



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

**PROCEEDINGS
NINTH MEETING OF THE
PLANTS COMMITTEE**

**DARWIN, AUSTRALIA
7 - 11 JUNE 1999**

Rapporteurs
C. Salgado
J. Roberts

Prepared by the CITES Secretariat

September 1999

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
CLOSED SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE	11
1. Action Points of the eighth meeting of the Plants Committee	13
- Regional reports and regional directories	
2. Working Programme of the Plants Committee until the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties	13
- Programme of the Significant Trade studies	
- Review of the appendices	
- Checklists	
- Identification Manual sheets	
3. Rules of Procedure	13
4. Budget	14
- Additional funds requested by the Secretariat	
5. The use of the budget of the previous year for regional meetings	14
6. Registration fee for NGOs	15
7. Standing Committee items: Strategic Plan, Action Plan and Terms of Reference for the review of the criteria	15
8. Agenda of ninth meeting of the Plants Committee	16
9. Time and venue of the 10th meeting of the Plants Committee	16
10. Any other business	16
OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE	17
1. Opening of the meeting	19
2. Adoption of the Agenda	19
3. Preliminaries	19
4. Rules of Procedure	19
5. Regional reports and reports on regional meetings	20
5.1 Africa	20
5.2 Asia	20
5.3 Central and South America and the Caribbean	20
5.4 Europe	20
5.5 North America	21
5.6 Oceania	21
6. Follow-up to the eighth meeting of the Plants Committee (Action points from the eighth meeting not treated under other agenda items)	21
6.1 Communication with Nepalese authorities on the deletion of species included in Appendix III	21
6.2 Directories of regional Management and Scientific Authorities	22
6.2.1 Europe	22
6.2.2 North America	22

7. Technical proposals for the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties	23
7.1 Harmonization of annotations to plant species traded for medicinal properties; report	23
8. Species proposals for the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties	24
8.1 Rain sticks	24
8.2 <i>Araucaria araucana</i>	25
8.3 <i>Kalmia cuneata</i>	25
8.4 <i>Guaiacum sanctum</i>	26
8.5 Review of <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> with respect to CITES Appendix-II listing criteria	26
8.6 <i>Panax ginseng</i>	27
8.7 Review of <i>Aniba rosaeodora</i> and <i>Aniba duckei</i> developed in response to a request to propose CITES Appendix-II listing	28
8.8 <i>Camptotheca acuminata</i>	29
8.9 <i>Cistanche deserticola</i>	29
9. Significant Trade	29
9.1 Progress reports	29
9.1.1 Orchid trade in Thailand (CITES Project S-57); report of Phase II	29
9.1.2 Trade in <i>Dendrobium</i> (CITES Project S-56); report	20
9.1.3 Trade in medicinal plants (CITES Project S-109); report	30
9.1.4 Trade in Chinese orchids	31
9.1.5 Implementation of trade controls for <i>Nardostachys</i> and <i>Picrorhiza</i>	31
9.1.6 Implementation of trade controls for <i>Aquilaria malaccensis</i>	32
9.1.7 Bulb trade from Georgia	32
9.1.8 Bulb trade from Turkey	33
9.2 Medicinal Plants	34
9.2.1 Definition of future working priorities regarding significant trade studies, taking into account the report of CITES project S-109 and priorities established at PC8	34
9.2.2 Trade in <i>Prunus africana</i> ; report	34
9.3 Priorities for the Review of Significant Trade as approved at the 10th meeting of the Conference of the Parties	36
9.4 Draft resolution on trade in wild-collected plant specimens	36
9.5 Threats to plant population in Poland because of trade as medicinals	38
10. Review of the Appendices	38
10.1 Progress report	39
10.1.1a Carnivorous plants	39
10.1.1b <i>Byblis</i>	39
10.1.2 <i>Ceropegia</i> spp.	40
10.1.3 United States species	40
10.1.4 Didiereaceae	40
10.1.5 Three succulent species	40
10.1.6 <i>Frerea indica</i>	40
10.1.7 <i>Cyclamen</i> , <i>Dioscorea</i> and <i>Dypsis</i>	40
10.1.8 Report on the initiative of the Netherlands on the evaluation of tree species	40
10.2 Taxa for next period of the review	42
10.3 Tree ferns	43
11. Checklists and nomenclature	43
11.1 Progress report	43
12. Identification materials for plants	44
12.1 Progress report on identification sheets, ID Manual	44
12.2 Vernacular names of timber species	44
12.3 Progress under priorities proposed by the Identification Manual Committee	44
12.3.1 National identification material sent to the Secretariat; update	44
12.4 Guide for identification of timber	44
12.5 <i>Hydrastis</i> and <i>Panax</i>	44

