



Council of the
European Union

Brussels, 20 January 2023
(OR. en)

5508/23

ENV 44
WTO 7

INFORMATION NOTE

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Delegations
Subject:	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES): Nineteenth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP19) (Panama-City, 14-25 November 2022)
	- Statements by the EU and its Member States

Delegations will find in the Annex, for information, a compilation of agreed statements on behalf of the EU and its Member States for the above meeting.

**Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES):
Nineteenth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP19)
(Panama-City, 14-25 November 2022)**

- Statements by the EU and its Member States –

Document No: 4.1
Agenda item: Report of the Standing Committee
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We support the recommended amendments to Rule 7.2 a) to enable balanced representation of all six regions in the Credentials Committee.
3. We support adoption of proposed amendments to Rule 25.5 streamlining the way forward for discussions when proposals reducing the scope of the proposal are made.
4. We support recommended amendments to Rule 25.6 as proposed by the SC, inter alia that the Conference shall first decide on the proposal that will have the most restrictive effect on trade and then on the proposal with the next most restrictive effect on trade.
5. Regarding voting order, although we accept that the Chair should be allowed to propose different order than it is prescribed by the Rules of Procedure, we would like to stress the importance that any such change in the voting order would need to be exceptional and duly justified by the Chair in the meeting.

Document No: 4.2
Agenda item: Proposed amendment to Rule 26
Proponents: Botswana and Zimbabwe

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We understand and recognize the parties' intentions about management and accountability for their own species' populations. However, the proposed changes to Rule 26 would fundamentally change the right of Parties to vote on listing proposals and can therefore not be accepted. The principle that every Party should have one vote is fundamental and not negotiable, therefore there is no room for compromise.
3. Besides the fundamental issue, this change would result in highly complicated and heavily contested negotiations before every vote on how to assign votes. The change would result in a complicated voting procedure that would likely be contested by Parties.

Document No: 7.6
Agenda item: Sponsored delegates project
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We welcome the Secretariat's update on the full implementation of Decision 18.12 on the Sponsored Delegates Project. We express appreciation for this Project, which benefits from the EU and its Member States' financial support, for enabling all Parties to participate in the CoP.
3. We acknowledge that the expansion of the Sponsored Delegates Project to the Standing Committee would put a burden on the Secretariat.
4. However, we agree to the proposed limited expansion of the Programme to eligible Parties subject to Article XIII procedures.
5. We remind and urge Parties to ensure they actually attend CoP meetings with valid credentials when having been granted funding and suggest that Secretariat keeps track of cases where this has not happened.

Document No: 8
Agenda item: Language strategy for the Convention
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. We have understanding for this request and the reasons for its submission.
2. We agree that there is a need to improve the linguistic tools and accessibility for Parties to the CITES Convention of the key CITES documents in all six UN official languages.
3. However, any such endeavor needs to respect the budgetary constraints, as well as the possible implications for CITES implementation and enforcement.
4. We consider option 2 to be the most appropriate, as it will most likely lead to better implementation of CITES, as documents which are essential to the work of Management and Scientific Authorities will be more widely accessible to officials in their everyday work.
5. We cannot support option 1, 3 and 4 as they have significant budgetary implications.
6. We are ready to join the proposal made by Kuwait.

Document No: 9.3.1
Agenda item: Report of the Chair
Proponent: Plants Committee

1. Thank you, Chair. We stress how important the work of the Technical Committee is, and appreciate the work done under difficult circumstances (Covid).
2. We thank the Chair, members all Parties and Organizations and the Secretariat contributing to its functioning for their valuable work.

Document No: 10
Agenda item: CITES Strategic Vision
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you Chair. We agree with the secretariat to delete Decision 18.24 as it has now been completed and agree that a set of new draft decisions are needed to map our CITES Strategic vision to the new post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and contribute to its implementation.
2. Agree with the Secretariat recommendation on the following draft decisions to be submitted to the CoP, subject to some additions:
 - 19.AA Directed to the Secretariat “The Secretariat shall undertake a comparative analysis in order to illustrate the linkages between the CITES Strategic Vision 2021-2030 and the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, as a starting point for an assessment of how CITES can contribute to the implementation of the Global Biodiversity Framework and its monitoring framework, make any recommendations for additional actions as appropriate, and present its analysis and recommendations to the Chairs Animals and Plants Committee and the Standing Committee.”
 - 19.CC Directed to the Standing Committee “The Standing Committee shall review the information provided by the Secretariat in Decision 19.AA and the comments made by the chairs of the Animals and Plants Committee according to Decision 19.BB, and make recommendations to the 20th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.”
3. We would like to propose a new 19.BB Directed to the chairs of the Animals and Plants Committees “The chairs of AC and PC shall review the information provided in 19.AA and make further recommendations to the Standing committee prior to its review in 19.CC.”
4. The indicators developed by the Working Group might be further modified depending on the developments in the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.

Document No: 11
Agenda item: Appendix-I listed species
Proponents: Animals Committee, Plants Committee

1. Thank you Chair. We are open to discussing adjustments to the proposed process if suggested by other Parties.

2. We support adoption of draft decisions in Annex 1 with some suggestions:
 - under 19.AA a) insert "and relevant experts" after range States;
 - under 19 BB b) it may be useful to include that there is merit to identify and collect examples for such "measures" adopted or to be adopted by the CoP that benefit the specific species. That could be done based on the case examples. As at present it is still unclear what measures that could be.

Document No: 12
Agenda item: World Wildlife Trade Report
Proponent: South Africa

1. Thank you Chair. The EU and its Member States would like to thank South Africa for the preparation of this document. While we support the general idea of preparing a 'World Wildlife Trade Report', uncertainties remain with regard to the projected timeline, on how to avoid additional reporting obligations as well as with regard to the parties' feasibility of collecting price data and socio-economic information. Against this background, we support the establishment of an intersessional working group in which these uncertainties should be addressed and clarified eventually to better define the report with the view to decide at CoP20.

Document No: 14
Agenda item: Livelihoods
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We support the amendments proposed by Bolivia, but we cannot support the amendments proposed by Gabon.

Document No: 15
Agenda item: Participatory mechanisms for rural communities in CITES
Proponents: Eswatini, Namibia and Zimbabwe

1. Thank you Chair. The EU and its Member States thank Eswatini, Namibia and Zimbabwe for their proposal, which covers a very important topic. As already discussed, there are two separate processes focusing on Engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities and Livelihoods.
2. We note the changes made by the proponents to document 15 in rev. 1. As pointed out by the Secretariat in their comments, the proposed composition of the Rural Communities Advisory sub-Committee in para 16 b) is not in line with Resolution Conf. 18.2 and only parties would be able to participate in such sub-committee if established.

3. In order to be efficient and consistent when it comes to engagement of indigenous peoples and local as well as rural communities, we invite the proponents to align their proposal with the processes under agenda points 13. and 14., and to submit it in the respective WG or both WGs, as appropriate, for consideration.

We do not see the need for a third separate process, therefore, as we have mentioned before, we invite the proponents to submit their proposal to the intersessional working group under working document 13. This would allow that this proposal is discussed as a potential option while not creating additional processes.

Document No: 16
Agenda item: Capacity building
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you, Chair. On behalf of the EU and its Member States, we commend Sec., SC, AC, PC, Parties and WG on the progress made regarding capacity building.
2. We support the draft resolution on capacity building and the draft decisions to continue work on an integrated capacity-building framework, with proposed amendments made by the CITES Secretariat.
3. We think that some minor clarifications might be necessary in particular to clarify the scope of point 2b in the draft resolution. In particular, we would like to add “relevant” before “bilateral and multilateral programmes” in order to avoid generalization, as well as seek clarification with regard to the word “participate”. If this point is addressed to donors, we suggest to remove the word “participate”. Moreover, we suggest to replace “development aid” by “cooperation”. The final version would therefore read: “ensure the inclusion of capacity-building, including targeted, technical, enforcement and compliance assistance, in the relevant bilateral and multilateral cooperation programmes.”

Document No: 17.1
Agenda item: Cooperation with other biodiversity-related conventions
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. We thank the CITES Secretariat for compiling the report on partnerships and cooperation.
2. We agree with the draft decisions outlined in the Annex of the document and support the work towards a partnership strategy.
3. We highlight that setting priorities should be an important goal for such a strategy.

Document No: 17.3
Agenda item: Cooperation with the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. We thank the Secretariat and the Standing Committee for the document.
2. We also thank the Chairs of the SC, AC and PC for representation of the Convention in the launch of the Assessment Report on the Sustainable Use of Wild Species at IPBES9; and for submitting the report of SC's work on IPBES.
3. We agree with the draft decisions contained in the Annex I of the document.

Document No: 17.4
Agenda item: Joint CITES-CMS African Carnivores Initiative
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. We express once again our interest in further developing this joint initiative. We believe that the cooperation between CITES and CMS will be beneficial for the conservation of African Carnivores.
2. We welcome the deployment of the CITES-CMS African Carnivore Initiative through a joint programme of work, organization of regular range states meetings and the establishment of a sustainable funding mechanism.
3. Finally, we support the amendment to draft decision 19.AA to ensure that the Animals Committee is actively consulted regarding the activities and outputs of the Initiative as suggested by the AC and several observer organizations at the last SC.

Document No: 17.5
Agenda item: International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. We thank the Secretariat for the preparation of this important document and the ICCWC for their efforts in the fight against wildlife crime, support and coordinate the Parties.
2. We also welcome the ICCWC intention to assist in developing an effective law enforcement and criminal justice system.
3. We stress that securing long term funding for the program is necessary to ensure its continuity.

Document No: 18
Agenda item: United Nations World Wildlife Day
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you Chair. The EU and its Member States take note of the increasing workload for the Secretariat linked to organizing the World Wildlife Day, for which we are very thankful. This work is an important element of CITES' PR activities.
2. We support deletion of Decision 18.38 on World Wildlife Day as it has been implemented.

Document No: 19
Agenda item: CITES and forests
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you Chair, the EU and its Member States want to thank Secretariat for preparing the document.
2. We generally support the proposed approach, however duplication with work by other international forest related activities like the International Arrangement on Forests (IAF) and notably the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) should be avoided.
3. Support adoption of the draft decisions contained in Annex 1, with the following amendments to proposed decisions 19.AA and 19.CC:
 - 19.AA a) after "...contribute more effectively to global forest-relevant mandates and forest policies and initiatives" add "while avoiding duplication and supporting joint action". Decision 19.AA a) will then read:
 "prepare a report for the consideration of the Plants and the Animals Committees and the Standing Committee summarizing existing Resolutions and Decisions relevant to forests (a 'CITES forest compendium') and advising on any measures to enhance the implementation of the Convention with respect to forests and to contribute more effectively to global forest-relevant mandates and forest policies and initiatives, while avoiding duplication and supporting joint action."
 - 19.CC b) i) after "...contribution to global forest-relevant mandates and forest policies and initiatives" add same text as suggested above. Decision 19.CC b) i) will then read:
 "enhance the implementation of the Convention with respect to forests and CITES' contribution to global forest-relevant mandates and forest policies and initiatives, while avoiding duplication and supporting joint action."

Document No: 20
Agenda item: Tree species programme
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you Chair. The EU and its Member States thank the Secretariat for the report and for its effort in managing the Tree Species Programme. We support the draft Decisions as proposed by the Secretariat.

2. We take note of the progress made and we wish to stress the importance of continued support of the implementation of the Convention for listed tree species.
3. The EU has contributed 7 million Euro over past 5 years and we are currently exploring options to provide additional support in the future. We would like to invite Parties to contribute, or continue contributing financially to the program in the next intersessional period as well.

Document No: 21
Agenda item: Review of the ETIS programme
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you Chair. We think every good program can benefit from a review after a certain amount of time has passed. We were reassured to see that the ETIS overall performance is deemed satisfactory and that the ETIS analysis can indeed support CITES processes and decision-making.
2. We can support almost all recommendations, including the editorial changes suggested by the CITES Secretariat related to Res. Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP18) except for the change in the submission date for ETIS data. After having analyzed the information provided by Traffic on the repercussions of this alignment of the deadline for submission of data to ETIS and the Illegal Trade Reports, we have reconsidered our earlier position on this and now are convinced this would weaken the process due to the time lag that would arise between the data used in the ETIS analysis and the reporting to the CoP. So we oppose the relevant addition to Annex 1. We do however support the strengthening of cooperation between ICCWC and ETIS and the sharing of data from the Annual Illegal Trade reports with ETIS, provided the Annual Illegal Trade data meet the minimal requirements of reporting to ETIS.
3. We want to take this opportunity to advocate also for more transparency in the process by making the data used in the ETIS analysis available, as mentioned in recommendation 16. Furthermore, we call upon Parties to make sure the necessary financial resources are made available for ETIS to continue its important work.
4. The EU and its Member States also support the draft decisions 19.AA and 19.BB as proposed by the CITES Secretariat on the development of criteria for the categorization of Parties based on the ivory seizure data. We are of the view this will improve the NIAP process and make it more transparent.
5. We do not align ourselves with the proposals by Japan regarding amendments to Res. Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP18) and draft decisions. These elements have been discussed and explained previously and the proposed additions do not seem to be necessary.

Document No: 22
Agenda item: MIKE and ETIS programmes
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you Mr. Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We share the concerns on the long term viability of both MIKE and ETIS, as these programs are dependent on external funding and it is a continuous worry if adequate financing will be found. A long term funding mechanism should be developed.
3. We fully support the set of decisions allowing the Secretariat to explore options to secure support as well as ways to improve the functioning of the MIKE programme, and we echo the call for all Parties and organizations to support elephant range States and provide resources for the MIKE and ETIS programmes.

Document No: 23.1
Agenda item: Report of the Standing Committee
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. We appreciate the work of the Standing Committee and its intersessional WG on the role of CITES in reducing risk of future zoonotic disease emergence associated with the international wildlife trade.
2. We support the proposed decisions including and the amendments proposed by the CITES Secretariat and the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP16) on transport of live specimens.
3. It is crucial to further explore measures and practical solutions to mitigate the risk of zoonotic pathogen spillover from international wildlife trade which should be done in cooperation with other relevant authorities like the World Organisation for Animal Health, FAO, WHO, IATA etc.

Document No: 23.2
Agenda item: One Health: Human and animal health risks from wildlife trade
Proponents: Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, The Gambia, Liberia, Niger, Nigeria and Senegal

1. Thank you Chair. We welcome all initiatives to identify measures and solutions how to reduce the risks of zoonoses spillover from international wildlife trade and agree there is a role to play for CITES in this discussion.
2. Nevertheless, it is not for CITES to base decision on human and animal health risk analysis or sanitary issues that go clearly beyond the scope of CITES. There are specific other regulations and international fora and regulations addressing those aspects. in place for that.

3. The EU therefore does not support adoption of the proposed resolution on reducing human and animal health risks from international wildlife trade.
4. On the other hand, we support some of the elements contained in the draft resolution, such as the use of international definitions in para 1a) and cooperation with animal and public health authorities in para 1c) and we suggest their integration in draft decisions proposed by the Standing Committee in the Doc 23.1., as appropriate.

Document No: 24
Agenda item: Implications of the COVID-19 pandemic on the implementation of the Convention
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you Chair. We would like to thank the CITES Secretariat for conducting the survey on the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the operation of the Convention and the submission of the Doc. 24 with further recommendations on this issue. We support decisions proposed by the Secretariat to develop the relevant guidance documents and to review Rules of Procedures of the committees to ensure that CITES meetings and inter-sessional work can take place also when faced with exceptional operational issues, such as those experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Document No: 25
Agenda item: Action plan on gender-related matters
Proponent: Panama

1. Thank you chair. The EU and its Member States would like to thank Panama for this important initiative. We support exploring and effectively addressing gender related issues under CITES, and consider this an overdue effort. In general, we support the recommendations set out by Panama in paragraph 13.
2. To ensure the effectiveness of the initiative, it is important that any measure is tailored to the challenges, gaps and opportunities specific to CITES and the mandate of the Convention. In our view, the suggested resolution and decisions could set this context out more clearly. This includes careful coordination with ongoing CITES processes addressing the participation and involvement of stakeholders in the processes of the Convention. Further, we welcome the comments and proposed amendments by the Secretariat.
3. We would like to submit a few changes to the resolution and the decision.
4. As regards the resolution, we would like to suggest an amendment and would appreciate a clarification from the proponents.

5. In paragraph 7, we would like to replace “assist” with “support“, so the paragraph will then read:
 - ENCOURAGES Parties, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations and other appropriate bodies, to support capacity-building and research efforts with respect to considering gender in wildlife trade;
6. The request for clarification concerns paragraph 3. Paragraph 3 encourages parties to include gender-specific indicators, however, it is not indicated where these indicators should be included. We would appreciate if Panama could clarify this.
7. As regards the decision, we would like this CoP to adopt a set of decisions to initiate a process, which would include the establishment of an intersessional working group mentioned in draft Decision 19AA to consider how to fully and effectively implement the resolution, and provide specific recommendations to CoP20, for instance, in the form of guidelines or an action plan.
8. Finally, we would like to suggest the following amendments to Decision 19.AA lit.g):
 - 19.AA The Secretariat, subject to available resources, shall develop a gender draft action plan for submission to the Standing Committee, ...
 - g) enhance the full, equal and meaningful participation and leadership of women in the implementation of the Convention, including through the engagement of civil society organisations, women’s groups and women delegates; ...

Document No: 26
Agenda item: Review of Resolutions
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you chair, I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We would like to thank to the CITES Secretariat for the preparation of the document on the review of resolutions and decisions. We support proposed changes in the resolutions as they will contribute to better interpretation and implementation of the Convention. We also support the deletion of Decision 14.81 if the relevant change to Resolution Conf. 14.8 (Rev CoP17) is adopted.
3. Finally, we would like to note, that possible changes to Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP18) have already been also discussed under other agenda items during the present meeting (in CoP19 Doc. 32, Doc. 37, Doc. 39 and Doc. 41) and that changes should be consolidated by the Secretariat into one single document prior to their adoption (in Committee II or Plenary), so that coherence of the proposed changes is ensured.

