



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

SUMMARY RECORD
FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE
PLANTS COMMITTEE

Windhoek, Namibia
16-20 February 2004



Photo: Nika Debeljak

Rapporteur
Matthew Mustard
Prepared by the CITES Secretariat

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 5 |
| — Closed session of the Plants Committee | 7 |
| — Open session of the Plants Committee | 8 |
| CLOSED SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE | 13 |
| Participants | 15 |
| 1. Opening of the meeting | 15 |
| 2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure | 15 |
| 3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme | 15 |
| 3.1 Agenda | 15 |
| 3.2 Working programme | 15 |
| 4. Admission of observers | 15 |
| 5. Working programme for the Plants Committee until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties | 16 |
| 5.1 Preparation of the Chairman's report for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties | 16 |
| 5.2 Resolutions and Decisions directed or related to the Plants Committee | 16 |
| 6. Budget of the Plants Committee (2000-2004) | 16 |
| 7. Time and venue of the 15th meeting of the Plants Committee | 16 |
| OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE | 17 |
| Participants | 19 |
| 1. Opening of the meeting | 19 |
| 2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure | 19 |
| 3. Adoption of the agenda and the working programme | 19 |
| 3.1 Agenda | 19 |
| 3.2 Working programme | 19 |
| 4. Admission of observers | 19 |
| 5. Working programme for the Plants Committee until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties | 19 |
| 5.1 Preparation of the Chairman's report for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties | 19 |
| 5.2 Resolutions and Decisions directed or related to the Plants Committee | 20 |
| 5.3 Strategic Planning: Review of the Action Plan of the Plants Committee [Decisions 12.9 b) and 12.11 a)] | 20 |
| 6. Follow up of CoP12 Decisions | 20 |
| 6.1 Review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) (Decision 12.97) | 20 |
| 6.2 <i>Harpagophytum</i> spp. (Decisions 12.63-12.65): progress report | 24 |
| 6.3 <i>Guaiacum</i> spp. [Decision 11.114 (Rev. CoP12)]: progress report | 25 |

| | | |
|------------|--|-----------|
| 6.4 | <i>Aquilaria</i> spp. (Decisions 12.66-12.71): progress report | 25 |
| 7. | Technical proposals from the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties | 26 |
| 7.1 | Improving regional communication and regional representation | 26 |
| 7.2 | Definitions of the technical terms used in the annotations for medicinal plants [Decisions 12.23 and 11.118 (Rev. CoP12)] | 27 |
| 7.3 | Implementation of the annotation for artificially propagated hybrids within the genus <i>Phalaenopsis</i> | 27 |
| 7.4 | Review of Resolution on plants and plant trade (Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11) and definition of 'Artificially Propagated' [Decision 12.11 e)]..... | 28 |
| 7.5 | Determination of the definition of <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> plywood | 29 |
| 7.5.1 | Definition of " <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> plywood" | 29 |
| 7.5.2 | Revision of Resolution Conf. 10.13 on the Implementation of the Convention for timber species | 29 |
| 8. | Species proposals for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties | 30 |
| 8.1 | Annotations for certain artificially propagated orchid hybrids | 30 |
| 8.2 | Specimens in international trade under exemption | 30 |
| 8.3 | Proposal to include <i>Caesalpinia echinata</i> in the Appendices | 31 |
| 9. | Significant trade in plants | 31 |
| 9.1 | Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade (Decision 12.75) | 31 |
| 9.2 | Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.8 | 32 |
| 9.2.1 | Trade in plants from Madagascar (Decision 12.73) | 32 |
| 9.2.2 | Progress within the implementation of species review | 32 |
| 9.2.3 | Taxa review (Decision 12.74) | 32 |
| 9.3 | Selection of new species | 32 |
| 10. | Review of the Appendices | 34 |
| 10.1 | Periodic review of animal and plant taxa in the Appendices [Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP12), Decision 12.96 and document SC49 Doc. 20.1] | 34 |
| 11. | Review of heavily traded non-CITES species | 34 |
| 11.1 | Review of heavily traded non-CITES species [Decision 12.9 a) 111)] | 34 |
| 11.2 | Progress report on the evaluation of tree species (Decision 12.10) | 34 |
| 12. | Checklist and nomenclature | 34 |
| 12.1 | Progress report | 34 |
| 12.2 | Preparation of CITES checklist for <i>Bulbophyllum</i> (Orchidaceae) | 34 |
| 13. | ID Manual: progress report | 34 |
| 14. | Guidelines for transport of live plants | 35 |
| 15. | Relationship between <i>in situ</i> conservation and <i>ex situ</i> production plants [Decision 12.11 l)] | 35 |
| 16. | Links with industry and traders to promote projects on sustainable use [Decision 12.11 k)] | 35 |
| 17. | Role of Appendix II [Decision 12.11 m)] | 35 |
| 18. | Global Strategy for Plant Conservation: analysis and links with the Convention on Biological Diversity (Decisions 12.12 and 10.86) | 36 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 19. Other issues resulting from PC13 | 36 |
| 19.1 Report of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group (Decision 12.21) | 36 |
| 19.2 Export Quota Working Group (Decision 12.17) | 36 |
| 19.3 Technical implementation issues | 36 |
| 20. Training initiatives | 36 |
| 24.1 Standard slide package: progress report | 36 |
| 24.2 Master's course | 36 |
| 21. Production systems involving CITES-listed species and their impact on wild populations; designation of source code | 37 |
| 22. Registration of nurseries exporting <i>Araucaria araucana</i> | 37 |
| 23. Regional reports and updated regional directories (Decisions 12.14 and 12.15) | 37 |
| 24. Time and venue of the 15th meeting of the Plants Committee | 37 |
| 25. Any other business | 37 |
| 25.1 Report of a short study of <i>Tillandsia xerographica</i> in Guatemala, 17-24 January 2004 | 37 |
| 26. Closing remarks | 37 |
| ANNEX 1 | |
| Opening speeches | 39 |
| ANNEX 2 | |
| List of participants | 45 |
| ANNEX 3 | |
| Working groups reports | 57 |



Photo: Milena S. Schmidt

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| ACTION POINTS | RESPONSIBLE |
|---|----------------------------|
| CLOSED SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE | |
| 1. Opening of the meeting No action. | |
| 2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure Amended. | |
| 3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme 3.1 Agenda Amended. 3.2 Working programme Accepted without amendments. | |
| 4. Admission of observers List of observers amended and agreed. | |
| 5. Working programme for the Plants Committee until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties 5.1 Preparation of the Chairman's report for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties 5.2 Resolutions and Decisions directed or related to the Plants Committee Preparation of the report. | Chairman, Plants Committee |
| 6. Budget of the Plants Committee (2000-2004) Consider reducing number of Secretariat staff at meetings of the Plants Committee. Chairman's report to CoP13 to reflect on the advantages and disadvantages of holding Plants Committee meetings in Geneva. | Chairman, Plants Committee |
| 7. Time and venue of the 15th meeting of the Plants Committee Secretariat and Slovenia to try to conclude a Memorandum of Understanding regarding the financing and organization of the meeting. | Slovenia, Secretariat |

| ACTION POINTS | RESPONSIBLE |
|--|---|
| OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE | |
| 1. Opening of the meeting No action. | |
| 2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedures Adopted as amended in closed session. | |
| 3. Adoption of the agenda and the working programme PC adopted the Agenda, as amended in closed session, and of the working programme. No further action required. | |
| 4. Admission of observers Adopted as amended in closed session. No further action required. | |
| 5. Working programme for the Plants Committee until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties 5.1 Preparation of the Chairman's report for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties Preparation of the report. 5.2 Resolutions and Decisions directed or related to the Plants Committee and 5.3 Strategic Planning: Review of the Action Plan of the Plants Committee [Decisions 12.9 b) and 12.11 a)] Eliminate all Decisions directed to the PC and reformulate those still requiring implementation. Recommend in Chairman's report to CoP13 that more funding be allocated to the PC to support the work of its members. | Chairman, Plants Committee Chairman Chairman |
| 6. Follow up of CoP12 Decisions 6.1 Review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) (Decision 12.97) Representative of Oceania to re-draft document PC14 DG1 Doc. 1. Chairman to present the revised document PC14 DG1 Doc. 1 to the AC at AC20. 6.2 <i>Harpagophytum</i> spp, (Decisions 12.63-12.65): progress report Secretariat to request information from the importing countries of <i>Harpagophytum</i> spp. 6.3 <i>Guaiaacum</i> spp, [Decision 11.114 (Rev. CoP12)]: progress report Mexico to share project results with the Cuban Authorities once complete. Secretariat to write to Cuban Authorities requesting that they write a proposal for CoP13 for a similar study to be conducted for <i>Guaiaacum</i> spp. in Cuba, including a complete breakdown of costs. | Representative of Oceania, Chairman Secretariat Mexico Secretariat |

| ACTION POINTS | RESPONSIBLE |
|---|---|
| <p>7. Technical proposals from the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</p> <p>7.1 Improving regional communication and regional representation</p> <p>Secretariat to submit document PC14 WG2 Doc. 1 as an information document to the AC and the SC at their next meetings.</p> <p>The Netherlands to prepare documents pursuant to the recommendations in document PC14 WG2 Doc. 1.</p> <p>Switzerland to submit, as Depository Country, a proposal to amend Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP12) as outlined in document PC14 WG2 Doc. 1.</p> <p>Further recommendations in document PC14 WG2 Doc. 1 to be included in Chairman's report to CoP13.</p> <p>7.2 Definitions of the technical terms used in the annotations for medicinal plants [Decisions 12.23 and 11.118 (Rev. CoP12)]</p> <p>Committee to support recommendations of the supervisory group as outlined in document PC14 SG1 Doc. 1.</p> <p>7.3 Implementation of the annotation for artificially propagated hybrids within the genus <i>Phalaenopsis</i></p> <p>United States of America to prepare a proposal to change the annotation to change the number of <i>Phalaenopsis</i> hybrids to be included in a shipment to qualify for exemption from 100 to 20.</p> <p>7.4 Review of Resolution on plants and plant trade (Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11) and definition of 'Artificially Propagated' [Decision 12.11 e)]</p> <p>Working group on Plant Resolutions to make further amendments to document PC14 WG4 Doc. 1</p> <p>United States to submit proposal at CoP13 to amend Resolutions Conf. 11.11 and Conf. 9.19.</p> <p>7.5 Determination of the definition of <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> plywood</p> <p>7.5.1 Determination of the definition of "<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> plywood"</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>7.5.2 Revision of Resolution Conf. 10.13 on the Implementation of the Convention for timber species</p> <p>United States to submit at CoP13 the proposal outlined in the Annex to Document PC14 Doc. 7.5.2 (Rev. 1).</p> | <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Netherlands</p> <p>Switzerland</p> <p>Chairman</p> <p>Chairman, IUCN</p> <p>United States of America</p> <p>Regional representatives of Africa, Chile, France, Mexico, United States of America, European Commission, IWMC, Secretariat</p> <p>United States</p> <p>United States</p> |