13. Other projects on plants	45
13.1 Progress reports on CITES projects	45
13.1.1 <i>Aloe vera</i> var. <i>vera</i> (CITES Project S-93); progress report	45
13.2 New projects	45
14. Technical issues	45
14.1 Trade in seeds of Mexican cacti: update on implementation and explanatory document to be distributed	45
14.2 Trade in pitcher plants	47
14.3 Export quotas for plants	47
14.4 <i>Turbinicarpus</i> in Mexico	47
15. Training initiatives	47
15.1 Standard slide package on CITES plant issues; progress report	47
15.2 Regional training session on CITES issues	48
15.3 Training initiatives in Poland	48
16. Public awareness	48
16.1 Information exchange between Management Authorities; update of information received	48
16.2 Information for the public on the significance of Appendix II; progress report	48
16.3 Information exchange between Management Authorities and Custom offices	49
16.4 Timber brochure	49
17. Timber issues	49
17.1 Report on the working group on <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> ; progress report	49
18. How to improve CITES implementation for plants, report of discussion with Animals Committee	50
19. Issues from the Standing Committee	50
19.1 Strategic Plan of the Convention	50
19.2 Action Plan of the Plants Committee	50
19.3 Terms of Reference for the Review of the Criteria	50
20. Rescue centres	51
21. Time and venue of the 10th Plants Committee meeting	52
22. Any other business	52

ANNEX 1
Opening speeches 55

ANNEX 2
List of participants 63

ANNEX 3
Review of the appendices 73

ANNEX 4
Comments on the draft of the Strategic Plan and Action Plan
proposed by the Plants Committee 77

ANNEX 4a
PC comments (PCC) on the draft of the Strategic Plan 81

ANNEX 4b
Action Plan to be implemented by the different bodies 89

ANNEX 4c
Action Plan for the Plants Committee (English only) 109



Photo: Victoria ZENTILLI

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
CLOSED SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE	
<p>1. Action points from the eighth meeting of the Plants Committee The Committee met during the week and prepared a document on tasks of regional representatives for presentation to the Standing Committee.</p> <p>3. Rules of procedure These were adopted with a few minor, textual amendments.</p> <p>5. The use of the budget of the previous year - Regional meetings Plants and Animals Committees to present a strong and cohesive recommendation to the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to seek specific budget lines to assist in the conduct of regional meetings.</p> <p>6. Registration fee for NGOs From the 10th meeting of the Plants Committee onwards, NGOs, with some specific exceptions, will be charged a registration fee of USD 100.</p>	<p>Secretariat, Chairman</p> <p>Chairman</p> <p>Secretariat</p>
OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE	
<p>6. Follow-up to the eighth meeting of the Plants Committee (Action points from the eighth meeting not treated under other agenda items)</p> <p>6.2 Regional directories</p> <p>1. Regional directories should be prepared for inclusion in the report of the Chairman of the Plants Committee to the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties. These should at the least include the names and addresses of plant experts in the Management and Scientific Authorities;</p> <p>2. Consider methods for inclusion of this information in Web sites or any other mechanism for information exchange. The Chairman will inform the Plants Committee about the process to be followed.</p> <p>7. Technical Proposals for the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</p> <p>7.1 Harmonization of annotations to plant species traded for their medicinal properties The Plants Committee supported the proposal by the Secretariat and agreed that paragraph d) should be amended to read:</p> <p>d) chemical derivatives and finished pharmaceutical products.</p>	<p>Regional representatives</p> <p>Chairman</p> <p>Secretariat</p>

