

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



Fifty-ninth meeting of the Standing Committee
Doha (Qatar), 12 march 2010

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Compliance and enforcement

Review of Significant Trade

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ANIMALS AND PLANTS COMMITTEES

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.

Introduction

2. The role and responsibilities of the Standing Committee in conducting the Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species are described in paragraphs q) to v) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) on *Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species*.
3. The Standing Committee is to be informed about whether the recommendations formulated by the Animals and Plants Committees to ensure compliance with Article IV for trade in selected Appendix-II species have been implemented or not.
4. For each case under review, a brief history of the background to the recommendations is given below. For those cases already considered by the Standing Committee under paragraph s) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the text below contains a summary of recent developments and a recommendation to the Standing Committee from the Secretariat on appropriate further action required.

Plant species selected for the Review of Significant Trade following CoP12

5. At its 16th meeting (PC16, Lima, July 2006), the Plants Committee categorized certain populations of the following species as 'of possible concern': *Cyathea contaminans*, population of Indonesia and *Galanthus woronowii*, population of Georgia. In consultation with the Secretariat, the Plants Committee formulated recommendations with deadlines for their implementation, and these were transmitted to the range States concerned by the Secretariat in August 2006.
6. Based on the responses received, and in consultation with the Chair of the Plants Committee, the Secretariat made a determination regarding compliance with the recommendations by the range States concerned which was reported to the Standing Committee at its 57th meeting (SC57, Geneva, July 2008) and 58th meeting (SC58, Geneva, July 2009). The Standing Committee's recommendations were communicated to the Parties concerned on 30 July 2008. These recommendations and subsequent follow-up are reported in paragraphs 7 and 8 below.
7. *Cyathea contaminans*: population of Indonesia
 - a) At SC57, the Standing Committee agreed to extend until 31 March 2009 the deadline for Indonesia to comply with the following Plants Committee recommendations:

- i) *The Management Authority should report to the Secretariat its actions to implement the provisions of Article IV, and how the Scientific Authority determines that levels of export are not detrimental to the populations concerned.*
- ii) *Carry out a preliminary inventory of standing stock, establish estimates of sustainable offtake and establish a scientific monitoring system of the harvested and un-harvested populations.*
- iii) *Establish a revised conservative export quota based on the inventory of standing stock and estimates of sustainable offtake.*

The Standing Committee also decided that:

Indonesia should refer to the status of C. contaminans rather than general management policies for Cyathea spp. If the conservation and management status of C. contaminans is not yet clear in the country due to a lack of scientific surveys, Indonesia should consider submitting a project proposal to the Secretariat under Resolution Conf. 12.2 on Procedure for approval of externally funded projects.

- b) At SC58, the Secretariat expressed concern about the increase in the Indonesian voluntary export quota for *C. contaminans* for 2009 and, about the lack of implementation of the Plants and Standing Committee's recommendations.
- c) Since the Management Authority of Indonesia showed willingness to comply and responded to the Secretariat's communications on the review of this species, the Standing Committee agreed, also at SC58, that:

... by 31 October 2009, Indonesia should submit to the Secretariat a detailed programme of work to implement the recommendations directed to it at SC57, and requested the Secretariat to report on this matter at SC59.

