

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



Sixty-second meeting of the Standing Committee  
Geneva (Switzerland), 23-27 July 2012

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.
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. After consulting the Chairs of the Animals or Plants Committees, the Secretariat informs the Standing Committee about whether the recommendations formulated by the Scientific Committees to ensure compliance with Article IV for trade in selected Appendix-II species have been implemented or not.
4. The cases referred to in the present document were selected for review after the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP14, The Hague, 2007), either at the 23rd meeting of the Animals Committee (AC23, Geneva, April 2008) or the 17th meeting of the Plants Committee (PC17, Geneva, April 2008). After consideration of the replies received from the range States concerned at their subsequent meetings (PC18, Buenos Aires, March 2009, and AC24, Geneva, April 2009), the Committees determined that the species concerned were of either of least, possible or urgent concern, in line with paragraph i) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13). For those species of possible or urgent concern, the Committees, in consultation with the Secretariat, formulated recommendations to the range States concerned comprising specific actions to address problems related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraph 2 (a), 3 or 6 (a), or interim measures, where appropriate, for the regulation of trade.
5. The Annex to the present document summarizes the status of each review for which deadlines for implementing the recommendations of the Animals and Plants Committees have passed. It comprises three columns that contain:
  - the text of the recommendations made by the Committees;
  - a summary of the information received from the range States; and
  - the Secretariat's determination, made in consultation with the Chair of the Animals or Plants Committee, regarding compliance with the recommendations, and its recommendations to the Standing Committee.

Recommendation

6. On the basis of the information presented in the Annex the Standing Committee is invited in each case to decide on appropriate action and make recommendations to the State concerned or to all Parties.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AC AND PC FOR SPECIES SELECTED FOR THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE,  
RESPONSES FROM THE RANGE STATES CONCERNED, DETERMINATION OF IMPLEMENTATION  
AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE

Fauna

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<b><i>Hippopotamus amphibius</i> (hippopotamus)</b>		
<p><b>Cameroon (CM)</b> (Possible concern)</p> <p><u>Within 90 days (by 4 January 2012):</u></p> <p>a) The Management Authority should clarify what legal protection is afforded to this species in Cameroon and provide an explanation for the perceived discrepancies between reported Customs data (imports) and CITES data (exports) referred to in AC25 Doc 9.4;</p> <p>b) Provide available information to the Secretariat on the distribution, abundance and conservation status and any current management measures in place for <i>H. amphibius</i> in Cameroon; and</p> <p>c) Provide justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the quantities of <i>H. amphibius</i> exported were not detrimental to the survival of the species and in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</p>	<p>No response has been received by the Secretariat in relation to the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</p> <p>The CITES trade database shows that CM exported specimens of <i>H. amphibius</i> in 2009 and 2010, including 99 teeth and 17 trophies.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The recommendations of the Animals Committee have not been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of <i>H. amphibius</i> from CM until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p><b>Mozambique (MZ) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p><u>Within 90 days (by 4 January 2012):</u></p> <p>a) The Management Authority should provide an explanation of the 'internal system of annual quotas' and other management measures in place, and clarify the perceived discrepancies between reported Customs data (imports) and CITES data (exports) referred to in document AC25 Doc 9.4;</p> <p>b) Information derived from the national survey undertaken in 2008 on the distribution, abundance and conservation status of <i>H. amphibius</i> in MZ, including details of methodologies employed; and</p> <p>c) Justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the quantities of <i>H. amphibius</i> exported were not detrimental to the survival of the species and in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</p>	<p>No response has been received by the Secretariat in relation to the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</p> <p>The CITES trade database shows that MZ exported specimens of <i>H. amphibius</i> in 2009 and 2010, including 204 teeth and 151 trophies.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The recommendations of the Animals Committee have not been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of <i>H. amphibius</i> from MZ until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</b></p>
<b><i>Chamaeleo africanus</i> (African chameleon)</b>		
<p><b>Niger (NE) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p><u>Within 90 days (by 4 January 2012):</u></p> <p>a) The Management Authority should provide the Secretariat with available information on:</p> <p>i) the distribution and abundance of <i>Chamaeleo africanus</i> in its country; and</p>	<p>No response has been received by the Secretariat in relation to the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</p> <p>The CITES trade database shows that NE exported 750 live specimens of <i>C. africanus</i> in 2009 and 650 in 2010.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The recommendations of the Animals Committee have not been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>ii) the justification, and the scientific basis, by which it has been established that the quantities exported will not be detrimental to the survival of the species and in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3; and</p> <p>b) The Management Authority should establish an interim conservative quota for this species, based on estimates of sustainable off-take and available scientific information and provide details to the Secretariat;</p> <p><u>Within two years (by 4 October 2013):</u></p> <p>c) Conduct a national status assessment, including an evaluation of threats to the species; and advise the Secretariat of the details and any management measures in place;</p> <p>d) Establish a revised annual export quota for wild taken specimens based on the results of the assessment;</p> <p>e) Forward the quota details to the Secretariat (including zero quotas) and provide an explanation of how the Scientific Authority determined that the quantities would not be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild; and</p> <p>f) The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Animals Committee, should consider the information provided and, if satisfied, publish the proposed export quota.</p>		<p><b>The Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of <i>C. africanus</i> from NE until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<b><i>Chamaeleo feae</i> (Fea's chameleon)</b>		
<p><b>Equatorial Guinea (GQ) (possible concern)</b>  <u>Within 90 days (by 4 January 2012):</u></p> <p>a) The Management Authority should confirm that no export permits have been issued for this species since 1999, and provide an explanation to the Secretariat for the perceived discrepancies between reported Customs data (imports) and CITES data (exports) referred to in document AC25 Doc 9.4;</p> <p>b) If there is no intent to allow export of this species for the foreseeable future establish a zero quota which should be communicated to Parties by the Secretariat; or</p> <p>c) If trade is allowed provide justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the quantities of <i>Chamaeleo feae</i> exported are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</p>	<p>No response has been received by the Secretariat in relation to the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</p> <p>The CITES trade database shows that GQ exported 449 live specimens of <i>C. feae</i> in 2009, and 215 in 2010.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The recommendations of the Animals Committee have not been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of <i>C. feae</i> from GQ until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</b></p>
<b><i>Cordylus mossambicus</i> (girdled lizard)</b>		
<p><b>Mozambique (MZ) (Possible concern)</b>  <u>Within 90 days (by 4 January 2012):</u></p> <p>a) The Management Authority of MZ should provide the Secretariat with detailed information on:</p> <p>i) the distribution and abundance of <i>C. mossambicus</i> in its country;</p> <p>ii) the justification, and the scientific basis, by which it has established that</p>	<p>No response has been received by the Secretariat in relation to the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</p> <p>The CITES trade database shows that MZ exported 1,392 live specimens of <i>C. mossambicus</i> in 2009 and 300 in 2010 (annual export quotas for wild live specimens were 1,500 for those years).</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The recommendations of the Animals Committee have not been complied with.</p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>the quantities exported will not be detrimental to the survival of the species and are in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3; and</p> <p>iii) MZ should also provide an explanation for the quota apparently exceeded in 2003, 2004 and 2007.</p> <p><u>Within 2 years (by 4 October 2013):</u></p> <p>b) Conduct a national status assessment, including an evaluation of threats to the species, and advise the Secretariat of the details of any management measures in place;</p> <p>c) Establish a revised annual export quota for wild taken specimens based on the results of the assessment;</p> <p>d) Forward the quota details to the Secretariat (including zero quotas) and provide an explanation of how the Scientific Authorities determined that the quantities would not be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild; and</p> <p>e) The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Animals Committee, should consider the information provided and, if satisfied, publish the proposed export quota.</p>		<p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of <i>C. mossambicus</i> from MZ until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<b><i>Uroplatus ebenai</i>, <i>U. fimbriatus</i>, <i>U. guentheri</i>, <i>U. henkeli</i>, <i>U. lineatus</i>, <i>U. malama</i>, <i>U. phantasticus</i>, <i>U. pietschmanni</i> and <i>U. sikorae</i> (flat-tailed geckos)</b>		
<p><b>Madagascar (MG) (possible concern)</b></p> <p><u>Within 90 days (by 4 January 2012):</u></p> <p>a) The Management Authority of Madagascar should provide to the Secretariat detailed information on:</p> <p>i) the distribution and abundance of the <i>Uroplatus</i> spp. under consideration; and</p>	<p>MG provided full information on the status of the nine <i>Uroplatus</i> species with details on distribution, abundance and threats; the background to the export quotas for wild, live specimens of <i>Uroplatus</i> species for 2011; and justifications for revised export quotas for 2012 and 2013 based on new scientific information. It also informed that <i>Uroplatus</i> export quotas would be reviewed in 2014, and drew the attention of the Animals Committee to issues concerning the taxonomy of <i>Uroplatus</i> spp.</p> <p>Concerning recommendation a). i):</p> <p>-- MG referred to a national Red List workshop for endemic snakes and lizards of MG held in January 2011 and resulting in the most informed and up-to-date accounts of <i>Uroplatus</i> species available (published on the IUCN website in November 2011).</p> <p>-- All <i>Uroplatus</i> species have disjunct distributions within their respective ranges and, with the exception of <i>U. ebenai</i> and <i>U. sikorae</i> which occur in degraded forest, are strongly associated with relatively intact forest. Quantitative information on their abundance or population size is lacking. The lizards are widely believed to occur naturally in low densities, but this maybe a consequence of their crypsis and behaviour which render them difficult to find.</p> <p>-- Given the absence of quantitative information on population abundance of this genus, the Scientific Authority bases advise regarding quotas on the range and distribution of species. Five species occur over wide geographic areas, and although their forest habitats are declining, the pace of decline is not considered a threat to the species. Modest trade in <i>Uroplatus fimbriatus</i>, <i>U. lineatus</i>, <i>U. phantasticus</i> and <i>U. sikorae</i> would therefore be unlikely to be detrimental to their survival in the wild. Considerable more care is needed if export of <i>U. ebenai</i>, <i>U. guentheri</i>, and <i>U. henkeli</i> occurs as these species are more restricted in range.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The recommendations of the Animals Committee have been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p>In compliance with paragraph r) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the Secretariat has, following consultation with the Chair of the Standing Committee, notified the Party that the species was removed from the review.</p> <p><b>The Standing Committee is required to take note of this information.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>ii) the justification, and the scientific basis, to demonstrate that the 2011 export quotas, if not zero, will not be detrimental to the survival of the species and are in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3;</p> <p>b) The Management Authority of Madagascar should provide to the Secretariat, for publication on the CITES website, any zero quotas established for <i>Uroplatus</i> spp.</p>	<p>Concerning recommendation a). ii):</p> <p>The Authorities have been using the same formula to establish quotas for <i>Uroplatus</i> species since 2006. The values in the formula are based on the best available scientific information about the distribution of the species and their tolerance of degraded habitats. In its response, MG provided details of the calculations of the export quota for 2011 for each <i>Uroplatus</i> species. MG noted that the IUCN Red List workshop in January 2011 produced a thorough update of the range maps for each species and new estimates of extent of occurrence were made. This was complemented by new information on the threatened status of each species. MG therefore revised the export quota of 2012 for <i>Uroplatus</i> spp. using these new data.</p> <p>Concerning recommendation b):</p> <p>New quotas for <i>Uroplatus</i> species were decided based on the formula indicated above and updated distribution maps. These quotas also took into account a 10 % mortality during collection and transport, and are 90 % of the initial value calculated. These quotas are to be applied in 2012 and 2013, and revised in 2014.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>U. ebenauai</i>: quota reduced from 125 to 83 because its range is smaller than previously known.</li> <li>– <i>U. fimbriatus</i>: quota increased from 312 to 497 because its range is greater than previously known. The species is widespread and not threatened.</li> <li>– <i>U. guentheri</i>: quota reduced from 125 to zero because the species is classified as Endangered.</li> <li>– <i>U. henkeli</i>: quota reduced from 125 to 35 because its range is smaller than previously known. Also, there is growing uncertainty about the taxonomy of species in this group.</li> <li>– <i>U. lineatus</i>: quota increased from 63 to 227 because its range is greater than previously known. The species is widespread and not threatened.</li> <li>– <i>U. malama</i>: no change to the zero quota for this species which has a restricted range.</li> </ul>	



Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>U. phantasticus</i>: quota increased from 0 to 70 because its range is greater than previously known. The species is widespread and not threatened.</li> <li>– <i>U. pietschmanni</i>: no change to the zero quota for this species which has a restricted range.</li> <li>– <i>U. sikorae</i>: quota reduced from 2000 to 867, although its range and capacity to survive in degraded forests are greater than previously known. Very difficult to distinguish from <i>U. sameiti</i> but, as both taxa are not threatened and the most widespread and abundant <i>Uroplatus</i> species, mis-identification is not considered a threat to either taxa.</li> </ul> <p>MG further informed that zero export quotas would be applied in 2012 and 2103 for the following <i>Uroplatus</i> species (including some not yet recognized under CITES and for which the taxonomy is under review): <i>U. alluaudi</i>, <i>U. finiavana</i>, <i>U. giganteus</i>, <i>U. malahelo</i> and <i>U. sameiti</i>.</p> <p>MG produced an identification guide for <i>Uroplatus</i> species in trade, and submitted sample plates and text from the brochure to the Secretariat.</p>	
<b><i>Heosemys annandalii</i> (yellow-headed temple turtle)</b>		
<p><b>Lao People's Democratic Republic (LA) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p><u>Within 90 days (by 4 January 2012):</u></p> <p>The Management Authority should clarify what legal protection is afforded to this species in LA and liaise with the Management Authority of Viet Nam to provide an explanation for the perceived discrepancies between reported VN import data and LA export data referred to in document AC25 Doc. 9.4;</p> <p>In addition, the Management Authority should:</p> <p>a) If there is no intent to allow export of wild-caught specimens of this species for the foreseeable future, establish a zero quota which should be communicated to Parties</p>	<p>No response has been received by the Secretariat in relation to the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</p> <p>The Animals Committee based its categorization and recommendations on reported imports from LA of 1,000 live wild specimens between 2003 and 2008, but since that time there appears to have been a significant increase in trade. The CITES trade database shows that 4,500 live ranched specimens of <i>Heosemys annandalii</i> were imported from LA in 2009, and 20,500 live ranched specimens and 1,800 live captive bred specimens in 2010. A non-detriment finding should be made for all exports of specimens declared to be of source 'R' (ranched).</p> <p>During a mission to LA in October 2011, the Secretariat was advised by</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendation</u></p> <p>The recommendation of the Animals Committee has not been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of <i>H. annandalii</i> from LA until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for</b></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>by the Secretariat; or</p> <p>b) If it intends to permit trade, provide a justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that any export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species and will be in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.</p>	<p>the Management Authority that there were no registered breeders of <i>H. annandalii</i> in the country.</p>	<p><b>this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendation of the Animals Committee.</b></p>
<b><i>Heosemys grandis</i> (orange-headed temple turtle)</b>		
<p><b>Lao People's Democratic Republic (LA) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p><u>Within 90 days (by 4 January 2012):</u></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p>a) Clarify what legal protection is afforded to this species in LA and liaise with the Management Authority of China to provide an explanation for the perceived discrepancies between reported import data and reported export data referred to in document AC25 Doc 9.4; and</p> <p>b) Provide full details of the ranching facilities in LA, including stock numbers and source, annual production of eggs and hatchlings, as well as an assessment of the impact of this facility on wild populations. In addition the Management Authority should:</p> <p>i) If there is no intent to allow export of wild-caught specimens of this species for the foreseeable future, establish a zero quota which should be communicated to Parties by the Secretariat; or</p>	<p>No response has been received by the Secretariat in relation to the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</p> <p>The Animals Committee based its categorization and recommendations on reported exports of 10,000 live ranched specimens between 2003 and 2008.</p> <p>The CITES trade database shows that 7,000 live ranched specimens of <i>H. grandis</i> were imported from LA in 2009, and 23,500 live ranched specimens and 2,100 live captive-bred specimens in 2010.</p> <p>During a mission to LA in October 2011, the Secretariat was advised by the Management Authority that there were no registered breeders of <i>H. grandis</i> in the country.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The recommendations of the Animals Committee have not been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of <i>H. grandis</i> from LA until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
ii) If it intends to permit trade, provide a justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that any export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species and will be in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3.		
<b><i>Testudo horsfieldii</i> (Horsfield's tortoise)</b>		
<p><b>Tajikistan (TJ) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p><u>Within 90 days (by 4 January 2012):</u></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p>a) Provide information on population distribution, size and trends; and</p> <p>b) Provide justification for and details of the scientific basis by which it has been established that the current quota for wild specimens is not detrimental to the survival of the species and in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, taking into account any potential unregulated and/or illegal off take and trade.</p>	<p>No response has been received by the Secretariat in relation to the recommendations of the Animals Committee.</p> <p>The CITES trade database shows no exports of specimens of <i>T. horsfieldii</i> from TJ in 2009 and 2010.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The recommendations of the Animals Committee have not been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>In view of the absence of recent trade in this species, the Standing Committee should instruct the Secretariat to liaise with TJ to determine whether it is still exporting specimens of <i>T. horsfieldii</i>, and to report at the 63rd meeting of the Committee.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p><b>Uzbekistan (UZ) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p><u>Within 90 days (by 4 January 2012):</u></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p>a) Provide justification for and details of, the scientific basis by which it has been established that the current quotas are not detrimental to the survival of the species and are in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, taking into account any potential unregulated and/or illegal off take and trade; and</p>	<p>UZ submitted full information on the status, conservation and management of <i>T. horsfieldii</i> in the country; the required additional explanations concerning ranching practices, and copies of existing scientific and technical literature on this species in UZ. It would also welcome visits from experts, CITES representatives or interested organizations to assess the situation on the ground.</p> <p>Concerning recommendation a):</p> <p>Catch and export quotas are approved by a commission including the CITES Management and Scientific Authorities, the Academy of Sciences and the State Committee for Nature Protection. Permits for collecting tortoises and harvesting eggs are issued by Gosbiocontrol, a body under the State Committee for Nature Protection.</p> <p>The Scientific Authority, in collaboration with Gosbiocontrol, has been annually monitoring the status of wild populations since 2001. In Spring (April), when individuals emerge from wintering, counts are organized in typical tortoise habitat in the 12 provinces of Uzbekistan, with compulsory surveys in areas where collection takes place. The data are analysed and reviewed by experts, and used to determine annual harvest quotas. Additionally, the Society for the Protection of Amphibians and Reptiles (Moscow, Russian Federation) has been making independent population assessments for a number of years.</p> <p>Overall findings have shown that tortoise populations did not undergo significant fluctuations and remained stable where habitat was not altered by agricultural development. The total UZ population is estimated to be around 20 million tortoises. Densities range from 0,001-3 animals per ha in unsuitable conditions, to 50-70 animals per ha in highly suitable habitat. The male-female ratio averages 0.75 to 1.</p> <p>Most collection of tortoises occurs in the Navoi province, where populations are very high (an estimated 12 million). Smaller numbers are collected in some other provinces. Collection zones in each province are restricted in area (less than 10 % of the total surface) and must demonstrate high population densities, usually exceeding 20 tortoises/ha. To further reduce collection pressure on wild populations,</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The recommendations of the Animals Committee have been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p>In compliance with paragraph r) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the Secretariat has, following consultation with the Chair of the Standing Committee, notified the Party that the species was removed from the review.</p> <p><b>The Standing Committee is required to take note of this information.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>b) In addition to the information provided on ranching in document AC24 Doc. 8.1, provide additional information to explain how the impact of ranching operations on the wild population is assessed, including an assessment of the survival rate of female specimens used in the ranching operation.</p>	<p>the Scientific Authority developed a 12-year rotation system whereby collectors are allocated sites that are divided in 12 sectors. Annual harvests move from one sector to the next to return to the first sector after 12 years. Long-term studies have shown that this approach causes minimal impacts and does not disturb the age-sex composition of the targeted populations.</p> <p>UZ is of the opinion that population numbers of <i>T. horsfieldii</i> are high, and that an annual harvest of 1-2 % is not detrimental to the wild population. The accompanying management measures and ongoing monitoring provide further assurances that the current quotas are scientifically justified and sustainable.</p> <p>The Authorities report that, owing to stronger Customs controls and participation of Gosbiocontrol, illegal exports of tortoises from UZ have significantly reduced since 2009. As the number of private companies exporting tortoises increased in recent years, controls by Gosbiocontrol inspectors have expanded in response.</p> <p>Concerning recommendation b):</p> <p>The ranching operations are reported to result in a decrease of the annual export of wild tortoises from Uzbekistan. This is true for the years 2003-2008; however, from 2008, the export quota of wild tortoise has increased. Details of the females specimens used in the ranching operations have been reported and monitored. An optimized protocol using oxytocin is used to stimulate oviposition, and then the female is marked and returned to the wild. Every year after that, attempts are made to capture the same females. It is reported that there is no change in the number of eggs recovered from one year to the next from the females repeatedly captured.</p> <p>Eggs used in the ranching programmes come from the brood stock of the hatcheries, but more importantly from collection in the wild (ratio of 1:10). Eggs are collected from wild females in areas with high population densities. The harvest is regulated and subject to annual quotas and permits. The females are tested for their readiness to lay eggs, injected with oxytocin (a gonadotropic hormone widely used in veterinary practices for stimulating the passage of eggs if these are retained in oviducts) and, after the egg production labelled, and released back in the wild. The eggs hatch in incubators. Long-term</p>	