Document No: 27
Agenda item: Review of Decisions
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you chair, I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We would like to thank the Secretariat for the submitted review of decisions. We support the suggestions made by the Secretariat in the list of decisions to be retained or deleted as specified in the Annex 1 of the document 27 with one single amendment: We would prefer Decision 18.55 (Cooperation on the Black Sea Bottlenose dolphin) not to be deleted as its implementation is still pending.

Document No: 28
Agenda item: National legislation
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you chair. On behalf of the EU and its Member States I would like to thank the Secretariat for all the work and support given to Parties in the National Legislation Project over the past 30 years and for the development of the model law.
2. An adequate national legislation for the implementation of the Convention is of utmost importance to ensure trade in protected species is legal and sustainable.
3. We therefore urge Parties with a warning to submit as soon as possible details of appropriate measures that have been adopted or any progress made for the effective implementation of the Convention.
4. We appreciate and support the identification of new emerging legal issues for future technical and legislative assistance, for example exceptional circumstances impeding the normal functioning of CITES at national level.
5. We support adoption of the draft decisions contained in Annex 1 to document CoP19 Doc. 28, as well as the deletion of Decisions 18.62 to 18.67, with one small addition to proposed decision 19.EE. h) concerning reporting:
6. We would like to suggest to report any progress to the 77th and 78th Standing Committee - as appropriate.
7. Decision 19.EE. h) will then read:
 - a. “h) report at the regular meetings of the Standing Committees as appropriate and at the 20th meeting of the Conference of the Parties on progress made with regard to the implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.4 (Rev. CoP15) in National laws for the implementation of the Convention and Decisions 19.AA to 19.EE.”

Document No: 29.1
Agenda item: Implementation of Article XIII and Resolution Conf. 14.3 (Rev. CoP18) on CITES compliance procedures
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. The EU and its Member States thank the Secretariat for preparing the report on the implementation of Article XIII and Resolution Conf. 14.3 (Rev. CoP18) on CITES compliance procedures.
2. Regarding the expedited and range state focused approach reported on in paragraphs 33 to 38 we like to note that this should not be a regular procedure, but such an expedited procedure is a useful tool for urgent cases of pervasive, illegal trade.
3. We recognize that the length of the agenda for SC meetings is creating problems and that the number of ongoing compliance cases contributes to that. Dealing with compliance cases in an efficient manner should be our goal and we stand ready to engage in discussion on how to achieve that. On the other and given that we see compliance cases as a core responsibility of the SC we should take other possible means to reduce the agenda of the SC into account as well. As a general point, we would urge parties to collaborate as well as possible to end compliance cases as soon as possible.
4. Regarding the pre-compliance procedure with regard to captive-breeding in the EU, we value the visit by the Secretariat in the two EU Member States Germany and Spain. In our view, the visit was very useful and provided an opportunity for us to explain how we ensure that the requirements for captive-breeding under Resolution 10.16 are met.
5. Currently, the possibility to issue captive breeding certificates for App I animals is not used by EU Member States. In case of export of captive bred App. I animals, export permits are issued after an assessment in each individual case that the requirements for the granting of an export permit are fulfilled, in particular LAF, NDF and requirements for qualification as captive bred specimen as set out in Res. 10.16. This approach of carefully assessing is formalized in the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations and is subject to continuous efforts for effective implementation. As already mentioned, we are willing to provide more information to the Secretariat, if needed.

Document No: 29.2.1 and 29.2.2
Agenda items: -Report of the Secretariat - Renewed and updated Decisions for CoP19
Proponents: -CITES Secretariat -United States of America

1. Thank you chair, the EU and its Member States want to thank the Secretariat for all the work on this issue, especially for its second mission to Mexico and the substantial report thereof.

2. We appreciate the good progress that was made by Mexico, but there are still areas for improvement, especially: the controlling of unauthorized launching sites. We are worried that these are insufficient in preventing fishers using gillnets from entering the vaquita refuge and zero-tolerance areas and therefore, these areas are not maintained completely gillnet-free. We urge Mexico to step up enforcement and focus on key places that might be used by fishers.
3. Also, strict zero-tolerance policy and strict penalties should be implemented. Mexico needs to improve and streamline controls of fishermen in the Gulf to prevent circumvention. Enforcement also needs to be improved by inspecting possible places where manufacturing, possession or selling of gillnets might occur, seizing unauthorized nets and fining fishermen involved in illegal activities so that it does not pay them to continue these activities.
4. Without strong and immediate actions, it will be impossible to prevent the extinction of the vaquita.
5. Therefore, we support the adoption of the revised and new draft decisions proposed by the Secretariat.

Document No: 29.3
Agenda item: Malagasy ebonies (<i>Diospyros</i> spp.) and palisanders and rosewoods (<i>Dalbergia</i> spp.)
Proponent: CITES Secretariat in consultation with the Chair of the Standing Committee

1. Thank you chair. The EU and its 27 Member States fully support the new draft decisions as set out by the secretariat in CoP 19 Doc 29.3 in Annex 1. We congratulate Madagascar on all the work carried out especially the scientific work, We can fully support Decision 19.AA directed to Madagascar as this brings forward our concerns raised at SC 75 on the amendment of 18.96 (f) with regard to securing “all stockpiles”, providing regular inventories to SC, and ensuring independent oversight mechanisms. and also we would highlight the particular need for the independent oversight mechanisms and for Parties not to accept (re) exports for commercial purposes from Madagascar of specimens of *Diospyros* spp (#5) or *Dalbergia* spp (#15) until Madagascar has made a Legal Acquisition Finding and a Non-Detriment Finding for these species on a national level to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and the chair of the Standing Committee.
2. We also agree that decisions 18.94 and 18.99 can now be deleted as continued capacity building and dealing with illegal specimens will continue under new draft decisions 19.BB (a) and (b).
3. We thank the Secretariat for aligning the SC and CoP recommendations and decisions under these new draft decisions 19.AA and 19.BB which provides the necessary clarity on actions for Madagascar and parties.

Document No: 30
Agenda item: Compliance Assistance Programme
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you Chair. Thank the Standing Committee for the preparation of this document.
2. The EU supports the decisions on the implementation of the Compliance Assistance Programme and agrees with the proposed draft decisions. We also agree with the Secretariat's suggestions to amend Resolution Conf. 14.3 (Rev. CoP18) on compliance procedures to reflect the activities of the Compliance Assistance Programme.

Document No: 32
Agenda item: Review of Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP18) on Compliance and enforcement
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you Chair. We agree on the adoption of the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP18) as found in Annex 1 to the present document with the following editorial changes:
 - 12. a) i) "of" is missing after "time"
 - 12. a) iii v) requires grammatical clarification
2. In addition, the phrasing in 15 a) could be improved. We would like to revise this sentence as follows:
 - 15. RECOMMENDS that Parties:
evaluate or develop domestic measures to ensure that they are sufficient to address the challenges of identifying and investigating illegal wildlife trade and punishing the perpetrators, giving high priority to the offer for sale of specimens of species included in Appendix I;
3. We further agree on the adoption of draft decision as contained in Annex 3 to the present document. However, with regard to the identified gaps under a) and d), we would like to remind about CITES' mandate and remit.

Document No: 33
Agenda item: Enforcement matters
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. The EU and its Member States would like to thank the Secretariat for preparing this document. We support its recommendations while stressing the importance of continuing to promote active enforcement of the Convention at national and international level which relies above all on sufficient capacity of enforcement institutions and the specialisation of their units. Furthermore, we would like to stress the importance of addressing the financial flows emanating from illegal wildlife trade. The EU would also like to encourage all Parties to share their experience and all best practices in law enforcement.

Document No: 34
Agenda item: Annual illegal trade reports
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. On behalf of the EU and its Member States, congratulate the Secretariat and UNODC on the work done. Support the amendment to Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP18) deletion of Decisions 18.75 and 18.76 on Annual illegal trade reports.
2. We generally support the proposed draft Decisions 19.AA and 19.BB.
3. However, regarding 19.AA, we acknowledge the importance of submitting annual illegal trade data but we would like to note that the first sentence includes a long standing and reoccurring task, which should not be covered by a decision and is already covered by a Resolution. We therefore consider that it should be deleted.
4. We share the concerns of the CITES Secretariat in relation to the draft Decision 19.BB, that long term financial support of the database is needed.

Document No: 35
Agenda item: Task Force on illegal trade in specimens of CITES-listed tree species
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. We thank the Secretariat for organizing the Taskforce meeting and all participants for their work on this important topic.
2. We agree that all recommendations tackle important issues and highlight in particular that the need for stronger cooperation between Parties and engagement with organisations like INTERPOL and the World Customs Organisation was identified by the Taskforce as an important topic.
3. We support the proposed amendment to draft decision 19.CC and deletion of Decisions 18.79 and 18.80.

Documents No: 36.1 and 36.2
Agenda items: -Report of the Standing Committee -Wildlife crime and CITES enforcement support in West and Central Africa
Proponents: - Standing Committee - Côte d'Ivoire, The Gambia, Liberia, Niger, Nigeria and Senegal

1. The EU and its Member States thank the SC for the work summarized in document 36.1 on Wildlife crime enforcement support in West and Central Africa. We like to thank Côte d'Ivoire, The Gambia, Liberia, Niger, Nigeria and Senegal as well on the progress made on Wildlife crime enforcement and the challenges the region faces outlined in document 36.2.

2. Even though the region has taken commendable steps in implementing Decisions 18.88 and 18.89, we recognize the urgency with which wildlife crime needs to be addressed in West and Central Africa. We recognize as well that the implementation of CITES and wildlife crime enforcement poses significant challenges around the world and in this region as well.
3. Wording to be added in case this is not proposed from the beginning by the Chair: Documents 36.1 and 36.2 propose separate sets of draft decisions and we note that the Secretariat proposed a third set of draft decisions under paragraph W in document 36.1. The recommendations should therefore be merged into one set of draft decisions.
4. It is important to avoid duplication of already existing activities or networks and focus on gaps in enforcement and targeting challenges that are not already dealt with. We therefore agree with the comments made by the Secretariat regarding existing activities and networks - like using the secure channels by INTERPOL and the World Customs Organization or pursuing the implementation of the Outcome document of the Task Force on illegal Trade in Specimen of CITES listed Tree Species, or analyzing the data of the newly established CITES Illegal Trade Database as a resource to develop appropriate law enforcement responses.
5. In the same vein, we see value in the comments by the Secretariat that ICCWC might provide a more practical and feasible manner to undertake the work envisaged compared to the establishment of a Standing Committee intersessional working group.
6. While we fully recognize that funding is a core challenge for enforcement, we agree with the Secretariat that the establishment and management of a CITES Enforcement Fund would require significant effort and investment, including human resources and administration costs and, like the Secretariat, we encourage all Parties to make use of existing programmes and projects managed by the Secretariat like ICCWC, Compliance assistance Programme (CAP) or other programmes as INTERPOL Environmental Crime Programme or UNDOC's Global Programme for Combatting Wildlife and Forest Crime.
7. In conclusion, we are of the opinion that the set of draft decisions proposed by the Secretariat under paragraph W in document 36.1 are the most practical and feasible manner to tackle the urgent issue of Wildlife crime enforcement support in West and Central Africa.

Document No: 37
Agenda item: Wildlife crime linked to the Internet
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. We thank the Secretariat for the preparation of this document.
2. We support the changes to Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP18) and the draft Decisions. We would like to propose one amendment in Decision 19.AA. We suggest that together with best practices, also national laws put in place by Parties to address wildlife crime linked to the Internet should be identified. We therefore suggest an addition to the paragraph, which will then read:

“Subject to external funding, the Secretariat shall commission a study to identify the CITES-listed species that are most commonly found in illegal trade on digital and online platforms, national laws as well as best practices put in place by Parties to address wildlife crime linked to the Internet, and based on the findings of the study, prepare recommendations for consideration by the Standing Committee.”

3. We encourage all parties to check the Wildlife crime linked to the Internet webpage, where several interesting documents such as Guidelines for Law Enforcement Practitioners are available as well as examples of best practices and model measures received from Parties and ICCWC.
4. Given that an important volume of trade has moved online, we would like to encourage Parties to take appropriate steps to combat wildlife crime linked to the Internet.

Document No: 38
Agenda item: Demand reduction to combat illegal trade
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. On behalf of the EU and its Member States, we thank the Standing Committee for preparing document.
2. We also would like to thank the Secretariat for the CITES guidance and thank the parties which provided financial contribution to the preparation of the guidance.
3. We support the adoption of the guidance at CoP19.
4. We also support the adoption of draft decisions and amendments to Resolution Conf. 17.4, as amended by the Secretariat, to improve and reflect the availability of the guidance to Parties in all CITES languages as a new tool.
5. We would like to encourage Parties to use the guidance and share their experience in its implementation.

Document No: 40
Agenda item: Guidance for making legal acquisition findings
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you Chair. On behalf of the EU and its Member States, I would like to thank the Secretariat and everyone who participated in the work that lead to the ‘Rapid guide for making legal acquisition findings’.
2. We believe that the updated Guide in the addendum to working document 40 is a more clear and improved document than the previous version; the LAF Workshop held in Oxford has been very useful and improved the text.

3. However, the addendum and the revised Guide became available only very shortly before the CoP and there is no explanation about the differences among the two versions of the Guide, therefore we would like to seek for some clarifications.
4. We note that Table 2 of the Rapid Guide dedicated to the evidence of legality along the chain of custody for timber has been reduced by half compared to the previous version; in this regard, we believe that it would be more helpful to keep the exhaustive list of points to be checked of the previous text than the contrary, therefore we ask the Table 2 in the Addendum to be changed accordingly.
5. We support the deletion of the reference to the “Potential for automatization” under point 7. “Framework for making a Legal Acquisition Finding”, of the Rapid Guide. However, the reference to it seems still to be included in draft decision 19.BB a): it is not clear to us what this wording is now referencing. In this regard, we would like to reiterate that we are not convinced that a risk assessment – step 2 of the diagram - can and should be automated; we believe that such step should be discussed at a later stage; therefore, we suggest, in Decision 19.BB, to delete the words “develop digital solutions to automate relevant parts of the “Rapid guide for making legal acquisitions findings”.
6. Regarding digitalization mentioned under paragraph 4 of the addendum, we are open to discuss this, but we remain concerned about possibly high costs of developing a central LAF database and it is unclear what administrative burden it would bring to Parties, and how it would be linked to CITES (e-)Permitting systems.
7. In conclusion, with the change to the Table 2 of the Addendum and the change to Decision 19.BB, we support the adoption of the revised ‘Rapid guide for the making of legal acquisition findings’ and the amendment to Resolution Conf. 18.7.

Document No: 41
Agenda item: Electronic systems and information technologies and authentication and control of permits
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. The EU and its Member States agree with the amendments to Res Conf 12.3 (Rev CoP18) on Permits and Certificates and to Res Conf 11.3 (Rev CoP18) on Compliance and Enforcement, as suggested by CITES Secretariat, and with the decisions proposed on risk assessment & analysis and on electronic systems & information technology.
2. We acknowledge the progress made in the WG so far and. We welcome the inclusion of requirements for security measures and mechanisms for the electronic equivalent of original paper permits and certificates and added reference to the use of two-dimensional barcodes to reflect and accommodate the requirements of the electronic permits and certificates.
3. We support continuation of further work within the WG e.g. on development of guidance on the dynamic use of two-dimensional barcodes, seeking possible alternatives to physical endorsement of permits and certificates or reflecting nomenclature changes in e-Permitting systems e.g. by the use of the Species+/CITES Checklist Application Programming Interface (API) etc.

4. We support the electronic endorsement of CITES documents at the point of export.
5. We signal the importance to take into account the interoperability with systems organized over a hub architecture in the eCITES Implementation Framework, the CITES electronic permitting toolkit and Guidelines and the specifications for Electronic Permit Information eXchange (EPIX) of CITES permits and certificates.
6. We fully support the access by customs of information in permitting databases of management authorities, preferably via the EU Customs Single Window for EU customs, and the electronic provision by Customs.

Document No: 42
Agenda item: Purpose codes on CITES permits and certificates
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you Chair. The EU and its Member States agree with the amendments to the resolutions Conf. 12.3, 5.10, 17.8, 18.7 as proposed by the Standing Committee;
2. The EU and its Member States note that a consensus was not reached on the definitions of purpose codes “P” and “T”: given the importance of such codes, the Standing Committee should continue its work.
3. Therefore, we support the adoption of the decision 19.AA proposed by the Standing Committee, in order to re-establish an intersessional joint working group to further review the use of purpose codes by Parties and, in particular, to continue the discussions on purpose codes “P” and “T”.
4. We appreciate the suggestions made by the United Kingdom regarding the purpose code “T”, that contain interesting ideas that it is worth exploring; however, we do not support the proposed changes to the decision 19.AA because we believe that such ideas should be explored by the WG.
5. The EU and its Member States support the deletion of decision 14.54.

Document No: 43.1
Agenda item: Report of the Animals and Plants Committees
Proponents: Animals Committee, Plants Committee

1. Thank you Chair, I speak on behalf of the European Union and its Member States.
2. The EU and its Member States thank the Animals and Plants Committees and the Secretariat for the preparation of this Document and for bringing this important issue forward.

3. Non-detriment Findings are at the heart of the Convention. They are the only instrument in place to prove that legal international trade in specimens of CITES-listed wild animals or plants is sustainable and doesn't threaten their survival. The EU and its Member States, together with partners, have since long been working on NDFs and on guidance to support Scientific Authorities in making NDFs and improve the quality.
4. Considering the importance of NDF in implementing CITES we strongly support the draft decisions presented in Document 43.1 [with the additions made by the secretariat]. Moreover, we would like to encourage active involvement of all Parties and stakeholders in the implementation of the draft Decisions and in the improvement of NDFs, their Guidance and materials and of course the application thereof.

Document No: 43.2
Agenda item: Making non-detriment findings for specimens of Appendix-II species taken in the marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State
Proponent: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1. Thank you Chair, I speak on behalf of the European Union and its Member States.
2. The EU and its member states would like to thank the UK for bringing forth this matter and producing the document and the secretariat for their comments.
3. Producing NDFs of species with stocks shared between different countries and taken at the high seas remains a challenge. The draft decisions from the UK and those prepared by the secretariat, align with several other initiatives on the same matter, and will help strengthen synergies between fisheries and CITES and assist the protection of species fished in the high seas.
4. We support this proposal.