| ACTION POINTS | RESPONSIBLE |
|---|---|
| <p>8. Species proposals for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</p> <p>8.1 Annotations for certain artificially propagated orchid hybrids Switzerland to incorporate the comments of the meeting participants and work with the Secretariat to prepare a final proposal for CoP13.</p> <p>8.2 Specimens in international trade under exemption No action required.</p> <p>8.3 Proposal to include <i>Caesalpinia echinata</i> in the Appendices Observer from COMURNAT to prepare a comment for the Chairman's report for CoP13.</p> | <p>Switzerland, Secretariat</p> <p>COMURNAT</p> |
| <p>9. Significant Trade in Plants</p> <p>9.1 Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade (Decision 12.75) Committee adopted the draft Terms of Reference for the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade, as outlined in the Annex to the document PC14 WG 3.1 Doc. 1.</p> <p>9.2 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.8</p> <p>9.2.1 Trade in Plants from Madagascar (Decision 12.73) Secretariat to encourage Malagasy Authorities to determine appropriate milestones for assessing the implementation of the action plan, and keep PC informed about progress with the action plan at future meetings.</p> <p>9.2.2 Progress within the implementation of species review</p> <p>and</p> <p>9.2.3 Taxa review (Decision 12.74) Committee adopted the recommendations of working group 3.2, as outlined in the Annex to the document.</p> <p>9.3 Selection of new species Committee to adopt the recommendations of working group 3.3 after the representative of Africa has incorporated the recommendations of the meeting participants into document PC14 WG 3.3 Doc. 1.</p> | <p>Plants Committee</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Plants Committee, Secretariat</p> <p>Representative of Africa, Plants Committee</p> |
| <p>10. Review of the Appendices</p> <p>10.1 Periodic review of animal and plant taxa in the Appendices [Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP12), Decision 12.96 and document SC49 Doc. 20.1] Committee to support the proposed guidelines for the periodic review of animal and plant taxa in the CITES Appendices, as outlined in the Annexes to document PC14 Doc. 10.1.</p> | <p>Plants Committee</p> |

| ACTION POINTS | RESPONSIBLE |
|---|---|
| <p>Working group on the review of the Appendices of the Plants and Animals Committees to incorporate the recommendations made by the meeting participants and submit the amended documents to the Animals Committee for their consideration.</p> | <p>Working group on the review of the Appendices of the Plants and Animals Committees</p> |
| <p>11. Review of heavily traded non-CITES species 11.1 Review of heavily traded non-CITES species [Decision 12.9 a) iii)] Chairman to present <i>Harpagophytum</i> spp. as a case study of a heavily traded non-CITES species, in the Chairman's report for CoP13.</p> | <p>Chairman</p> |
| <p>12. Checklists and nomenclature 12.1 Progress report Botanist of the Nomenclature Committee to draft a proposal for CoP13 to amend Resolution Conf. 12.11. 12.2 Preparation of CITES checklist for <i>Bulbophyllum</i> (Orchidaceae) No action required.</p> | <p>Botanist of the Nomenclature Committee</p> |
| <p>13. ID Manual: progress report No action required.</p> | |
| <p>14. Guidelines for transport of live plants Secretariat to prepare a Notification to the Parties recommending they use the Annex to document PC14 Inf. 15 for reporting non-compliance with transport guidelines.</p> | <p>Secretariat</p> |
| <p>15. Relationship between <i>in situ</i> conservation and <i>ex situ</i> production plants [Decision 12.11 l)] IUCN to re-draft document in the Annex to document PC14 Doc. 15. Chairman to inform IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme of recommendations and request that it re-draft the document for consideration at PC15. The Committee report to CoP13 that it could not make a decision on these two agenda items and would propose to deal with them again at PC15.</p> | <p>IUCN Chairman Plants Committee</p> |
| <p>16. Links with industry and traders to promote projects on sustainable use [Decision 12.11 k)] Observers to submit text for the Chairman's report at CoP13, giving examples of links with industry and traders to promote projects on sustainable use.</p> | <p>Germany, Guatemala, Netherlands, United States of America, COMURNAT</p> |
| <p>17. Role of Appendix II [Decision 12.11 m)] Representative for Oceania, and the observers for Austria, Mexico, the United States and the IWMC to submit text for the Chairman's report for CoP13, giving examples of how Appendix-II listing could encourage the sustainable use of plants.</p> | <p>Representative for Oceania, Austria, Mexico, United States, IWMC</p> |

| ACTION POINTS | RESPONSIBLE |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| <p>18. Global Strategy for Plant Conservation: analysis and links with the Convention on Biological Diversity (Decisions 12.12 and 10.86)</p> <p>FFI to continue with their work.</p> <p>Plants Committee member to represent the Plants Committee at the 'Analyzing links between CITES and the CBD' meeting in Germany in March 2004.</p> | <p>FFI Plants Committee</p> |
| <p>19. Other issues resulting from PC13</p> <p>19.1 Report of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group (Decision 12.21)</p> <p>Committee to adopt the recommendations of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group.</p> <p>19.2 Export Quota Working Group (Decision 12.17)</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>19.3 Technical implementation issues</p> <p>No action required.</p> | <p>Plants Committee</p> |
| <p>20. Training initiatives</p> <p>20.1 Standard slide package: progress report</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>20.2 Master's course</p> <p>Chairman's report for CoP13 to include request for a Decision on ways to maintain funding for the Master's course in Baeza, Spain.</p> | <p>Chairman</p> |
| <p>21. Production systems involving CITES-listed species and their impact on wild populations; designation of source codes</p> <p>See agenda item 15.</p> | |
| <p>22. Registration of nurseries exporting <i>Araucaria araucana</i></p> <p>No action required.</p> | |
| <p>23. Regional reports and updated regional directories (Decisions 12.14 and 12.15)</p> <p>No action required.</p> | |
| <p>24. Time and venue of the 15th Plants Committee meeting</p> <p>Offer from Slovenia to host PC15 accepted, Secretariat to seek ways to help with the funding of this meeting.</p> | <p>Slovenia, Secretariat</p> |
| <p>25. Any other business</p> <p>25.1 Report of a short study of <i>Tillandsia xerographyca</i> in Guatemala, 17-24 January 2004</p> <p>The Committee to support recommendations outlined in document PC12 Inf. 8.</p> <p>Chairman to notify Management Authority of Guatemala and the European Commission about this agreement.</p> | <p>Plants Committee Chairman</p> |



Photo: Victoria Zentilli

Plants Committee members

CLOSED SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE

Participants

Plants Committee members: Mr J. Donaldson and Mr Q. Luke (Africa); Ms Irawati and Mr N.P. Singh (Asia); Mr E. Forero (Central and South America and the Caribbean); Ms M. Clemente (Chairman) and Mr G. Frenguelli (Europe); Ms P. Dávila Aranda (North America); and Mr G. Leach (Oceania).

Observer Parties: Austria, Botswana, Canada, Chile, China, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Malaysia, Namibia, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain, South Africa, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania and the United States of America.

UNEP: UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre

Intergovernmental organizations: European Commission

Chairman of the Animals Committee

CITES Secretariat

1. Opening of the meeting (no document)

The Chairman welcomed all participants to the meeting and thanked the Secretariat for organizing the meeting and the Namibian authorities for hosting it.

2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure (PC14 Doc. 2)

The Secretariat notified the Committee of its difficulty in interpreting Rule 18, as outlined in document PC14 Doc. 2.1. Mr Forero (Representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) agreed that it was difficult to know who "may be directly affected" by any discussion of the documents at a Plants Committee meeting and supported the proposed amendment. The Committee decided to change Rule 18 to the wording recommended in document PC14 Doc. 2.1.

The Chairman notified the Committee that Rule 24 had been difficult to implement because the Secretariat was rarely notified of the receipt of the summary record of each meeting by the meeting participants. Mr Forero recommended that an additional agenda item be included in future closed session meetings of the Plants Committee to discuss and agree on the summary record of the previous meeting. The Chairman recommended changing "sent to the Parties represented at the meeting" to "sent to the regional representatives of the Plants Committee and to the observers of the Parties present at the meeting". This was agreed by the Plants Committee.

3. Adoption of the agenda and working programme

3.1 Agenda [PC14 Doc. 3.1 (Rev. 2)]

Mr Schürmann (observer from the Netherlands) proposed that the Committee treat document PC14 Inf. 8 as a separate agenda item. The Committee agreed and decided to add item 25.1, "Report of a sort study of *Tillandsia xerographica* in Guatemala, 17-24 January 2004", to the agenda.

3.2 Working programme (PC14 Doc. 3.2)

The Committee accepted the working programme.

4. Admission of observers [PC14 Doc. 4 (Rev. 1)]

The Chairman informed the Committee that two changes to document PC14 Doc. 4 were necessary. Firstly, that there would not be an observer from IUCN-the World Conservation Union at the current meeting. Secondly, that observers from the Species Survival Network and CONREFI would be admitted to the present meeting.

5. Working programme for the Plants Committee until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

5.1 Preparation of the Chairman's report for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (PC14 Doc. 5.1)

The Chairman informed the Committee of her intention to request its assistance in preparing the Chairman's report for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and to convene a working group to that effect.