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>8. Species Proposals for the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</p> <p>8.1 Rain sticks The Plants Committee supported the proposal by Chile and will ask it to consider the exemption of all rain sticks. With regard to the rain sticks from Mexico and Peru, Mexico supported the exemption and the Representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean will contact Peru.</p> <p>8.2 <i>Araucaria araucana</i> The Plants Committee supported the proposal by Argentina.</p> <p>8.3 <i>Kalmia cuneata</i> The Plants Committee supported the United States to prepare a proposal for delisting.</p> <p>8.4 <i>Guaiacum sanctum</i> Information, including that contained in the Netherlands/WCMC study regarding the evaluation of tree species using the new CITES Listing Criteria and information from a current study in Costa Rica, to be provided to the United States if they still wish to consider the submission of a proposal for uplisting.</p> <p>8.5 Review of <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> with respect to CITES Appendix-II listing Criteria Any further information on the subject to be submitted to the United States.</p> <p>8.6 <i>Panax ginseng</i> The concerns and comments expressed by the Republic of Korea during the debate on this agenda item will be communicated by the Secretariat to the Russian Federation.</p> <p>9. Significant Trade</p> <p>9.1 Progress reports</p> <p>9.1.3 Trade in medicinal plants (CITES project S-109) The Plants Committee requests the Secretariat to circulate the relevant parts of the report to the range states concerned, asking for comments and additional information.</p> <p>9.1.5 Implementation of trade controls for <i>Nardostachys</i> and <i>Picrorhiza</i> The Plants Committee supports the project and requests the Secretariat to take relevant actions on the basis of final version of the report that will be submitted by the consultant by the end of July.</p> <p>9.1.7a Bulb trade from Turkey The Plants Committee recognises the quality of the management programme in place in Turkey and encourages those who have participated in this to collate their knowledge and develop a model for use by other range States on the sustainable use of this natural resources</p>	<p>Regional representative (Brazil), Chile</p> <p>Argentina</p> <p>United States</p> <p>All Parties</p> <p>All Parties</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Netherlands</p>

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>9.2 Medicinal Plants</p> <p>9.2.1 Definition of future working priorities regarding significant trade studies The Secretariat to consult with the range states on the relevant parts of the project S-109 (see Agenda item 9.1.3 above) before further actions will be determined.</p> <p>9.2.2 Trade in <i>Prunus africana</i> The Plants Committee supports further action in two phases:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a project to assist Parties in evaluating the population status and to make recommendations on the mechanism to establish quotas. 2. Use the information from this study and bring together the experience of all parties involved in order to develop and test the methodology for use in other areas. <p>9.4 Draft Resolution on Trade in Wild-Collected Plant Specimens</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Plants Committee approves the preparation of a single draft Resolution for both plants and animals. 2. The Plants Committee requests the Secretariat to communicate to the Plants Committee the results of the relevant discussions at the forthcoming meeting of the Animals Committee. 	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p>
<p>10. Review of the Appendices</p> <p>10.1 Progress report A working group was established with all the co-ordinators involved in the Review of the Appendices and any other interested parties/individuals. The working group will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reach a decision for which taxa dealt with in the documents Doc. PC9-item 10.1a to Doc. PC9-item 10.1.7 the Plants Committee should request the Depository Government to present proposals for de-listing or transfer of taxa from Appendix I to Appendix II; 2. Analyse the difficulties encountered during the Review process, for example the procedures adopted and the reliability of the process; 3. Reach a decision on the groups that should be dealt with in the next Review of the Appendices. <p>The report of the working group document Doc. PC9-item 10.1 (see Annex 3) was approved by the Plants Committee with a few amendments:</p>	<p>Plants Committee, Secretariat</p>