- d) On 24 October 2009 the Management Authority of Indonesia submitted a report on the implementation of the recommendations directed to it on *C. contaminans*.
- e) Regarding recommendation a) i) above, the report explains how, each year, the Management Authority (MA) and the Scientific Authority (SA) liaise in order for the latter to make the non-detriment finding for establishing the harvest quota and the draft voluntary export quota for *C. contaminans* for that calendar year. Population density, harvest potential, previous levels of exports, environmental conditions, level of protection, level of enforcement and level of illegal trade are also reported as being considered by the Scientific Authority when preparing its report to the Management Authority. Indonesia explains that this is a process of consultation that involves many different stakeholders involved in the conservation and management of and trade in this species in Indonesia. On the basis of the initial harvest volume determined by the SA, a draft annual export quota is proposed and consulted publicly with all stakeholders. Then a final export quota is suggested to the MA, which this distributes it between the provinces after reducing the proposed volume by 10 % to allow for domestic use and material not of export quality. Therefore always the harvest quota will be higher than the final export quota e.g. in 2008 the harvest quota for this species was 350 tonnes and its export quota was 315 tonnes.
- f) Concerning the implementation of recommendation a) ii) above, Indonesia explains that inventories and estimates of sustainable offtake were made in 2006-2007 in six provinces of the country. The SA also conducts monitoring activities in various locations. It has been estimated that the sustainable harvest could be 750 kg/year. With this information the SA is confident of the sustainability of the current quota for *C. contaminans* from Indonesia. Information on density and two harvesting methods is also provided in the report. One of the methods is used in clearing areas and results in the death of the plant while the other technique does not harm in any way the plant since is sawing roots with no scars or wounds. The latter seems to be a sustainable way of harvesting the tree fern covering roots. Eight other provinces need urgently their surveys and assessment of standing stock. Indonesia explains that it does not intend to open the harvest in these sites until sound scientific information is available and can be considered to revise the current quotas. Therefore Indonesia is proposing a Program of work for the conservation of *C. contaminans* that includes surveys and monitoring systems in all provinces as well as training programmes for the staff involved in these activities.

- g) Indonesia further explains that harvest and export quotas have been set for those provinces that have information available on inventories and sustainable offtake, but that in future other provinces will also be allocated quotas when similar information is available.
- h) The Secretariat notes that, sustainable harvesting in some areas of the six provinces has been established but that care should be taken not to include material produced unsustainable from land conversion amongst this harvesting. Recommendation a) iii) has been implemented for these areas and Indonesia should take care to maintain similar standards for further areas to be opened for harvesting of *C. contaminans* in the future.
- i) The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Plants Committee, has determined that the recommendations of the Plants Committee have been complied with. Consequently the Secretariat recommends that the Standing Committee conclude that *C. contaminans* from Indonesia should be removed from the Review of Significant Trade.

8. *Galanthus woronowii*: population of Georgia

- a) In response to the recommendations of the Plants Committee, Georgia submitted a project entitled *Improving implementation of CITES for G. woronowii and Cyclamen coum from Georgia*, under Resolution Conf. 12.2. This project was funded by the Netherlands and should ensure the establishment of a robust, scientifically-based export quota for these species in compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee. Meantime, the export quota for *G. woronowii* from Georgia for 2009 remained at 15 million bulbs as in 2007 and 2008.
- b) At SC58, the Committee recommended that the deadline for Georgia to comply with the recommendations of the Plants Committee be extended until 31 December 2009 when the project was scheduled to finish and that a conservative export quota based on the inventory of standing stock and estimates of sustainable offtake should be established in cooperation with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee.
- c) The recommendations of the Plants Committee were as follows:

Within 3 months (i.e. by November 2006)

The Management Authority should report to the Secretariat its actions to implement the provisions of Article IV, and how the Scientific Authority determines that levels of export are not detrimental to the populations concerned.

Within 1 year (i.e. by August 2007)

- i) *Carry out a preliminary inventory of standing stock, establish estimates of sustainable offtake and establish a scientific monitoring system of the harvested and un-harvested populations.*
- ii) *Establish, in consultation with the CITES Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, a conservative export quota based on the inventory of standing stock and estimates of sustainable offtake.*
- d) On 18 December 2009, the Management Authority of Georgia submitted a resume of the final report on the implementation of the above-mentioned project and explained its compliance with the recommendations by the Plants Committee as elaborated in the following paragraphs.
- e) Regarding recommendation 'within 3 months' the report explains that the Scientific Authority (SA) of Georgia is fully operational and how it formulates the non-detriment findings. The SA is an advisory board to the Minister of Environment Protection and Natural Resources (MEPNR); the SA is composed of eight members who are experts in appropriate fields. Since the main exports from Georgia are *Galanthus* bulbs, the SA has significant expertise in geophytes, their taxonomy, distribution, conservation, sustainable use and horticulture.
- f) The SA is authorized to establish annual harvest and export quotas for snowdrop bulbs and submit it to Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, who further submits it to the Ministry of Economic Development. In accordance with the decree of the Minister of Economic Development, the quota is distributed among the license holders.