Document No: 44.1
Agenda item: Review of Resolution Conf. 11.19 (Rev. CoP16)
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. The EU and its Member States thank the Standing Committee for the review of resolution Conf. 11.19 and drafting the new resolution on Materials for the identification of specimens of CITES-listed species and two alternative decisions in Annex 2.
2. We recommend to adopt resolution in Annex 1 which replace Res. Conf. 11.19 (Rev. Cop16) but we would like to suggest one clarification and two minor amendments.

3. In the context of the proposed resolution, the phrase "identification of specimens of CITES-listed species" probably means only taxonomic identification. However, the individual identification of live specimens of CITES-listed species may also play an important role, for example in relation to trade in Appendix I species. We are not sure whether such cases are covered by this resolution. We would therefore recommend clarifying this and possibly adding a clarification in the preamble, e.g. a note that information on individual identification of CITES-listed species specimens may also be collected.
4. We found one typo in the title of Annex 1 where should be "specimens" not "specimenTs".
5. We also recommend in the draft resolution (Annex 1, paragraph 4.b, line 4), to slightly modify the sentence to allow for the inclusion of traded non-CITES species in the identification materials in cases where confusion with CITES-protected species is possible. We suggest rewording line 3 to read "where possible, include non-CITES species that are traded and potentially confused with CITES species in these species identification materials".

Document No: 44.2
Agenda item: Identification of timber and other wood products
Proponent: Plants Committee

1. On behalf of the EU and its Member States we agree with the general principles of the draft decisions set out in Annex 1 to the document. We do however, feel that these decisions would benefit from the extended amendments to these draft decisions as suggested by the North American Region in CITES CoP 19 inf 97.
2. In inf 97 we agree to the NAR update to 19.AA (a) in Inf 97 ie. to review the utility and practicality of the online repository and make recommendations on its development.
3. And we also agree to the addition to 19.AA (b) to insert the text "based on the outcomes of the review". We also thank the secretariat for setting up the new online repository timber ID repository which is now available for this review.
4. Under 19.CC directed to the Plants Committee we also support all the amended decisions as set out in inf 97 by the North American region and agree that the relevant outcomes of the Working Document 35 on the Task Force on illegal trade in specimens of CITES-listed tree species be taken into account.

Document No: 45
Agenda item: Labelling system for trade in caviar
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you Chair. The EU and its Member States note that the SC has been trying to identify ways to improve the caviar labelling system that take into account the complexity of aquaculture production, the need to adopt transparent traceability systems, the goal to ensure legal and sustainable trade, but none of the options discussed in the past has attracted enough support.

2. The report to the SC 74 of the intersessional working group on the labelling system for trade in caviar showed that the assessment of using QR codes might inject new ideas into the debate that it is worth exploring.
3. Therefore, the EU and its Member States support the decisions proposed by the Secretariat and suggest that the SC establishes an intersessional WG that will work on the analysis and recommendations of the Secretariat, once they are available.
4. The EU and its Member States support the deletion of decision 18.146.

Document No: 46
Agenda item: Trade in stony corals
Proponent: European Union and its Member States

1. Thank you Chair, I speak on behalf of the European Union and its Member States.
2. In CoP19 Document 46, the EU has outlined to the Conference of the Parties several issues relating to the trade in stony corals that we propose need some further consideration.
3. Whilst Resolution 11.10 (Rev. CoP15) already provides working definitions for types of coral, including coral sand, fragments, coral rock, live rock and substrate, there remains confusion as to what types of coral are subject to the provisions of the Convention. For example, whilst some Parties report on their trade in substrate, others consider substrate to be fossilized, and therefore not subject to the provisions of CITES.
4. The document further draws attention to the lack of identification guides for corals and in particular stony corals and also suggests that the use of the term Scleractinia for coral rock could be further explained, noting that trade from different orders can be included under Scleractinia which is used in CITES as a container concept.
5. Analysing the data within the CITES Trade Database reveals further problems with the reporting of trade in corals. Whilst it should not be possible to report trade in live coral specimens at the order level “Scleractinia”, more than 100,000 live corals were reported as such in the five years 2016-2020 according to exporters. When considering importer-reported trade – the volume increases to 1.6 million live corals over the same period – all of this trade is likely to have been in coral rock that was misreported by Parties. Similar errors seem apparent for the trade in 1.1 million kilograms of Scleractinia, reported by exporters as “live corals”.
6. The EU have therefore proposed a set of Decisions that would direct the Animals Committee to consider possible improvements to the coral definitions in Res. 11.10 (Rev. CoP15) and direct the Animals Committee and Standing Committee to make recommendations on the *Guidelines for the preparation and submission of Annual reports* to provide additional clarity on reporting. We note the Secretariat’s suggested revisions to the Decisions, that would ensure the Standing Committee are involved in any revision of the Resolution - we fully support these amendments. The EU will also submit its coral identification guide and key to the Animals Committee for review under its existing mandate, as suggested by the Secretariat.

Document No: 47
Agenda item: Specimens produced through biotechnology
Proponents: Standing Committee, CITES Secretariat

1. We thank the Standing Committee (including its intersessional WG) and the Secretariat for the preparation of this document.
2. We support proposed recommendations including the amendment to Res. Conf. 9.6 (Rev. CoP16). We equally support the proposed meeting of specialists to discuss issues addressed in draft decision 19.AA as well in the report of the WG. Before further changes to resolutions can be made, definitions and conservation issues have to be clarified. We would propose that the Standing Committee discusses the questions in the context of an intersessional WG once the input of the meeting of specialists becomes available.

Document No: 48
Agenda item: Definition of the term 'appropriate and acceptable destinations'
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you Mr. Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. The EU and several Member States participated actively in the intersessional working group that developed the non-binding best practice guidance on how to determine whether “the trade would promote in situ conservation” as presented in Annex 1 of this document and the non-binding guidance for determining whether a proposed recipient of a living specimen of African elephant and/or southern white rhinoceros is suitably equipped to house and care for it, as presented in Annex 2 of this document.
3. We fully support the content of both documents and think they provide useful considerations for all Parties involved in this trade.
4. We therefore support the adoption of the two non-binding guidance documents as well as the set of draft decisions presented in Annex 3 of this document which will allow Parties to provide their feedback on the use of the guidance on housing and care of these two species.

Document No: 49
Agenda item: Introduction from the sea
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you, Chair. On behalf of the EU and its Member States, I would like to thank the Secretariat for the report and the efforts made to improve the implementation of provisions linked to CITES trade from areas beyond national jurisdiction.

2. The report of the Secretariat shows the need to collect more information about CITES regulation on trade in listed marine species and also shows that provisions on IFS are not yet sufficiently implemented by the Parties. In this regard, we would like to express our deep concern about the lack of implementation.
3. We believe that for a successful implementation of CITES provisions for marine species, support to Parties and the effective cooperation between CITES and fisheries authorities is essential; we, also, believe that clear and comprehensive information on IFS can play a key role in the implementing of such provisions.
4. Therefore, the EU and its Member States support the draft decisions proposed by the Standing Committee.
5. We also think that the SC should review the list of FAQ intersessionally. In this regard, we would welcome if all interested Parties and stakeholders would receive the opportunity to submit comments on the FAQs for consideration by the SC. We would appreciate if the Secretariat would inform Parties of the further process to ensure transparency in the review with the aim of publishing it on the CITES IFS website.
6. The EU and its Member States believe that the Secretariat should be instructed to submit a proposal to CoP20 to insert an explanatory note based on the FAQs as reviewed by the SC as an Annex to Resolution Conf. 14.6.
7. Therefore, we ask to insert the following text after Decision 19.CC:
 - 19.DD. The Secretariat, through a Notification, will collect views on the FAQ from Parties and stakeholders and submit them to the SC for their consideration.
 - 19.EE. The Secretariat will submit a proposal to CoP20 to insert an explanatory note based on the FAQs as reviewed by the SC as an Annex to Resolution Conf. 14.6.
8. Decision 19.DD directed to the Standing Committee should be renumbered accordingly.

Document No: 51
Agenda item: Quotas for leopard (<i>Panthera pardus</i>) hunting trophies
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you chair. The EU and its Member States support the draft decision presented by the SC, inviting CoP19 to amend paragraph 1 a) of Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP16) on Quotas for leopard hunting trophies and skins for personal use by changing the quota indicated for Ethiopia from 500 to 20 and by removing the quotas for Kenya and Malawi, in accordance with Decision 18.167 of the AC31 (June 2021).
2. In addition, we see a need for regular assessments and reviews of quotas to address population dynamics.

3. Therefore we would like to propose the following two amendments to the decisions proposed by the Secretariat as outlined in WD 51 on page 3:
- Directed to Parties with quotas established under Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP16):***
18.166 All Parties which have quotas for leopard hunting trophies established under Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP16) are encouraged to conduct regular surveys, adjust quotas as appropriate and exchange information and lessons learnt regarding the process for determining that such quotas are non-detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild.
- Directed to the Animals Committee***
 18.168 (Rev. CoP19) The Animals Committee shall review on regular basis as appropriate any information submitted by the Secretariat under Decision 18.169 (Rev. CoP19) and make recommendations to the Secretariat and leopard range States, as appropriate.
-

Document No: 52
Agenda item: Transport of live specimens: improving implementation of the transport regulations
Proponents: Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria, Senegal and the United States of America

1. The EU fully supports the request of the proponents to make an abridged version of IATA available free of charge. We also support the organization of a workshop aiming at sharing of best practices related to live animal and plant transports. We therefore call for the adoption of the two draft decisions mentioned in annex 1 taking on board the amendments as suggested by the CITES Secretariat.
 2. We can also support the proposed amendments to Res. Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP16) on Transport of live specimens.
-

Document No: 53
Agenda item: Review of CITES provisions related to trade in specimens of animals and plants not of wild source
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. We support the continuation of the work on captive breeding issues in the AC and SC, and we think that an intersessional WG of the SC is necessary to continue the work done in the last intersessional period. The issues addressed are complex and there was not enough time to discuss all the points in the mandate. Therefore, we support the proposed decisions in Annex 2.
2. The Secretariat's advice to rethink the proposed changes to Resolution 10.16 are well placed and are supported. We should not create new problems while trying to fix existing problems. Therefore, the issues identified by the Secretariat need to be discussed thoroughly. In our opinion, as proposed by the Secretariat, the best approach would be not to change Resolution 10.16 now, but to reconsider during the next intersessional period and taking into account the issues identified by the Secretariat. If you think that the points can be addressed at this COP, we would be happy to participate.

3. In addition to the issues raised by the Secretariat we would like to refer to two further - more editorial - amendments to Annex 1 that should also be addressed in the future work on this topic:
 - 2.b) ii) B3. “when appropriate specimens of other sources are not available” instead of “for”
 - 2.b) iii) here the link between breeding operation and species is missing (in version before there was a link to the breeding stock). Even though it may be clear what is meant, the lack of reference may constitute a loophole, if interpreted in a way that it would be sufficient if the operation just has to breed any species to F2, but not this specific species. Therefore we recommend to insert “of the respective species” or something similar after (F3, F4, etc.) under A and after second-generation offspring under B.

Document No: 54
Agenda item: Review of the provisions of Resolution Conf. 17.7 on Review of trade in animal specimens reported as produced in captivity
Proponent: CITES Secretariat on behalf of the Standing Committee and in consultation with the Chair of the Animals Committee.

1. Thank you Chair. We also would like to thank the Secretariat for the preparation of document 54.
2. The review process was adopted in order to detect cases, where trade in specimens not of wild source represents a conservation concern, such as in cases of unsustainable offtake and laundering of wild specimens through captive breeding/ ranching facilities.
3. In the EU, for specimens of App. I species traded under source code C, the compliance with Res. Conf. 10.16 is checked in each individual case of export, meaning that those species unlikely reflect cases of conservation concern. This approach may not be in line with Resolution 12.10 to the extent that exports with source code C and purpose code T of specimens produced in captive breeding operations originate from breeders which have not been registered. This issue is subject to an assessment in the context of a possible compliance procedure under Art XIII and we actively support the assessment of this issue.
4. We think that compliance with Resolution 12.10 should not be addressed at the same time in the context of the review procedure under Art. 17.7. The proposed amendment in paragraph 2 a) v) bears the risk of the review mainly focusing on compliance issues relating to trade in App. I species traded under a wrong source code rather than on those cases which are really of genuine conservation relevance.
5. Probably the best approach would be not to amend paragraph 2 a) v) but to delete it completely, because its current content is limited to apparent incorrect use of captive production codes, such as source code D and A. (D for exports from facilities that are not registered and A for animals). These are also compliance issues that should be addressed under Art. XIII.

Document No: 55
Agenda item: Registration of operations that breed Appendix I animal species in captivity for commercial purposes
Proponent: United States of America

1. Thank you Chair. We thank the USA for the preparation of this document.
2. We generally support the idea that commodities that are indicated in the registration are made public on the CITES website. In this context, we propose only some smaller changes relating to the content of the published information. They are set out in the information document of the EU and its Member States.
3. There are some parts presented in document 55, which we cannot support, for example that additional commodities that have not been mentioned in the original application for registration require a new registration. If accepted, this change would lead to an additional administrative burden for applicants and CITES authorities. In our view this is not necessary, because it does not provide added value for the conservation of species. It is not clear what is the problem that we are trying to fix. In which cases in the past have additional commodities exported by a registered captive-breeding operation given rise to conservation problems?
4. We are also not convinced that the other situations listed in the proposal should trigger a new registration, for example change in ownership or change in management of the captive-breeding operation.
5. In addition, if the operation of a registered operation no longer meets the requirements for registration, Resolution 12.10 already provides for several procedures to address any problems. If necessary, the operation can be removed from the register.
6. Some of the proposed changes like the obligation of the Secretariat to inform the Parties of any major change in management of the registered facilities to the CITES Secretariat go beyond their intention. In our view it would be sufficient to inform Parties if the change, in the Secretariat's assessment, could call into question that the facility continues to meet the requirements for captive-breeding contained in Resolution 10.16.
7. We do not support to add as a further requirement for registration that the trade will not negatively affect efforts to combat illegal trade in the species or other CITES listed species. The registration of captive-breeding facilities is not the appropriate place to promote more effective enforcement. The criteria for registration should remain focused on the requirements for captive-breeding contained in Resolution 10.16.
8. The European Union therefore proposes changes to the Recommendations and proposed amendments contained in Document 55 as described in Inf. Doc XX. The Information Document also explains further why we cannot support some of the core elements of document 55.

Document No: 58
Agenda item: West African vultures (<i>Accipitridae</i> spp.)
Proponent: Standing Committee in consultation with the CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. Vultures have a crucial role in the functioning of healthy ecosystems. Most Vulture species has been recently facing an extremely rapid population decline in Asia, resulting from the poisoning by the veterinary drug diclofenac. Diclofenac also poses a threat to African vulture populations, however, the cause of the decline in Africa is also illegal domestic and international trade. Deliberate poisoning to prevent vultures drawing attention to poaching activities has also been documented.
3. The EU and its member states are a range of countries for one of the species listed in the document (Egyptian vulture) and are fully aware of the need to protect vultures throughout their range.
4. To maintain populations of these key species, it is essential that Parties, West African range States, relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations supported by Secretariat and AC and SC work closely together to protect them. The EU therefore welcomes and thanks to the Standing Committee and Secretariat for the preparation of the document and fully supports adoption of suggested decisions.

Document No: 59
Agenda item: Illegal Trade in Cheetahs (<i>Acinonyx jubatus</i>)
Proponent: Ethiopia

1. Thank you Chair. On behalf of the European Union and its Member States we would like to thank Ethiopia for this document.
2. Illegal trade is an urgent threat, and we therefore support the drafted decisions as amended by the Secretariat and further amended as proposed by the USA.
3. Further, we would like to be assured that the Northwest African and Iranian subspecies are also included into all considerations about combating illegal trade, to the relevant extent.
4. Lastly, we would like to recommend creating a mechanism to inform and strengthen the work of the Big Cat Taskforce.

Document No: 62.1 and 62.2
Agenda items: -Report of the Plants Committee -The history and challenges of agarwood and CITES
Proponents: -Plants Committee -United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

1. Thank you Chair. The EU welcomes the ongoing process of reviewing the implementation of CITES for agarwood species and the potential revision of Res. Conf. 16.10 on Implementation of the Convention for agarwood-producing taxa.
2. We also very much appreciate the reviews provided by the UK in CoP19 Doc. 62.2 and CoP19 Inf. 5, and by the ITTO in CoP19 Inf. 12, which are very helpful and relevant to update and improve the understanding of agarwood production and trade and of the implementation of CITES for species of Aquilaria and Gyrinops.
3. These documents do also recall the still existing and even growing concerns regarding the ongoing decline of wild populations of agarwood species and issues to implement effective conservation and sustainable use of agarwood taxa.
4. The EU emphasizes the need to take information from CoP19 Doc. 62.2, the proposed research therein, and of Information Documents CoP19 Inf. 5 and Inf. 12 into account when revising Res. Conf. 16.10.
5. We therefore support the recommendations of the Secretariat to consider the findings of these documents and future research in the review process of Res. Conf. 16.10.
6. In the same sense, we support the Secretariat's amendment to Draft Dec. 19.AA par. a) that adds Res. Conf. 11.11 on Regulation of trade in plants as an additional reference for potential revisions of Res. Conf. 16.10.
7. Based on this, the EU supports the draft Decisions in CoP19 Doc. 62.1 only in the amended version by the Secretariat.
8. However, the EU also wants to make clear that it is our critical interest that Res. Conf. 10.13 on Implementation of the Convention for tree species and Res. Conf. 11.11 on Regulation of trade in plants must not be weakened regarding definitions and specifications of artificial propagation during the processes proposed in CoP19 Doc. 62.1.
9. We consider the specifications for agarwood taxa in Res. Conf. 16.10 as an exemption from otherwise expedient regulations for artificial propagation of tree species in other Resolutions which should be maintained.
10. Further on, we emphasize the option to use source code "Y" for assisted production as the appropriate code to implement CITES in those cases that do not fit within the strict definitions of artificial propagation laid out in Res. Conf. 10.13 and 11.11, but that are not wild sourced either.