5.2 Resolutions and Decisions directed or related to the Plants Committee (PC14 Doc. 5.2)

The Chairman informed the Committee that it may wish to form a working group that will prepare a summary report on developments pursuant to the Resolutions and Decisions directed or related to the Plants Committee.

6. Budget of the Plants Committee (2000-2004) (PC14 Inf. 2)

The Secretariat introduced document PC14 Inf. 2, and informed the Committee that the CITES budget would be discussed at the 50th meeting of the Standing Committee (SC50) as outlined in document SC50 Doc. 12.4.

Mr Luke (representative of Africa) asked the Secretariat why there was such a large difference in the travel and daily subsistence allowance of Secretariat staff compared to Conference staff. The Secretariat explained that the same UN rules apply to all staff. It added that Plants Committee members were sometimes able to make savings on travel and that Secretariat staff usually stayed for longer periods of time in the host country for the organisation of the meeting. Mr Alvarez (observer from the United States) remarked that the budget did not reflect the savings made by other participants to the meeting on subsistence costs when attending meetings in less expensive countries than Switzerland.

The Chairman requested the Secretariat to consider reducing the number of its staff attending Plants Committee meetings in order to reduce the cost of holding the meetings.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that the biggest savings were made when part of the costs of running the meetings were covered by the host country.

Mr Donaldson (representative of Africa) commented that two major reasons for conducting the meeting in different countries were to raise the awareness of CITES issues in those regions and to make it easier for Parties near to the host country to attend the meetings. Mr Forero agreed with Mr Donaldson and commented that increasing regional participation was the most important argument for having the meetings in different host countries.

Mr Althaus (Chairman of the Animals Committee) recommended that the Chairman's report for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties include a full breakdown of costs for each Plants Committee and Animals Committee meeting. He also advised the participants of the meeting to encourage their delegations to deal with the issues of budget constraints. The Committee agreed that the Chairman's report for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties should reflect on the advantages and disadvantages of holding meetings of the Plants Committee in Geneva.

7. Time and venue of the 15th meeting of the Plants Committee (no document)

The Chairman informed the Committee that she had received an invitation from Slovenia to host the 15th meeting of the Plants Committee. The Secretariat informed the Committee that it had proposed to Slovenia to conclude a Memorandum of Understanding regarding the financing and organization of the meeting.



Photo: Victoria Zentilli

Group photo, Friday 20 February 2004

OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE

Participants

Plants Committee members: Mr J. Donaldson and Mr Q. Luke (Africa); Ms Irawati and Mr N.P. Singh (Asia); Mr E. Forero (Central and South America and the Caribbean); Ms M. Clemente (Chairman) and Mr G. Frenguelli (Europe); Ms P. Dávila Aranda (North America); and Mr G. Leach (Oceania).

Observer Parties: Austria, Botswana, Canada, Chile, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, France, Germany, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, the Netherlands, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America and Zimbabwe.

UNEP: UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre

Intergovernmental organizations: European Commission

Non-governmental organizations: Confederation of Craftsmen and Users of Natural Resources (COMURNAT), Organization for the Investigation, Protection and Conservation of Phytogenic Resources (CONREFI), Fauna and Flora International (FFI), International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, Species Survival Network (SSN), TRAFFIC, Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and WWF.

Chairman of the Animals Committee

CITES Secretariat

1. Opening of the meeting (no document)

The Chairman welcomed all participants and thanked them for their hard work following the 13th meeting of the Plants Committee (PC13). The Minister of Environment and Tourism, Mr Philemon Malima, officially opened the meeting and thanked the Plants Committee for accepting Namibia's invitation to host the meeting.

2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure (PC14 Doc. 2)

The Secretariat explained to participants that the Rules of Procedure had been modified in the closed session. The Committee adopted the Rules of Procedure as amended in the closed session.

3. Adoption of the agenda and the working programme

3.1 Agenda [PC14 Doc. 3.1 (Rev. 2)]

The Secretariat explained the changes to the agenda that had been agreed in the closed meeting. The Committee adopted the agenda as amended in the closed session.

3.2 Working programme (PC14 Doc. 3.2)

The Plants Committee adopted the working programme.

4. Admission of observers [PC14 Doc. 4 Rev. 1]

The Secretariat introduced the observers from NGOs that were admitted to the meeting.

5. Working programme for the Plants Committee until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

5.1 Preparation of the Chairman's report for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (no document)

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 1) to assist the Chairman in the production of the Chairman's report for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

(CoP13). This working group would comprise the Chairman of the Plants Committee, each Plants Committee member and the Secretariat.

5.2 Resolutions and Decisions directed or related to the Plants Committee (PC13 Doc. 8.1)

and

5.3 Strategic Planning: Review of the Action Plan of the Plants Committee [Decisions 12.9 b) and 12.11 a)] (PC14 Doc. 5.3)

The Committee dealt with these two agenda items together. The Committee tasked Working Group 1 with assessing the progress made by the Committee in addressing the Resolutions and Decisions directed or related to it as outlined in document PC13 Doc. 8.1.

Later in the meeting the Chairman reported on the three recommendations by Working Group 1:

- i) to eliminate all Decisions directed to the Plants Committee and reformulate those that still required implementation;
- ii) not to present a working plan for the Plants Committee at CoP13 but to decide on the working plan at PC15; and
- iii) to recommend in the Chairman's report to CoP13 that more funding be allocated to the Plants Committee to support the work of its members.

The Committee adopted these recommendations.

6. Follow up of CoP12 Decisions

6.1 Review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) (Decision 12.97) (PC14 Doc. 6.1)

The Secretariat introduced documents PC14 Doc. 6.1, and PC14 Inf. 9, 10 and 11, and Inf. 13 pertaining to this agenda item. The Chairman expressed thanks to the all participants in the Review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12). She informed the Committee that she had received comments on document PC14 Doc. 6.1 from Ecuador and would only consider those comments after she had received the comments from all members.

Mr Leach (representative of Oceania) commented that all elements of the criteria for listing species on the CITES Appendices (the Criteria) did not have to apply to plants. Mr Althaus (Chairman of the Animals Committee) agreed with Mr Leach adding that as a lot of work had gone into Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) it was important not to make unnecessary, and possibly detrimental, changes to it. Mr Forero remarked that there was a lot of repetition in the reviewers comments, highlighting that there was a set of common terms in the Criteria that required amendment.

Ms Reeve (observer from SSN) reported that the SSN had taken great interest in the Review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) and summarized the recommendations of SSN to the Plants Committee, as outlined in document PC14 Inf. 16. Mr Leach replied that the group that had produced document CoP12 Com. I. 3 had reached agreement on most of the text and that the participants of the meeting should focus on only the few extra points left for discussion. The Chairman, Mr Alvarez and Mr Ó Críodáin (observer from the European Commission) expressed their agreement with Mr Leach on this point.

Mr Leach summarized the reviewers' comments on the Trade Criterion, as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. There was agreement amongst the participants that 'trade' as expressed in the Criteria always referred to 'international trade'. The Committee agreed with the first recommendation in relation to the trade criterion, as outlined in the Annex to document PC14 Inf. 9.

The Chairman commented that it would be useful for Management Authorities to have a handbook clarifying the terms and expressions used in the Criteria. The Committee agreed to propose at CoP13 the production of a user's manual to aid Parties in the interpretation of the criteria for including species on CITES Appendices I and II. Mr Althaus commented that there may not be the need for such a guide as adding another document may just cause further confusion to those interpreting the Criteria.

Mr Donaldson, Mr Althaus (as the observer from Switzerland) and Mr Ó Críodáin expressed support for the inclusion of 'demonstrable' before 'potential' as outlined in the Annex to document PC14 Inf. 9. The Committee agreed with this recommendation.

The Committee agreed that the new additional point 3 was redundant and therefore agreed with recommendation 3 for the trade criterion, as outlined in the Annex to document PC14 Inf. 9.

The Committee agreed with recommendation 4 for the trade criterion, as outlined in the Annex to document PC14 Inf. 9.

Ms Dávila Aranda (representative of North America) summarized the reviewers' comments on Appendix-I Criterion A), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. The Committee agreed with the first recommendation made by the representative of North America, that the text in CoP12 Com. I. 3 should include a definition of "wild population".

Mr Althaus reported that some reviewers of the Criteria for the Animals Committee thought that the term 'small wild population' required further clarification. Mr Kiehn (observer from Austria) commented that it was important to define 'small wild population' with reference to species within the taxonomic group of the species concerned. He added that the examples of a 'small wild population' could be omitted if it was defined relative to a species in the same taxonomic group. Mr Alvarez (observer from the United States) supported the second recommendation on Appendix-I criterion A), as outlined in document PC14 Inf. 9, with the exception that he did not agree that the definition of 'small wild population' should be linked to the level of exploitation of the species. Mr Ó Críodáin agreed with this view, adding that the species' role in its ecosystem is another factor that should be considered when defining 'small wild population'. Mr Benítez Díaz (observer from Mexico) commented that he thought the definition of 'small wild population' required a reference to levels of trade because, otherwise, it would be unclear if the definition related to populations that were small due to exploitation levels or small for biological reasons. Mr Donaldson replied that the definition of 'small wild population' of species 'affected by trade' dealt with whether a population was small due to exploitation levels and that this made the inclusion of exploitation levels in the definition redundant. Mr Althaus remarked that levels of harvesting were irrelevant in the biological criteria. Mr Ó Críodáin agreed with this point, however he added that he understood the alternative point of view that natural decline should be considered in association with the anthropogenic threats to species.

Mr Alvarez supported the third recommendation on Appendix-I criterion A), as outlined in document PC14 Inf. 9. Ms Reeve proposed changing 'it should be made clear whether the information' in the definition of 'population size' to 'it should be made clear, where possible, whether the information'. Mr Althaus and Ms Dávila Aranda agreed that there was no need for this proposed change as any proponent of a change to a species listing would always make clear what their measure of population size related to.