- g) Before 2006, the annual quota was established on the basis of results of field site verification surveys conducted by experts recommended by the SA. Between 2006 and 2008 such surveys were not conducted. In 2009 extensive field research was carried out within the project 'Improving implementation of CITES for *Galanthus woronowii* and *Cyclamen coum* from Georgia'. The SA in close cooperation with botanists from the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, United Kingdom and Microsoft Research, Cambridge, United Kingdom, has participated in the field surveys and assessments of *Galanthus* populations in Georgia.
- h) The SA considered the information collected during the extensive research and field surveys and made the following non-detriment finding:
- Harvest is banned from wild sites of high conservation value to conserve the structure and functioning of those ecosystems. This is around 21% of the total area of wild sites surveyed (90 hectares).
 - Around 10% of the area of wild sites of medium conservation value can be harvested in any one year. The total area of medium conservation value sites is around 60% of the total area of wild sites (263 hectares).
 - Around 20% of the area of wild sites of low conservation value can be harvested in any one year. The total area of low conservation value sites is around 19% of the total area of wild sites (84 hectares).
 - Cultivation sites can be harvested a minimum of every 3 years.
- i) Considering these recommendations and the new information gathered on population size, the SA determined that a very precautionary quota of 15 million bulbs would not be detrimental to the survival of wild populations of *G. woronowii* in Georgia. A monitoring system is being established to continue collecting data and assess the harvest impact on populations in order to adapt harvest management as required. The SA will monitor this process.
- j) Concerning the implementation of recommendation i) to be implemented within one year, the MA of Georgia explains that it has reviewed the status of *Cyclamen* and *Galanthus* in Georgia and that extensive field research on cultivated and wild stocks of *Galanthus* has been carried out through the implementation of the project. During 2009, field surveys were made on almost all (41 populations) of the populations of *G. woronowii* found in Georgia. Detailed information was compiled on habitat types, population sizes and conservation value of sites. Projections using the data from the population sampling concluded an estimation of 163 million harvestable bulbs in the sampled area. Modelling the population data estimation, the total standing stock of *G. woronowii* in Georgia has been estimated in around 233 million bulbs covering 639 hectares. 65 million bulbs have been estimated to be exportable sized bulbs in the cultivation fields. Regarding the establishment of a scientific monitoring system of the harvested and non-harvested populations, the MA of Georgia explains that such a system is currently being designed. When applying for the quota, traders must supply full details of the collection area including GPS data to facilitate monitoring of the harvest. It was estimated that the area of occupancy of the studied populations is some 70% of the total area occupied by the national population.
- k) On the implementation of recommendation ii) to be implemented within one year, the MA of Georgia concluded, after the recent surveys and modelling carried out with the assistance of international experts, that an export quota of 15 million bulbs can be considered precautionary. In the light of the information submitted by Georgia in its report the Secretariat agrees with the proposed figure.
- l) Although Georgia has not mentioned its plans to monitor currently non-harvested populations, the Secretariat considers that it has made a lot of progress with the overall implementation of recommendation i) to be implemented within one year, made by the Plants Committee. Georgia will probably consider the currently non-harvested populations in the near future in the overall management of *G. woronowii* in the country. Georgia has fully complied with the recommendation a) to be implemented within one year and recommendation ii) to be implemented within one year.

- m) The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Plants Committee has determined that the recommendations of the Plants Committee have been complied with and recommends that the Standing Committee conclude that *G. woronowii* from Georgia should be removed from the Review of Significant Trade.

Plant species selected for the Review of Significant Trade following CoP13

9. At its 17th meeting (PC17, Geneva, April 2008), the Plants Committee categorized the named populations of the following species as 'of urgent concern': *Christensonia vietnamica*, population of Viet Nam; *Taxus wallichiana*, population of India and *Pterocarpus santalinus*, population of India. Additionally, the following were categorized as 'of possible concern': *Rauvolfia serpentina*, populations of Myanmar and Thailand; *Pachypodium bispinosum*, population of South Africa; *Pachypodium succulentum*, population of South Africa and *Myrmecophila tibicinis*, population of Belize. The Plants Committee formulated recommendations and these were transmitted to the range States on 19 May 2008.