11. The EU very much appreciates the very useful synthesis of information and data in Doc. 62.2 and in CoP19 Inf. 5 and thanks the UK for their efforts and diligence in compiling all this information and for pointing out relevant research fields in Section 3 of the Document.
12. We agree with the necessity and relevance of the proposed research, and we would suggest, in agreement with the recommendations made by the Secretariat in both Documents, that the information compiled in CoP19 Doc. 62.2 and potential results of the proposed research must be taken into account for any revisions of Res. Conf. 16.10 as per Draft Decision in CoP19 Doc. 62.1.

Documents No: 64.1 and 64.2
Agenda items: -Report of the Secretariat and of the Standing Committee -Conservation of marine turtles
Proponents: -Standing Committee, CITES Secretariat - Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Peru and the United States of America

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States and the Caribbean part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.
2. We welcome the report of the Standing Committee and the Secretariat in working document 64.1 as well as the idea of proposing a new resolution on Marine Turtles as proposed by Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Peru and the United States of America in working document 64.2.
3. We agree that it is necessary to collectively step-up efforts in protecting marine turtles to prevent further decline and extinction and to ensure that the illegal trade in marine turtles is effectively addressed by CITES Parties.
4. To strengthen the work and avoid duplication we see merit in merging relevant decisions of a long-term nature as presented in WD 64.1 into a resolution, which also would address relevant updated elements of Resolution 9.20.
5. The EU and its Member States as well as the Caribbean part of the Netherlands therefore support the way forward as proposed by the Secretariat in both document 64.1 (Rev. 1) and 64.2.
6. To be precise, we support the following:
 - a) the revised decision 18.217 (Rev. CoP19) directed to the Standing Committee in document 64.1 to be adopted;
 - b) the amended resolution by the Secretariat as included in document 64.2 incorporating relevant decisions originally proposed in WD 64.1, and incorporate updated elements of Resolution 9.20; and finally,
 - c) the repeal of Resolution 9.20 (Rev.).

7. This does not mean we do not support the amendments made during the meeting per se. We need time to study them.

Document No: 65
Agenda item: Sharks and rays (Elasmobranchii spp.)
Proponents: Standing Committee, Animals Committee, in consultation with the CITES Secretariat and the Animals Committee

1. Thank you Chair, I speak on behalf of the European Union and its member states.
2. Thank you to the Standing Committee and the Animals Committee for preparing working document 65.
3. We support this document, and support the recommendations to adopt the draft decisions 19.AA to 19.FF contained in Annex 4 of the document, and are ready to participate in an in-session working group to discuss the draft decisions further.
4. We have a suggestion for Decision 19.BB. As long-term financing is key to provide the necessary support to implementation of listings of marine species, the actions in Decision 19.BB should not be subject to availability of external funding.
5. In addition we would like to specifically support Draft Decision 19.AA e) where it is suggested to “consider seconding staff members with expertise in fisheries and the sustainable management of aquatic resources to the Secretariat “.
6. We would also like to stress how important the issue of traceability is, including the identification and monitoring of CITES-listed shark-products in trade, in source, transit, and consumer Parties, as noted in 19. CC and 19.EE in Annex 4. Not only will close collaboration with custom authorities be needed (and maybe also with The World Custom Organization), but also budget for the work of the Secretariat, which seems to be missing.

Document No: 66.1
Agenda item: Implementation of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP18) on Trade in elephant specimens
Proponent: CITES Secretariat at the request of the Standing Committee

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We thank the Secretariat for this extensive report on the implementation by Parties of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP18) on Trade in elephant specimens.

3. On part 1, dealing with the closure of domestic ivory markets, we support the renewal of decisions 18.117 to 18.119. In this section. We have noted paragraph 16 which refers to our request made at SC74 where we ask the Secretariat and TRAFFIC to liaise with the MIKE & ETIS Technical Advisory Group to analyses the seizure data in connection with Parties that have a legal domestic market for commercial ivory trade. We'll come back to this issue in our comment for WD66.3 where the Secretariat also inserted its comments on this topic.
4. Section 2 deals with two decisions on Trade in mammoth ivory: the EU and its Member States can support the draft decisions contained in Annex 2 with the amendments made by the Secretariat, ensuring that no additional resources are required to undertake this task.
5. Part 3 of this report provides feedback on the implementation of the decisions linked to the Trade in Asian elephants. We support the renewal of decision 18.226 and call upon the Asian elephant range States to report on their implementation in the next intersessional period. We also support the new draft decisions 19.AA and 19.BB on the development of minimum requirements for a registering, marking and tracing system for live Asian elephants.
6. At SC74, the practical guidance for the management of ivory stockpiles, including their disposal, was adopted and this has been posted on the CITES website. The EU and its Member States agrees that Decision 18.2 and 18.183 have been implemented, but we agree as well that this guidance should remain a living document so we support the new draft decision 19.AA that will allow Parties to provide information about new techniques and technologies on ivory stockpile management. We also support the renewal of the two other decisions 18.184 and 18.185 as mentioned in Annex 4.

Document No: 66.2.1
Agenda item: Ivory stockpiles: Implementation of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP18) on Trade in elephant specimens
Proponents: Benin, Burkina Faso, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Kenya, Liberia, Niger, Senegal and Togo

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. The EU and its Member States share the call of the proponents for Parties to report properly on their ivory stockpiles as foreseen in paragraph 7 e) of Res. Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP18) on Trade in elephant specimens. As mentioned in our intervention during the discussion of WD66.1, we support the renewal of decisions 18.184 and 18.185 related to the reporting on ivory stockpiles.

3. We consider that several elements in the suggested decisions of the proponents are not appropriate and remind Parties of the practical guidance on ivory stockpile management as well as the provisions of Res. Conf. 17.8 (Rev. CoP18) on Disposal of illegally traded and confiscated specimens of CITES-listed species. We agree with the analysis of the CITES Secretariat that the recommendations in paragraph 48 to 50 are already addressed in Res. Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP18) and the relevant Notification issued by the Secretariat. As mentioned before, we can accept the renewal of decisions 18.184 and 18.185 as discussed previously. We cannot support the decisions as suggested by the proponents nor do we see the need to adopt the declaration of ivory stocks and model inventory form as mentioned in Annex 1 of this document.

Document No: 66.2.2
Agenda item: Establishing a fund accessible to range States upon non-commercial disposal of ivory stockpiles
Proponent: Kenya

1. Thank you Mr. Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. The EU and its Member States appreciate the proposal and fully recognize the need for resources for the management of elephant populations and assist range states in living together with these animals.
3. Although the EU does not think a resumption of ivory trade is in order, we feel this proposal is looking at the issue of sustainable financing in a too narrow way. We think there is a need for a broader discussion on this and therefore support the recommendations as proposed by the Secretariat.
4. We thank Kenya for their proposal and can confirm that we had an informal talk with Kenya as well as with other range states concerned about their COM doc 9. We have indeed looked at it and have proposed changes because we feel any intersessional work should look at the broader picture of sustainable financing for elephant conservation, which can include the establishment of a fund that's linked to the disposal of ivory stockpiles. We do not want to pre-empt the outcome of the deliberations of the WG, which is why we have proposed multiple changes to the draft decisions proposed by Kenya. We did however specify clearly that we feel that there needs to be buy-in from all relevant range states. It seems that these consultations have not been held which we regret, as we think this is a missed opportunity. Our support is subject to this wide buy-in of relevant parties. We will listen attentively to the comments made on the floor, but as the EU and its Member States were mentioned in the intervention from Kenya, we wanted to make our position clear from the beginning.

Document No: 66.3
Agenda item: Implementing aspects of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP18) on the closure of domestic ivory markets
Proponents: Benin, Burkina Faso, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Liberia, Niger, Senegal and Togo

1. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. As already mentioned in our earlier intervention when we discussed WD 66.1, the EU and its Member States accept the renewal of the draft decisions 18.117 to 18.119. We feel it is not clear what is meant by the addition of the words “any other available information” as proposed by the proponents of this document. We are not convinced of the added value and therefore do not agree to these changes.
3. We can accept the revised decision 19.DD as redrafted by the CITES Secretariat.

Document No: 66.4.1
Agenda item: International trade in live African elephant specimens: Proposed revision to Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP18) on Trade in elephant specimens
Proponents: Benin, Burkina Faso, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Liberia, Niger, Senegal and Togo

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We share the intention of the proponents, and that of all of us in this room, to clarify the framework under which trade in live elephants should take place. Having different interpretations only leads to confusion and this is something we really need to avoid. As mentioned in our intervention at SC74, we think we should look forward and create this framework, based as much as possible on the current rules, but in a way that it is no longer open to interpretation. In our document 66.4.2, we have detailed some option on how we think we can arrive at such a common understanding, where the only difference would be whether or not the trade can be done for commercial purposes or not (depending on the listing in Appendix I or II) but where all other circumstances for trade in live elephants are the same.
3. While we share the goals of the proponents, we do not support the suggested approach in document 66.4.1. It does not recognize the delicate compromise reached at CoP18, and the need for exceptional circumstances under which a transfer could be envisaged toward ex situ locations. It also would mean that trade in captive held elephants that were taken from the wild at some point in the past could only go towards in situ locations, which would not be in the best interest for many of such captive held animals. And thirdly, the proponents do not suggest any change to Res. Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP18) on Appropriate and acceptable destinations in which the conditions for such trade are now defined. If this proposal were to be adopted, it would result in conflicting and contradicting elements in both Resolutions whereas it would not solve the remaining legal interpretation issues in the annotation applicable to elephants.

4. We call upon all African elephant range States to consider working together to resolve these issues, as we have suggested in our proposal in WD. 66.4.2.

Document No: 66.4.2
Agenda item: Clarifying the framework: Proposal of the European Union
Proponent: European Union and its Member States

1. Thank your Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. As the EU has already mentioned during the Standing Committee in Lyon, we stand ready to work together with the African elephant range States to develop a coherent legal framework for the trade in live elephants. It is clear that the current framework has led to different interpretations and risks us losing ourselves in long legal discussions. So, we have formulated a way forward in which we've tried to take the different views of Parties in this matter into account. Trade in live elephants can be done for commercial purposes or not, depending on the Appendix in which the population is listed. Above all, it should be done in a transparent manner which will generate conservation benefits. To arrive at such an unambiguous framework, changes will need to be done to the relevant Resolutions as well as the elephant annotation itself. This was also the reason why we've incorporated our thoughts on the issue of reservations to annotation in this document, although it is clear that this goes beyond the discussion on elephants. We will therefore not come back to our arguments in that discussion and are convinced this will be resolved at this CoP, which will be needed to also make progress on this matter.
3. In our document, we have proposed several options. First and foremost, we think it would be useful to have a dedicated chapter on trade in live African elephants in the dedicated elephant Resolution 10.10. This would be based on the current existing conditions in Res. Conf. 11.20 (Rev. CoP18) and should also refer to the just adopted this item is on the agenda just prior to this discussion non-binding best practice guidance on how to determine whether the trade would promote in situ conservation as well as the practical guidance for determining whether a proposed recipient of a living specimens of African elephant and/or southern white rhino is suitably equipped to house and care for it. We have suggested concrete language for this in paragraph 17 of this document. A similar action could be envisaged in a later stage for the white rhino, which could then lead to the deletion of Res. Conf. 11.20. At the same time the necessary changes should be introduced to annotation 2 applicable to African elephants. References to Resolutions should not be made in this revised annotation.
4. Given the complexity and sensitivity of this discussion, we've suggested calling a CITES dialogue meeting as per Res. Conf. 14.5 allowing African elephant range States to consider these options in the hope common ground can be found as we are convinced all range States share a common goal to manage the remaining elephant populations in a manner consistent with the objectives of CITES. We sincerely hope this suggestion is given a chance and we call upon everyone to work together constructively so we can turn a page in this discussion.

Document No: 66.7
Agenda item: Review of the National Ivory Action Plan process
Proponents: Malawi, Senegal and the United States of America

1. The EU and its Member States thank the proponents of this document.
2. We support a strong and effective NIAP process as an essential tool to address illegal ivory horn trade. Therefore, we support an external review of the process with a view to strengthening the NIAP process.

Document No: 67
Agenda item: CITES Big Cats Task Force (Felidae spp.)
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. On behalf of the EU and its Member States, we would like to thank the Secretariat for the preparation of this document. The EU and its Member States supports the proposed new decisions, revised terms of reference and modus operandi for the CITES Big Cats Task Force as agreed at the SC74.
2. With respect to the prioritizing key countries to be part of the CITES Big Cats Task Force we would like to urge those Parties who have not yet done so to report illegal trade in Big Cat specimens. As such we remain open for possible extension of the list of priority countries.
3. (Reflect on the spot the modification made under 59 and 73.2)

Document No: 68
Agenda item: Asian big cats (Felidae spp.)
Proponent: CITES Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Standing Committee

1. Thank you Chair. The EU and its Member States would like to thank the Secretariat for the preparation of this important summary report.
2. We support proposed amendments to Resolution Conf 12.5 (Rev. CoP18) and newly drafted decisions in this document. In order to strengthen the combatting illegal trade in Asian Big Cats specimens the EU and its Member States support the retaining of the decisions 18.100, 18.101 and 18.105. On a general note, considering the importance of cooperation and avoiding overlap, we see clear merit in creating a mechanism to inform and strengthen the work of the Big Cat Task Force on gained insights as appropriate.
3. In addition, we would like to propose a small amendment to the decision 19. AA:
 - In the text of the draft decision 19.AA para a), we propose to broaden the range of projects that the Secretariat should be informed about, to also include other forensic methods, rather than only genetic research projects, as broader variety of methods can be used, for example morphological methods.

4. We therefore suggest changing the words “genetic research projects” to “forensic research projects including genetic and other methods”.
5. (If the in-session working group on Asian Big Cats is established the EU would like to participate in it.)

Documents No: 69.1 and 69.2
Agenda items: -Report of the Standing Committee -Next steps towards the successful implementation of the Appendix-II listing for seahorses
Proponents: -Standing Committee -Maldives, Monaco, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Togo, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America

1. We thank the Standing Committee and the proponents (the Maldives, Monaco, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Togo, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America) for the preparation of documents 69.1 and 69.2.
2. These documents are complementary, and it should be considered to merge the two documents, as 69.2 also includes Draft Decisions addressed to Parties, IGOs and NGOs with a view to more effectively implement the inclusion of seahorses in Appendix II. If this is the case, it is important to include seahorses at the proposed NDF workshop as suggested in 69.2.

Document No: 70
Agenda item: Rosewood timber species
Proponent: Plants Committee

1. We support adoption of Draft decisions as agreed by the Plants Committee on Rosewood tree species in the Annex 1 to this document and fully recommend their consideration to CoP 19.
2. We are extremely concerned about sharply increasing trade and trade shifts to Rosewood species and legume timbers not currently included within the CITES appendices. We are also fully committed to enforcing and ensuring a legal and sustainable trade in those rosewoods species which are included and note that despite CITES efforts a pervasive illegal trade still exists for many rosewood species.

Document No: 71.1 and 71.2
Agenda items: -Report of the Standing Committee and the Animals Committee - Proposed amendment to Resolution Conf. 17.10
Proponents: -Standing Committee in consultation with the Chair of the Animals Committee - United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We agree that the two documents, 71.1 and 71.2 should be considered jointly, as proposed by the Secretariat.
3. At SC74 it has been reported that pangolins continued to be significantly affected by illegal trade and that due to the lack of up-to-date knowledge and data about pangolin abundance and population trends, determining the true impact of poaching and illegal trade remain a challenge.
4. In particular, we consider it important to identify seized pangolin specimens at species level and report the seizures at species level in their annual illegal trade reports as agreed at the SC74. We believe that better species level identification of seized specimens would clearly be a useful tool to enhance protection of certain pangolin populations subject to greater pressure by illegal trade.
5. We would like to thank United Kingdom for the document 71.2 and we support the recommendations suggested.
6. We support the consolidated set of proposed decisions, as proposed by the Secretariat.
7. We welcome the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf 17.10 on Conservation of and trade in pangolins such as: ensure strict enforcement controls to address illegal trade in pangolin; close to of domestic markets for commercial trade; to ensure enforcement units and personnel receive relevant and effective support in anti-poaching operations or to remove references to parts and derivatives of pangolins from the official pharmacopoeia and include acceptable substitute products.
8. We also support the recommendation to work with IWCCM partners to promote increased capacity and training amongst the law enforcement community to tackle the serious nature and impact of illegal trade in pangolins; and to improve cooperation and a multidisciplinary approach in the detection, investigation and prosecution of crimes related to this species.

Document No: 72
Agenda item: African lion (<i>Panthera leo</i>)
Proponent: CITES Secretariat in consultation with the Chair of the Standing Committee

1. Thank you Chair. The EU and its Member States thank the Secretariat for preparing this document.

2. We support the adoption of the newly drafted Decisions 19.AA to 19.EE.
3. On a general note, considering the importance of cooperation, we see merit in creating a mechanism to inform and strengthen the work of the CITES Big Cat Task Force on gained insights as appropriate. For example on the work done in relation to decision 19DD.
4. The EU and its Member States also support to have the outcomes of the research and analysis of dec 18.246a be reviewed by the AC next to making it available for consideration by the CITES Big Cat Task Force.

Document No: 73.2
Agenda item: Proposed amendments to the draft decisions on jaguars agreed at SC74
Proponents: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Mexico and Peru

1. On behalf of the EU and its Member States I would like to thank Costa Rica, El Salvador, México and Perú for preparing this document.
2. We support the amendment to decision 19.CC to issue a notification. This will be helpful to collect the necessary information. At this stage however the EU and its Member States do not support draft decision 19.DD b) request assessing the necessity for a specific Resolution on jaguars. We feel that would be pre-mature to assess as the proposed activities are still to be undertaken. In this respect we question the need for establishing an intersessional working group with the proposed Terms of Reference.
3. Considering the importance of cooperation and avoiding overlap, we see clear merit in creating a mechanism to inform and strengthen the work of the Big Cat Task Force as appropriate.

Document No: 74
Agenda item: Songbird trade and conservation management (Passeriformes spp.)
Proponent: Animals Committee

1. The EU and its member states fully support the renewed decisions listed in Annex I of the document submitted by the Animals Committee. We believe that further work needs to be done on this issue and identifying particular taxa of song birds that are affected by trade is crucial for their protection. It is important that the necessary funding be available for these activities as soon as possible, therefore we support that the COP adopts the set of decisions proposed in its entirety, including decision 18.259.

