development and plans for a monitoring process. d) Upon completion of other recommendations, provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions the range State has taken, or will take, address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.	Concerning recommendations a) to c) of the Plants Committee In its response dated 10 January 2019, Nicaragua submitted a set of 34 files. The two main files identified by the Secretariat were those relating to a 2017 forest management plan, as well as a comprehensive general forestry management plan for the period 2017 to 2033 relevant to the long-term harvest of timber species including *Dalbergia retusa*. The dossier also included an extensive set of supporting inventories and distribution maps of natural populations and plantations of *D. retusa* in the country. Concerning recommendations d) of the Plants Committee In its response on 18 December 2020, Nicaragua submitted a consolidated report on the overall implementation of the RST recommendations for *Dalbergia retusa*. The report builds upon the information included in 2019 dossier, but with a focus on updates of the outcomes of national forestry inventories that took place from 2007 to 2020. The report also includes information on the scientific basis for the non-detriment findings to ensure the sustainability of exports for *D. retusa*. While it is clear from the information thus far provided by Nicaragua that long-term management and monitoring systems are in place to ensure the sustainable harvest of *D. retusa* from wild populations and plantations. However, it remains unclear how the allowed levels of harvest at the national level will translate into the establishment of sustainable annual export quotas of *Dalbergia retusa*.	The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations Recommendations a) to c) of the Plants Committee have been implemented. Recommendation d) of the Plants Committee has been partially implemented. Actions recommended by the Secretariat **The Standing Committee is invited to:** **a) commend Nicaragua in its timely implementation of the Plants Committee's recommendations a) to c); and,** **b) request Nicaragua to finalize implementation of recommendations c) and d) of the Plants Committee by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77.**

Species/country combination	Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist	Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
Panama (PA): *Dalbergia retusa*	Short-term action (by 20 December 2018) a) Establish an interim zero export quota, and inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota so that it can be included in the national export quota section on the CITES website. Before trade is resumed, the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee should be informed of the process under which the non-detriment finding was made, for their agreement. b) Clarify the current ban, what inventories have taken place, current controls on harvest, monitoring systems and reporting mechanisms. Long-term actions (by 20 May 2020) c) Review and, as appropriate, revise management systems in place, including how population levels are calculated and sustainable off- take assessed, taking into account levels and frequency of harvest, annual growth rates for the species, and the location of harvest. Critically review monitoring measures, the reporting and assessment of same, assess their effectiveness and amend as appropriate. Overall, the review should aim to ensure an effective NDF process with clearly defined harvest management measures (e.g., minimum rotation periods, minimum DBH, good harvesting techniques, impact of harvest) with a locally- appropriate and effective monitoring system.	Since the inclusion of *Dalbergia retusa*/Panama in Stage 2 of the RST process at PC24 to date, the Secretariat has not received any response from Panama on this case.	The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations Recommendations a) to e) of the Plants Committee have not been implemented. Actions recommended by the Secretariat **The Standing Committee is invited to:** a) **urge Panama to implement recommendations a) to e) by three months before the documentation deadline for SC77; and** b) **if Panama fails to meet that deadline, request the Secretariat to publish a zero-export quota as an interim measure, and encourage Panama to implement outstanding recommendations in time for the matter to be considered at SC77.**

Species/country combination	Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist	Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
	d) Undertake monitoring of the impact of harvest and implement harvest and export restrictions based on monitoring results. e) Upon completion of other recommendations, provide the scientific basis by which it has established that exports are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are compliant with Article IV, paragraphs 2(a), 3 and 6(a) of the Convention. Particular focus should be given to how the actions the range State has taken, or will take, address the concerns/problems identified in the Review of Significant Trade process.		
Paraguay (PY): *Bulnesia sarmientoi*	Short-term Action (by 22 December 2017) a) Establish in consultation with the Secretariat and with the Chair of the Plants Committee an interim conservative quota, for the species, its products, derivatives and extracts and communicate the quota to the Secretariat. No exports should occur until this revised quota has been published on the Secretariats website. b) The export quota should be justified as conservative based on estimates of sustainable offtake that make use of best available scientific information. Information should also be supplied on the management and monitoring measures that are in place and active. c) Before making any future increase to the quota, the planned changes should be communicated to the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee along with a justification how the updated quota is conservative, based on estimates of	Concerning recommendations a), b) and c) of the Plants Committee, and recommendation i) of the Standing Committee In their letter, received on 26 April 2019, Paraguay proposed a quota of 1,400 tons for wood and 250 tons for extract, taking into account the recommendations established in the 2018 study. In addition to the technical aspects established in the draft of the resolution, these were analyzed and discussed in an intergovernmental and multidisciplinary table[2], with a view to implement the RST-related recommendation. Together with the report of the working table, Paraguay provided the following files: • A map that outlines the natural area of distribution of palo santo, including identification of areas certified under the regime of environmental services. The reminder area will be subject to a territorial management.	The Secretariat's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations Recommendations a) to f) of the Plants Committee have been implemented. Recommendations g) to l) of the Standing Committee have also been met. Actions recommended by the Secretariat **The Standing Committee is invited to:** **a) note that the species/country combination *Bulnesia sarmientoi*/Paraguay**