Ms Dávila Aranda summarized the reviewers comments on Appendix-I sub criterion A) (i), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. Mr Alvarez commented that he disagreed with recommendation 3 for this sub-criterion as the Resolution did not say that a decline in the number of individuals or the area and quality of habitat should relate to anthropogenic phenomena. Mr Donaldson agreed with Mr Alvarez commenting that this sub-criterion should not consider human threats.

Mr Althaus reported that one of the reviewers of the Criteria for the Animals Committee suggested that sub criterion A) (i) should be split into two criteria covering number of

individuals and area and quality of habitat separately. Mr Ó Críodáin replied that subsequent criteria deal with area and quality of habitat at length and that in many circumstances an area based measurement is better for indicating a decline in the number of individuals.

Mr Farr (observer from Canada) commented that it was important to avoid the assumption that a decrease in the number of individuals, or area or quality of habitat, was necessarily bad for a species. He added that it was very difficult to define a population 'decline' for long lived plant species. Ms Reeve remarked that the numerical guidelines in the sub-criterion should be removed.

Ms Dávila Aranda summarized the reviewers comments on Appendix-I sub criterion A) (ii), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. Mr Althaus reported that the reviewers of the Criteria for the Animals Committee also thought that the term 'very' required definition, and were concerned that the sub-criterion was now dealing with sub populations rather than populations. Mr Benítez Díaz stated that the term 'very small' was highly subjective and may confuse proponents. He queried how close to non-viable was 'very small'.

Mr Luke commented that the figure of '500 individuals' for a very small wild sub-population was a figure that came from the early days of conservation biology and related to viable populations of animals. He asked the participants whether any similar figures had been suggested for minimum viable populations of plants. Mr Griffin (representative of Africa for the Animals Committee) suggested that the IUCN red-listing criteria may offer a useful definition of 'sub-population'. Mr Kiehn responded that a numerical guideline for a minimum viable population size for *Tillandsia xerographica*, as suggested in the document PC14 Inf. 8, was 125 plants / km², but advised against the use of numerical guidelines in the definition as such figures were taxon specific.

Mr Ó Críodáin commented that the word 'justify' in the proposed rewording of criterion A) (ii) was redundant, as any proponent would automatically justify why a species met such a sub-criterion. Mr Althaus replied that the criteria should say somewhere that when a species is stated to meet a particular criterion, this should be justified by comparing its status with that of similar species.

Ms Reeve argued that other factors such as the degree of gene flow should be included in the definition of 'very small wild sub population'. Ms Dávila Aranda replied that gene flow was already included within the definition of 'very small wild sub population'.

Ms Dávila Aranda summarized the reviewers comments on Appendix-I sub-criterion A) (iii), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. In response to the recommendation that the sub-criterion did not apply to plants, Mr Donaldson commented that he could think of examples where the sub criterion did apply to plants, even though it did not apply to any of the plant species used in the review. Mr Althaus reported that one reviewer for the Animals Committee commented that it was unclear how 'sub-population' was defined for criterion A) (ii). Mr Benítez Díaz added that this sub-criterion was much more closely related to Criterion B and could be eliminated from criterion A. Mr Donaldson replied that this sub-criterion applied to very important characteristics of wild populations and that it was essential to keep sub-criterion A) (ii). Mr Ó Críodáin agreed with Mr Donaldson and emphasized that a degree of repetition in the Criteria was not the main concern in the review.

Ms Dávila Aranda summarized the reviewers comments on Appendix-I sub-criterion A) (iv), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. Mr Althaus reported that a reviewer for the Animals Committee suggested that the sub criterion should refer to the number of breeding pairs, adding that the recommendation was more relevant to animals. Mr Alvarez stated that the sub-criterion did not apply to most plants, that the definition of 'fluctuation' was unclear, and that the overall intention of the sub-criterion was unclear. Mr Kiehn agreed, adding that it was unclear whether 'fluctuation' referred to the natural population dynamics of a species or additional factors that might influence the species population. Mr Newton (observer from TRAFFIC) recommended that the sub-criterion be modified to indicate that background information should be provided on the magnitude and period of the species' population fluctuations. Mr Alvarez commented that the wording of the sub-criterion in Resolution

Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) was better than in document CoP12 Com. I. 3. and recommended keeping the text as it was in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12).

Ms Dávila Aranda summarized the reviewers comments on Appendix-I sub-criterion A) (v), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. Mr Alvarez agreed with all the recommendations other than clarifying or defining 'slow growth rate' as the reviewers' comment on this matter simply requested personal clarification of what the term meant. Mr Ó Críodáin and the Chairman suggested that 'slow growth rate' be more clearly defined in the proposed user's guide to the Criteria.

Mr Frenguelli (representative of Europe) summarized the reviewers' comments on Appendix-I criterion B), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. Ms Reeve, Mr Benítez Díaz, Mr Althaus, Mr Kiehn and Mr Ó Críodáin supported the recommendation to remove the numerical guidelines from the definition of 'area of distribution', reasoning that they would prefer the definition to point out that a 'restricted area of distribution' should be justified relative to a species in the same taxonomic group. Mr Luke recommended changing 'has a restricted area of distribution' to 'has a restricted area of distribution or restricted habitat preference' in criterion B).

Mr Luke commented that in relation to recommendation 2, those using the criteria should clearly not proceed in to the sub-criteria if criterion B was not met.

In relation to the recommendation to remove the fluctuation sub-criterion from criterion B), Mr Frenguelli commented that he thought it was necessary to keep the sub-criterion in B) to maintain the general applicability and flexibility of the criteria. Mr Althaus agreed, adding that two of the reviewers for the Animals Committee suggested changing "area of distribution" to "area of occupancy" to match the term used in the IUCN Red-List criteria. Mr Donaldson agreed with this recommendation stating that the Scientific Committees have tended to equate occupancy with occurrence. He recommended checking with IUCN as to the best term to use.

Mr Forero summarized the reviewers' comments on Appendix-I criterion C), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. Mr Althaus reported that many reviewers for the Animals Committee thought that the term 'human induced' should be removed from sub-criterion C) (ii). Mr Kiehn supported this recommendation and added that 'high vulnerability' should be added to the list in sub-criterion C) (ii) to make it consistent with criteria A) and B). Ms Reeve supported the addition of disease and climate change to the list in sub-criterion C) (ii).

The Chairman summarized the reviewers' comments on Appendix I criterion D), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. Mr Leach argued that criterion D was a 'safety net' criterion and advised against its removal. Mr Berney (observer from IWMC-World Conservation Trust) disagreed, commenting that the existence of criterion D) displayed the lack of confidence by Parties in the effectiveness of Appendix-II listings. Mr Kiehn supported the comments of Mr Leach adding that there may be aspects of a species other than those covered in criteria A) to C) that make it suitable for an Appendix-I listing. Mr Ó Críodáin commented that criterion D) was often used to move a species from Appendix II to Appendix I.

Ms Reeve recommended that the term 'within a period of five years' be replaced with 'within the near future', and the definition of 'near future' state that 'near future' for a species is taxon specific. Mr Ó Críodáin responded that both terms had their advantages but that 'five years' did not need to be changed. The Committee agreed that the term 'five years' should remain in criterion D).

The Chairman summarized the reviewers' comments on Appendix-II criterion A), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. Mr Althaus reported that some of the reviewers for the Animals Committee thought they needed guidance on the evidence they should use when deciding whether a species met this criterion. Mr Ó Críodáin and the Chairman commented that every proposal should be backed by sufficient data, and that there was no need to spell this out in the criteria, adding that a proposed user's guide may make this point. Mr Donaldson commented that he preferred the term 'near future' to 'five years' in Appendix-II criterion A because 'near future' was defined by the biology of the species.

The Chairman summarized the reviewers' comments on Appendix-II criterion B), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. Mr Althaus reported that a reviewer for the Animals Committee proposed that the list of vulnerability factors was not complete enough, however he personally thought that adding further factors to the list may be unnecessary as the criterion was more related to species trade, than to species biology. Mr Alvarez added that Appendix-II is to monitor trade and it is for that reason that the authors of Resolution Conf. 9.24 did not describe biological factors in detail. He suggested that the text in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12), for this criterion, was preferable to that in document CoP12 Com. I. 3.

Mr Donaldson summarized the reviewers' comments on Appendix-II criterion C), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. Mr Althaus supported the suggested amendment to the text for this criterion.

The Chairman summarized the reviewers' comments on Appendix-II criterion D), as outlined in the Annex of document PC14 Inf. 9. Mr Althaus reported that many reviewers for the Animals Committee had problems implementing this criterion.

The Committee established a drafting group (Drafting Group 1) to make changes to document CoP12 Com. I. 3, pursuant to agreements reached in the open session, to be presented to the Plants Committee for discussion later in the meeting. Drafting Group 1 would comprise the representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean and Oceania, observers from the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the European Commission and SSN, the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committee and the Secretariat. However, the group was also open to the participation of any other interested Party.

The Committee agreed to propose to the Conference of the Parties the production of a user's manual to aid Parties in the interpretation of the criteria for including species in the CITES Appendices.

Mr Benítez Díaz congratulated the Chairman, on behalf of his delegation, for her excellent leadership in the review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12).

Later in the meeting Mr Leach introduced document PC14 DG1 Doc. 1, outlining the recommended changes to document CoP12 Com I. 3. He then outlined further comments submitted to the Committee by Australia regarding the review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12). Mr Forero outlined further comments submitted to the Committee by Ecuador regarding the review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12). He also recommended that the draft Spanish version of document PC14 DG1 Doc. 1 be completely revised to maintain accuracy in the translation from the English version.

Recommendations were made by the meeting participants regarding small changes to the wording used in document PC14 DG1 Doc. 1.

The Committee agreed that the representative of Oceania should re-draft document PC14 DG1 Doc. 1 following recommendations by the meeting participants. The Committee agreed that the Chairman also present the revised document PC14 DG1 Doc. 1 to the Animals Committee at its following meeting.

6.2 *Harpagophytum* spp. (Decisions 12.63-12.65): progress report (PC14 Doc. 6.2)

Ms Foden (observer from South Africa) introduced this agenda item. The devil's claw industry in South Africa was not supporting management plans for this taxon.