Document No: 75
Agenda item: Rhinoceroses (Rhinocerotidae spp.)
Proponents: Standing Committee, CITES Secretariat

1. We thank the Standing Committee, the Secretariat and the IUCN Species Survival Commission African and Asian Rhino Specialist Groups and TRAFFIC for this extensive report on Rhinoceroses. We support the document prepared by the Standing Committee and the Secretariat and the changes to Res. Conf. 9.14 (CoP17), as well as the set of decisions in Annex 3.
2. However, we believe that some elements of decisions addressed to the Parties and proposed for repeal should be retained in resolution 9.14 (CoP17) or in the decisions. We suggest retaining part of the text of the Decision 18.110 that is addressed to all Parties that should continuously review trends associated with illegal trade in rhinoceros specimens, and the measures and activities they are implementing to address this crime, to ensure that these measures and activities are effective. We believe that this should not only apply to range countries like Botswana and South Africa mentioned in the new point 19.CC, but also to other Parties that may be affected by illegal trade in rhino horns.
3. We would also like to ask for clarification on what is meant by the term “implicated states and relevant experts” in Res. 9.14 point 8 and add “and trends” to paragraph 8 line 3 of Res. 9.14 (CoP17).

Document No: 77
Agenda item: Queen conch (Strombus gigas)
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States and the Caribbean part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.
2. We thank the Secretariat for preparing the document. BEING range states to this species we strongly support the collaborative efforts to protect this species adequately.
3. We support the draft decisions 19.AA to 19.DD in Annex 1 to the present document and deleting Decisions 18.275 to 18.280, but we would like to retain decision 18.278b and to be included into the new decision 19.BB.
4. Decision 18.278b is directed to the Secretariat to provide assistance to range States of Strombus gigas on relevant enforcement issues and report new developments in this regard to the Standing Committee, as appropriate.
5. The reason for this request is that we still see the need to address enforcement issues, also in relation to illegal trade, next to the proposed activities undertaken by the established joint CFMC/OSPESKA/WéCAF/CRFM/CITES Queen conch working group.
6. Also, as mentioned in the document – the funds made available for implementing decision 18.278 is still to be allocated.

7. We are of the opinion it will be beneficial, next to the other proposed updates, to have the results reported back to Standing Committee, as appropriate.
8. Further, considering the importance of regional cooperation, we welcome the opportunity for the relevant CITES authorities to collaborate in the joint CFMC/OSPESCA/WECAF/CRFM/CITES Queen conch working group.
9. In this respect we also appreciate decision 19.BB.c directed to the Secretariat to „provide updates on relevant activities of the joint working group on queen conch to the Animals Committee and the Standing Committee, as appropriate “.

Document No: 78
Agenda item: Tortoises and freshwater turtles (Testudines spp.)
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. We thank the Secretariat for reporting on the progress of Decisions 18.286 to 18.291. We agree they have been implemented and may be deleted.
2. We also thank Madagascar for their continued effort to respond to and address wildlife crime, including illegal trade in tortoises and freshwater turtles.
3. We are however concerned about the continued high levels of illegal trade in tortoises and freshwater turtles, which is compounded by high rates of deforestation causing habitat loss.
4. We would like to especially highlight the four terrestrial *Astrochelys* and *Pyxis* species which are all assessed as Critically Endangered by the IUCN Red List with rapidly declining populations.
5. *Astrochelys yniphora*, the ploughshare tortoise, is highly sought after for the illegal pet trade. With an estimated population size of near 200 mature individuals, restricted to five small subpopulations, the species is predicted to go extinct within the next generation if current threats continue unabated.
6. Both *Pyxis* species also face extinction primarily due to high rates of habitat loss. *Pyxis arachnoides*, the spider turtle, has in the past decade come under increasing direct exploitation for consumption, due to the rapid population decline of *Astrochelys radiata*, the radiated tortoise.
7. Therefore, the EU would like to propose a follow-up decision to request Madagascar to present a comprehensive conservation strategy for its threatened turtle species, and at least for the four terrestrial *Astrochelys* and *Pyxis* species, to be assessed by the Animals Committee at its 33rd meeting and the subsequent Standing Committee.

Document No: 82
Agenda item: Trade in medicinal and aromatic plant species
Proponent: Plants Committee

1. The EU generally supports the Draft Decisions but would like to suggest one small amendment to Draft Dec. 19.CC b), which Germany has already proposed in PC25. The suggested amendment was not accepted by the PC, due to concerns of parties that more time is needed to consider the amendment, so Germany was invited to submit the suggestion to CoP19, which is reflected in Par. 8 of the current Document.
2. In the end of the Draft Decision 19.CC b) the Plants Committee is meant to prepare recommendations for a revised Resolution on Traditional Medicines or a new Resolution on plant-based medicinal products.
3. Regarding the potential new Resolution, the EU thinks that a restriction to medicinal products is too limited and would not take into account that many products containing medicinal and aromatic plants are not medicinal products in a strict sense but would rather be considered cosmetics, personal care products, food supplements and so on.
4. We think that this has also been the general understanding of the PC25 Working Group and the analyses of the Secretariat that have been provided in documents PC25 Doc. 30 and CoP18 Inf. 11 so that that this larger scope should be taken into account when considering any potential new resolution about plant-based products.
5. We would therefore like to propose the following amendment:
 - In Dec. 19.CC b) in the last line deletion of the term “plant-based medicinal products” and replacement with the term “medicinal and aromatic plants products”
 - The last line of Dec. 19.CC b) would then read:
“Resolution on traditional medicines or a new Resolution on medicinal and aromatic plants products;”

Document No: 83
Agenda item: Identifying species at risk of extinction for CITES Parties
Proponents: The Gambia, Liberia, Niger, Nigeria and Senegal

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. In line with the assessment by the Secretariat we do not think that establishing the new database is necessary or advisable. The existing IUCN Red List is an easily accessible source of information that, in conjunction with trade data and other relevant information, can be used to assess whether a species should be proposed for listing under CITES.
3. Moreover, we agree with the Secretariat’s assessment that the additional tasks proposed would add additional burden on the Animals and Plants Committee and might interfere with their other tasks.

4. Finally, we acknowledge that the process for listing species is complex and some parties might require technical support to be able to prepare and submit proposals. We call on the parties concerned to seek assistance from the Secretariat and use the tools and programmes that are already available.

Document No: 84.1
Agenda item: Report of the Animals and Plants Committees
Proponents: Animals Committee, Plants Committee, prepared by their specialists on nomenclature

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. Firstly, we would like to thank the nomenclature specialists for their leadership in addressing the large amount of work accomplished in this intersessional period, the Animals and Plants Committees and their Chairs for their valuable discussions, as well as the various teams who have collaborated in producing the Checklists presented for adoption at this meeting.
3. We support the Decisions proposed in Annex 1 to CoP19 Doc. 84.1 outlining the workplan for the next intersessional period.
4. However, we note that investigation of the nomenclature for the taxon *Dipteryx panamensis* (currently listed in Appendix III) is proposed for inclusion in the workplan for the next intersessional period in paragraph 16 of the document but consider that this may need to be resolved as a matter of urgency should proposal CoP19 Prop. 48 to include *Dipteryx* spp. in Appendix II be adopted, as the nomenclature in the proposal does not recognise this taxon.
5. We also support the Secretariat's proposed decision 19AA to provide a mandate for the nomenclature specialists for plants and animals to participate in the initiative of the International Union of Biological Sciences to develop a standardized global of species, and report on progress to the 20th meeting of the Conference of the Parties. We suggest that the nomenclature specialists report to the Committees so that they may inform any recommendations to be put forward for consideration at CoP20.
6. We agree with the Secretariat's recommendation to renew Decisions 18.309 and 18.310 on Use of time-specific versions of online-databases as standard nomenclature references and Decisions 18.311 and 18.312 on Nomenclature and identification of corals.

Document No: 84.2
Agenda item: Standard nomenclature for <i>Dipteryx</i> spp.
Proponent: European Union and its Member States

1. Thank you Chair, I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. Noting that the taxonomy of *Dipteryx* spp. remains unresolved, and, in order to avoid any misinterpretation of the listing should proposal 48 be adopted, the EU has submitted Document 84.2 on "Standard Nomenclature for *Dipteryx* spp."

3. This document suggests the adoption of Carvalho et al. (2020) as the standard reference for this genus, which is supported by the Secretariat and the Nomenclature Specialist to the Plants Committee.
4. It also proposes to direct the Plants Committee to evaluate the nomenclatural issues related to *Dipteryx* spp., and, provide recommendations to CoP20.
5. The European Union and its Member States agree to the minor proposed edits to the Decisions by the Secretariat as outlined in the document.

Document No: 84.3
Agenda item: Standard nomenclature for <i>Khaya</i> spp.
Proponent: European Union and its Member States

1. Thank you, Chair. We note that the taxonomy of the genus *Khaya* remains unresolved and in order to avoid any misinterpretation of the listing should proposal 51 be adopted, the EU has submitted Document 84.3 on “Standard Nomenclature for *Khaya* spp.”.
2. In this document we propose the adoption of two existing references by the CoP (Bouka et. al, 2017 and 2022) until a full taxonomic revision of the genus can be completed. The Secretariat recommends the adoption of these references. Document 84.3 also directs the Plants Committee to consider and evaluate the nomenclatural issues related to *Khaya* and provide recommendations to CoP20. The European Union and its Member States agree to the minor proposed edits to the Decisions by the Secretariat as outlined in the document.

Document No: 84.4
Agenda item: Standard nomenclature for <i>Rhodiola</i> spp.
Proponent: European Union and its Member States

1. Thank you Chair. The taxonomy of the genus *Rhodiola* appears not entirely resolved for a few number of the species in some of the popular nomenclatural databases and references used in international contexts.
2. Discrepancies and ambiguities regarding the number of accepted species, and the exact taxonomic placements and representations of some of the taxa could eventually lead to confusion or misinterpretation among Parties in the context of implementation and enforcement of trade controls for *Rhodiola* specimens under CITES.
3. To address these issues and with regard to requirements laid out in Res. Conf. 12.11 on Standard nomenclature, a CITES standard nomenclatural reference seems to be necessary for the genus *Rhodiola*.

4. Doc. 84.4 outlines the nomenclatural issues in *Rhodiola* species, highlights a potential candidate Standard nomenclature reference and proposes draft Decisions that direct the Plants Committee to consider and evaluate the nomenclatural issues and to identify and recommend a suitable standard nomenclatural reference for amendment of the Annex to Res. Conf. 12.11 to the 20th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
5. This document has been prepared with the involvement of and in line with the recommendations made by the Nomenclature Specialist for Plants. We are grateful for her expertise.

Document No: 85.2
Agenda item: Information system for trade in specimens of CITES-listed tree species
Proponents: Standing Committee, CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you Chair. The EU and its Member States thank the CITES Secretariat and the Standing Committee for preparing the document.
2. We support the proposed renewal of Decision 18.317 and adoption the new Decision 19.AA presented in Annex 1. We would like to highlight the importance of identification and building on existing work. We agree with the outline in paragraph 31 of the document to give initial priority to species of the largest volumes in trade. We support the suggestion that the Secretariat consult the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) for guidance, however duplication of the work should be avoided.
3. We welcome the initiative to potentially add a HS Code for *Dalbergia* timber. A long-term vision for cooperation between the World Customs Organization (WCO) and CITES to better reflect CITES (timber) trade in HS Codes is beneficial for goods that are frequent in trade. Support request to WCO to revise the HS codes so that relevant products of CITES-listed tree species are explicitly identified, as mentioned in paragraph 9.

Document No: 86
Agenda item: Products containing specimens of Appendix-II orchids
Proponent: Standing Committee

1. Thank you Chair. We support the draft decisions; however we propose changes to the draft decisions:
 - 19.BB Directed to the Plants Committee by adding “or the Conference of the Parties, as appropriate.” at the end of the sentence. The decision will then read: “The Plants Committee shall consider the study as per Decision 19.AA, and make recommendations on how to improve CITES implementation for Appendix-II listed orchids to the Standing Committee or the Conference of the Parties, as appropriate.”

- 19.CC Directed to the Standing Committee by adding “as appropriate” at the end of the sentence. The decision will then read: “The Standing Committee shall review any recommendations of the Plants Committee, and make recommendations to the Conference of the Parties, as appropriate.”

Document No: 87.1
Agenda item: Proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17)
Proponents: Botswana, Cambodia, Eswatini, Namibia, Zimbabwe

1. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. The number of species listed in the Appendices has increased to over 38,000 and keeps increasing by several hundred species at each CoP; the total value of international trade controlled by CITES has gone up enormously, in particular with listing of some commercially exploited marine species and timber, and it reaches billions of EUR/USD annually.
3. People worldwide depend on CITES listed species for their livelihood: either because they live together with those species and manage and use them, or because they are involved in the captive breeding or artificial propagation of CITES species. After all, over half of CITES-controlled trade is now in species bred in captivity or artificially propagated. Therefore, Parties do consider impact of CITES listings on livelihoods.
4. However, these considerations must be done OUTSIDE of Res. 9.24 on listing criteria. The Convention text is clear in that biological and trade criteria are the basis for listings. Further, CITES provides sufficient tools to address livelihood issues, such as delayed implementation in cases where more time to adjust to new listings is needed, or technical support to making NDFs.
5. We are convinced that sustainable use of species is key to securing livelihoods of millions of people in the long term, and that CITES has proven to be an effective instrument to achieve this objective. Introducing a livelihood element to the listing criteria would undermine the scientific basis of decision making in CITES and weaken the listing criteria. It would lead to situations where species threatened by international trade may not receive the necessary protection from overexploitation through international trade in time to avoid the decrease of their populations. This may then result in populations that are depleted to levels which would no longer allow for their use.
6. Therefore, we cannot support this proposal to amend the Resolution 9.24 but are open to discussing the means to provide support to Parties in their effort to minimize impact of CITES listings on livelihoods.

Document No: 87.2
Agenda item: Aquatic species listed in the CITES Appendices: Proposals for a new approach to the listing of sharks and rays
Proponent: Senegal

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the European Union and its Member States.
2. Thank you to Senegal for preparing working document 87.2 on a new approach to the listing of sharks and rays and for the suggested way forward and draft decisions.
3. We welcome the suggestion to set-up an in session working group. We also welcome that the proposed draft decisions do not only focus on chondrichthyans. However, we would also like to come back to the original proposal which highlights the need for a revision of the footnote in Annex 5 to Res Conf. 9.24 (rev CoP17). This footnote, on “Application of decline for commercially exploited aquatic species” establishes a special regime for the listing of some aquatic species. However, in practice the footnote has been difficult to implement and has been the source of misunderstandings.
4. The scope of the application of the footnote should be clarified, especially of the sentence “Nevertheless, some species may fall outside this range” in the first paragraph of the footnote, which notes that not all commercially exploited aquatic species should be subject to the footnote.
5. An in-session working group provides an excellent opportunity to discuss these issues and to find the best way forward for all aquatic taxa with slow growth rates and a low reproductive output and the EU is ready to participate in such an exchange.
6. Again, we would like to thank Senegal for initiating this discussion.

Document No: 88
Agenda item: Communications concerning amendments to the Appendices received by the Depositary Government after the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Proponent: CITES Secretariat

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We want to thank the CITES Secretariat for preparing this document. We think this discussion is of high importance as it touches upon the core functioning of this Convention. We hope to reach a consensual agreement on a way forward at this CoP.

3. The EU has also touched upon this topic on our document n°66.4.2 (Trade in live elephants) in which we have given some suggestions on how to take this issue forward. We also note Inf. Doc. 17 from the USA on the same topic. We are open to discuss different proposals on wording, as long as certain basic elements remain clear. The first element is that it should be clear that future annotations should not contain references to Resolutions or Decisions. We agree with the Secretariat that the Interpretation section of the Appendices is the best place to incorporate definitions of key terms whenever this is deemed necessary. Secondly, as long as we have existing annotations that refer to a Resolution or Decision, changes to these Resolutions or Decisions should be done in such a way that the right of any Party to enter a reservation is respected. On these two elements, we support the changes suggested by the Secretariat as mentioned in Annex 1 and 2 of this document.
4. The third element in this document is on how to deal with reservations to changes to an existing annotation. Although we admit that the suggested solution will potentially result in complex situations, with different regimes in place for one single species, we are of the opinion that this is the only solution that respects the basic principle that Parties have the right to enter a reservation with respect to an amendment of the Appendices. We hope however that this right is to be used sparsely and we continue to work together with all Parties so proposals can be adopted by consensus as much as possible. Regarding the changes proposed by the Secretariat in annex 3, we do wonder why only annotation to animal species are targeted, whereas we also have numerous plant species that are listed with an annotation. We do not see any reason why animal and plant species should be treated differently. We also noted the suggestions from the US on this topic, and would suggest taking some of their language, notably where one or more populations, subspecies or species of an already listed taxon is transferred to a different Appendix and incorporate this into the amendments of Res. Conf. 4.25 (Rev. CoP18). We can provide textual suggestions on this if this is deemed useful.

Document No: 91
Agenda item: Closing remarks (Observers, Parties, CITES Secretary-General, Host Government)

1. The European Union and its Member States came to the Conference of Parties with a clear objective to advance in the protection of species that are affected by unsustainable levels of trade and to strengthen the response of international community to wildlife trafficking. We believe that these objectives have been met. The results speak eloquently for themselves.
2. As parties, we might have different views and perspectives. However, when coming here, we are ready to listen to each other and try to find solutions that are based on the best available evidence and the precautionary principle, to ensure that, collectively, we advance conservation and protection of species affected by international trade.
3. We would therefore like to thank the parties for their constructive approach and readiness to dialogue and find compromise.
4. We would also like to thank the chairs of the plenary, committees, and working groups.
5. Our gratitude as well to Ivonne Higuero and the whole the secretariat for the intense and excellent work, to interpreters, translators and everyone else who facilitated the meeting and contributed to making it a success.