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>10.1.8 Contribution to an evaluation of tree species using the new CITES Listing Criteria The Plants Committee recognises the report as an extremely valuable and useful document to be used in the framework of CITES. The Plants Committee welcomes all comments and additional data that improve the report and keep it updated to form a dynamic source of information. The report should have a wide distribution. The Plants Committee recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The report be distributed to the Management Authorities and Scientific Authorities of the Parties, to relevant international organisations and experts; 2. A notification to be send to the Parties, explaining the purpose and contents of the report, to prevent confusion or misunderstanding and with suggestions for further distribution on national level; 3. The report be made also available in electronic form on the WEB; 4. The report be updated with additional data provided by parties, institutions and experts; and 5. Requests the Netherlands to co-ordinate the implementation of the recommendations above. <p>10.2 Taxa for the next period of review The Plants Committee recommended that the following taxa be included in the next phase of the Review of the Appendices: Orchidaceae spp. Some Appendix-I Orchids and some <i>Aloe</i> spp. from the first phase. In addition the following Appendix-I Cactaceae: <i>Coryphantha werdermannii</i> <i>Mammillaria pectinifera</i> <i>Mammillaria solisioides</i> <i>Strombocactus</i> spp. <i>Obregonia denegrii</i> <i>Aztekium ritteri</i> <i>Astrophytom asterias</i> <i>Discocactus</i> spp. <i>Melocactus</i> spp.</p> <p>10.3 Tree ferns Only maintain in the Appendices: <i>Cyathea</i> (including <i>Alsophila</i>, <i>Nephelea</i> and <i>Sphaeropteris</i>), <i>Cibotium barometz</i> and <i>Dicksonia sellowiana</i> from Central and South America.</p>	<p>Netherlands, Secretariat</p> <p>Netherlands</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Netherlands, WCMC</p> <p>Netherlands</p> <p>Netherlands</p> <p>Plants Committee</p> <p>Secretariat</p>

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>12. Identification materials for plants 12.3 Progress under priorities proposed by the Identification Manual Committee The Plants Committee requested all Parties to send outstanding identification material to the Secretariat.</p>	All Parties
<p>14. Technical issues 14.1 Trade in seeds of Mexican cacti Mexico will send a very clear note to the Chairman and the Secretariat before 1 July 1999, outlining the exact procedures for collecting seeds for scientific purposes.</p>	Mexico
<p>15. Training activities 15.1 Standard slide pack on CITES plant issues The Plants Committee congratulated the United Kingdom on its initiative, supports the preparation of new titles and also encourages representative and observers to provide funds for the production of further editions in the three languages of the Convention.</p>	United Kingdom, Secretariat
<p>15.2 Regional training session on CITES issues The Plants Committee congratulated Spain on its initiative for the Master's course and strongly supports the continuation of further courses.</p>	Spain
<p>16. Public awareness 16.2 Information for the public on the significance of Appendix II; progress report The Plants Committee accepted the offer by TRAFFIC to prepare a draft on this issue to be submitted to the Secretariat, within the next six months, for distribution to the members of the Committee for comments.</p>	TRAFFIC
<p>16.4 Timber brochure The Plants Committee congratulated the United States on their initiative and requests all offers of support for drafting and production of the final brochure to be submitted to the United States.</p>	United States
<p>19. Issues from the Standing Committee 19.1 Strategic plan of the Convention The participants were divided into working groups chaired by the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the representative for Oceania. The working groups held several meetings and the following topics were discussed: Comments on the draft of the Strategic Plan; Action Plan to be implemented by the different bodies, and the Action Plan to be implemented by the Plants Committee. The committee agreed that the Chairman would combine the documents prepared by the working groups. The Chairman would submit this document before July 1999 to the Plants Committee members, to the Secretariat and to the Chairman of the Animals Committee for information of the meeting of the Animals Committee. It would also be sent to the Chairmen of the Strategic Plan Working Group and the Standing Committee. (Annexes 4a and 4b).</p>	Chairman

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>19.2 Action plan of the Plants Committee From the document referred under 19.1, an action plan for the Plants Committee will be prepared by the Chairman. (Annex 4c)</p> <p>19.3 Terms of reference for the Review of the Criteria The Plants Committee agreed to the process outlined in the draft Terms of Reference prepared by the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees for consideration at the 42nd Standing Committee.</p> <p>20. Rescue centres The Plants Committee expressed concern about the lack of rescue centres in many regions and therefore Parties are encouraged to adopt national measures to implement Resolution Conf. 10.7, Annex 3 by enabling botanic gardens and other appropriate institutions to act as rescue centres for CITES plants and to network in order to optimise <i>ex-situ</i> conservation.</p>	<p>Chairman</p> <p>Chairman, Secretariat</p> <p>All Parties</p>