Ms Hamunyela (observer from Namibia) introduced document PC14 Inf. 14. She also reported a negative response from the devil's claw industry in Namibia, and expressed her desire for the Plants Committee to offer advice in this matter.

The Chairman asked the range States (Botswana, Namibia and South Africa) on the proportion of devil's claw in international trade that was cultivated. Mr Maggs-Kolling (observer from Namibia) replied that all of the devil's claw exported by Namibia was collected from the wild

but that the commercial product was often labelled as cultivated. He added that Namibia was not interested in cultivation as the collection from the wild provided sustainable benefits to harvesters living on land with very little other economic potential.

The Secretariat reported that it had to prepare a report to the Conference of the Parties on the compliance of range States with Decisions 12.63 to 12.65 and requested advice from the range States on the recommendations that they would like the Secretariat to make. The Committee established a working group (Working Group 4) to prepare a document proposing further ways in which the Plants Committee could assist in this issue, in relation to Decisions 12.63-12.65. Working Group 4 would comprise the representative of Africa and the observers from Botswana, Namibia and South Africa.

Mr McGough (observer from the United Kingdom) commented that the importing countries may be able to promote the trade in sustainably harvested devil's claw. Mr Ó Críodáin (observer from the European Commission) reported that the decision by the European Union to put devil's claw on its Annex D would provide more information on the levels of trade in devil's claw. Mr Dickson added that the issue of the livelihoods of harvesters could not be ignored by CITES and argued that the Plants Committee should also consider more general lessons to be learned from the devil's claw industry for future studies.

Mr Berney (observer from IWMC-World Conservation Trust) commented that no report had been received from the importing countries in relation to Decision 12.64. He argued that this should be noted by the Plants Committee and requested to hear from Germany on what it has done concerning its devil's claw industry.

Later in the meeting Mr Donaldson reported on the results of an informal meeting held during the present Plants Committee meeting to discuss whether any further involvement by the Plants Committee was required in relation to the trade in *Harpagophytum* spp., as outlined in document PC14 WG Doc. 1. The Committee adopted the recommendations outlined in that document and asked the Secretariat to request information from the importing countries of *Harpagophytum* spp. pursuant to Decision 12.64.

6.3 *Guaiaacum* spp. [Decision 11.114 (Rev. CoP12)]: progress report (PC14 Doc. 6.3)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. Mr Benítez Díaz (observer from Mexico) summarized the progress of current research on the population status and management of *Guaiaacum sanctum* in Mexico, as outlined in document PC14 Inf. 1 and thanked the German Authorities for the additional financial support for the project. The Committee congratulated Mexico on its progress and thanked Germany, Mexico and the United States for supporting the project.

Mr Schürmann commented that Mexico was not the only range State for *Guaiaacum sanctum* and requested more information on the status of funding for similar research in Cuba. Mr Benítez Díaz notified the Committee that Mexico had sent its research protocol to the Cuban CITES Authorities as a model of how similar research could be carried out for *Guaiaacum* spp. in Cuba. He added that Mexico intended to share the project results with the Cuban Authorities once complete. The Secretariat reminded participants that there was already a mechanism by which Parties could submit proposals for externally funded projects to the Secretariat contained in Resolution Conf. 12.2. Mr Kiehn (observer from Austria) suggested that the Secretariat should encourage Cuba to submit a proposal to study *Guaiaacum sanctum* in Cuba. The Committee requested the Secretariat to write to the Cuban CITES Authorities suggesting that they submit a proposal for a similar study to be conducted for *Guaiaacum* spp. in Cuba in compliance with the relevant Resolution. The Secretariat recommended that this proposal contain a complete breakdown of the costs required to conduct such a study.

6.4 *Aquilaria* spp. (Decisions 12.66-12.71): progress report (PC14 Doc. 6.4)

Mr Newton (observer from TRAFFIC) introduced the progress report on *Aquilaria* spp., containing information on progress achieved on six related COP-12 decisions. Regarding Decision 12.66, DNA work should be undertaken to clarify whether *A. agallocha* is

synonymous with *A. malaccensis*. Regarding Decision 12.67, distribution data must improve to enable re-evaluation. Regarding Decision 12.68, the Plants Committee should consider whether listing all agarwood taxa on Appendix II would help harmonize management of harvest and trade. Regarding Decision 12.69, re-evaluation of the IUCN Red List should be endorsed. Regarding Decision 12.70, Malaysia and Indonesia should convene a working group on the making of non detriment findings. Regarding Decision 12.71, an international agarwood conference had been convened in Vietnam. Certain Decisions were further discussed in the working group dealing with Review of Significant Trade.

Later in the meeting, Mr McGough introduced the recommendations of the working group concerning *Aquilaria* spp (see document PC14 WG 3.1 Doc.1 Annex 2). Recommendations include that DNA work by the Netherlands continue; detailed information of the distribution of species be coordinated by the IUCN Species Survival Commission (IUCN-SSC) with input from the IUCN Global Trees Specialist Group; listing of all agarwood producing taxa on Appendix II be discussed; and further field research be conducted in East Asia and the Middle East. The Plants Committee adopted the recommendations.

7. Technical proposals from the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

7.1 Improving regional communication and regional representation (PC14 Doc. 7.1)

Mr Schürmann (observer from the Netherlands) introduced this agenda item. Mr Forero commented that document PC14 Doc. 7.1 clearly laid out the problems associated with regional communication and regional representation. Mr Luke added that the most valuable suggestion in the report was that a Party should be required to support a regional representative from their country. He suggested that alternatively such an agreement could take the form of a proposal that regional representatives could take to donors agencies. Mr Donaldson suggested that the Parties of regional representatives could make clear exactly the support they would give to their representative. Mr Singh supported this recommendation adding that such support should include financial support to allow regional representatives to attend meetings in their region. Mr Frenguelli also supported the idea and added that it was also important for regional representatives to have reliable contacts for the Parties in their region. Ms Dávila Aranda supported the idea of Parties having to make an official declaration that they would support their regional representatives, adding that Parties were often ignorant of the level of commitment the position involved. Mr Leach commented that he agreed with the robust approach of making parties support their regional representatives but warned that this may prevent Parties from nominating regional representatives.

Mr Leach commented that the Committee may prefer to have regional representatives that did not also represent a Scientific Authority. Mr Luke replied that in many developing countries the only candidates for such a position worked in a Scientific Authority.

The Chairman commented that each country should know who its regional representative was. She added that Parties and candidate representatives should both know the responsibilities involved in regional representation before elections. She recommended the preparation of a calendar for regional representatives that would outline relevant meetings and deadline to assist in organizing their work. Mr Singh commented that often a regional representative could not contact his or her alternate because they often changed jobs or workplace. He recommended that each region support a permanent position that deals with CITES issues. Mr Forero emphasized that a problem for developing countries was that many Parties did not know who their regional representatives were. He recommended that questionnaires that were circulated to Parties in the European region should be given to the other regional representatives as they would be useful tools for contacting Parties.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 2) to discuss the recommendations outlined in document PC14 Doc. 7.1 and to develop ways to deal with the issues raised in the report.

Later in the meeting Mr Schürmann reported on the recommendations of Working Group 2, as outlined in document PC14 WG2 Doc. 1. The Committee agreed that the report should be

submitted as information documents to the Animals Committee and the Standing Committee at their following meetings. The Committee accepted the offer from Mr Schürmann to draft the documents pursuant to the recommendations in document PC14 WG2 Doc. 1. The Committee requested from the observer from Switzerland that his country, as Depositary Country, submit a proposal to amend Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP12) as outlined in document PC14 WG2 Doc. 1. The Committee agreed that further recommendations in document PC14 WG2 Doc. 1 should be included in the Chairman's report for CoP13.

7.2 Definitions of the technical terms used in the annotations for medicinal plants [Decisions 12.23 and 11.118 (Rev. CoP12)] (PC14 Doc. 7.2)

Mr Allain (observer from France) announced that he would no longer be able to chair the supervisory group on definitions of technical terms used in the annotations of medicinal plants, established at PC13. The Chairman congratulated Mr Alain on behalf of the Plants Committee for his excellent work in the past, and the Committee appointed Mr Schippmann (observer from Germany) as the new Chairman of the supervisory group.

The Secretariat then introduced agenda item 7.2. Mr Schippmann introduced document PC14 Inf. 3 and gave a presentation on *Revision of the # annotations for medicinal and aromatic plants included in the CITES Appendices* on behalf of the IUCN/SSC Medicinal Plant Specialist Group. Mr Allain congratulated Mr Schippmann on his presentation and remarked that it would be important for the supervisory group to compare CITES technical terms for medicinal plants and the Customs' harmonized coding system already in use by enforcement authorities. He advised that the supervisory group also consider whether the types of medicinal plant products were likely to change in the future, as these could potentially bypass CITES controls. Finally, he remarked that it was important for the group to bear in mind the biology of the species when addressing the #1 annotation. The Committee congratulated the IUCN/SSC Medicinal Plant Specialist Group and the supervisory group for their work.

Mr Kiehn (observer from Austria) remarked that it may be necessary to incorporate terms that were not strictly correct to define plant parts, such as 'roots', to simplify the technical terms used in the annotations of medicinal plants for those implementing the convention.

Mr Yu (observer from China) stated that *Taxus wallichiana* extracts require 20 tonnes of raw material to produce 1 kg of extract. He argued that *T. wallichiana* should therefore have a #1 annotation, with all parts and derivatives being controlled. In addition, he argued that the #1 annotation should also be given to *Cistanche deserticola* for similar reasons.

The Committee decided that the supervisory group should review document PC14 Inf. 3 and advised on the process that should be followed to implement Decision 11.118 (Rev. CoP12), for consideration later in the meeting. The supervisory group would comprise the original members [the representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean, and of North America, and the observers from Canada, China, France, Germany (Chairman), Switzerland and the United States, and TRAFFIC and the Secretariat].

Later in the meeting, Mr Schippmann reported on the recommendations by the supervisory group on definitions of technical terms used in the annotations of medicinal plants. The Committee agreed to support the recommendations of the supervisory group as outlined in document PC14 SG1 Doc. 1.