6. And of course, we also extend our warm thanks to the Government and the people of Panama for hosting us during this meeting. With your excellent organisation in this impressive conference center and your relentless positive spirit, you have created the conditions for a very successful conference.
7. We would like to finish by supporting the statement just delivered by Ukraine.
8. The EU and its Member States strongly condemns the Russian Federation's war of aggression against Ukraine, as it grossly violates international law and is causing massive loss of life and injury including to civilians.
9. The EU and its Member States demand that Russia immediately ceases its military actions. Russia should be held to account, including for the damage to the biodiversity and ecosystems in Ukraine.
10. Muchas gracias presidenta y felicidades por el exito de la COP.

Proposal No: 1
Agenda item: Hippopotamus amphibious (Hippopotamus)
Proponents: Benin, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Gabon, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo

1. Thank you, Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We acknowledge the concerns expressed by the proponents with regard to conservation challenges that hippopotamus faces in several range States.
3. We do not think that transferring the species from Appendix II to Appendix I is going to address the main challenges and have the impact the proponents wish for. We do not think that the proposal meets CITES criteria. In particular, it seems that the global population of H. amphibius does not have a restricted range, nor does it have a small population. There were declines in the population in some range States, but in others the population is stable or increasing. Moreover, the international trade is not considered a significant threat to the species as this trade has remained stable or declined over the last ten years and the main exporters of hippopotamus specimens are from eastern and southern Africa where many national populations appear to be stable or increasing in number.
4. An Appendix I listing would not reduce the main threats to H. amphibius in many range States – which is loss/degradation of habitat and increased competition and conflict with local communities over water and grazing areas, particularly during droughts.
5. Nevertheless, we acknowledge the need of enhanced conservation in certain regions, and we encourage the relevant range states to adopt additional measures within Appendix II listing.

6. In particular, we encourage all the range States to set sustainable quotas, based on recent population data. We believe that an adequate management will have a stronger effect on wild populations than an Appendix I listing would, without effective management. In this context, we consider that it would be useful to improve reporting on trade, in particular with regard to the number of harvested individuals.
7. We consider that any future concerns regarding export levels of hippo products should be addressed in the framework of the Review of Significant Trade process.

Proposal No: 2
Agenda item: Ceratotherium simum simum (Southern white or southern square-lipped rhinoceros) (population of Namibia)
Proponents: Botswana, Namibia

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We recognize the success of Namibia in the management of their white rhino populations as well as all their efforts made in the continuous fight against poaching and illegal trade in rhino horn. We welcome the good cooperation between South Africa and Namibia, which has greatly contributed to the conservation of the species by reintroducing white rhino to the Namibian territory.
3. However, this is also part of our concern: the increase of the Namibian population is to a large extent due to the imports of live rhinos from South Africa, and many populations remain small and fragmented in Namibia.
4. Therefore, the EU and its Member States can only support the transfer to App. II for live animals for in situ conservation purpose, with the clarification in the annotation that such transfers are only to be done to sites within the species' natural and historical range in Africa.
5. We cannot support the transfer to App. II for trade in hunting trophies for precautionary reasons. There is evidence that rhino horns originating from hunting trophies have entered illegal trade. Trade in App. II would also no longer require the need for an import permit to be issued by importing Parties so there would be less scrutiny of such trade should it be taking place under the App. II regime.
6. To conclude, the EU and its Member States support part a) of the Annotation with the addition that such transfers of live rhinos are only to be done to sites within the species' natural and historical range in Africa, but we oppose part b) on hunting trophies.

Proposal No: 3
Agenda item: Ceratotherium simum simum (Southern white or southern square-lipped rhinoceros) (population of Eswatini)
Proponent: Eswatini

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.

2. The EU and its Member States remain committed to stand by Eswatini and other African range States of the white rhinoceros in their continued investment in the conservation of this species and their combat against poaching and illegal trade in rhino horn.
3. We fully recognize the concerns of Eswatini related to in the costs associated with this work. However, rhino poaching and rhino horn trafficking continue at an unacceptable level. We think it is not advisable to resume trade as this would undermine all efforts done to reduce the demand for of this product. We do not think the precautionary safeguards are met that would allow for a resumption of trade.
4. The EU and its Member States cannot support this proposal to remove the existing annotation or any other change that could result in a resumption of commercial international trade in rhino horn.

Proposal No: 4
Agenda item: Loxodonta Africana (African elephant) (populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe)
Proponent: Zimbabwe

1. Thank you Chair, I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We recognize and applaud the successful work done by of those four range States concerned by this proposal in conserving this iconic species. We encourage all African elephant range States to continue their efforts in combating the poaching of elephants and the illegal ivory trade.
3. However, the EU and its Member States oppose any change to the current CITES regime which would result in a resumption of the international trade in elephant ivory. We are of the view this would negate all the work done by Parties to close down markets that may contribute to illegal trade and may lead to a new spike in poaching and illegal trade in ivory. Such a move would undermine all efforts done to reduce the demand for ivory.
4. If a revised proposal would be submitted that would only modify the annotation to make it more readable and up to date, without any legal effects on the current trade rules, we can reconsider our position. But the current proposal cannot be supported by the EU and its Member States.

Proposal No: 5
Agenda item: Loxodonta africana (African elephant) (populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe)
Proponents: Burkina Faso, Equatorial Guinea, Mali, Senegal

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.

2. While we share the concerns of the proponents about the continuous need to conserve the African elephant and we see that all Parties have the same goal in mind: to protect this species. We are concerned that there are different views on how to achieve that goal. We regret the lack of agreement and consultation between African range States on this matter.
3. Taking into account the provisions in Res. Conf. 9.24 on the criteria for amendments of the Appendices, we continue to believe that the population of *Loxodonta africana* in Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe do not meet the biological criteria for inclusion in Appendix I. It is also clear that those range States involved do not agree with this uplisting.
4. We therefore do not support the uplisting of all African elephants in Appendix I.

Proposal No: 6
Agenda item: <i>Cynomys mexicanus</i> (Mexican prairie dog)
Proponent: Mexico

1. Thank you, Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We agree with the assessment by Mexico that the criteria for Appendix I listing are no longer fulfilled.
3. There is no official record of the sale of specimens of this species, nor is there a national or international market that threatens its wild populations.
4. The EU and its Member States therefore support the proposal.

Proposal No: 8
Agenda item: <i>Kittacincla malabarica</i> (White-rumped Shama)
Proponents: Malaysia, Singapore

1. Thank you, Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. The species is recognised amongst the highest priorities for action by the IUCN SSC Asian Songbird Trade Specialist Group. The main threat to this species is trapping for both domestic and international trade.
3. It can therefore be recognized that the criteria for inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2 (a), of the Convention, particularly Annex 2a, paragraph B of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) are met.
4. Therefore, the EU and its Member States support this proposal.

Proposal No: 9
Agenda item: <i>Pycnonotus zeylanicus</i> (Straw-headed bulbul)
Proponents: Malaysia, Singapore, United States of America

1. Thank you, Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. The species has experienced a marked population decline across its range in Southeast Asia resulting from its popularity in the caged bird trade, compounded by habitat loss. Wild population is small, estimated to be 600–1,700 mature individuals. The species is extinct in Thailand, Myanmar, and Java and Sumatra in Indonesia, and only found in Singapore, parts of Malaysia and Kalimantan.
3. Due to the extremely rapid decline, the strawheaded bulbul was listed as Critically Endangered by the IUCN in 2018. Population decline is rapid and likely ongoing, estimated to exceed 80% in the previous three generations (15 years).
4. It is obvious that the species meets the criteria for inclusion in Appendix I in accordance with the biological criteria in Annex 1 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).
5. Therefore, the EU and its Member States support this proposal.

Proposal No: 11
Agenda item: <i>Caiman latirostris</i> (Broad-snouted caiman) (population of Brazil)
Proponent: Brazil

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its member states.
2. We thank Brazil for presenting their proposal to transfer the Brazilian population of broad-snouted caiman *Caiman latirostris* from Appendix I to Appendix II.
3. We noted that species is widespread and abundant in many localities. With an estimated adult population of 500.000 specimens, it faces no risk of extinction in the foreseeable future. As such, it meets the criteria for Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2. a) of the Convention and it meets precautionary safeguards for downlisting from Appendix I to Appendix II as stated in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) Annex 4, paragraph A. 2. a) ii) A).
4. Therefore, the EU and its Member States support the proposal.

Proposal No: 12
Agenda item: <i>Crocodylus porosus</i> (Saltwater crocodile) (population of the Palawan Islands (Philippines))
Proponent: Philippines

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its member states.

2. We thank the Philippines for presenting their proposal to transfer the saltwater crocodile *Crocodylus porosus* population of the Palawan Islands from Appendix I to Appendix II with a zero-export quota for wild specimens.
3. We note that the species is neither globally nor locally threatened and with a population size of over 5000 adult specimens the population of Palawan is reasonably secure.
4. We find that the zero-export quota for wild specimens provides a precautionary safeguard in accordance with Annex 4 paragraph A. 2. a) iii) of Res. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).
5. The EU recognizes the importance of alternative conservation methods which help to increase local acceptance of a growing crocodile population by providing incentives to local communities.
6. With the perspective that it will promote the recolonization of other parts of the Philippines, the EU and its Member States support the proposal.

Document No: 13
Agenda item: <i>Crocodylus siamensis</i> (Siamese Crocodile) (population of Thailand)
Proponent: Thailand

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its member states.
2. We acknowledge the efforts of Thailand to protect its native fauna. However, although the captive population of the Siamese Crocodile is large, the wild population is small and has a decreasing population trend. As only the wild population lives under natural selection conditions, it is crucial to maintain it on an effective population size which can genetically ensure the long-term adaptability and survival of the species. This is currently not the case.
3. The species remains threatened by extinction and accordingly meets the criteria for continued inclusion in Appendix I. Therefore, considering the global and national conservation status, the EU and its Member States deem it necessary to oppose the proposal.
4. Still, we encourage Thailand and all other range states to further improve the conservation status of the species until it is no longer threatened and meets the Precautionary Measures stated in Annex 4 of CITES Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Many success stories demonstrate that crocodile populations can recover under the protection of CITES and we hope that this will also be the case for *Crocodylus siamensis*.

Proposal No: 14
Agenda item: <i>Physignathus cocincinus</i> (Indo-Chinese Water Dragon)
Proponents: European Union, Viet Nam

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.

2. The EU highly appreciates the close collaboration with Viet Nam in drafting the proposal and the joint research activities, including population studies and market surveys on the semi-aquatic species in northern, central and southern Viet Nam that have been referred to by the representative of Vietnam and provided a profound scientific basis for this proposal and point to low population densities.
3. While international trade in *P. cocincinus* has been documented at least since the 1970s, trade in the species into the EU is being closely monitored since its listing in Annex D of the EU Council Regulation No. 338/97 in 2010. As mentioned by Vietnam, recorded imports to the EU and the US involved about 70,000 mostly wild-caught individuals per year.
4. As prices for the species remain cheap, there currently appear to be few incentives for large-scale captive breeding as alternative to collection from the wild, even though wild caught specimens do worse in captivity. Thus, it is likely that international trade will continue to focus on wild specimens if trade is not regulated.
5. Considering the high numbers of wild sourced specimens in the international trade and the low population densities of this Vulnerable species, as already pointed out by the representative of Viet Nam, we invite the Parties to support the proposal to list *Physignathus cocincinus* in Appendix II of the Convention.

Proposal No: 15
Agenda item: <i>Cyrtodactylus jeyporensis</i> (Jeypore hill gecko)
Proponent: India

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. It is typical for species of the genus *Cyrtodactylus* to have a small range and this does not necessarily cause any conservation concerns. However, the situation for *C. jeyporensis* seems to be different. The recent re-discovery of this small gecko species created a specific demand and market prices are so high that they might stimulate an unsustainable exploitation of the two small areas where the species occurs.
3. Therefore, the EU and its Member States consider it necessary to include the species in Appendix II and we hope that this will protect it from unsustainable and illegal international trade.

Proposal No: 16
Agenda item: <i>Tarentola chazaliae</i> (Helmethead gecko)
Proponents: Mauritania, Senegal

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We welcome the efforts of the respective range States to protect their native fauna.

3. The information available suggests that international trade is currently or may negatively impacting the wild population of *Tarentola chazaliae*.
4. The species is listed as Vulnerable (VU) in the IUCN Red List. At the time of assessment in 2004, it was known from fewer than 10 locations, which were threatened by exploitation and coastal development. A continuing decline in mature individuals due to collection for the pet trade has been recorded.
5. In the European Union, seizures of the species have been reported in recent years.
6. Therefore, we are convinced that criterion B. of Annex 2 (a) of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) is met, and the EU supports the proposal.

Proposal No: 17
Agenda item: <i>Phrynosoma platyrhinos</i> (Desert horned lizard)
Proponent: United States of America

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. The best available information suggests that *P. platyrhinos* is one of the most widespread species in its genus and is locally abundant. The species was recently assessed as Least Concern with no major threats being reported.
3. While *Phrynosoma platyrhinos* has been exported in some numbers for a long time, there is no indication that trade is currently posing a threat to the species. Moreover, trade from the US seems to have almost ceased since 2018.
4. Demand for this species in the EU seems to be rather low, which could be related to the fact that the species is not easy to maintain in captivity. However, captive breeding has been reported since the 70ies and is regularly occurring in the EU.
5. We understand that the proposal explicitly excludes *P. goodei*, which is meanwhile considered a subspecies of *P. platyrhinos*. It is morphologically similar and appears to have a much smaller distribution range than *P. platyrhinos*. Other species in the genus seem to be intrinsically more vulnerable to exploitation than *P. platyrhinos*.
6. We are inclined to oppose this proposal to only list *Phrynosoma platyrhinos* in Appendix II.
7. However, we recommend listing the species in Appendix III in order to monitor if trade in conservation relevant numbers will resume.

Proposal No: 19
Agenda item: <i>Tiliqua adelaidensis</i> (Pygmy Bluetongue Lizard)
Proponent: Australia

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.

2. The EU acknowledges that Australia is following a listing policy in strict compliance with the criteria of Res. Conf. 9.24 (rev. CoP17) and the EU and its member states appreciate this considerate approach as well as the persistent efforts of Australia to provide any necessary protection to its native fauna and flora. The generic affinity and comparably small size of *Tiliqua adelaidensis* compared with to other congeners, generates a high demand which cannot be sustainably met. The unique biological trait to exploit spider dwellings and the dependence on a rare biome make the species especially vulnerable.
3. Accordingly, the EU and its Member States agree that the Endangered *T. adelaidensis* meets the criteria for being listed in Appendix I and we strongly support this proposal.

Proposal No: 20
Agenda item: <i>Epicrates inornatus</i> (Puerto Rican boa)
Proponent: United States of America

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its member states.
2. Listing species in the Appendices of CITES highlights conservation deficits but can be necessary to prevent further declines or even extinctions. Whenever international trade is not the main cause for declines, species listings should need to be complemented by other conservation measures which reduce domestic consumption and improve habitat quality in order to effectively protect the species. *Epicrates inornatus* has never been high in international demand and trade. However, it was threatened by high deforestation rates and now has become a positive example that re-forestation can rapidly improve the conservation status of a threatened species.
3. The EU and its Member States applaud the USA and specifically Puerto Rico to this success and we support the proposal to transfer the species from Appendix I to Appendix II.

Proposal No: 21
Agenda item: <i>Crotalus horridus</i> (Timber Rattlesnake)
Proponent: United States of America

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We understand the will of the United States of America to protect their native species, yet we are in doubt whether the inclusion of the timber rattlesnake in Appendix II of CITES is an adequate conservation tool for this species or it will help to reduce unwanted anthropogenic impacts or illegal activities present on national level.
3. Populations of the timber rattlesnakes are affected by different threats including national Rattlesnake roundups and habitat degradation, yet it appears the species remains common and widespread in a majority of its range, even in parts without local protection.

4. Utilization of the species remains mostly on national level and even though cases of poaching and illegal activities have been recorded, it remains unclear whether these incidents have a connection to international demand. Best available data indicate extremely low international trade volumes; hence the EU and its Member States take the view that international trade currently does not pose a threat to the timber rattlesnake and that listing criteria are not met. Therefore, the EU and its Member States oppose this proposal.
5. Since this is not the first time the United States propose to include the timber rattlesnake in Appendix II of CITES, the EU and its Member States would like to suggest and urge once again the United States to reconsider listing of this species in Appendix III of CITES.

Proposal No: 22
Agenda item: <i>Chelus fimbriata</i> and <i>C. orinocensis</i> (Amazon matamata and Orinoco matamata)
Proponents: Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Peru

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We would like to thank the proponents. EU is a range Party for *Chelus fimbriatus*.
3. Although both *Chelus* species have a large area of distribution, data on the population size and status is completely lacking. This makes solid assessments of the impact of trade on wild populations difficult.
4. Available information suggests that a majority of specimens in international trade may originate from hatching in controlled environment. However, it seems that large numbers of *Chelus orinocensis* are transported from Columbia to Peru to be laundered by local farms which also release juveniles to the wild. Thereby, it is likely that relevant numbers of *C. orinocensis* escape or are released within the natural range of *C. fimbriatus*. This would threaten the genetic integrity of *C. fimbriatus* populations. Due to this risk, the listing criteria in Annex 2(a) of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) are met. To prevent trade which causes this danger, regulation of trade in both species of the genus *Chelus* under CITES is necessary. Therefore, the EU supports the proposal.

Proposal No: 23
Agenda item: <i>Macrochelys temminckii</i> and <i>Chelydra serpentina</i> (Alligator Snapping Turtle and Common Snapping Turtle)
Proponent: United States of America

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. Although the proposal presents rather incomplete data about the trade in *Macrochelys temminckii*, the wild population might be affected by the current harvest level and the EU is of the opinion that criterion B in Annex 2 (a) of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) is met. Therefore, the EU and its Member States support listing of this species in Appendix II.

3. Concerning the second species proposed for inclusion in Appendix II, *Chelydra serpentina*, the EU is of the opinion that compliance with criterion A in Annex 2 (b) of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) seems not to be met. Even juveniles of *Macrochelys temminckii* can be easily distinguished from *Chelydra* long before they reach a size at which trade becomes conservation relevant. Although the listing of *Chelydra serpentina* might ease aspects of the enforcement for the USA, it will create even larger complications internationally, since *Macrochelys temminckii* is much easier distinguishable from *Chelydra serpentina* than the three species of *Chelydra* amongst each other. The EU is also worried about possible shift of international trade from *Chelydra serpentina* to the other two *Chelydra* species which would not be covered by CITES, although they are more threatened. Therefore, we have serious concerns that the listing of *Chelydra serpentina* may have a negative effect on the conservation of the Latin American species in the genus.
4. Based on explained concerns, we cannot support the proposal in its current form. However, the EU proposes the amendment to reduce the scope to listing only *Macrochelys temminckii* in Appendix II.