10. Progress on some of these cases was already reported to the Standing Committee at SC58. Further developments on these together with information about the remaining cases are reported in paragraphs 11 to 17 below. In each case, the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Plants Committee, has made a determination regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee by the range States concerned.

11. *Christensonia vietnamica*: population of Viet Nam

- a) At PC17, the Plants Committee categorized the populations of *C. vietnamica* as 'of urgent concern' and it formulated recommendations to address the problems of implementing the provisions of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) or 3, with deadlines for their implementation. These recommendations were as follows:

Within 3 months (i.e. by 19 August 2008)

- i) *The Management Authority of Viet Nam should confirm to the Secretariat that they will not be issuing export permits for C. vietnamica and that the Secretariat can include this on the CITES website as a voluntary export quota; and*
- ii) *If exports are confirmed, the Scientific and Management Authority of Viet Nam should provide to the Secretariat confirmation that the existing policies in place provide an adequate scientific basis for the formulation of non-detriment findings for C. vietnamica. The MA should explain existing procedures for identifying the species, the issuing of export permits, and explain also the scientific basis for the formulation of non detriment findings and procedures for monitoring the volume of exports in accordance with Article IV.*
- b) In May 2008, the Secretariat communicated these recommendations to Viet Nam although it did not receive a response by the time of SC58. At that meeting, the Committee instructed *the Secretariat to liaise with Viet Nam in order to determine if it is still exporting specimens of this species and report to the 59th meeting of the Committee.* The Secretariat wrote to Viet Nam again on the 16 July 2009 although no response has been received to the time of writing this document.
- c) The recommendations of the Plants Committee have not been complied with despite several communications that the Secretariat has sent to Viet Nam since May 2008 to date.
- d) The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Plants Committee, recommends that the Standing Committee recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of *C. vietnamica* from Viet Nam until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full and detailed information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.

12. *Taxus wallichiana*: population of India

- a) At PC17, the Plants Committee categorized the populations of *T. wallichiana* from India as 'of urgent concern' and it formulated recommendations to address the problems of implementing the provisions of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) or 3, with deadlines for their implementation. These recommendations were as follows:

Within 3 months (i.e by 19 August 2008)

- i) *India should confirm that they do not allow export of wild harvested product; and*
 - ii) *If exports are confirmed, India should provide to the Secretariat:*
 - A) *confirmation that the existing policies in place provide an adequate scientific basis for the formulation of non-detriment findings for T. wallichiana;*
 - B) *an explanation of the procedures for identifying the species, the issuing of export permits and the basis of the non-detriment finding; and*
 - C) *an explanation of the procedures for monitoring the volume of exports in accordance with Article IV.*
- b) In May 2008, the Secretariat communicated these recommendations to India. Although the Secretariat did not receive a response by the time of SC58, according to document PC17 Doc. 8.4, export of wild specimens of this species from India has been prohibited since at least 1996. At SC58, the Committee instructed the Secretariat to liaise with India in order to determine if it is still exporting specimens of this species and report at the 59th meeting of the Committee. The Secretariat wrote to India in July 2009 but it has not received an answer at the time of writing this document.
- c) The recommendations of the Plants Committee have not been complied with despite several communications that the Secretariat has sent to India since May 2008.
- d) The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Plants Committee, recommends that the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of *T. wallichiana* from India until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full and detailed information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.

13. *Pterocarpus santalinus*: population of India

- a) The Plants Committee considered this matter at PC17. The Committee determined that trade in *P. santalinus* was of 'urgent concern' in India. Consequently, in consultation with the Secretariat, it formulated recommendations to address the problems of implementing the provisions of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) or 3, with deadlines for their implementation. The short term recommendations to India were as follows:

Within 3 months (i.e by July 2008)

- i) *The Management Authority should clarify the legislative status of exports of specimens of P. santalinus, the level of artificial propagation, the permit process, and perceived discrepancies between reported Customs data and CITES data; and*
 - ii) *If exports of wild origin are to be continued, the Management Authority in consultation with the CITES Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, should establish a conservative quota of CITES listed specimens of this species.*
- b) It also made the following long-term recommendations:

Within 2 years (i.e. by April 2010)

If exports of wild origin are to continue:

- i) *carry out a preliminary inventory of standing stock, establish estimates of sustainable offtake and establish a scientific monitoring system of the harvested and unharvested populations;*
- ii) *establish a revised conservative export quota based on the inventory of standing stock and the estimates of sustainable offtake; and*

- iii) *the Management Authority report to the Secretariat the result of its actions to implement the provisions of Article IV, and how the Scientific Authority currently determines that levels of export are not detrimental to the populations concerned.*
- c) On 19 May 2008, the Secretariat communicated the recommendations by the Plants Committee to India. The short term recommendations for India were urgent measures that needed to be implemented by this country in order to correct identified problems with the implementation of Article IV for *P. santalinus*.
- d) No response has been received by the Secretariat in relation to the recommendations of the Plants Committee and the short-term recommendations of the Plants Committee have not therefore been complied with.
- e) The Secretariat recommends that the Standing Committee recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of *P. santalinus* from India until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full and detailed information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.

14. *Rauvolfia serpentina*: population of Myanmar

- a) At PC17, the Plants Committee categorized the populations of *R. serpentina* from Myanmar as 'of possible concern' and it formulated recommendations to address the problems of implementing the provisions of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) or 3, with deadlines for their implementation. These recommendations were as follows:

Within 3 months (i.e by 19 August 2008)

- i) *The Management Authority of Myanmar should confirm to the Secretariat that they do not issue export permits for R. serpentina and the Secretariat should include this information on the list of voluntary export quotas; and*
- ii) *If exports are confirmed, the Scientific and Management Authority of Myanmar should provide to the Secretariat confirmation that the existing policies in place provide an adequate scientific basis for the formulation of non-detriment findings for R. serpentina. The MA should explain existing procedures for identifying the species, the issuing of export permits, and explain also the scientific basis for the formulation of non detriment findings and procedures for monitoring the volume of exports in accordance with Article IV.*
- b) At the time of SC58, the recommendations of the Plants Committee had not been complied with but Myanmar had shown its willingness to address its implementation of the Convention for this species. At the same meeting, the Committee extended the deadline for Myanmar to comply with the recommendations of the Plants Committee until 31 December 2009 and instructed the Secretariat to report at the 59th meeting of the Standing Committee on progress achieved.
- c) The Secretariat wrote to Myanmar in July 2009 but it did not received a response. The recommendations of the Plants Committee have not been complied with.
- d) The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Plants Committee, recommends that the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of *R. serpentina* from Myanmar until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full and detailed information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.

15. *Rauvolfia serpentina*: population of Thailand

- a) At PC17, the Plants Committee categorized the populations of *R. serpentina* from Thailand as 'of possible concern' and it formulated recommendations to address the problems of implementing the provisions of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) or 3, with deadlines for their implementation. These recommendations were as follows:

Within 2 years (i.e by 19 May 2010)

- i) *carry out a preliminary inventory of standing stock, establish estimates of sustainable offtake and establish a scientific monitoring system of the harvested and unharvested populations;*
 - ii) *establish a revised conservative export quota based on the inventory of standing stock and the estimates of sustainable offtake for *R. serpentina* and the Secretariat should include this information on the list of voluntary export quotas; and*
 - iii) *report to the Secretariat the result of a) and b) with an explanation of how the Scientific Authority determines that levels of export are not detrimental to the populations concerned.*
- b) At the time of SC58, the recommendations of the Plants Committee had been complied with except for the establishment of the export quota. At the same meeting, the Committee decided that if Thailand, to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, established a revised conservative export quota based on the inventory of standing stock and the estimates of sustainable offtake for *R. serpentina* by 31 December 2009, the Standing Committee should conclude that *R. serpentina* from Thailand may be removed from the Review of Significant Trade.
- c) The Secretariat wrote to Thailand in July 2009 and the latter responded on 4 January 2010.
- d) Thailand has established a zero export quota for specimens of *R. serpentina* taken from the wild. The country is only allowing the export of specimens that meet the definition of 'artificially propagated' contained in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP14) on *Regulation of trade in plants*. The concerns of the Plants Committee regarding the implementation of Article IV of the Convention have been addressed.
- e) The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Plants Committee, recommends that the Standing Committee conclude that *R. serpentina* from Thailand may be removed from the Review of Significant Trade.