7.3 Implementation of the annotation for artificially propagated hybrids within the genus *Phalaenopsis* (no document)

Mr Gabel informed the Committee that the United States had contacted countries that were significantly involved in the trade of artificially propagated *Phalaenopsis* to see whether they were using the exemption and whether they were experiencing problems in implementing the exemption. He reported that the respondents were not implementing the exemption for several reasons. Firstly, the traders in *Phalaenopsis* were accustomed to permits and often the plants were exported in mixed shipments, making it unproblematic to include the *Phalaenopsis* on the export permits. Secondly, several countries reported that the limit of 100 plants was too high

and should be reduced to about 40 plants. Thirdly, Singapore had responded that it used phytosanitary certificates as CITES permits and since it had to issue the phytosanitary document for *Phalaenopsis* exports, then it was not much more of a problem to issue the CITES permit also. Fourthly, some orchid growers reported that they were afraid to use the exemption in case Customs authorities were unaware of the exemption. He concluded that the exemption had no effect on the *Phalaenopsis* trade and recommended that it be modified. The Committee noted the report from Mr Gabel that most Parties were not implementing the annotation for artificially propagated hybrids within the genus *Phalaenopsis*.

Mr Gabel reported further problems in the production of identification materials to assist in implementing the exemption. Mr Benítez Díaz expressed his concern that no identification guides were yet available. He stated that Mexico was not implementing the exemption and continued to oppose it, stating that a lowered limit as to the number of plants required to qualify for exemption would still not improve the situation. Ms Irawati remarked that many importing countries still required import permits for *Phalaenopsis* hybrids anyway, making the exemption useless.

Mr Ó Críodáin reported that the European Commission had added the exemption to its legislation but that it was too early to measure whether it was having any effect. He suggested that a numerically based exemption was obscure and that the exemption may be unenforceable and inoperable in its current state.

Mr Yu argued that *Cymbidium* hybrids should not be exempted from CITES controls because most of them were of wild origin. Instead, he suggested that nurseries exporting such hybrids become CITES registered.

Later in the meeting Mr Gabel reported that Working Group 5 recommended changing the lower limit for the number of *Phalaenopsis* hybrids to be included in a shipment to qualify for exemption from 100 to 20. The Committee noted that the United States intends to prepare a proposal to change the annotation to this effect.

7.4 Review of Resolutions on plants and plant trade (Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11) and definition of 'Artificially Propagated' [Decision 12.11 e)] (PC14 Doc. 7.4 and PC14 Doc. 7.4 Addendum)

Mr Gabel (observer from the United States) introduced this agenda item. The Secretariat introduced the Addendum to document PC14 Doc. 7.4.

Mr Gabel disagreed with the Secretariat's proposed definition of 'artificially propagated', as outlined in the Addendum to document PC14 Doc. 7.4 because the term introduced an exemption within an exemption. He added that the Secretariat's proposed definition did not exempt the wild-collected seeds of Appendix-I plants. Mr Gabel said that he preferred the Secretariat's definition of 'ranching'. Mr Donaldson commented that he disagreed strongly with the Secretariat on its position with regard to not exempting the seeds of Appendix-I plants from CITES controls. He cited the example of Appendix-I Cycads in which collectors would not collect the plants if they could collect their seeds as an alternative. The Chairman agreed with the comments by Mr Gabel and Mr Donaldson and remarked that the definition may also have to accommodate for a situation in the future where seeds were harvested from a short-lived plant species. Mr Benítez Díaz (observer from Mexico) suggested that the definition of 'artificially propagated' include a definition of 'non-natural environment' alongside the definition of 'under controlled conditions' and that the term 'grown from cuttings or divisions' be deleted. Regarding the recommended changes to Resolution Conf 11.11, outlined in Annex 3 of document PC14 Doc. 7.4, Mr Benítez Díaz recommended changing 'competent government authorities' to 'CITES authorities', further simplifying the recommendation for deeming wild-collected seeds as artificially propagated, and that the advice regarding flaked seedlings of Appendix-I orchids be re-written to apply to all flaked seedlings. Ms Irawati added that many nurseries in developing countries would not fit the definition of 'controlled conditions' since they grew plants in private forest gardens. Mr Gabel commented that the United States would not be opposed to adding a section to Resolution Conf. 11.11 stating that plants grown from

wild-collected seeds of Appendix-I species would only be exempted from control for the range States. He continued that further definitions in Resolution Conf. 11.11 may be required. Mr Berney (observer from IWMC-World Conservation Trust) argued that the definitions of captive breeding had influenced the definitions of 'artificial propagation' for plants and that 'cultivated parental stock' was not possible for plant species such as annual species, monocarpic species and some palms. He argued that Resolution Conf. 11.11 should be written to be generally applicable and that exceptions be made through species annotations.

The Committee congratulated the working group on plant Resolutions for their work and requested it to prepare a further review of Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11, in consideration of the recommendations made to document PC14 Doc. 7.4 and in document PC14 Doc. 22, and by the meeting participants, for consideration by the Committee later in the meeting. The Committee decided that the working group (Working Group 4) would comprise the original members [the observers from Chile, France, Mexico, the United States (Chairman) and the Secretariat], the regional representative of Africa and the observers from the European Commission and IWMC.

Later in the meeting Mr Gabel introduced document PC14 WG4 Doc. 1, outlining the recommended changes to Resolution Conf. 11.11. Recommendations were made by the participants regarding minor changes to the wording used in document PC14 WG4 Doc. 1. The Committee agreed that the working group had to continue its work, making further amendments to the document following recommendations by the meeting participants and through working with the Secretariat, with the intention of preparing proposed amendments to Resolutions Conf. 11.11 and Conf. 9.19 for consideration at CoP13.

7.5 Determination of the definition of *Swietenia macrophylla* plywood

7.5.1 Definition of "*Swietenia macrophylla* plywood" [PC14 Doc. 7.5.1 (Rev. 1)]

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item, indicating the two following corrections to document PC14 Doc. 7.5.1:

- a) deletion of the first sentence in paragraph 5; and
- b) changing 'HS code 44.12' to 'HS codes 44.12.13, 44.12.14 and 44.12.22' in paragraph 7.1 of the Annex.

7.5.2 Revision of Resolution Conf. 10.13 on the Implementation of the Convention for timber species [PC14 Doc. 7.5.2 (Rev. 1)]

Mr Gabel (observer from the United States) introduced this agenda item. Mr Forero reported that he had received a recommendation from Peru that the definition of *Swietenia macrophylla* plywood be simplified to cover any plywood with *S. macrophylla* in any of its layers. Mr Kiehn (observer from Austria) noted that the proposed revision to Resolution Conf. 10.13, as outlined in the Annex to document PC14 Doc. 7.5.2 (Rev. 1), did not offer guidance on the unit of measurement to use for *S. macrophylla* plywood and asked whether the United States had made any decision regarding that issue. Mr Benítez Díaz (observer from Mexico) added that the forestry authorities of Mexico had offered two modifications to the proposed definition of *S. macrophylla* plywood which were i) to include in the definition that the layers of *S. macrophylla* should be 6 mm or less and ii) to define plywood as "three or more sheets of wood that are pressed or stuck together so that they form 90 degree angles transversally". Mr McGough added that the European Commission data entry system could only record timber units in cubic metres and that they did not have a reliable mechanism to convert square metres into cubic metres. He added that timber traders said that they could work with units in square metres because this only formed a small part of the trade volume. He stated that UNEP-WCMC needed a reliable way to convert square metres into cubic metres. Ms Sprotte (observer from Germany) added that situations where plywood contained multiple layers of *S. macrophylla* in plywood also needed to be accommodated for Resolution Conf. 10.13. Mr Ciambelli (observer

from COMURNAT) advised that units of measurement were not normally included in Resolutions and that the units could be submitted as guidelines following the adoption of an amended Resolution Conf. 10.13. Mr Kiehn responded that 'less than 6 mm thickness' was a guideline that appeared in the standard Customs codes and advised that quoting the shipment of *S. macrophylla* plywood in square metres allowed a precise calculation of the amount of *Swietenia macrophylla* in a shipment if it was defined as being 'less than 6 mm thickness'. Mr Gabel replied that the definition needed to be workable and adopting the limitation of 'less than 6 mm thick' excluded one of the three Customs codes relating to plywood. He argued further that *S. macrophylla* was such an expensive wood that it was very unusual for it to be used in the internal layers of plywood, or for multiple layers of it to be used.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 6) to provide final recommendations regarding the definition of the term 'plywood', outlined in document PC14 Doc. 7.5.1, and to recommend possible amendments to the draft revision of Resolution Conf. 10.13, as proposed in the Annex of document PC14 Doc. 7.5.2 (Rev. 1), for consideration later in the meeting. Working Group 6 would comprise the observers from Canada, Chile, Italy, Mexico, the United Kingdom and the United States (Chairman), and the Secretariat.

Later in the meeting the observer from the United States reported that Working Group 6 recommended that the United States submit the proposal outlined in the Annex to document PC14 Doc. 7.5.2 (Rev. 1) at CoP13. The Committee agreed to that recommendation.

8. Species proposals for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

Mr Gabel informed the Committee that the United States was investigating, with the assistance of China, the possibility of a proposal to list Asian species of *Taxus* on Appendix II for consideration at CoP13.

Mr Donaldson advised the Committee that Botswana, Namibia and South Africa were preparing a proposal to include the genus *Hoodia* in Appendix II for consideration at CoP13.

8.1 Annotations for certain artificially propagated orchid hybrids (PC14 Doc. 8.1)

Mr Lüthy (observer from Switzerland) introduced document PC14 Doc. 8.1.

The Committee established a working group to review the proposal drafted by Switzerland and recommend possible amendments in light of the discussion and recommendations made by the meeting participants, for consideration later in the meeting. The working group (Working Group 5) would comprise the representative of Asia, the observers from China, Germany, Mexico, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the United States (Chairman), TRAFFIC and the Plants Committee Chairman.