Proposal No: 24
Agenda item: <i>Graptemys barbouri</i> , <i>G. ernsti</i> , <i>G. gibbonsi</i> , <i>G. pearlensis</i> and <i>G. pulchra</i> (Barbour's map turtle, Escambia map turtle, Pascagoula map turtle, Pearl River map turtle, Alabama map turtle)
Proponent: United States of America

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. Trade information from the CITES Trade Database for *G. barbouri*, *G. ernsti*, *G. gibbonsi*, *G. pearlensis* and *G. pulchra* shows a total of 24 transactions for 318 specimens between 2010 and 2020. The majority of them occurred between non-range Parties, and the concerned specimens were bred or born in captivity. During these 10 years, only 24 specimens were traded commercially on international level. There is no recent evidence for illegal trade or seizures for any of these species. Accordingly, it is not comprehensible how a stronger regulation of international trade would benefit the conservation of the species.
3. All of them are threatened by other threats, such as pollution in riverine habitats leading to the loss of primary prey species; habitat loss and alteration; overharvesting for the domestic pet trade and other pressures, which require increased national conservation efforts.
4. Consequently, the EU and its Member States come to the same conclusion as the CITES Secretariat and IUCN/Traffic, that acceptance of this proposal would not be in compliance with the listing criteria. Therefore, the EU and its Member States do not support this proposal. However, if the chair considers that the majority of parties supports the proposal, the EU will not block the consensus.

Proposal No: 25
Agenda item: Batagur kachuga (Red-crowned Roofed Turtle)
Proponent: India

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. Protecting large turtle species which occurs in densely populated areas is extremely challenging and the EU and its Member States thank India, the only remaining range state of Batagur kachuga, for proposing the uplisting of this species. We agree that it fulfills the listing criteria and that the inclusion in Appendix I will provide necessary trade restrictions.
3. As CITES can only prevent international trade, it is important to supplement the listing with additional conservation efforts which are already conducted by India in cooperation with the Madras Crocodile Bank Trust and the Turtle Survival Alliance. We hope that the head starting program, as well as the surveying and protection of nesting sites, will continue and allow the species to recover to a conservation status where it is not any more threatened by extinction.
4. The EU and its Member States wish India that the efforts to save this iconic species receive all the required sponsorship and we fully support the proposal.

Proposal No: 27
Agenda item: Rhinoclemmys spp. (Neotropical wood turtles)
Proponents: Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Panama

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We welcome the efforts of several range States to protect their native fauna. Likewise, we also assume the responsibility to consider based on the best scientific data, whether the inclusion the genus Rhinoclemmys in Appendix II of CITES serves the conservation of these species.
3. There is insufficient indication that international trade is currently negatively affecting wild populations of any Rhinoclemmys species. Most species are assumed to have relatively extensive ranges and were partly shown to be locally common. Those species with a more confined distribution do not appear in the international trade in conservation relevant numbers.
4. While most species are reported to be domestically used in large scales, known international trade is mainly in captive-bred specimens and largely in *R. pulcherrima manni*.
5. Therefore, we are not convinced that criterion 2 (a) of Article II of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) met for all Rhinoclemmys species. As all nine species within the genus Rhinoclemmys can be distinguished from each other, criterion Annex 2(b) is not to be met.

6. Consequently, we do not support this proposal in its current form but would be willing to support a reduced proposal. We encourage the proponents to restrict the proposal to *R. areolata*, *R. diademata*, *R. rubida*, *R. pulcherrima* and *R. punctularia* only.

Proposal No: 29
Agenda item: Kinosternon spp. (Mud turtles)
Proponents: Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, United States of America

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We welcome the efforts of range States to protect their native fauna.
3. The EU assessed - based on the available scientific data - the extent to which a genus listing of Kinosternon is in line with the listing criteria, proportionate and beneficial to the conservation of the individual species.
4. *K. cora* and *K. vogti* which are proposed for an inclusion in Appendix I appear to meet the biological criteria A and B of Annex 1 of the Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Both species have been documented to occur in trade, being aware that both species have likely entered the international trade under the name *K. chimalhuaca* years ago.
5. On the other hand, the available information provides insufficient indication that international trade is currently negatively impacting wild populations of all Kinosternon species, which are proposed for an inclusion in Appendix II. Species which are traded in relevant numbers, such as *K. leucostomum* and *K. scorpioides* are widely distributed and usually described to be common. Large numbers of turtles in trade are reportedly captive-bred.
6. At the same time, the genus contains few (sub-)species which are threatened, but do not appear to be impacted by the international trade (e.g., *K. sonoriense* or *K. hirtipes*).
7. We are not convinced that an inclusion of all remaining Kinosternon species in Appendix II according to Article II 2 (a) of the Convention is justified and the appropriate measure to address the main threats to the genus, which are habitat degradation and local use.
8. However, we are inclined not to oppose this proposal as we support the listing of *K. cora* and *K. vogti* in Appendix I and see some merit in listing clear look-alike species as well as those species with highest intrinsic vulnerability to over-collection.

Proposal No: 34
Agenda item: Centrolenidae spp. (Glass Frogs)
Proponents: Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gabon, Guinea, Niger, Panama, Peru, Togo, United States of America

1. The EU is concerned by a number of listing proposals for higher taxa presented to this CoP, in which only few species seem to comply with the CITES listing criteria, and thus make accurate decisions difficult.
2. Assessments made by the EU of proposal 34 revealed that only one single species out of 158 may weakly meet the CITES listing criteria. All other 157 species do not comply with the listing criterium of Article II (2)a as there is no indication that current or expected trade poses a threat to any species of the family. Recorded international trade is restricted to few, non-threatened species and there is no reference to a specific demand for threatened taxa. The EU will therefore oppose the proposal, if it is not substantially reduced.
3. The EU is also concerned about the application of the lookalike criterion as no evidence is provided that each of the species proposed according to Article II (2) b resemble at least one of the species proposed according to Article II (2) a.
4. Furthermore, there are no externally discernable characters which would allow identifying a frog as belonging to the family Centrolenidae and striking similarities exist between members of this family and [several] species belonging to at least 5 other frog families [with several hundred species]. While the EU acknowledges that listing high taxa can make enforcement easier in some cases, customs officers would depend on experts to know whether a frog is a member of the family glass frogs.
5. In this context, we also want to remind that CITES trade is regulated at the level of species and if species in legal trade are not accurately identified at species level, wildlife laundering may occur. Therefore, reducing the scope of the proposal would significantly increase the applicability and still ensure the protection of all species which might be affected by trade.
6. To meet the concerns of the proponents about trade which violates their national legislation, we recommend listing all species of the family Centrolenidae in Appendix III. This would ensure that only legally exported specimens enter international trade.

Proposal No: 35
Agenda item: Agalychnis lemur
Proponents: Colombia, Costa Rica, European Union, Panama

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. The EU, together with Colombia, Costa Rica, and Panama propose to include Agalychnis lemur, the Lemur leaf frog, in Appendix II with a zero-export quota for wild-taken specimens traded for commercial purposes in accordance with Annex 2(a) of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

3. *Agalychnis lemur* is a charismatic tree frog which is currently known from only a few locations in Costa Rica and Panama, and its population status is unknown in Colombia. It has suffered an estimated 80 - 95 % decline over the past 21 years and was assessed as Critically Endangered in the IUCN Red List in 2020, with a decreasing population trend.
4. *Agalychnis lemur* is affected by a combination of habitat loss and disease. While it is unknown if the species continues to be collected from the wild, it is in demand within the pet trade, and is reported in international trade as of captive-bred origin. According to a recent study assessing the exotic pet market in Germany, *A. lemur* was among the most frequently offered *Agalychnis* species. Inclusion in Appendix II thus appears necessary, combined with a restriction on any commercial trade in wild specimens.
5. The genus *Agalychnis* was included in Appendix II at CoP15, however the listing was limited to the five species recognised by the standard nomenclatural reference at that time. The current CITES standard reference for amphibians recognises 15 *Agalychnis* species, including *Agalychnis lemur*.
6. An extract of *Amphibian Species of the World* is proposed as the standard reference for the *Agalychnis* genus, which would replace the current Appendix II listing for *Agalychnis* with individual species-level listings for seven species, as outlined in the proposal, which also includes a recommendation of AC31.
7. We therefore invite the Parties to support the proposal to list *Agalychnis lemur* in Appendix II of the Convention.

Proposal No: 36
Agenda item: <i>Laotriton laoensis</i>
Proponent: European Union

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. The EU proposes to include the species *Laotriton laoensis* (Laos Warty Newt), in Appendix II with a with a zero-export quota for wild-taken specimens traded for commercial purposes in accordance with Annex 2(a) of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).
3. The Laos warty newt is a monotypic species with a very small distribution range restricted to northern Lao PDR, which is not included under any protected area.
4. Shortly after the species' discovery in 2002 it has been in high demand in the pet trade due to its spectacular colour pattern.
5. Over-harvesting for the international pet trade, medicinal use and consumption is considered to be the primary threat to this species.
6. Mature specimens accumulate and form large breeding groups inside the pools of small streams and therefore can be easily collected from known sites with minimal effort during the breeding season. Together with its slow maturation, this increases the species' risk of over-exploitation and local extirpations.

7. As a consequence, *L. laoensis* has already suffered an estimated 50% decline in the last 10 years and the species was assessed as Endangered in the IUCN Red List in 2014 with a declining population trend.
8. Due to the intrinsic vulnerability of the species, its uniqueness and the actual and potential negative effects of trade on its wild population, the regulation of trade seems necessary, including the restriction of any commercial trade in wild specimens.
9. We therefore invite Parties to support the proposal to list the *Laotriton laoensis* in Appendix II of the Convention.

Proposal No: 37
Agenda item: Carcharhinidae spp.
Proponents: Bangladesh, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Gabon, Israel, Maldives, Panama, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1. Thank you Chair, I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. The EU and its member states support this proposal. As highlighted in this proposal, the 19 species within the family that form the core of this proposal have shown significant declines in their populations over the past decades and meet Annex 2a, Criteria A and B.
3. At least three species clearly meet the Appendix I listing criteria and one or more may already be approaching extinction. The remaining members of the family are included in this proposal under criteria Annex 2b, Criterion A.
4. The listing proposal has addressed the challenges regarding identification of products in trade and lookalike issues. To support the inclusion of lookalike species in the family of requiem sharks, detailed matrices were provided in the proposal to identify where there are inter-species lookalike issues for meat and for dorsal, pectoral, and lower caudal fins, which are the largest and most valuable shark fins.
5. With regard to the inclusion of blue shark, the EU recommends consulting with the relevant RFMO in order to prepare an NDF for the blue shark.
6. Finally, a CITES listing is complementary to the International Plan of Action for Sharks and is one of the tools to ensure sustainable management of these species.

Proposal No: 38
Agenda item: Sphyrnidae spp.
Proponents: Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, European Union, Panama

1. Thank you Chair. On behalf of the EU and its Member States, we are glad to present you the Proposal 38 for the inclusion of all species of the Sphyrnidae family not already listed on Appendix II.

2. We propose the inclusion of *Sphyrna tiburo*, commonly referred to as the bonnet head shark, in CITES Appendix II in accordance with Annex 2a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). *S. tiburo* meets these listing criteria due to the significant population declines documented in much of the species' range. The presence of *S. tiburo* fins in international shark fin trade hubs combined with the increasing prevalence in the international fin trade market of coastal shark species, mean that a CITES Appendix II listing is necessary to ensure that any growth in international trade in *S. tiburo* can be managed sustainably, and in a way that allows the species to recover from the declines already documented.
3. In addition, and in accordance with Annex 2b of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) we propose the inclusion of all remaining species in the Family Sphyrnidae in CITES Appendix II. When the three large hammerhead species (*S. lewini*, *S. mokarran*, and *S. zygaena*) were included in CITES Appendix II at CoP16, it was believed that only these three Sphyrnidae species were in international trade, due to their superior size. However, since then it has become evident that smaller-bodied hammerhead species are also being subject to international trade. Considering the lookalike issue with the fins of the whole family of hammerhead sharks, we propose inclusion of the remaining five species of hammerhead sharks, as well as *S. tiburo*.
4. We would like to note that the assessment by the IUCN the CITES Secretariat and the FAO expert advisory panel concluded that it is in line with the CITES listing criteria and appropriate to list hammerhead sharks at the family level. in Appendix II.
5. We therefore invite Parties to support the proposal.

Proposal No: 39
Agenda item: <i>Potamotrygon albimaculata</i> , <i>P. henlei</i> , <i>P. jabuti</i> , <i>P. leopoldi</i> , <i>P. marquesi</i> , <i>P. signata</i> and <i>P. Wallacei</i>
Proponent: Brazil

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. According to current references, the genus *Potamotrygon* is comprised of 31 species, distributed throughout Latin America. We thank Brazil for bringing forth a proposal on seven of these species endemic to their country.
3. These freshwater stingrays are valued in the ornamental fish trade. Unfortunately, considerable confusion exists about which species are traded, kept and bred in captivity. The fact that hybrids between different *Potamotrygon* sp. are popular in trade complicates the matter.
4. We thus support the Appendix II listing, which could control the sustainability of trade of the species from the wild. Yet, we recommend Brazil to provide additional identification information on the species to guide international enforcement as well as explain the practice of establishing a harvest management system. Since all *Potamotrygon* spp. are on Appendix III, we would recommend a review of the trade in *Potamotrygon* species by all range states to assess the need of future listings in the genus.

Proposal No: 40
Agenda item: Rhinobatidae spp.
Proponents: Israel, Kenya, Panama, Senegal

1. Thank you Chair, I speak on behalf of the European Union and its member states.
2. We support the proposal as presented by Israel on behalf of the co-proponents, to list the family of Rhinobatidae on Appendix II.

Proposal No: 41
Agenda item: Hypancistrus zebra
Proponent: Brazil

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. The species is endemic to the Rio Xingu watershed in Brazil where it is strictly protected by national legislations. Due to its attractive appearance, the species is in demand for the aquarium trade worldwide. Currently, the biggest threat to the wild populations appears to be the recently completed Belo Monte hydropower dam project, which greatly alters the habitats of the species. To date the implications for the species survival in the wild remain unclear.
3. At the same time the species is being bred in captivity in large numbers worldwide. The captive-breeding likely meets most of the international demand and could also provide a valuable backup population for the wild population at risk.
4. Thus, the EU and its member states are not convinced that the Appendix I criteria are met or that an Appendix I listing would be a proportionate and useful measure to protect the species. Thus, the EU will not support the proposal in its current form.
5. Instead, in order to provide sufficient protection for the wild population and to gain control over illegal trade in wild specimens, the EU suggests to list the zebra pleco in Appendix II (with a zero-export quota for wild specimens for commercial purposes).

Proposal No: 42
Agenda item: Thelenota spp.
Proponents: European Union, Seychelles, United States of America

1. Thank you Chair. On behalf of the EU and its Member States, we are glad to present you the Proposal 42 for the inclusion of the sea cucumber genus Thelenota in appendix II.
2. The three species of the genus Thelenota fulfil criteria A and B of Annex 2a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the convention.

3. Thelenota's species play an important role in the Indo-Pacific region among the many invertebrates that have been fished more than a thousand years. Their exploitation has risen for the last 25 years and is filling growing international markets seeking sea cucumbers. Thelenota ananas and anax are part of the most fished Sea cucumber in the tropical Indo-Pacific region. Their commercial value, the general ease of capture of those species and their vulnerability (low mobility of adults, late sexual maturity, density-dependent reproduction and low recruitment rates) encourages their overexploitation and therefore contribute to stocks shrinking seen in some areas.
4. Thelenota are of the bigger species of sea cucumbers, diurnal, so they are easy to detect. However, they are not observed anymore in many areas. They are also easy to pick up and do not require complex fishing or processing methods. Despite the size of their geographical range, most of them prefer very specific habitats with an important role in their ecosystems: they regulate water quality, by digging sediments, by recycling nutrients. Predation is very low on those species. Fishing is the main cause of population collapse. Their overexploitation induces a cascading effect in the ecosystem.
5. For sea cucumbers in general, one major challenge is the recognition of those species by enforcement authorities. Thelenota are easy to identify from other sea cucumbers species, even in their dried or process forms. France has also edited an identification guide for fresh and dried sea cucumbers, including the 58 species detected in the international trade by FAO.
6. Biological and commercial data clearly seem to suggest that Thelenota should be included in the CITES appendix II. Sea Cucumbers are mostly exported to a central market in Asia, then re-exported around the world. This inclusion will permit Parties to manage and sustain their trade in the greatest interest of fishermen (from local community as well), exporters and importers, while preserving these species and therefore letting them play their ecological role, to meet future generations' needs.
7. Many Range Parties have expressed their concerns to us, in particular the time required to complete the NDFs necessary to implement this proposal if adopted. We hear these concerns, and the three proponents wish to amend the proposal with an 18 month delay for this implementation.
8. We therefore invite Parties to support the proposal.

Proposal No: 44
Agenda item: Handroanthus spp., Roseodendron spp. and Tabebuia spp.
Proponents: Colombia, European Union, Panama

1. Thank you Chair. The European Union and its Member States are grateful for the collaborative process of preparing this proposal together with range states. One of them, namely Costa Rica, has launched the Consultation also in the name of the European Union. However, the final Co-Proponents of this proposal are Columbia, Panama and the European Union. We are extremely grateful for the exceptional good collaboration.