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
	<p>studies on the effect of the gonadotropic hormone on the reproduction of animals in captivity and observations in the wild (recapture of marked females used before) showed that the induced egg production did not affect the reproductive ability of captive or wild females, even when applied repeatedly for many years. Females usually produce 2 eggs (1 to 6), and the viability of the females or the eggs did not deteriorate over the years. These findings concur with those of other researchers.</p> <p>The CITES Scientific Authority, in collaboration with Gosbiocontrol, launched a programme in Spring 2011 to release annually 3-5 % of the tortoises reared in the hatcheries from wild-harvested eggs. Tortoises grown to over 7 cm were released at sites where the egg harvesting took place (previous attempts to release tortoises of a smaller size failed as most died due to weather conditions, predation, trampling by cattle, etc.).</p> <p>UZ submitted good identification materials to distinguish wild <i>Testudo horsfieldii</i> from captive-bred and ranched specimens. This may otherwise be problematic, although differentiation is possible with training.</p>	
<b><i>Amyda cartilaginea</i> (Asiatic softshell turtle)</b>		
<p><b>Indonesia (ID) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p><u>For submission by the deadline of documents to AC26 (by 15 January 2012):</u></p> <p>a) Consider revision of the current export quota for wild specimens, taking into account both harvest for domestic consumption and export, based on available estimates of sustainable offtake and scientific information, forward the quota details, including how the quota is divided by province or district, to the Secretariat; and provide information and data used by the Scientific Authority to</p>	<p>ID submitted general information and several reports to the Secretariat, addressing the short-term recommendations of the Animals Committee to be implemented by 15 January 2012.</p> <p>Concerning recommendation a):</p> <p>The export quota for specimens of wild origin was revised, taking account of harvest quotas and brief surveys that were conducted in the course of 2009-2011 in six of the 14 provinces where the species is collected. The revision concluded that the national annual quotas for wild <i>A. cartilaginea</i> could remain at the same levels established since 2008, i.e. a harvest quota of 28,000 specimens and an export quota of 25,200 specimens. These levels are considered not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild. However, based on the results of the</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The short-term recommendations of the Animals Committee have been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The Standing Committee is requested to take note of the progress that Indonesia has made in implementing the short-term recommendations of the Animals Committee concerning</b></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>determine that the quantities would not be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild;</p> <p>b) Provide the Secretariat and the AC Chair with:</p> <p>i) English translations of the survey reports for West Kalimantan, South Sumatra, Riau and Jambi;</p> <p>ii) data on the size distribution of animals in trade; and</p> <p>iii) a detailed explanation how survey data are used to establish the quota;</p>	<p>surveys, harvest quotas were adjusted and re-distributed among 14 provinces where capture takes place, the details of which were provided to the Secretariat.</p> <p>Concerning recommendation b):</p> <p>i) The following reports were submitted in English:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Asiatic soft-shell turtle (<i>Amyda cartilaginea</i>) population survey for sustainable harvest in West Sumatra, Indonesia, R. Mumpuni <i>et al.</i>, 2011</li> <li>– Harvest, population and natural history of soft-shell turtle (<i>Amyda cartilaginea</i>) in South Sumatra, Jambi and Riau provinces, Indonesia, R. Mumpuni, 2010</li> <li>– Selected demography of harvested soft shell turtles in Sambas and Ketapang, West Kalimantan, L. Lilly <i>et al.</i>, 2011</li> <li>– <i>Amyda cartilaginea</i> in Indonesia: A review of its natural history and harvest, M. Kusruni <i>et al.</i>, 2012 (draft manuscript).</li> </ul> <p>ii) The general information and reports mentioned above contain data on the size distribution of animals that are harvested and traded.</p> <p>iii) ID provided a detailed explanation on the establishment of harvest quotas from which export quotas are derived, and how survey data should be applied in the process. However, the extrapolation of very limited survey results to determine provincial and national harvest quotas as well as export quotas requires further examination. ID acknowledges that more surveys need to be conducted, suggesting a phased approach of one or two per year in different provinces, and requests financial assistance in that regard. The Secretariat notes that it would also be recommendable to agree on an effective survey methodology. A further concern is that, according to one of the reports mentioned above, the estimated number of harvest turtles in the three provinces that it studied exceeded the provincial annual harvest quota in 2010 (in one instance fivefold).</p>	<p><b>A. <i>cartilaginea</i>.</b></p> <p>The information and studies submitted by Indonesia contain practical recommendations that would support and facilitate the implementation of the long-term recommendations formulated by the Animals Committee, and strengthen the making of non-detriment findings. <b>The Standing Committee is recommended to encourage ID to follow up on these recommendations, and the Secretariat to support Indonesia in this regard.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p><u>Within 18 months (by 4 May 2013):</u></p> <p>c) Explain how captive-bred specimens are distinguished in trade from wild-harvested animals, and how their production is incorporated into quota and overall trade calculations;</p> <p>d) Establish a detailed monitoring programme for <i>A. cartilaginea</i> at representative sites, including sites where active harvest takes place, sites where harvest took place in the past, and sites (protected areas) where no significant recent harvest has taken place; report to the Animals Committee on the monitoring programme; initiate a detailed study of the population dynamics of <i>A. cartilaginea</i>, including growth rate, size and age at maturity, average annual reproductive output, and annual survivorship of different age classes; demonstrate how the findings of the monitoring programme and population dynamics study will be used to establish adaptive management programmes for harvesting of and trade in <i>A. cartilaginea</i> including changes to the conservative annual export quota; and</p> <p>e) Work with UNEP-WCMC to evaluate trade data to explain the discrepancy between UNEP-WCMC CITES trade database and Indonesian exports reported in Indonesia's intervention at AC25.</p>		



Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<b><i>Mantella crocea</i> (eastern golden frog), <i>M. expectata</i> (blue-legged mantella) and <i>M. viridis</i> (green golden frog)</b>		
<p><b>Madagascar (MG) (possible concern)</b></p> <p><u>By 22 July 2011:</u></p> <p>a) a zero quota should be established immediately.</p> <p><u>By 15 January 2012:</u></p> <p>b) Madagascar should find the resources for a long-term standardized monitoring programme for the three species to be able</p>	<p>MG has established zero export quotas for the three species, as recommended. For <i>Mantella expectata</i>, it has submitted the required information concerning its compliance with the other recommendations by the agreed deadline. Finally, it has provided a full justification for establishing an export quota of 250 live specimens in 2012 and 2013 for <i>Mantella expectata</i>, while retaining zero export quotas for <i>M. crocea</i> and <i>M. viridis</i> in 2012.</p> <p>Concerning recommendation a):</p> <p>Already prior to the recommendation by the Animals Committee, MG had notified the Secretariat on 14 July 2011 of the establishment of zero annual export quotas for the three <i>Mantella</i> species concerned. These quotas were subsequently published on the CITES website.</p> <p>Concerning recommendation b):</p> <p>– As there are few monitoring programmes for vertebrates in the country because of a lack of funding, MG notes that expecting it</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Recommendation a) of the Animals Committee has been complied with for <i>Mantella crocea</i>, <i>M. expectata</i> and <i>M. viridis</i>.</p> <p>Recommendations b) to d) have been complied with for <i>M. expectata</i>.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p>In compliance with paragraph r) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the Secretariat has, following consultation with the Chair of the Animals Committee, notified the Party that <i>Mantella expectata</i> was removed from the review.</p> <p><b>The Standing Committee is invited to take note of the information regarding <i>M. expectata</i>.</b></p> <p><b>The Standing Committee should recommend that Madagascar implement recommendations b) to d) of the Animals Committee before exports of <i>Mantella crocea</i> or <i>M. viridis</i> can take place, and that the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairman of the Animals Committee, should determine compliance with these recommendations.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>to monitor the population trends in protected and unprotected areas and the effect of trade, should it be resumed. Reference to such a standardized monitoring programme may be found in the publication <i>Measuring and Monitoring Biological Diversity – Standard Methods for Amphibians</i>, which is referenced in document AC24 Doc. 9.1, page 25;</p>	<p>to launch long-term standardized monitoring programmes for three frog species to enable modest international trade appears rather ambitious and potentially beyond what MG needs to deliver in order to comply with the provisions in Article IV of the Convention for trade in these species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– MG has been unable to find the resources to launch a long-term standardized monitoring programme for <i>M. viridis</i> and <i>M. crocea</i> till now, but it reported on the results of a long-term research project on <i>M. expectata</i> that started in 2004 and provided helpful information for the making of non-detriment findings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>M. expectata</i>, which has a distinctive coloration, is currently considered endemic to the Isalo massif in the mid-West of MG.</li> <li>• Small pools inside rocky canyons and temporary streams exposed to the sun are its preferred habitat. Reproduction lasts from September to December. Eggs are laid under rocks or in humid cavities and hung on the walls of canyons. The species can withstand regular fires and has a life strategy well adapted to the dry arid grasslands and rocky canyons of the Isalo massif.</li> <li>• The northern portion of its range is protected in the Isalo National Park where all harvest is prohibited.</li> <li>• The species is listed as ‘Endangered’ on the IUCN Red List (previously considered ‘Critically endangered’). The main confirmed threats are declines in its habitat (harvest is considered a potential threat).</li> <li>• <i>M. expectata</i> has a short breeding season timed to coincide with the early wet season. Surveys for <i>M. expectata</i> during this period have revealed a high local abundance (300 individuals in 100 m<sup>2</sup>), even in sites that were subject to harvest when the annual export quota was of 1,000 specimens.</li> <li>• Work in MG is ongoing on a Population Viability Analysis (PVA) to investigate the impact of trade on <i>Mantella</i> species, which will be used to inform future revisions to the annual</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Recommendations by the Animals Committee		Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>c) on the basis of the information received and the results stemming from these programmes, such as population estimates and NDFs, precautionary quotas may be set in the future; and</p>	<p>quota for these species. Although difficult to estimate, experts believe there are between 200 and 10,000 sub-populations of <i>M. expectata</i>. With a mean sub-population size of 700 frogs, the total population size may be between 140,000 and 7,000,000 frogs. Preliminary results of a PVA for <i>M. expectata</i> indicate that a quota of 250 specimens would be sustainable if there were a single, isolated, subpopulation of 1,096 animals. Additional modeling over the next year will help to refine this assessment and investigate additional scenarios.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– MG argues that it has fulfilled recommendation b) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an ongoing long-term research project on <i>M. expectata</i> by a team of scientists from Italy, Germany and Madagascar which meets the recommendation for “a long-term standardized monitoring programme”;</li> <li>• Research has been conducted throughout the confirmed range of <i>M. expectata</i>, including sites both inside Isalo National Park (where no harvest is allowed) and outside, which meets the recommendation to “monitor the population trends in protected and unprotected areas and the effect of trade.”;</li> <li>• The methods used (e.g. breeding site surveys) are included in the publication suggested by the Animals Committee, and the research was conducted by experienced herpetologists while the results are published in peer-reviewed journals; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Researchers familiar with the species consider previous levels of commercial collection to have been non-detrimental to wild populations.</p> <p>Concerning recommendation c):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– MG has decided to establish an export quota of 250 live specimens of <i>M. expectata</i>, only, and to maintain a zero export quota for <i>M. crocea</i> and <i>M. viridis</i> in 2012.</li> <li>– <i>M. expectata</i> is one of Madagascar’s best studied amphibians. Over the course of the last decade, published research has</li> </ul>	

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
	<p>revealed that it occurs widely outside of Isalo National Park, is locally abundant and is tolerant of habitat degradation. Recent evidence indicates that a quota of 250 specimens is sustainable, and so would a larger quota as long as the harvest is not restricted to on a small number of subpopulations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Recent research on this species concluded that (i) harvest of <i>M. expectata</i> was concentrated outside of Isalo National Park and (ii) no detrimental impact was evident on the species when the annual export quota was 1,000 (i.e. prior to the recommendations of the Animals Committee); and (iii) PVA analysis indicates that a quota of 250 specimens from two or three subpopulations would be sustainable.</li> <li>– Further details regarding information received and the establishment of precautionary quotas for <i>M. expectata</i> are provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legal context: <i>M. expectata</i> is classified as a Category-1, Class-II species in the National Wildlife Law under Decree 2006-400. This allows for harvest from the wild under authorization from the CITES Management Authority in all areas except privately owned or leased land and strictly protected areas. Permits issued by the Management Authority state that harvest is only permitted outside of protected areas. Madagascar National Park staff is responsible for ensuring that there is no collection inside Isalo National Park.</li> <li>• Legal and illegal trade: The CITES Trade Database reveals a gradual decline in the number of <i>M. expectata</i> exported for commercial trade since 2005, even before Madagascar established the precautionary quota of 250 specimens in 2009. This is most likely explained by reduced commercial demand rather than a result of excessive harvest, because biologists reported ostensibly healthy populations in harvesting sites before 2009.</li> <li>• Scientific basis for quota of 250 specimens: The formula that the CITES Authorities in MG use for calculating quotas gives an annual quota of 5,113 individuals for <i>M. expectata</i>. MG</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Recommendations by the Animals Committee		Determination of implementation and actions recommended
	<p>proposes to re-establish a precautionary quota of 250 specimens, with a view to reviewing this after 2013 as more information becomes available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– With regard to non-detriment findings, MG advises that its Scientific Authority (Fauna) states that an annual export quota of 250 live <i>M. expectata</i> is non-detrimental for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Co-Chair of the Madagascar Section of the IUCN/SSC Amphibian Specialist Group, who worked on <i>M. expectata</i> for over 10 years and is the world's authority on this species, states that the populations outside of Isalo National Park can sustain a harvest of at least 1,000 specimens per year without any detrimentally impact, and he endorses the precautionary quota of 250 specimens proposed by MG. This is supported by recent PVA modeling that shows that the species supports modest-to-high offtake as long as collection efforts are distributed among different subpopulations (and a quota of 250 can be achieved from 2-3 sub-populations).</li> <li>• The quota is divided between the commercial operators (max. 16) and each is therefore permitted to harvest and export a relatively small number of frogs. When the relevant authorization to harvest is requested from the Management Authority, the Scientific Authority will provide a list of localities for allocation of frog harvests to each operator.</li> <li>• The species has a distinctive coloration and, even though some colour morphs resemble <i>M. betsileo</i>, the latter species is widespread, not threatened, and has its own export quota of 6,840 specimens in 2011. Therefore, potential confusion does not threaten either species.</li> <li>• The Scientific Authority (Fauna) of MG and its partners produced an identification guide to <i>Mantella</i> frogs, including <i>M. expectata</i>.</li> <li>• Permits issued by the Management Authority clearly stipulate that collection is only allowed outside of Isalo National Park.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>d) adaptive management strategies should be implemented.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The species is abundant in almost all of the sites where it has been found. This local abundance and wide distribution on the Isalo massif, coupled with high fecundity indicate that the species could withstand modest harvest levels.</li> <li>• The quota of 250 specimens is less than the historical quota of 1,000 (which was already widely reported as sustainable, including in scientific literature of 2008). It is precautionary as ongoing research indicates that the species could sustain much higher levels of harvest if the harvest were distributed amongst different subpopulations.</li> </ul> <p>It is proposed to discuss with the commercial collectors the best approach to achieving spatially separation of harvesting efforts in filling the quota.</p> <p>Concerning recommendation d):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– MG states to already use an adaptive management strategy. Following concern raised by the Animals Committee, it proposed to reduce the quota for <i>M. expectata</i> from 1,000 to 250. When it later became evident, based on the results of long-term research, that the species was less threatened than previously assumed (it was reclassified from ‘Critically Endangered’ to ‘Endangered’) and also tolerant of harvest, MG increased the quota using the revised data. Given that scientific results and knowledge show that <i>M. expectata</i> is a species that can tolerate export quota of 1,000 specimens, an externally imposed zero export quota would prevent MG from implementing an adaptive management approach. MG set an entirely precautionary quota, and committed to review the implementation of necessary measures in 2014 to ensure that harvest and export of this species are in accordance with CITES and national legislation. Additional information on PVA modeling, as well as biological data from the field will also be available by 2014. Based on the principles of adaptive management, the annual export quota will be retained, increased or decreased in 2014 based on the new information.</li> </ul>	