Later in the meeting Mr Gabel (observer from the United States) reported that Working Group 5 recommended that Switzerland incorporate caveats and suggestions in its proposal in order to accommodate for the difficulty in enforcing and for ensuring that plants of illegal origin were not smuggled as exempt specimens. He added that the group recommended a lower limit for specimens to be exempt of 10 per shipment. The observer from IWMC-World Conservation Trust added that the proposal should specify that the orchid hybrids should have open flowers and that the proposal should contain a course of action when it was impossible for an applicant to state the country of origin of the hybrids. The Committee recommended Switzerland to incorporate the comments of the working group and the meeting participants, and to prepare final proposals for CoP13.

8.2 Specimens in international trade under exemption (PC14 Doc. 8.2)

Mr Lüthy (observer from Switzerland) introduced this agenda item. Mr Gabel (observer from the United States) reported that his country supported the proposal outlined in document PC14 Doc. 8.2. In contrast, Mr Benítez Díaz (observer from Mexico) reported that Mexico did not

support the proposal because exporters would not have to indicate the country of origin for specimens in international trade under exemption and this allowed the possibility for countries to obtain illegal access to genetic resources. Mr Gabel replied that exporters would still have to indicate the source of the material to their Management Authority. Mr Benítez Díaz responded that he still saw the proposed amendment to Resolution Conf. 11.11 as potentially allowing the smuggling of specimens.

Ms Sprotte (observer from Germany) introduced document PC14 Inf. 7. She remarked that although she supported the draft proposal by Switzerland she considered it important that Parties were made aware of the problem that some flaked seedlings had been illegally traded under exemption from CITES. Mr Ó Críodáin (observer from the European Commission) stated that the burden of proof laid with the holder of the specimen, who had to justify the case for exemption.

The Committee agreed to consider whether to support the draft proposal prepared by Switzerland, as presented in document PC14 Doc. 8.2, and to communicate its conclusions to the participants later in the meeting. The conclusions of the Committee were reported under agenda item 7.4.

8.3 Proposal to include *Caesalpinia echinata* in the Appendices (no document)

Mr Schippmann (observer from Germany) introduced this agenda item, reporting that he had not received an official response from the Brazilian CITES Authorities with regard to their position on a proposal to include *Caesalpinia echinata* in Appendix II. Mr Ciambelli (observer from COMURNAT) reported on the progress of the International Pernambuco Conservation Initiative (IPCI). This five-year plan initiative comprised 52 complimentary projects addressing scientific researches as well as environmental, social and economic issues. The Committee agreed that the IPCI was a good example of constructive links between industry and traders to promote projects on sustainable use [Decision 12.11k] and requested the observer from COMURNAT to prepare a brief summary of the project for the Chairman's report for CoP13. Mr Berney (observer from IWMC-World Conservation Trust) commented that, given that the project by COMURNAT had been so successful, CITES involvement may not be required.

9. Significant trade in plants

9.1 Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade (Decision 12.75) (PC14 Doc. 9.1)

The observer from the European Commission introduced this agenda item. The Committee congratulated the working group for its production of the draft Terms of Reference for the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade.

The main remaining issue of concern was the timing of the evaluation. The Animals Committee would start after CoP13, while the Plants Committee favoured starting the evaluation after CoP14.

Mr Alvarez requested clarification on whether the funding for this evaluation came from the same common fund for the Animals Committee and the Plants Committee, and whether there was a risk of the Animals Committee spending most of the money after CoP13 before the Plants Committee started its evaluation after CoP14. The Secretariat suggested that either the Committees decide to share the available funds or they look for external funds for the evaluations. It suggested that since certain NGO's were insisting that the evaluation by the Animals Committee should start 'as soon as possible', then perhaps they should fund the work.

The Committee decided that this matter should be addressed by the working group that dealt with the Review of Significant Trade.

Later in the meeting Mr McGough outlined the recommendations of Working Group 3.1 on the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade, as outlined in document PC14 WG 3.1 Doc. 1.

The Committee adopted the draft Terms of Reference for the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade, as outlined in the Annex to the document.

9.2 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.8

9.2.1 Trade in plants from Madagascar (Decision 12.73) (PC14 Doc. 9.2.1)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and document PC14 Inf. 12. The Committee commended the work of the Malagasy Authorities on their implementation of Decision 12.73. Mr Leach remarked that although he welcomed the procedure outlined in document PC14 Inf. 12 it was important that the document was actually implemented. He commented that the ban on the export of living plants from Madagascar was hampering scientific progress and the problems that resulted in the ban should be resolved as quickly as possible. The Committee accepted the action plan for the reform of Madagascar's wildlife export trade, as outlined in document PC14 Inf. 12, noting that it should be used as a model for implementing similar country-wide reviews of significant trade in the future.

The Committee requested that the Secretariat encourage the Malagasy Authorities to determine appropriate milestones for assessing the implementation of the action plan, and requested to be kept informed about progress with the action plan at future meetings.

9.2.2 Progress within the implementation of species review (PC14 Doc. 9.2.2)

and

9.2.3 Taxa review (Decision 12.74) (no document)

The Secretariat introduced these agenda items. Mr Newton (observer from TRAFFIC) summarized the outcome of the reviews of significant trade for Cycads (document PC14 Doc. 9.2.2 Annex 1) and *Aquilaria malaccensis* (document PC14 Doc. 9.2.2 Annex 2). Ms Oldfield (observer from FFI) summarized the outcome of the reviews of significant trade for *Pericopsis elata* (document PC14 Doc. 9.2.2 Annex 3) and *Aloe* species from East Africa used as extracts (document PC14 Doc. 9.2.2 Annex 4). Mr Ngoy (observer from the Democratic Republic of Congo) summarized document PC14 Inf. 18 outlining the situation of *Pericopsis elata* in the country. The Committee established a working group (Working Group 3.2), chaired by the observer from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, to:

- a) review the draft Terms of Reference for the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade;
- b) to review the reports in the Annexes to document PC14 Doc. 3.2.2 and responses received from the Range States; and
- c) revise the preliminary categorizations proposed and make recommendations for species in categories i) and ii) of Resolution Conf. 12.8.

Later in the meeting the Chairman of Working Group 3.2 outlined the recommendations of working group 3.2 on progress with the implementation of species reviews, as outlined in document PC14 WG 3.2 Doc. 1. The Committee adopted the recommendations of the group, as outlined in the Annex to the document.

9.3 Selection of new species (PC14 Doc. 9.3 and PC14 Doc. 9.3 Addendum)

Ms Gillett (observer from UNEP-WCMC) introduced this agenda item and gave a presentation on *Analysis of trade trends with notes on the conservation status of selected species*. She remarked that it made more sense for UNEP-WCMC to produce the analyses of trade data for a set time before Plants Committee meetings rather than a set time after CoPs because it was in

the Plants Committee meetings that the data were used. She suggested that the wording of Resolution Conf. 12.8 be changed to suit the meetings of the scientific committees. The Secretariat concurred with this proposal.

Mr Alvarez (observer from the United States) commended UNEP-WCMC on its innovative species selection protocol. He recommended that in addition to reporting the slope of the linear regression for the trade data with time, the analysis should report whether the slope was significantly different from zero. In addition, he recommended that the Committee decide on the methodology for species selection at the meeting and defer deciding on new species for the Review of Significant Trade until PC15. Ms Dávila Aranda also congratulated UNEP-WCMC on its work but expressed concern that the analysis relied too heavily on numerical data and did not sufficiently consider species specific biological factors.

Mr Schürmann (observer from the Netherlands) remarked that the trade situation for *Cyclamen cilicicum* and *C. hederifolium* were very similar and yet the UNEP-WCMC analysis had selected only *C. hederifolium*. He recommended that UNEP-WCMC include either both or none in their recommendations.

Mr Leach explained that the trade data for four species of *Cyathea* selected by UNEP-WCMC were plants that came from pine plantations. He added that the upturn in the trade data in *Cyathea cunninghamii* was due to a data entry error and the overall trade figures for *Cyathea* from New Zealand were a more accurate representation of the trade patterns. He concluded that the apparently high trade volumes were easily consistent with sustainable harvesting as there were several million hectares of pine forest plantations in New Zealand and that there was therefore no reason to include the species in the analysis.

Mr Schippmann (observer from Germany) suggested that a more qualitative analysis would be preferable and asked Ms Gillett (observer from UNEP-WCMC) whether species that were consistently traded in large volumes were automatically excluded from selection for the Review of Significant Trade. Ms Gillett replied that following the automatic selection approach UNEP-WCMC had manually reviewed the trade data for all species and included extra species using knowledge of their biology and trade characteristics, such as some that were consistently traded in high volumes. Mr Ó Críodáin (observer from the European Commission) commented that there had been a lot of debate at previous meetings about the weighting that was given to trade data and that from such discussions it was decided to introduce a 'safety clause' to allow for the inclusion of species of urgent concern in the review. He added that the trade data for animals also required consideration when selecting a candidate country for the Review of Significant Trade.

Mr Newton (observer from TRAFFIC) introduced documents PC14 Inf. 5 and PC14 Inf. 6. The Secretariat expressed its concern about the ambitious nature of the proposed species selection process in document PC14 Inf. 5, advising that adopting such a process might have significant financial and time implications. It suggested that a simple selection process could be envisaged. Ms Dávila Aranda agreed with the Secretariat that the process did need to be financially viable but added that the species selection process needed many of the recommendations made in the document. Mr Newton responded that the analysis TRAFFIC proposed was conducted very quickly and did not necessitate an increase in funding.

The Committee established a working group (Working Group 3.3) to develop recommendations on the process for selecting species to be included in the Review of Significant Trade and to select species for the next phase of the Review of the Significant Trade. The working group comprised the representatives of Africa (Chairman), Asia and North America, the observers from Austria, Germany, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, UNEP-WCMC, FFI, TRAFFIC and SSN, and the Secretariat.

Later in the meeting Mr Donaldson outlined the recommendations of Working Group 3.3 on the selection of new species for inclusion in the Review of Significant Trade, as outlined in document PC14 WG 3.3 Doc. 1. The Committee agreed to adopt the recommendations of the

working group after the representative of Africa had incorporated the recommendations of the meeting participants.