2. Building on the extremely helpful introduction by Panama (if true: and on subsequent statements) we would like to emphasize only a few aspects: There is evidence for conservation concerns due to both, deforestation, and high-volume trade in timber. Therefore, at least some of the species meet the listing criteria laid down in paragraph 2 a of Article II of the Convention.
3. Regarding the suggested listing of the entire genus, our experts have advised us that distinguishing timber specimens of the species formerly being united in a single genus *Tabebuia* and generally traded as “Ipe” is not possible for enforcement officers. That is, why all the species also fulfil the criteria laid down in paragraph 2 b of Article II, usually referred to as “look-alike criterion”. Being one of the main importers of Ipe we are also convinced that with proposing # 17 commodities dominating first time international trade are covered.
4. We therefore invite Parties to support the proposal to list all species of the genera *Handroanthus*, *Roseodendron* and *Tabebuia* with Annotation #17 on Appendix II of the Convention.
5. Regarding nomenclature we welcome any suggestions made by the Nomenclature Specialist for plants and to collaborate, be it right here at the Conference or in the intersessional period for resolving last open questions or identifying standard nomenclature references that would help in clarifying the scope.

Proposal No: 45
Agenda item: <i>Rhodiola</i> spp.
Proponents: China, European Union, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

1. Thank you for the floor, Chair. On behalf of the European Union and its Member States I am glad to present to you Proposal 45 for the inclusion of the genus *Rhodiola* spp. in Appendix II, proposed by China, the European Union, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.
2. *Rhodiola* is a genus of 58-90 long-lived perennial herb species, widely distributed among the Northern Hemisphere, including the EU.
3. The rhizomes of some species of *Rhodiola*, known as “roseroot”, have been part of traditional medicine systems in many countries. Nowadays they are used in a growing number of products and applications, including medicine, food supplements, cosmetics, and others.
4. International trade is currently focused on *R. rosea* and *R. crenulata* and industrial use has seen a rapid and ongoing rise in recent decades with regard to the diversity and volumes of *Rhodiola* products in trade.
5. Estimated trade volumes are considerable and are assessed to cover at minimum several hundred thousand kg of dried rhizomes and its equivalents annually.
6. The vast majority of material currently traded is wild-sourced, and harvesting is focused on the exploitation of the large rhizomes of reproductively mature individuals.

7. Commercial levels of exploitation therefore impact recruitment and long-term population viability, and significant declines in harvested populations of *Rhodiola* species have been reported for a number of range countries, including the Russian Federation and China, which are considered the main source countries for *Rhodiola* raw material.
8. Although information on population status and trends are scarce, over-exploitation has been reported to be a significant threat to *R. rosea* and *R. crenulata* in the principal sourcing regions. Accordingly, *R. rosea* is listed nationally as Category 3 in the Red Book of the Russian Federation, and it is in threatened categories in the national red lists of all other known principal source countries. In China, *R. crenulata* and *R. rosea* have been put under state protection and commercial collection needs permitting.
9. Based on a biological vulnerability to harvesting, increasing levels of international trade, and declines in wild populations, *R. crenulata* and *R. rosea* meet the criteria for inclusion in Appendix II of CITES.
10. Raw and semi-processed material and bulk commodities are considered to be the specimens that appear first and in large volumes in international trade and commercial demand for these commodities pose immediate conservation concerns for the species. By suggesting annotation #2 which designates “all parts and derivatives except: seeds and pollen; and finished products packaged and ready for retail trade”, we are convinced that the proposed listing would - in line with Res. 11.21 (Ref CoP18) on the use of annotations - cover those commodities that dominate international trade, without generating unnecessary administrative burden to industry, consumers and CITES authorities.
11. Identification of specific *Rhodiola* species can be challenging even for live plants but definitely for dried rhizomes. After specimens have undergone processing it is not considered possible to identify the respective species without molecular techniques such as DNA barcoding. Adding to this, it has been proven that *R. rosea* and *R. crenulata* products are frequently substituted and adulterated, both, with other *Rhodiola* species, as well as with each other at early stages in the supply chain.
12. Therefore, the look-alike provisions and criteria of the Convention are also met and consequently the inclusion of the whole genus *Rhodiola* is proposed.
13. We therefore invite Parties to support the adoption of Proposal 45 to include the genus *Rhodiola* spp. in Appendix II with annotation #2.

Proposal No: 46
Agenda item: <i>Afzelia</i> spp.
Proponents: Benin, Côte d’Ivoire, European Union, Liberia, Senegal

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. We are glad to present to you Proposal 46 for the inclusion of African populations of the genus *Afzelia* in Appendix II.

3. *Afzelia* is a genus of large paleotropical trees that are widespread across sub-Saharan Africa. International trade is the key threat impacting African *Afzelia* populations, which are in decline due to intense over-exploitation. The timber is of high quality being durable in humid conditions and termite resistant - it is sought after for use in construction and boat building and, due to its aesthetic quality, for decorative veneer, furniture, and flooring. *Afzelia* timber is traded internationally as “doussie” or African mahogany.
4. *Afzelia* spp. Are known to be intensively logged and threatened by overexploitation for the international timber trade (Oshingboye et al., 2017; Donkpegan et al., 2014, 2020) this has led to severe population declines and scarcity of mature seed trees as noted now during several African regional meetings (African Regional Workshop, 1998a, 1998b; Hills, 2019b; Hills, 2020). suggest we need to be stronger in our introduction as there are lots of data gaps, we need to highlight that up to date recent research and African regional and local knowledge of these species highlight severe population declines and scarcity the data is not perfect but we need to put forward that enough is known I added some words not in our proposal highlighted.
5. The EU, along with China and the United States are key importers of *Afzelia* timber, which is mainly exported from Cameroon, Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire. Trade data is not readily available at the genus or species level, although customs data indicate that more than 15 million kg of “African mahogany” under specific HS codes was exported during 2008-2014 We need to focus on what trade data we have not focus on or mention the lacking data unless we have to discuss it. Whilst this includes trade in other species such as *Khaya* spp., which is also proposed for listing in Appendix II under CoP19 Prop. no. 51, international trade in *Afzelia* is significant, and has led to depletions across African populations.
6. *Afzelia* typically occur at low densities and exhibit slow growth and high seedling mortality and are thus biologically vulnerable to over harvest. *A. africana*, *bipindensis* and *pachyloba* are categorised as globally Vulnerable in the IUCN Red List due to unsustainable harvesting. *Afzelia africana* has undergone a population decline of around 30% in three generations, and mature seed trees of *Afzelia bipindensis* and *pachyloba* are now considered scarce. *A. quanzensis* populations are also decreasing as a result of local declines driven by unsustainable and illegal logging.
7. Accordingly, four species, namely *Afzelia africana*, *bipindensis*, *pachyloba* and *quanzensis* meet the criteria for listing in Appendix II under criterion B of Annex 2a of Conference Res 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).
8. Since African *Afzelia* spp. are not easily distinguishable from one another based on wood morphological characteristics and the species are known to be traded interchangeably, inclusion of all other African populations of the genus in Appendix II under Criterion A of Annex 2b of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) is proposed – this would include a further three species.

9. Although additional species of *Afzelia* occur in Asia, no enforcement challenges are envisaged with the listing of African populations; this approach does not differ from other CITES listings that include only certain populations in the Appendices based on geographic region/location. Our proposal is also very clear on this. The Asian populations of *Afzelia* are not included in this proposal on the basis that three of these four species (*A. xylocarpa*, *A. rhomboidei*, and *A. javanica*) are not significantly traded internationally (see Section 9). While *A. palembanica* (or more widely *Intsia palembanica*) is present in international trade, it is traded with other *Intsia* spp. under the common name “Merbau” and is thus differentiated in trade from African mahogany also the Thünen Institute of Forest Genetics has developed genetic markers to identify *Intsia* spp. (Koch pers. comm. to UNEP-WCMC, 2022).
10. In their assessments of the proposal, the CITES Secretariat, ITTO and IUCN-Traffic (in Documents 89.1, 89.3 Annex 4 and Annex 5 respectively), all conclude that the four African species meet the criteria for listing in Appendix II as proposed, with the remainder meeting the look-alike provisions. As the proposal notes - thirteen range States are in support, and additionally, Nigeria expressed their support in document CoP 19 Doc. 89.2.
11. We therefore invite Parties to support the adoption of proposal 46 to include the genus *Afzelia* spp. in Appendix II with annotation #17, which would designate all timber commodities, including logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, plywood and transformed wood.

Proposal No: 47
Agenda item: <i>Dalbergia sissoo</i>
Proponents: India, Nepal

1. The EU and its Member States take note of the proposal from India and Nepal to delete *Dalbergia sissoo* from CITES Appendix II. We share the view of the proponents that the species doesn't meet the criteria laid down in paragraph 2 a of Article II of the Convention. However, a listing is also justified by fulfilling the criteria laid down in paragraph 2 b of Article II. Annex 2 b of Resolution 9.24 (Ref. CoP 17) explains what is usually referred to as “look-alike criterion”. The main important aspect of the explanation is, that resemblance with species meeting criterion 2 a of Article II of the Convention is in such a way that “enforcement officers who encounter specimens of CITES-listed species are unlikely to be able to distinguish between them”.
2. We take note of the fact that the species can be easily identified as a living organism. However, this is not the way specimens are usually presented to enforcement officers. The proposal states rightly that differentiation from four other species of the genus *Dalbergia* is possible. However, the genus comprises of several 100 species and not of four. The Proponents also argue with gene sequencing and mass spectrometry. Both techniques are definitely not available to enforcement officers. Therefore, they don't help in this case. The EU and its member states are grateful for additional information provided by India in a bilateral communication on the identification of *Dalbergia sissoo*. However, they didn't bring any new insight in how enforcement officers could differentiate from look-alike species, especially for semi-finished and/or manufactured wood products. With a lot of interest, we have read in the proposal about potential applications of other analytical instruments. We invite the proponents to further explore these seemingly easy to handle instruments and to provide the prove that they would help in distinguishing between *Dalbergia sissoo* and the rest of the genus.

3. For the time being the EU and its member states consider the criterion 2b of Article II of the Convention to be met and therefore oppose the proposal to delete *Dalbergia sissoo* from Appendix II.

Proposal No: 48
Agenda item: <i>Dipteryx</i> spp.
Proponents: Colombia, European Union, Panama

1. This intervention is on behalf of the European Union and its Member States. We thank Panama for the excellent introduction of this proposal and together with Columbia for the excellent collaboration. We will not repeat everything already said. Let me therefore only stress the following:
2. *Dipteryx* timbers are found to be in high global demand, are therefore traded in huge volumes and currently they are amongst the most expensive timbers in global demand.
3. Backed-up by sound scientific data there is international concern for the conservation of the genus with declining population trends. The species are known to be particularly susceptible to over-exploitation due to their slow growth rate. The EU is a major importer of timber from the species concerned. In summary it is evident that four species meet the listing criteria laid down in Article II in paragraph 2 a of Article II of the Convention. Due to the fact that timber of the species can't be distinguished by enforcement officers all other species meet the listing criteria as specified in paragraph 2 b of Article II of the Convention.
4. [Seeds of *Dipteryx* spp. are well known in international trade as tonka beans. They are proposed for inclusion here for precautionary reasons. In the consultation for this proposal we have asked range states about their evaluation of the impact of seed trade but have not received much feedback.] We are open to learn more on whether international trade in seeds has got an impact on the species in the wild. We are of course willing to ensure that the proposed Annotation is in line with Res. 11.21 (Rev CoP 18) on the use of Annotations.
5. Responding to what we have heard from Parties having approached us, we are also open to a delayed implementation. Giving Parties involved a year to arrange for it would certainly help facilitating an effective implementation.
6. We invite Parties to support the proposal to list all species of the genera *Dipteryx* with Annotation #17 on Appendix II of the Convention, and to come back to us now with comments on their views on the impact of trade in seeds.

Proposal No: 49
Agenda item: <i>Paubrasilia echinata</i>
Proponent: Brazil

1. The EU and its Member States agree that increased control of trade in the species is necessary and adequate to tackle the current problem of laundering wild sourced specimens into the trade chain. We do however have some alternative suggestions on how this might be achieved.
2. The current Annotation cannot stay, and the EU would like to see at minimum the deletion of the reference to a resolution. There are also doubts on whether any substantial Annotation for an Appendix I-listing not referring to geographical in- or exclusions (e.g. “Population of...”) would be acceptable at all.
3. There are many finished bows of stringed instruments in this world and a lot of international and European movement (and commercial trade) is to be expected to be continued after a potential listing.
4. While administrative burden for both holders of bows and administration will be high, no matter on which Appendix finished bows would be included we are keen to work towards a solution which will ensure maximum conservation benefit for the species.
5. We are willing to discuss with the proponents and other interested Parties possible options in order to maximise the conservation of the species while avoiding excessive administrative burden without conservation benefits, and we propose to discuss this within an in-session working group.

Proposal No: 50
Agenda item: <i>Pterocarpus</i> spp.
Proponents: Ivory Coast, European Union, Liberia, Senegal, Togo

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States. We will present to you Proposal 50 for the inclusion of the genus *Pterocarpus* in Appendix II.
2. Firstly, we would like to thank the co-proponents Ivory Coast, Togo, Liberia, and Senegal for their support.
3. The species occur in a variety of habitat types ranging from savannahs to tropical rainforests throughout Central, Eastern, Western and Southern Africa. At least five of the species of African *Pterocarpus* produce rosewood or other precious hardwoods, with several traded under the same tradename “Padouk”. Due to different stressors, the ranges and distribution of the *Pterocarpus* species have become reduced and fragmented, with the main drivers of the decline being heavy deforestation and targeting for trade.

4. The *Pterocarpus* genus consists of twelve recognized species and six subspecies found in Africa, according to the African Plant Database. Two of the species are already listed on Appendix II. However, after recent consultation with CITES nomenclature specialists, we would suggest, before implementation, to consider KEW POWO as the standard reference for nomenclature.
5. The trade in Rosewood has seen a strong increase over the last decade, with *Pterocarpus* species being targeted in order to meet the increasing demand for rosewood in general and other precious woods on the international market. While only limited information is available for the different populations of *Pterocarpus*, recent studies showed declining or unstable population trends for 90% of all studied African *Pterocarpus* populations.³ Three species, namely *Pterocarpus tesmanni*, *P. Mildbraedii* and *P. erinaceus* meet the criteria for listing in Appendix II under criterion B of Annex 2a of Conference Res 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).
6. Given the difficulties with wood identification to species level, and noting the taxonomic issues outlined in the proposal, the criteria for inclusion of the genus *Pterocarpus* in Appendix II under Criterion A of Annex 2b also are met.
7. As we foresee difficulties with the implementation of these proposals for some range states, we can suggest the option of having a delayed implementation of this listing.
8. We therefore invite Parties to support the adoption of proposal 50 to include the genus *Pterocarpus* in Appendix II with annotation #17, which would designate all timber commodities, including logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, plywood and transformed wood.

Proposal No: 51
Agenda item: <i>Khaya</i> spp.
Proponents: Benin, Ivory Coast, European Union, Liberia, Senegal

1. Thank you Chair. I speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States. We are glad to present to you Proposal 51 for the inclusion of the genus *Khaya* in Appendix II. Firstly, we would like to thank the co-proponents Ivory Coast, Benin, Liberia, and Senegal for their support.
2. *Khaya* is a genus of tree species occurring in tropical and subtropical forests of west and central Africa, Madagascar and Comoros. *Khaya* species are traded internationally as African mahogany or “acajou” and are targeted for their highly valuable hardwood timber, which is used in construction and boat building and for paneling, flooring, and furniture.
3. The European Union is one of the key importers of *Khaya*. Whilst available trade data is largely under the common name “African mahogany” which does include other taxa, it is clear that *Khaya* is highly traded internationally, with *Khaya ivorensis* being a key species in the EU market. Over 130 000 tons of African mahogany was exported from range States during 2007-2014. Inclusion in Appendix II would allow for better monitoring of trade in *Khaya* which is currently available using HS commodity codes.

4. Khaya species generally occur at low densities. Ongoing wild harvest for the international timber market is the primary threat to the genus, which is having a detrimental effect on natural populations that are particularly vulnerable as a result of intrinsic poor regeneration rates. Five species have been assessed as Vulnerable in the IUCN Red List on the basis of overexploitation for timber and loss of mature trees leading to poor regeneration.
5. Khaya madagascariensis was most recently assessed by the IUCN in 2020 – it has undergone a 30% decline in three generations due to timber harvest. Similarly, in Côte d’Ivoire, the volume of African mahogany exported declined by 90% from 2012 to 2019 from a peak of 42 million cubic meters, reflecting a dwindling national resource. Khaya ivorensis is now rarely encountered in the country.
6. Five species, namely Khaya anthotheca, grandiflora, ivorensis, madagascariensis and senegalensis meet the criteria for listing in Appendix II under criterion B of Annex 2a of Conference Res 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).
7. Given the difficulties with wood identification to species level, and noting the taxonomic issues outlined in the proposal, the criteria for inclusion of the genus Khaya in Appendix II under Criterion A of Annex 2b also are met.
8. Assessments of the proposal by the CITES Secretariat, ITTO and IUCN-TRAFFIC, all conclude that the genus qualifies for inclusion in CITES Appendix II. Thirteen range States have expressed their support for the proposal, as outlined in Annex 1 of the proposal; in addition, Nigeria expressed support in document 89.2.
9. As we foresee difficulties with the implementation of these proposals for some range states, we can suggest the option of having a delayed implementation of this listing.
10. We therefore invite Parties to support the adoption of proposal 51 to include the genus Khaya in Appendix II with annotation #17, which would designate all timber commodities, including logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, plywood and transformed wood.

Proposal No: 52
Agenda item: Orchidaceae spp.
Proponent: Switzerland

1. Thank you Chair. I am speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
2. Even though we agree that most cosmetics products produced and traded by the industry do not contain wild-sourced material, we do not feel confident that trade in wild plants would not be facilitated in the future under these proposed exemptions.
3. At the local and domestic level, trade in wild-sourced medicinal products of some of the relevant orchid species outlined here has been reported, and it is known that higher prices exist in many instances for wild sourced material and even specially demanded.

4. *Gastrodia elata* is listed as Vulnerable on the IUCN Red List and the conservation status of the other species remain unclear, a precautionary approach is suggested unless the Annotation is changed to exclude source codes "W" and "Y", which unfortunately is not now is not possible, because it would broaden the scope of the proposal.
 5. We also note under Para 6)b)i) of Res. Conf 11.21 which deals with compliance, outlines that commodities that are proposed to be excluded should not first appear in international trade as exports from range States, we found that *Bletilla striata* cosmetics do first appear in trade from a range States - Korea (Source A).
 6. We therefore sadly cannot accept and oppose Proposal 52.
-