16. *Pachypodium bispinosum* and *Pachypodium succulentum*: populations of South Africa

- a) At PC17, the Plants Committee categorized the populations of *P. bispinosum* and *P. succulentum* from South Africa as 'of possible concern' and it formulated recommendations to address the problems of implementing the provisions of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) or 3, with deadlines for their implementation. These recommendations were as follows:

Within 1 year (i.e by 19 May 2009)

- a) *Carry out a preliminary inventory of standing stock, establish estimates of sustainable offtake and establish a scientific monitoring system of the harvested and unharvested populations;*
 - b) *Establish a revised conservative export quota based on the inventory of standing stock and the estimates of sustainable offtake; and*
 - c) *The Management Authority should report to the Secretariat the result of a) and b) with an explanation of how the Scientific Authority determines that levels of export are not detrimental to the populations concerned.*
- b) At SC58, the Committee extended the deadline for the implementation of the recommendation in subparagraph a) until 31 December 2009 and requested the Secretariat to report on this matter at SC59.
- c) The Secretariat wrote to South Africa in July 2009. In October 2009 the Management Authority of South Africa submitted a communication from the Scientific Authority explaining that it had started some initial investigations that indicated that there is confusion between wild and artificially propagated sources of these two species. The Scientific Authority also expressed interest in proposing a set of actions that would respond to the Plants Committee recommendations with a different approach.

- d) At the time of writing this document the Secretariat has not received the final set of recommendations mentioned by the SA of South Africa. The recommendations of the Plants Committee have not been complied with.
- e) The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Plants Committee, recommend that the Standing Committee recommends that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of *P. bispinosum* and *P. succulentum* from South Africa until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for these species, and provides full and detailed information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.

17. *Myrmecophila tibicinis*: population of Belize

- a) The Plants Committee considered this matter at PC17. The Committee determined that trade in *M. tibicinis* was of 'possible concern' in Belize. Consequently, in consultation with the Secretariat, it formulated recommendations to address the problems of implementing the provisions of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) or 3, with deadlines for their implementation. The short term recommendations to Belize were as follows:

Within 3 months (i.e. by July 2008)

- i) *The Management Authority of Belize should confirm to the Secretariat that they will not issue export permits for M. tibicinis until surveys have been made to confirm the species being traded and status of the species and that the Secretariat can include this on the CITES website as a voluntary zero export quota; and*
 - ii) *If exports are confirmed, the Scientific and Management Authority of Belize should provide to the Secretariat confirmation that the existing policies in place provide an adequate scientific basis for the formulation of non-detriment findings for M. tibicinis. The Management Authority should explain existing procedures for identifying the species, the issuing of export permits, and explain also the scientific basis for the formulation of non detriment findings and procedures for monitoring the volume of exports in accordance with Article IV.*
- b) It also made the following long-term recommendations:

Within 2 year (i.e. by April 2010)

In relation to M. tibicinis and other species in this genus, probably confused with M. tibicinis:

- i) *Carry out a preliminary inventory of standing stock, establish estimates of sustainable offtake and establish a scientific monitoring system of the harvested and unharvested populations;*
 - ii) *Establish a revised conservative export quota based on the inventory of standing stock and the estimates of sustainable offtake; and*
 - iii) *The Management Authority should report to the Secretariat the result of a) and b) with an explanation of how the Scientific Authority determines that levels of export are not detrimental to the populations concerned.*
- c) On 19 May 2008, the Secretariat communicated the recommendations by the Plants Committee to Belize. The short term recommendations for Belize were urgent measures that needed to be implemented by this country in order to correct identified problems with the implementation of Article IV for *M. tibicinis*.
 - d) No response has been received by the Secretariat in relation to the recommendations of the Plants Committee and the short term recommendations of the Plants Committee have therefore not been complied with.
 - e) The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Plants Committee, recommends that the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of *M. tibicinis* from Belize until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full and detailed information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.