[2] *The outcomes of the working table are available here: http://www.mades.gov.py/2019/04/01/mesa-de-trabajo-para-analizar-el-uso-sostenible-y-sustentable-del-palo-santo/*

Species/country combination	Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist	Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
	sustainable off- take that make use of available scientific information, for their agreement. <u>By 22 June 2018</u> d) The Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee will take into account results of the review of management and monitoring measures, and the revised plans to provide an effective locally appropriate system. e) The Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee will review this information and make their recommendations on revision of the quota. <u>Long-term action (by 22 September 2019)</u> f) Review management systems in place, including how population levels are calculated and sustainable off- take assessed, taking into account levels and frequency of harvest, annual growth rates for the species, and the location of harvest. Critically review monitoring measures, the reporting and assessment of same, assess their effectiveness and amend as appropriate. **<u>Outcome of SC70</u>** The Standing Committee, at its 70th meeting: g) noted the information provided by Paraguay; h) encouraged Paraguay to fully implement recommendations a) and b) by working with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee to establish conservative quotas for 2018/2019;	• They also informed that they count with the Terms of Reference of the development of a management plan. • A proposed resolution for the 2019 quota, with a favorable opinion from the Management Authority. Regarding recommendation i) of the Standing Committee, following SC70 Paraguay provided the full report on "*Contribución al conocimiento de* B. sarmientoi *(palo santo) como base para la planificación de la conservación de los rodales puros o palosantales aún existentes en la Región Occidental del Paraguay*" (2018), which was developed by the Consejo Nacional de Ciencias y Tecnología (CONACYT), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Centro para el Desarrollo de Investigación Científica (CEDIC), and the Scientific Authority of Paraguay (MNHNP). The report included a map of potential distribution of the species in el Chaco in Paraguay, and it is on the basis of this that the sampling sites were established in nine zones. Based on this, the study concludes and highlights the need to: • Promote the conservation of the zones known as "palosantales" where the species is distributed evenly, and to avoid the implementation of use plans in those zones; • Promote alliances with Universities or research centers; • Continue the study of the dynamic of populations to know the tendency of the species wild populations; • Promote the study of growth and species regeneration, to establish the minimum diameter of cut; • Consider the criterion exposed in the report to establish the zonification of palosantales.	**has been removed from the Review of Significant Trade process; and,** **b) commend Paraguay in its commitment to formulate non-detriment findings and precautionary export quotas for *Bulnesia sarmientoi*.**

<table>
<tr><th>Species/country combination</th><th>Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist</th><th>Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)</th><th>Determination of implementation and actions recommended</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>i) encouraged Paraguay to share with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee the study of 2018 mentioned in its letter to the Secretariat of 2 August 2018;
j) reminded Paraguay of recommendations c) to e); and,
k) urged Paraguay to implement all outstanding recommendations by the deadline of 22 September 2019.

<u>Outcome of SC71</u>

l) The Standing Committee, at its 71st meeting, emphasized the importance of implementing existing recommendations.</td><td>Further, through a letter dated 19 October 2021, Paraguay requested a new export quota. The request was accompanied by an updated non-detriment finding for B. sarmientoi, valid for the period 2021-2025. The quota requested for 2021 represented an increase from that of previous years, however considering the updated information provided in the relevant NDF, the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee considered this increase to be conservative.

<u>Concerning recommendations d) and e) of the Plants Committee</u>

Based on the export quotas requested by Paraguay for B. sarmientoi and the supporting information submitted for consideration of the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee in the framework of the RST process, the following quotas have thus far been agreed for the years 2019 to 2021:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Export quotas
Paraguay/Bulnesia sarmientoi</th></tr>
<tr><th>Year</th><th>Quota/Unit</th><th>Specimens</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">2019</td><td>250,000 kg</td><td>extract</td></tr>
<tr><td>1,400,000 kg</td><td>wood</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">2020</td><td>250,000 kg</td><td>extract</td></tr>
<tr><td>1,400,000 kg</td><td>wood</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">2021</td><td>270,000 kg</td><td>extract</td></tr>
<tr><td>1,600,000 kg</td><td>wood</td></tr>
</table>

<u>Concerning recommendation f) of the Plants Committee</u>
Paraguay continues to take measures and implementing actions based on scientific information on conservation and sustainable management of B. sarmientoi, including:</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Species/country combination	Recommendations of the PC and of the SC where they exist	Update of implementation of recommendations (including Range State responses)	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		• The decree (Decreto No 13202; May 2001) on the establishment of the biosphere reserve "*Reserva de Biósfera del Chaco*"; • Resolution No. 200/01 (24 August 2001) which establishes the properties under public or private domain, and municipalities that must conserve at least 50% of the area with minimum anthropic alterations or in natural conditions. • The Decree No. 175/18 (14 September 2017) to propose a new regulation on forestry management; • Memo (9 April 2019) addressed to the Directorate of Environmental Services (DSA No. 317/19) informing on the certified areas that count with *B. sarmientoi*; and, • The updated non-detriment finding submitted by Paraguay on 19 October 2021 supports the establishment of sustainable annual quotas up to the year 2025, with an increase deemed precautionary by the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee. The NDF 2021-2025 is the guiding document that has been approved by Paraguay's CITES Authorities and will likely serve as reference for upcoming quota requests for *B. sarmientoi*.	