10. Review of the Appendices

10.1 Periodic review of animal and plant taxa in the Appendices [Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP12), Decision 12.96 and document SC49 Doc. 20.1] (PC14 Doc. 10.1)

Mr Gabel (observer from the United States) introduced this agenda item. Mr Leach recommended that the first selection criterion, outlined in Annex 2 of document PC14 Doc. 10.1, be revised because it automatically excluded species that had been highlighted as having problems by recent Reviews of Significant Trade. The Committee agreed to support the proposed guidelines for the periodic review of animal and plant taxa in the CITES Appendices, as outlined in the Annexes to document PC14 Doc. 10.1. The Committee recommended the working group on the review of the Appendices of the Plants and Animals Committees to incorporate the recommendations made by the meeting participants and submit the amended documents to the Animals Committee for consideration.

11. Review of heavily traded non-CITES species

11.1 Review of heavily traded non-CITES species [Decision 12.9 a) 111] (no document)

The Chairman introduced this agenda item. The Committee agreed that the Chairman present *Harpagophytum* spp. as a case study of a heavily traded non-CITES species in the Chairman's report for CoP13, pursuant to decision 12.9 a) iii).

11.2 Progress report on the evaluation of tree species (Decision 12.10) (no document)

Mr Schürmann (observer from the Netherlands) introduced this agenda item and reported on the work by the Netherlands, in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC, to hold four regional workshops on tree conservation between 2004 and 2006. The Committee asked the Netherlands to prepare a brief summary on this initiative for the Chairman's report for CoP13.

12. Checklist and nomenclature

12.1 Progress report (PC14 Doc. 12.1)

Mr McGough (as the botanist of the Nomenclature Committee) introduced this agenda item and also reported on the outcomes of the recent Nomenclature Committee meeting (Windhoek, 17 February 2004). He reported that clearer Terms of Reference for the Nomenclature Committee were proposed in document PC14 Inf. 4.

The Committee congratulated all those who were involved in the production of new CITES checklists. It also supported the recommendation of the botanist of the Nomenclature Committee that he draft a proposal for consideration at CoP13 to amend Resolution Conf. 12.11 in order to include taxon-based checklists as standard references for species nomenclature. Finally it also recommended that he produce a document outlining the Terms of Reference and the working practices of the Nomenclature Committee.

12.2 Preparation of CITES checklist for *Bulbophyllum* (Orchidaceae) (no document)

The Committee noted the presentation by Mr Kiehn (observer from Austria) and congratulated Austria on its progress with the production of the CITES checklist for *Bulbophyllum*.

13. ID Manual: progress report (PC14 Doc. 13)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item, adding that it had recently received additional identification sheets from Germany. The Committee noted the progress report by the Secretariat.

14. Guidelines for transport of live plants (no document)

Mr Gabel (observer from the United States) introduced document PC14 Inf. 15. The Committee agreed that the document proposed a useful standard form for reporting non-compliance with IATA transport guidelines. The Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare a Notification to the Parties recommending that the Parties use the standard form when such situations arise.

15. Relationship between *in situ* conservation and *ex situ* production plants [Decision 12.11 l)] (PC14 Doc. 15)

The Committee dealt with agenda items 15 and 21 together. The Secretariat introduced these agenda items. Mr Gabel (observer from the United States) introduced document PC14 Inf. 17, commenting that the document was submitted because the report of the IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme, outlined in document PC14 Doc. 15 had become confused on two issues. Firstly, the report suggested that particular plant production systems may be non-detrimental to the survival of species in the wild. He argued that any plant production system could be detrimental and that the report should have just defined different production systems and their source codes. Secondly, he reported that there were several errors in the report that required correcting. Mr Berney (observer from IWMC-World Conservation Trust) agreed, adding that Management Authorities had enough problems with the current source codes and that the report should not have suggested extra ones. Mr Leach added that there was concern that the increased awareness of the wide spectrum of different plant production systems could lead to an explosion in source codes and recommended that there be fewer rather than more of the current source codes. Mr Gabel responded that several changes to the report had not been made following the comments of the Animals Committee at its last meeting, such as the inclusion of additional source codes and the proposed definition of 'bred in captivity'. Mr Berney recommended that the report be re-drafted to deal with animal and plant issues separately. The Secretariat reminded the Plants Committee that Decision 12.11 l) was directed to them, and that the report by IUCN had been brought to its attention for information only. The Plants Committee could develop its own views on this matter.

The Committee agreed that it would not make recommendations based on the Review of Production Systems report by the IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme, as outlined in the Annex to document PC14 Doc. 15. The Committee agreed that the Chairman would inform the IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme of these recommendations. The Committee agreed that it would report to CoP13 that it could not make a decision on these two agenda items and would propose to deal with them again at PC15.

16. Links with industry and traders to promote projects on sustainable use [Decision 12.11 k)] (no document)

The Chairman introduced this agenda item. The Committee requested the following observers to submit text for the Chairman's report to CoP13, giving examples of links with industry and traders to promote projects on sustainable use:

- i) Germany (*Zamia* spp. from Mexico);
- ii) Guatemala and the Netherlands (*Tillandsia xerographica* from Guatemala);
- iii) Unites States (native medicinal plants including *Panax quinquefolius*); and
- iv) COMURNAT (*Cesalpinia echinata* from Brazil).

17. Role of Appendix II [Decision 12.11 m)] (no document)

The Chairman introduced this agenda item. Mr Kiehn (observer from Austria) stated that the fact that only a few species were selected for the Review of Significant Trade suggested that an Appendix-II listing was working for the remaining species. The Chairman of the Animals Committee commented that the acquisition of import and export permits often took a long time and could be expensive, bearing no relation to the value of the shipment. Mr Gabel (observer from the United States) pointed

out that its country had produced a leaflet on 'Appendix-II supports sustainable use' and that this may be useful in addressing Decision 12.11 m).

The Committee requested the representative for Oceania and the observers from Austria, Mexico, the United States and IWMC to submit text for the Chairman's report for CoP13, giving examples of good case studies for a better understanding of Appendix II.

18. Global Strategy for Plant Conservation: analysis and links with the Convention on Biological Diversity (Decisions 12.12 and 10.86) (PC14 Doc. 18)

The Committee congratulated the working group, established at PC13 (PC13 Working Group 5), and FFI for their work on analysing the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) and links with the CBD regarding the GSPC's target XI. Ms Oldfield (observer from FFI) introduced the Annex to document PC14 Doc. 18. The Committee encouraged FFI to continue with their work, and suggested that a Committee member represent the Plants Committee at the meeting on 'Analysing links between CITES and the CBD' in Germany in March 2004.

19. Other issues resulting from PC13

19.1 Report of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group (Decision 12.21) [(PC14 Doc. 19.1 (Rev. 1))]

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. The Committee established a working group (Working Group 7) to review and prioritize the report of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group, as outlined in the Annex to document PC14 Doc. 19.1 (Rev. 1), and provide practical advice on their implementation for consideration later in the meeting. The working group comprised the regional representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Chairman) the observers from Guatemala and the Netherlands, and the Secretariat.

Later in the meeting Mr Forero reported on the recommendations of the working group on the report of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group, as outlined in document PC14 WG7 Doc. 1. The Committee agreed to adopt the recommendations of the working group.

19.2 Export Quota Working Group (Decision 12.17) (no document)

The Secretariat reported to the Committee that the Export Quota Working Group had not yet had its first meeting. The Committee agreed to comment on reports and reply to requests from the Export Quota Working Group as appropriate.

19.3 Technical implementation issues (no document)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. The Committee agreed that it did not have any technical implementation issues for consideration by the Standing Committee at its next meeting.

20. Training initiatives

20.1 Standard slide package: progress report (PC14 Doc. 20.1)

Mr McGough introduced this agenda item. The Committee congratulated the United Kingdom on the production of the packages and PowerPoint presentation.

20.2 Master's course (no document)

The Chairman introduced this agenda item. The Committee agreed that the Master's Course in Baeza, Spain, was a very useful tool for training people working on CITES issues. The Committee agreed that the Chairman's report to CoP13 include a request for a decision to support the Master's Course, and recommended the Chairman of the Animals Committee to do the same.

21. Production systems involving CITES-listed species and their impact on wild populations; designation of source code (PC14 Doc. 21)

This agenda item was discussed together with agenda item 15.

22. Registration of nurseries exporting *Araucaria araucana* (document withdrawn)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and explained that it intended to wait until Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11 were amended before it reconsidered the registration of Chilean nurseries wishing to export *Araucaria araucana*. The Committee supported the suggestion of the Secretariat.

23. Regional reports and updated regional directories (Decisions 12.14 and 12.15) (PC14 Doc. 23.1.1 to 23.6.2)

The Committee recommended all participants at the meeting to read the regional reports and regional directories.

24. Time and venue of the 15th meeting of the Plants Committee (no document)

The Plants Committee expressed its gratitude to Slovenia for its offer to host the 15th meeting of the Plants Committee. The Committee accepted the offer and requested the Secretariat to seek ways to fund this meeting.

25. Any other business (PC14 Doc. 25)

25.1 Report of a short study of *Tillandsia xerographica* in Guatemala, 17-24 January 2004 (PC14 Doc. 25.1)

The observers from Guatemala and the Netherlands introduced this agenda item. The Committee noted the presentation by the observer from CONREFI. The Committee agreed to support the recommendations outlined in document PC14 Inf. 8. The Chairman accepted to inform the CITES Management Authority of Guatemala and the European Commission about these recommendations.

26. Closing remarks (no document)

Before closing the meeting, The Chairman thanked the organizers of the meeting, in particular the national authorities of Namibia and their staff, for the excellent venue they had elected to host the meeting and for the smooth way in which the meeting had been run. She further thanked the members of the Committee and the observers for their constructive spirit and their cooperation in arriving at the decisions that had been taken. She also thanked the Secretariat for the work done for the preparation and during the meeting, the interpreters for their support throughout the meeting and Mr Mustard for his job as rapporteur.