Animal species selected for the Review of Significant Trade following CoP12

18. *Falco cherrug*

- a) At its 21st meeting (AC21, Geneva, May 2005), the Animals Committee categorized *F. cherrug* as 'of urgent concern' in nine range States and 'of possible concern' in a further 26 range States. In consultation with the Secretariat, it formulated recommendations directed to the range States concerned with deadlines for their implementation. The Secretariat provided updates on the implementation of these recommendations at the 54th and 55th meeting of the Standing Committee [SC54, Geneva, October 2006 (see document SC54 Doc. 42), and SC55 (The Hague, June 2007) (see document SC55 Doc. 17)].
- b) The Secretariat conveyed information on the Review of Significant Trade in *F. cherrug* to all Parties in Notification No. 2006/061 of 14 November 2006. Through that Notification, the Secretariat informed Parties that, as recommended by the Animals Committee, all range States of urgent concern (the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan) had suspended the issuance of export permits for *F. cherrug*.
- c) The case of Mongolia was dealt with at SC58 [see SC58 Doc. 21.1 and SC58 Sum. 2 (Rev. 1)]. Concerning the remaining range States of urgent concern, the Animals Committee recommended at AC21 that those range States wishing to resume the exportation of *F. cherrug* from the wild should, by August 2007:
 - i) *conduct a survey of the status of F. cherrug in the country, including an assessment of distribution and abundance, population trends, threats to populations and other relevant factors to provide the basis for the making of non-detriment findings as required under the provisions of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a); and*
 - ii) *develop a science-based population monitoring system, and establish adaptive management programmes for harvesting of and trade in F. cherrug, taking into consideration the results of the survey referred to in the previous paragraph*

None of the eight range States concerned (the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan) has provided this information to the Secretariat or expressed a wish to resume authorizing exports of wild specimens of *F. cherrug*.

- d) The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Animals Committee, proposes that the Standing Committee should therefore close this matter by including a zero export quota for wild specimens of *F. cherrug* from the States named in subparagraph c) in the export quota list on the CITES website. It is the view of the Chair of the Animals Committee that should any of these States subsequently wish to resume export of wild taken specimens of this species they should advise the Secretariat of the measures they have taken to comply with the recommendations in sub-paragraph c) above and the Secretariat shall, in consultation with the Chair of the Animals Committee, determine whether the recommendations have been implemented and report to the Standing Committee accordingly.

19. *Poicephalus senegalus*: population of Mali

- a) At its 22nd meeting (Lima, July 2006), the Animals Committee categorized the population of *P. senegalus* from Mali as 'of possible concern'. In consultation with the Secretariat, the Animals Committee formulated recommendations with deadlines for their implementation, and the Secretariat transmitted them to Mali on 7 November 2006.
- b) At SC57, the Standing Committee adopted the following recommendation for Mali regarding *P. senegalus*:

The Secretariat should engage further with Mali to determine the basis for the proposed export quota and obtain a copy of the study mentioned by Mali and report at SC58.
- c) On 27 August 2008, Mali provided information on how the export quota for *P. senegalus* was established but not on the status of the species. Mali stressed that it was having financial difficulties in conducting the required studies on the status of the population of this species.

- d) At SC58, the Secretariat informed the Committee that Mali had taken some action towards the implementation of the recommendation but that further progress was required. The Standing Committee instructed the Secretariat to engage further with Mali to carry out the study on status of this species, to be completed by SC61, and to provide a progress report at SC59. Until this study was completed, it recommended that Mali establish a quota not exceeding 5,000 specimens per year and that it consider suspending exports on a voluntary basis until a scientifically-established quota could be set.
- e) The Secretariat wrote to Mali on 7 September 2009 to inform them about the SC58 recommendations. In its response of 25 November 2009, Mali confirmed that it had established a quota of 5,000 specimens per year until a scientifically-established quota could be set. Mali provided no further information about the progress with the study on status of this species.
- f) The Secretariat welcomes the decision of Mali to establish a quota as recommended by SC58. However, Mali did not provide a progress report for SC59 about the study on status of *P. senegalus*.

Recommendations

19. The Secretariat proposes that the Standing Committee take note of the information in the present document and adopt the recommendations of the Secretariat in paragraphs 7 i), 8 m), 11 d), 12 d), 13 e), 14 d), 15 e), 16 e), 17 e) and 18 d).