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<b><i>Scaphiophryne gottlebei</i> (red rain frog)</b>		
<p><b>Madagascar (MG) (possible concern)</b></p> <p><u>Within 90 jours (by 4 January 2012):</u></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p>a) Provide justification for, and details of, the scientific basis by which, it has been established that the current quota for wild is not detrimental to the survival of the species and in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3; and</p>	<p>MG submitted biological information on the species, including new findings that were not available at the time the species was reviewed by the Animals Committee; and a full justification for maintaining the export quota at 250 live specimens in 2011, 2012 and 2013, noting that this will be revised in 2014 as it is believed that the species can withstand higher levels of harvest.</p> <p>Concerning recommendation a):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>S. gottlebei</i> is a mainly nocturnal frog that occurs in deep canyons and breeds in ephemeral rocky pools. It remains buried underground, or in cavities, during long dry spells and emerges for a short time for breeding during the onset of heavy rains. The species is short lived (two years) and an explosive breeder with relatively high fecundity.</li> <li>– Recent research revealed that the species, whilst a local endemic, occurs in several sites on the Isalo Massif, both inside and outside Isalo National Park, i.e. a much wider distribution than previously assumed.</li> <li>– Most of the breeding sites are quite inaccessible. As recently shown by a radio-telemetry study, adults remain in narrow canyons and rock crevices, and are highly secretive, making detection and extraction extremely difficult outside of the few days when the frogs are mating.</li> <li>– While it is difficult to obtain reliable estimates of the population abundance of this species, owing to its breeding activity being restricted to very short and sporadic periods in ephemeral ponds that are difficult to access, it is stated that it is locally abundant in canyons.</li> <li>– The impact of collection for the pet trade is poorly understood, but export quotas of up to 1,000 specimens per year are unlikely to pose a threat to the species. The main threat to this species is from sapphire mining and water extraction.</li> </ul>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Animals Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The recommendations of the Animals Committee have been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p>In compliance with paragraph r) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the Secretariat has, following consultation with the Chair of the Standing Committee, notified the Party that the species was removed from the review.</p> <p><b>The Standing Committee is invited to take note of this information.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Animals Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>b) Maintain the export quota at current levels or lower for wild specimens.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Collection of the species occurs outside Isalo National Park and focuses on the abundant metamorphs during dispersal away from the natal breeding ponds, a time when they undergo high natural mortality.</li> <li>– The CITES authorities in MG use a formula to calculate annual quota with values that are the best scientific information available, resulting in a quota of 292 individuals. A precautionary level of 250 was decided. The Management Authority provided full details on the formula and the values that had been applied.</li> </ul> <p>Concerning recommendation b):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– MG is of the opinion that a quota of 250 live <i>S. gottlebei</i> is not detrimental to the survival of the species, and in compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3. The quota of 250 live specimens will be maintained in 2012 and 2013, but because this species appears able to withstand a higher harvest, it will review the quota again for 2014.</li> <li>– The quota is based on the best available scientific data. MG points out that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– the species has a unique appearance that enables easy identification by non-specialists;</li> <li>– it is a highly fecund species that produces large numbers of tadpoles each year;</li> <li>– traditional commercial collection sites are outside Isalo National Park and target newly metamorphosed specimens (which suffer high natural mortality);</li> <li>– the legal protection of the species allows controlled harvest on non-protected public land (permits stipulate that collection is only allowed outside Isalo National Park, which has staff to prevent collection inside the Park); and</li> <li>– experts who studied <i>S. gottlebei</i> for over 10 years endorse the precautionary quota of 250 used by Madagascar.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



## Flora

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p><i>Euphorbia alfredii</i>, <i>E. aureoviridiflora</i>, <i>E. berorohae</i>, <i>E. bulbispina</i>, <i>E. capmanambatoensis</i>, <i>E. hofstaetteri</i>, <i>E. horombensis</i>, <i>E. iharanae</i>, <i>E. leuconeura</i>, <i>E. mahabobokensis</i>, <i>E. mangokyensis</i>, <i>E. pachypodioides</i>, <i>E. paulianii</i>, <i>E. primulifolia</i>, <i>E. robivelonae</i>, <i>E. rossii</i> (Euphorbias)</p>		
<p><b>Madagascar (MG) (Urgent concern)</b></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p><u>Within 3 months (by 8 September 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Establish a voluntary export quota system;</p> <p>b) Put in place a zero export quota for wild specimens;</p> <p>c) Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website; and</p> <p>d) Before trade may be reopened, the Secretariat should be informed of the process used to make non-detriment findings.</p>	<p>a) MG has established a voluntary export quota system for euphorbias and submitted the information to the Secretariat;</p> <p>b) A zero export quota for wild specimens has not been set officially. However, no export permits have been granted over the last five years since only artificially propagated plants are being produced for export purposes;</p> <p>c) and</p> <p>d) No non-detriment finding is being done for these taxa. Verification of the nurseries growing the plants is carried out jointly by the Management Authority and the Scientific Authority. Thirteen species of <i>Euphorbia</i> are highly traded (although it is not clear whether nationally or internationally): <i>E. ankarensis</i>, <i>E. horombensis</i>, <i>E. pachypodioides</i>, <i>E. bongolavensis</i>, <i>E. kondoii</i>, <i>E. primulifolia</i>, <i>E. guillauminiana</i>, <i>E. labatii</i>, <i>E. rossii</i>, <i>E. herman schwartzii</i>, <i>E. lophogona</i>, <i>E. suzannae-marnieri</i>, <i>E. waringae</i> and <i>E. horombensis</i>, <i>E. pachypodioides</i> and <i>E. primulifolia</i>, are on the list.</p> <p>Since there are no scientific data available for the majority of the species do not have, MG has submitted a project proposal to the Secretariat that will be funded through its capacity-building programme to generate this information.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>MG has made a lot of progress with identifying those species that are a priority owing to the strong demand on the market for these plants. It has demonstrated willingness to generate the information needed to make the non-detriment finding for wild populations. Action towards the implementation of these recommendations has been undertaken but further progress is required. At the time of writing (May 2012) no information on recommendations b) and c) had been submitted. Those species which are listed as highly traded could be considered as a priority for further action.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations a), b) and c) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendation d) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>Euphorbia alfredii</i>, <i>E. aureoviridiflora</i>, <i>E. berorohae</i>, <i>E. bulbispina</i>,</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		<p><i>E. capmanambatoensis, E. hofstaetteri, E. horombensis, E. iharanae, E. leuconeura, E. mahabobokensis, E. mangokyensis, E. pachypodioides, E. paulianii, E. primulifolia, E. robivelonae and E. rossii</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</p>
<i>Marojejya darianii</i>		
<p><b>Madagascar (MG) (Urgent concern)</b></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p><u>Within 3 months (by 8 September 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Establish a voluntary export quota system and put in place a zero export quota for wild live specimens of plants. Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website. Before trade may be reopened, the Secretariat should be informed of the process used to make non-detriments finding;</p> <p>b) Review the available information on the productivity, viability and generation of seeds of wild specimens and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota for wild seeds. Inform the CITES Secretariat of this</p>	<p>a) There are only 80 mature trees producing seeds. No other information under this recommendation has been submitted by MG;</p> <p>b) Most of the populations of this species are found in the protected areas of Masoala and Betampona. Most of the information submitted on this species concerns the number of seeds produced, harvestable, etc. The MG Scientific Authority estimates that 40 % of the seeds are harvestable, i.e 17,280 seeds or 38 kg;</p> <p>The Secretariat understands that a zero export quota is being</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Regarding recommendations a) to c):</p> <p>a) MG should provide more detailed information on the status of the population;</p> <p>b) The one paragraph report on this species and the numbers used to calculate the total volume of minimum seeds available per year should be completed with more data; this recommendation has been partially complied with. MG should</p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>quota so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website; and</p> <p>c) Prepare a draft management plan for trade in seeds of wild palms under review and present it at the 20th meeting of the CITES Plants Committee for review.</p>	<p>proposed by the Scientific Authority;</p> <p>c) A copy of the management plan for the conservation of palms in MG has been submitted to the Secretariat. Document PC20 Inf. 11, Annex 6 contains a <i>Guide pour l'identification des graines de palmiers malgaches commercialisées</i>.</p>	<p>communicate officially to the Secretariat the establishment of the zero export quota for the export of wild seeds. The source of the numbers quoted for productivity, viability and generation of seeds is not clear; and</p> <p>c) The recommendation on the management plan has been partially fulfilled. MG has nevertheless demonstrated that it has some information to set an annual harvest and export quota for both live plants and seeds. It will also be implementing the management plan that identifies actors and priorities. MG has submitted a project proposal to the Secretariat that will be funded through its capacity-building programme to generate some of the biological, ecological and trade information that is missing or that should be completed.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendation a) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>M. darianii</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<b>to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</b>		
<i>Voanioala gerardii</i>		
<p><b>Madagascar (MG) (Urgent concern)</b>  The Management Authority should:  <u>Within 3 months (by 8 September 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Establish a voluntary export quota system and put in place a zero export quota for wild live specimens of plants. Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website. Before trade may be reopened, the Secretariat should be informed of the process under which the non-detriment finding was made;</p> <p>b) Review the available information on the productivity, viability and generation of seeds of wild specimens and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota for wild seeds. Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website;</p>	<p>a) No information under this recommendation has been submitted by MG;</p> <p>b) There are only 15 mature trees producing seeds and 7 of them are reproductive. All estimations for this species have been made on the basis of the information for mature trees in the Masoala National Park. Most of the information submitted on this species is composed by numbers of seeds produced, harvestable etc. The Scientific Authority estimates that 40 % of the seeds are harvestable and that equals 672 seeds, which equals 42 kg;   A zero export quota is being proposed by the Scientific Authority.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Regarding recommendations a) to c):</p> <p>a) Recommendation not complied with;</p> <p>b) The one paragraph report on this species and their numbers used to calculate the total volume of minimum seeds available per year should be completed with more data; this recommendation has been partially fulfilled; the MG should communicate officially to the Secretariat the establishment of the zero export quota for the export of wild seeds. Where the numbers quoted for productivity, viability and generation of seeds resulted, is not clear; and</p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>c) Prepare a draft management plan for trade in wild seeds of palms under review and present it to the 20th meeting of the CITES Plants Committee for review.</p>	<p>c) A copy of the management plan for the conservation of palms in MG has been submitted to the Secretariat. Document PC20 Inf. 11, Annex 6 submitted a <i>Guide pour l'identification des graines de palmiers malgaches commercialisées</i> at PC20.</p>	<p>c) Recommendation on the management plan has been partially fulfilled. Although the MG has not fully complied with the recommendations, it has demonstrated that it has some information as to set an annual harvest and export quota for both live plants and seeds; also it will be implementing the management plan that identifies actors and priorities. Madagascar has submitted a project proposal to the Secretariat that will be funded through its capacity-building programme to generate some of the biological, ecological and trade information that is missing or that should be completed.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendation a) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>V. gerardii</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<b><i>Euphorbia banae</i>, <i>E. biaculeata</i>, <i>E. capuronii</i>, <i>E. denisiana</i>, <i>E. didiereoides</i>, <i>E. elliotii</i>, <i>E. herman-schwartzii</i>, <i>E. neobosseri</i> (Euphorbias)</b>		
<p><b>Madagascar (MG) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p><u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p> <p>b) Review the available information on the conservation, cultivation and trade status of the species concerned and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota; and</p> <p>c) Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website.</p>	<p>a) Since the majority of <i>Euphorbia</i> species do not have scientific data available, MG has submitted a project proposal to the Secretariat that will be funded through its capacity-building programme to generate this missing information. No NDF is being made at the moment for specimens taken from the wild; and</p> <p>b) and c) MG has submitted information on the cultivation of and trade in several species. MG reported that <i>E. herman-schwartzii</i> was highly traded (although it is not clear whether nationally or internationally), but has not informed the Secretariat that it had put in place any conservative quota.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>MG has made a lot of progress with identifying those species that are a priority owing to the strong demand on the market for these plants. It has demonstrated willingness to generate the information needed to make the NDF. Action towards the implementation of these recommendations has been undertaken but further progress is required. At the time of writing (May 2012), no information on recommendations b) and c) had been submitted. <i>E. herman schwartzii</i>, which is listed as highly traded, could be considered as a priority for further action.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendation a) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>Euphorbia banae</i>, <i>E. biaculeata</i>, <i>E. capuronii</i>, <i>E. denisiana</i>, <i>E. didiereoides</i>, <i>E. elliotii</i>, <i>E. herman-schwartzii</i> and <i>E. neobosseri</i> from MG</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		<p>until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</p>
<i>Aloe capitata</i>		
<p><b>Madagascar (MG) (Possible concern)</b>  <u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u>                      The Management Authority should:</p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p> <p>b) Review the available information on the conservation, cultivation and trade status of the species concerned and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota; and</p> <p>c) Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website.</p>	<p>a) MG has submitted partial information (see below); and                      c)</p> <p>b) Germination of <i>Aloe</i> species is considered 100 % successful, that is one <i>Aloe</i> seed produces one plant. There are four varieties: <i>var. capitata</i>, <i>var. Angavoana</i>, <i>var. Quartziticola</i> and <i>var. silvicola</i>. Distribution: confined to the high plateaux from Antananarivo to Fianarantsoa. A population of <i>Aloe capitata</i> produces on average 3,000 seeds.</p> <p>Proposal for an export quota: 3,000 seeds (or plants) annually.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Some action towards the implementation of these recommendations has been undertaken but further progress is required. Efforts have been made to set a conservative quota based on the information available to the Scientific Authority, discussions are ongoing with the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee. At the time of writing (May 2012) no information on recommendations a) and c) had been submitted, and some information on recommendation b) had been provided.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendation a) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		<p>suspend trade in all specimens of <i>A. capitata</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</p>
<i>Aloe conifera</i>		
<p><u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</li> <li>b) Review the available information on the conservation, cultivation and trade status of the species concerned and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota; and</li> <li>c) Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) MG has submitted partial information (see below); and</li> <li>c)</li> <li>b) The best known type population produces 1,300 seeds in one harvest. There are two known populations that produce about 2,600 seeds. Threats: Two sites are known to still contain these species, but one is now threatened by granite exploitation, bush-fires and illegal harvesting. Distribution: Confined to high plateaux between Antsirabe and Ambositra. Proposal for an export quota: 650 seeds (or plants) annually, i.e. 25 % of the seed production.</li> </ul>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Some action towards the implementation of these recommendations has been undertaken but further progress is required. Efforts have been made to set a conservative quota based on the information available to the Scientific Authority, discussions are ongoing with the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee. At the time of writing (May 2012) no information on recommendation a) and c) had been submitted, and some information on recommendation b) had been provided.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendation a) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants</b></p>



Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		<p>Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>A. conifera</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</p>
<i>Aloe deltoideodonta</i>		
<p><u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p> <p>b) Review the available information on the conservation, cultivation and trade status of the species concerned and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota; and</p> <p>c) Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website.</p>	<p>a) MG has submitted partial information on these and recommendations; and</p> <p>c)</p> <p>b) There are five varieties and subspecies: var. <i>amboahangyensis</i>, var. <i>brevifolia</i>, var. <i>candicans</i>, <i>ruffingiana</i>, var. <i>fallax</i>, var. <i>intermedia</i>. Distribution: very large, from Fort-Dauphin to Ambalavao. Data insufficient to propose a quota.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>MG has explained that there is not enough information available on this species to make a non-detriment finding or set a harvest or export quota.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendation a) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>A. deltoideodonta</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.
<i>Aloe erythrophylla</i>		
<p><u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p> <p>b) Review the available information on the conservation, cultivation and trade status of the species concerned and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota; and</p> <p>c) Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website.</p>	<p>a) MG has submitted partial information (see below); and and c)</p> <p>b) A population produces on average 2,000 seeds in one harvest. The species is known to occur in one location only: Itremo. Proposal for an export quota: 500 seeds (or plants) annually, i.e. 25 % of the seed production.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Although MG has not complied with recommendations a) and c), it has demonstrated that it has the information needed to set an annual harvest and export quota, discussions about a conservative export quota are ongoing with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendation a) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>A. erythrophylla</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<i>Aloe guillaumetii</i>		
<p><u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p> <p>b) Review the available information on the conservation, cultivation and trade status of the species concerned and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota; and</p> <p>c) Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website.</p>	<p>a) MG has submitted partial information (see below); and and c)</p> <p>b) A population produces on average 2,000 seeds in one harvest. The species is known to occur in one location only: Ambilobe. The species propagates easily by offsets. Proposal for an export quota: 1,000 seeds (or plants) annually, i.e. 50 % of the seed production.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Although MG has not complied with recommendations a) and c), it has demonstrated that it has information to set an annual harvest and export quota, discussions on a conservative export quota are ongoing with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendation a) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>A. guillaumetii</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<b><i>Aloe humbertii</i></b>		
<p><u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p> <p>b) Review the available information on the conservation, cultivation and trade status of the species concerned and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota; and</p> <p>c) Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website.</p>	<p>a) MG has submitted partial information (see below); and and c)</p> <p>b) The species is known to occur in one location only: National Park of Andohahela. Proposal for an export quota: zero quota.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Although MG has not complied with recommendations a) and c), it has demonstrated that it has information to propose a zero export quota. However, this has not been submitted to the Secretariat.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>MG should communicate to the Secretariat a zero export quota for specimens of <i>A. humbertii</i> from MG and this should be published on the CITES website.</b></p> <p><b>If MG seeks to recommence exports of specimens of this species, it should first provide information to the Secretariat on how the Plants Committee's recommendations have been implemented.</b></p>
<b><i>Aloe imalotensis</i></b>		
<p><u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>The Management Authority should :</p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p> <p>b) Review the available information on the conservation, cultivation and trade status of the species concerned and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat</p>	<p>a) MG has submitted partial information (see below); and and c)</p> <p>b) Seven known locations, each location contains on average three to four specimens that produce around 800 and 4,000 seeds. The seven populations should produce between 5,600 and 28,000 seeds. Distribution: from Isalo to Beza Antanosy in the</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Although MG has not complied with recommendations a) and c), it has demonstrated that it has information to set an annual harvest and export quota, discussions on a conservative export quota are ongoing with the Secretariat and the</p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota; and</p> <p>c) Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website.</p>	<p>south and Makay in the west. Proposal for an export quota: 3,000 seeds (or plants) annually.</p>	<p>Chair of the Plants Committee.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendation a) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>A. imalotensis</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</b></p>
<b><i>Beccariophoenix madagascariensis</i></b>		
<p><b>Madagascar (MG) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p><u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p>	<p>a) MG has reported on an outline of the methodology used to make NDFs. National specialists have been working with the Scientific Authority to work on setting the quotas for seeds;</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Regarding recommendations a) to d):</p> <p>a) The report on the methodology submitted by MG should provide more details on the status of the populations of this species and the numbers used to calculate the minimum total volume of seeds available per year;</p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>b) Establish a voluntary export quota system and put in place a conservative export quota for wild live specimens of plants. Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website;</p> <p>c) Review the available information on the productivity, viability and generation of seeds of wild plants and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota for wild seeds. Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website; and</p> <p><u>Within 9 months (by 8 March 2012)</u></p> <p>d) Prepare a draft management plan for trade in wild seeds of palms under review and present it the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Plants Committee for review.</p>	<p>b) No information has been submitted under this recommendation;</p> <p>c) 60 % of the seeds produced could be harvested, that is 378,000 seeds (about 1200 kg). However, an export quota of 800 kg of seeds is proposed by the Scientific Authority; and</p> <p>d) A copy of the management plan for the conservation of palms in Madagascar has been submitted to the Secretariat. Document PC20 Inf. 11, Annex 6, contains a <i>Guide pour l'identification des graines de palmiers malgaches commercialisées</i>.</p>	<p>b) This recommendation has not been complied with;</p> <p>c) The source of the numbers quoted for productivity, viability and generation of seeds is not clear; and</p> <p>d) The recommendation on the management plan has been partially complied with. MG has nevertheless demonstrated that it has some information to set an annual harvest and export quota for both live plants and seeds. It will also be implementing the management plan that identifies actors and priorities. MG has submitted a project proposal to the Secretariat that will be funded through its capacity-building programme to generate some of the biological, ecological and trade information that is missing or that should be completed.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		<p>recommendation a) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>B. madagascariensis</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</p>
<b><i>Lemurophoenix halleuxii</i> (red-lemur palm)</b>		
<p><b>Madagascar (MG) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p>The Management Authority should:  <u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p> <p>b) Establish a voluntary export quota system and put in place a conservative export quota for wild live specimens of plants. Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website;</p>	<p>a) MG has reported on an outline of the methodology used to make NDFs. National specialists have been working with the a Scientific Authority to work on setting the quotas for seeds;</p> <p>b) No information has been submitted under this recommendation;</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Regarding recommendations a) to d):</p> <p>a) The report on the methodology submitted by MG should provide more details on the status of the populations of this species and the numbers used to calculate the minimum total volume of seeds available per year;</p> <p>b) This recommendation has not been complied with;</p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>c) Review the available information on the productivity, viability and generation of seeds of wild plants and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota for wild seeds. Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website; and</p> <p><u>Within 9 months (8 March 2012)</u></p> <p>d) Prepare a draft management plan for trade in seeds of wild palms under review and present it at 20th meeting of the Plants Committee for review.</p>	<p>c) 60 % of the seeds produced could be harvested, that is 86,400 seeds (about 1,080 kg). So 1,000 kg of seeds are being proposed as the export quota. It is worth noting that half of the population of this species is found in the Masoala National Park and that this population is included in the proposed export quota; and</p> <p>d) A copy of the management plan for the conservation of palms in Madagascar has been submitted to the Secretariat. Document PC20 Inf. 11, Annex 6, contains a <i>Guide pour l'identification des graines de palmiers malgaches commercialisées</i>.</p>	<p>c) The source of the numbers quoted for productivity, viability and generation of seeds is not clear; and</p> <p>d) Recommendation on the management plan has been partially complied with. MG has nevertheless demonstrated that it has some information to set an annual harvest and export quota for both live plants and seeds. The proposed export quota for seeds could be revised as it is unclear whether it is possible to harvest from the populations found in the National Park. MG will be implementing the management plan that identifies actors and priorities. MG has submitted a project proposal to the Secretariat that will be funded through its capacity-building programme to generate some of the biological, ecological and trade information that is missing or that should be completed.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendation a) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants</b></p>



Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		<p><b>Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>L. halleuxii</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</b></p>
<b><i>Ravenea rivularis</i></b>		
<p><b>Madagascar (Possible concern)</b>                      The Management Authority should:  <u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p> <p>b) Establish a voluntary export quota system and put in place a conservative export quota for wild live specimens of plants. Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website;</p> <p>c) Review the available information on the productivity, viability and generation of seeds of wild plants and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota for wild seeds. Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota so</p>	<p>a) MG has reported on an outline of the methodology used to make NDFs. National specialists have been working with the Scientific Authority to work on setting the quotas for seeds;</p> <p>b) No information has been submitted under this recommendation;</p> <p>c) 80 % of the seeds produced could be harvested, that is 15,000,000 seeds (about 1800 kg). So 2000 kg of seeds are being proposed as the export quota. It is worth noting that there has been a recent discovery of another population of this species in Makay, inventories need to be made to estimate its potential productivity; and</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Regarding recommendations a) to d):</p> <p>a) The report on the methodology submitted by MG should provides more details on the status of the populations of this species and their numbers used to calculate the minimum total volume of seeds available per year;</p> <p>b) This recommendation has not been complied with;</p> <p>c) The source of the numbers quoted for productivity, viability and generation of seeds is not clear; and</p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website; and</p> <p><u>Within 9 months (8 March 2012)</u></p> <p>d) Prepare a draft management plan for trade in seeds of wild palms under review and present it at 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Plants Committee for review.</p>	<p>d) A copy of the management plan for the conservation of palms in Madagascar has been submitted to the Secretariat. Document PC20 Inf. 11, Annex 6, contains a <i>Guide pour l'identification des graines de palmiers malgaches commercialisées</i>.</p>	<p>d) Recommendation on the management plan has been partially complied with. MG has nevertheless demonstrated that it has some information to set an annual harvest and export quota for both live plants and seeds. The proposed export quota for seeds could be revised as it is unclear whether it is possible to harvest from the populations found in the National Park. MG will be implementing the management plan that identifies actors and priorities. MG has submitted a project proposal to the Secretariat that will be funded through its capacity-building programme to generate some of the biological, ecological and trade information that is missing or that should be completed.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendation a) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>R. rivularis</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		<p><b>species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</b></p>
<b><i>Satranala decussilvae</i></b>		
<p><b>Madagascar (MG) (Possible concern)</b>            The Management Authority should:  <u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p> <p>b) Establish a voluntary export quota system and put in place a conservative export quota for wild live specimens of plants. Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website;</p> <p>c) Review the available information on the productivity, viability and generation of seeds of wild plants and, based on this review and in association with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Plants Committee, put in place a conservative export quota for wild seeds. Inform the CITES Secretariat of this quota so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website; and</p>	<p>a) MG has reported on an outline of the methodology used to make NDFs. National specialists have been working with the Scientific Authority to set the quotas for seeds;</p> <p>b) No information has been submitted under this recommendation;</p> <p>c) 60 % of the seeds produced could be harvested, that is 5,400 seeds (about 120 kg). 120 kg of seeds are being proposed as the export quota. It is worth noting that parts of the populations of the species are found in protected areas (Masoala and Mananara Avaratra). It is unclear in the report how big these populations are; and</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>Regarding recommendations a) to d):</p> <p>a) The report on the methodology submitted by MG should provides more details on the status of the populations of this species and their numbers used to calculate the minimum total volume of seeds available per year;</p> <p>b) Recommendation not fulfilled;</p> <p>c) The source of the numbers quoted for productivity, viability and generation of seeds is not clear; and ere the numbers resulted from is not clear; and</p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p><u>Within 9 months (e.g. 8 March 2012)</u></p> <p>d) Prepare a draft management plan for trade in seeds of wild palms under review and present it at 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Plants Committee for review.</p>	<p>d) A copy of the management plan for the conservation of palms in Madagascar has been submitted to the Secretariat. Document PC20 Inf. 11, Annex 6, contains a <i>Guide pour l'identification des graines de palmiers malgaches commercialisées</i>.</p>	<p>d) Recommendation on the management plan has been partially complied with. MG has nevertheless demonstrated that it has some information to set an annual harvest and export quota for both live plants and seeds. The proposed export quota for seeds could be revised as it is unclear whether it is possible to harvest from the populations found in the National Park. MG will be implementing the management plan that identifies actors and priorities. MG has submitted a project proposal to the Secretariat that will be funded through its capacity-building programme to generate some of the biological, ecological and trade information that is missing or that should be completed.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations b) and c) should be extended to 30 September 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendation a) should be extended to 31 December 2013. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>S. decussilvae</i> from MG until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<b><i>Pericopsis elata</i> (African teak or afrormosia)</b>		
<p><b>Congo (CG) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p>The Management Authority should:  <u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings; and</p> <p>b) Establish a conservative harvest and export quota and inform the CITES Secretariat of the quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website.</p>	<p>a) On 29 June, CG submitted to the Secretariat a full report entitled <i>Inventaire de P. elata dans une forêt de production au Congo en vue de sa gestion durable; Avis de commerce non préjudiciable de P. elata</i>. The results of the inventory report a density of 0.26 stands/ha and, using the recovery rate as a basis for estimating the volume of <i>P. elata</i>, standing stock, a total of 13 326,55 m<sup>3</sup> was calculated, of which 10 661,24 m<sup>3</sup> is exploitable. Details on the methodology used to make this NDF were included in the report. This report is the output of one of the national activities implemented in CG under the CITES/ITTO cooperation programme on tree species and the full document is now available on the CITES/ITTO website; and</p> <p>b) Based on the results of the project mentioned in the paragraph above, CG, in consultation with the Scientific Authority concluded in October 2011, that a volume of 2 131,25 m<sup>3</sup> could be authorized for harvest in an area of 15 000 ha. In December 2011, CG communicated to the Secretariat that a volume of 863,561 m<sup>3</sup> of logs and sawn wood comprises the export quota for 2012. This has been published on the CITES website.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The recommendations of the Plants Committee have been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p>In compliance with paragraph r) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the Secretariat has, following consultation with the Chair of the Standing Committee, notified the Party that the species was removed from the review.</p> <p><b>The Standing Committee is required to take note of this information.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p><b>Democratic Republic of the Congo (CD)</b> <b>(Possible concern)</b></p> <p>The Management Authority should: <u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings; and</p> <p>b) Establish a conservative harvest and export quota and inform the CITES Secretariat of the quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website.</p>	<p>a) CD acknowledged reception of the recommendations on 9 June. It explained to the Secretariat that a proposal for a national project entitled <i>Elaboration d'un avis de commerce non préjudiciable pour P. elata en République démocratique du Congo</i>, was being submitted for consideration and funding under the CITES/ITTO cooperation programme on tree species. This activity will be funded during the second phase of the CITES/ITTO programme that started this year (2012). The implementation of the project should be starting in July 2012; and</p> <p>b) CD communicated to the CITES Secretariat an export quota of 50 000 m<sup>3</sup> in February 2011. The harvest export quota was not communicated to the Secretariat and the volume of the export quota would seem to be high even though the NDF for this quota is not available. The Secretariat asked CD for the NDF that justifies the export quota but it has not received a response. This recommendation has not been fully complied with.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>a) This recommendation has not been complied with.</p> <p>b) No harvest quota has been communicated and the proposed export quota does not appear to be "conservative" in view of the lack of non-detriment finding.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of <i>P. elata</i> from CD until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p><b>Ivory Coast (CI) (Urgent concern)</b></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p><u>Within 3 months (by 8 September 2011)</u></p> <p>Set a zero quota and inform the CITES Secretariat of it, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website. Before trade resumes, the Management Authority should clarify with the Secretariat how it determines that the level of trade is not detrimental to wild populations.</p>	<p>The short-term recommendation for CI was an urgent measure that needed to be implemented by this country to correct identified problems with the implementation of Article IV for <i>P. elata</i>.</p> <p>No response has been received by the Secretariat.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>The recommendation of the Plants Committee has not been compiled with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of <i>P. elata</i> from CI until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with recommendation of the Plants Committee.</b></p>
<b><i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> (bigleaf mahogany)</b>		
<p><b>Belize (BZ) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p><u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings; and</p> <p>b) Establish a conservative harvest and export quota and inform the CITES Secretariat of the quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website.</p>	<p>a) BZ has informed the Secretariat on the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings; and</p> <p>b) The harvesting quotas are based on a site specific compartment specific species inventory; therefore it is difficult to determine a national export quota for <i>S. macrophylla</i> distributed over 232,750 ha without conducting a national inventory. BZ has started a national evaluation for specific determination of conservative harvest and export quotas not only to meet the CITES requirements, but also to guide the national development discussions related to timber-related products. The country evaluation will be concluded by last quarter of 2012.</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>a) This recommendation has been complied with; and</p> <p>b) BZ has demonstrated willingness to fully comply with the PC recommendations and will be able to implement recommendation--- As soon as the country evaluation is concluded at the end of 2012.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p><b>Bolivia (BO) (Urgent concern)</b></p> <p>The Management Authority should:  <u>Within 3 months (by 8 September 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Set a zero quota and inform the CITES Secretariat, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website;</p> <p>b) Before trade resumes, the Management Authority should clarify with the Secretariat how it determines that the level of trade is not detrimental to wild populations; and</p> <p>c) Furthermore, BO should report on the results, recommendations and actions carried out under the CITES/ITTO cooperation project.</p>	<p>Before the Secretariat communicated the recommendations by the Plants Committee to BO on 8 June 2011, its Management Authority sent a letter to the Secretariat on 6 June acknowledging the difficulties that BO was facing and the recommendations by the PC at its 19th meeting. In that letter, BO asked the Secretariat for assistance for its Scientific Authority to train new staff in making non-detriment findings. Unfortunately, the Secretariat did not have funding as to respond positively to this request.</p> <p>a) BO communicated a zero export quota for exports of specimens of <i>S. macrophylla</i> valid from 19 September 2011. It will remain in place until its Scientific Authority has the capacity of formulating non-detriment findings for this species;</p> <p>b) BO further explained that it will be in a position to respond to this recommendation from the moment that its Scientific Authority is able to formulate non-detriment findings for this species; and</p> <p>c) BO advised on 31 August 2011 that it had received the final report on the national activity funded under the CITES/ITTO cooperation programme and that this was being evaluated. They would be</p>	<p>recommendation a) should be extended to 31 July 2012. The deadline for implementation of recommendation b) should be extended to 30 September 2012. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>S. macrophylla</i> from BZ until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</p> <p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>a) This recommendation which addresses the first point of urgent concern has been complied with; and</p> <p>b) Implementation pending. and c)</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p>



Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p><b>Ecuador (EC) (Possible concern)</b>                      The Management Authority should:  <u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p>	<p>responding to this recommendation in the following weeks.</p> <p>a) In 2009 a ministerial decree established a mid-term ban, of two years to use <i>S. macrophylla</i>. Once the two years passed, the Ministry of Environment issued a Memorandum (in February 2011) that directed the Provincial Departments of Environment, to “abstain from approving management plans and forestry production programmes that include mahogany”. This memorandum operates in practice as a continuation of the prohibition to make any use of specimens of the species. At the same time, EC has promoted the research and evaluation of its natural populations of <i>S. macrophylla</i>; this started in 2009 with the implementation of the Forestry National Evaluation with the support of FAO under its programme “FAO-Finland”. A research on ‘Identification of isotopes in samples of <i>C. odorata</i> and of <i>S. macrophylla</i> from the Equatorial Amazonia’ was also conducted;</p>	<p><b>If BO seeks to recommence exports of specimens of this species, it should first provide information to the Secretariat on how the Plants Committee’s recommendations b) and c) have been implemented.</b></p> <p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair’s determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>a) Recommendation has not been complied with. It appears that EC has establishment an export ban, but no quota has been formally notified to the Secretariat in compliance with recommendation b)</p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p>b) Establish a conservative harvest and export quota and inform the CITES Secretariat of the quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website; and</p> <p>c) Ecuador should clarify to the Secretariat whether the prohibition on export of this species remains in place.</p>	<p>b) This recommendation has not been complied with, a zero export quota could be set by Ecuador; and</p> <p>c) As mentioned under a) above, Memorandum No. MAE-D-2011-0046 dated 10 February 2011 is still valid and in force.</p>	<p>b) See above; and</p> <p>c) Recommendation has been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendation b) should be extended to 30 September 2012 to allow EC to formally communicate a zero export quota to the Secretariat. If this is not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>S. macrophylla</i> from EC until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</b></p> <p><b>Assuming this extended deadline is respected, if EC seeks to recommence exports of specimens of this species, it should first provide information to the Secretariat on how the Plants Committee’s recommendations have been fully implemented.</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p><b>Honduras (HN) (Possible concern)</b> The Management Authority should: <u>Within 6 months (i.e. by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings; and</p> <p>b) Establish a conservative harvest and export quota and inform the CITES Secretariat of the quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website.</p>	<p>a) HN explained that the non-detriment findings for this species are made using various technical instruments (e.g. manuals, copy of the transport permit, guides). HN has been working on undertaking a national inventory on mahogany; and</p> <p>b) HN has set both a harvest and export quota for 2012 for <i>S. macrophylla</i>; these are 6,397 m<sup>3</sup> and 4,066.70 m<sup>3</sup> respectively. The Secretariat is checking with HN the type of specimens that will be covered by this export quota (annotation 6 covers “logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets and plywood”).</p>	<p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>HN indicated a willingness to comply with the recommendations of the Plants Committee and has all the information needed to formulate its non-detriment findings for the exports on specimens of <i>S. macrophylla</i>. Although various communications from HN have been received, the basis for the establishment of the harvest and export quotas for 2012 has not been submitted to the Secretariat</p> <p>a) This recommendation has been partially implemented. HN has communicated to the Secretariat that it will submit the full response to recommendation a) by 15 May 2012; and</p> <p>b) The recommendation has been complied with, pending confirmation of the types of specimens that will be exported.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendations a) and b) should be extended to 30 September 2012. If these are not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>S. macrophylla</i> from HN until that country demonstrates compliance with</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
<p><b>Nicaragua (NI) (Possible concern)</b></p> <p>The Management Authority should:</p> <p><u>Within 6 months (by 8 December 2011)</u></p> <p>a) Inform the Secretariat of the methodology currently used for making non-detriment findings;</p> <p>b) Establish a conservative harvest and export quota and inform the CITES Secretariat of the quota, so that it can be included in the national export quotas on the CITES website; and</p> <p>c) Provide the Secretariat with information on the types of <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> products being exported.</p>	<p>a) In 2006, the Law on Forestry Bans No 585 entered into force for 10 years. It regulates the use of <i>S. macrophylla</i> in NI. This law prohibits all logging of and commercial trade in this species to let national populations of this species recover;</p> <p>b) In the areas affected by Hurricane Felix in September 2007 the species is recovering very quickly. For this reason, NI reports that there is a need to undertake an evaluation of the status of the populations of <i>S. macrophylla</i> and to apply the appropriate silvicultural treatments; and</p> <p>c) As mentioned under paragraph a), the forest law bans all logging and commercial trade in <i>S. macrophylla</i> until 2016. Exceptionally, wood resulting from the areas affected by Hurricane Felix, can be exported, but only if it has undergone a second or third transformation treatment.</p>	<p><b>Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3 for this species, and provides full information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</b></p> <p><u>The Secretariat and Plants Committee Chair's determination regarding implementation of the recommendations</u></p> <p>a) This recommendation has been partially complied with;</p> <p>b) This recommendation has been complied with by the establishment of the ban although a zero export quota has not been communicated to the Secretariat; and</p> <p>c) This recommendation has been complied with.</p> <p><u>Action recommended by the Secretariat</u></p> <p><b>The deadline for full implementation of recommendation b) should be extended to 30 September 2012 to allow NI to formally communicate a zero export quota to the Secretariat. If this is not implemented to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and Chair of the Plants Committee, the Standing Committee should recommend that all Parties suspend trade in all specimens of <i>S. macrophylla</i> from NI until that country demonstrates compliance with Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a) and 3, for this species, and provides full</b></p>

Recommendations by the Plants Committee	Summary of responses from range States	Determination of implementation and actions recommended
		<p>information to the Secretariat regarding compliance with the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</p> <p>Assuming this extended deadline is respected, if NI seeks to recommence exports of specimens of this species, it should first provide information to the Secretariat on how the Plants Committee's recommendations have been fully implemented.</p>