Photo: Kathy WILLIAMS

**CLOSED SESSION OF THE
PLANTS COMMITTEE**

Participants: Mr John Donaldson (representative for Africa), Mr De-yuan Hong (representative for Asia), Mr Wichar Thitiprasert (alternate representative for Asia), Mrs Lúcia Helena de Oliveira (representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean), Mrs Dora E. Mora Monge (representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean), Mrs Margarita Clemente Muñoz (representative for Europe), Mr Jan de Koning (representative for Europe), Mr Bertrand von Arx (representative for North America), Mr Greg Leach (representative for Oceania), Mr Jim Armstrong (CITES Secretariat), Mr Ger van Vliet (CITES Secretariat)

Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Italy, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, Japan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States

Chairman of the Animals Committee, Vice-Chairman of the ID-Manual Committee

1. Action Points of the eighth meeting of the Plants Committee

Regional reports and regional directories

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) welcomed the regional representatives, the observers from Parties and the Secretariat to the closed session. She informed the meeting that Mr Rejdali (representative for Africa) had sent a fax, explaining that he could not come due to last moment problems with his visa. She expressed regret about this, but mentioned that the Secretariat had warned well in advance about the need for obtaining visa to enter Australia.

She continued by thanking the host country Australia and its CITES Authorities for the cordial and generous invitation to hold the ninth meeting of the Plants Committee in Australia. She also thanked Spain and the Secretariat for preparing the proceedings of the eighth meeting and she apologized for the late distribution. Mrs Mora and Mrs Oliveira (representatives for Central and South America and the Caribbean) and Mr Hong (representative for Asia) confirmed receipt of the proceedings but made no further comments.

The Chairman expressed her concern that Asia had not submitted the regional report nor the directory and asked whether it would be submitted. Mr Hong apologized and explained that they had been very busy and had not had the time to prepare the regional directory. Mr Thitiprasert (alternate representative for Asia) explained that it was the first time for him to participate as a Committee member, but acknowledged the importance of preparing the regional directories and assured the Chairman that the Asian representatives would collaborate so that a regional directory would be submitted. He explained that he would send a letter of information on this issue to the Secretariat after the meeting.

The Chairman thanked the representatives for Asia and noted that Malaysia had promised at the last meeting to start the work on the regional directory and suggested that the representatives for Asia contact Malaysia to find out what progress had been made. She reminded participants that it is important to submit directories on time to get the work done.

Mrs Clemente expressed her wish that the representatives for Africa also prepare the regional directory, recommended that Mr Donaldson (representative for Africa) contacted the other representative for Africa, Mr Rejdali, to start the process.

The Chairman agreed and suggested that regional representatives meet with each other and Party observers during the breaks in the meeting to discuss ways to improve regional communication.

2. Working Programme of the Plants Committee until the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

The Chairman stressed the commitment to studies on significant trade in plants and said that the work was progressing well. She stated that the review of the appendices was also progressing well, and that information would be presented on the checklists at this meeting. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that although there was adequate progress in the preparation of the identification sheets for flora, the work was still far behind that for fauna.

3. Rules of Procedures

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that at her request at the eighth meeting of the Plants Committee, rules of procedure for the Plants Committee had been developed. She explained that the Secretariat had harmonised the rules of procedure with those adopted at the 41st Standing Committee.

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) stressed that in Rule 14, it was not clear to whom the documents should be sent. Furthermore, he also felt that the required 60 days prior to the meeting for preparation of the documents was too much in advance to receive all required information. He explained that although the 60 days prior to the deadline allowed time enough for the Secretariat to work with the

documents, much of the information needed to prepare the documents for his region had arrived after the deadline, so he suggested that 45 days would be preferable.

The Chairman then said that Rules 19 and 20 could be combined to define to whom this shall be provided. She then explained that to avoid receiving required material after the deadline, the regional representative should inform the countries they represent of the deadline and the required early submittal of information.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that by adding a few words to Rule 14, it would be clear that Parties should present documents, not NGOs.

Mr von Arx stated that clarification was needed on whether alternate representatives were included, to which Mrs Clemente replied that they were.

Mr Jenkins (Chairman of the Animals Committee) expressed his agreement with the approach taken by the Plants Committee. He expressed his hope that the Animals and Plants Committees would embrace the same rules. Mr Jenkins explained that for the Animals Committee many documents are received from NGOs and read by the Secretariat. He explained that NGOs wishing to present documents should do so through a Party. Mr Jenkins explained that he felt that this needed to be more explicit given the previous problems experienced in the Animals Committee.

The Secretariat acknowledged the importance of this issue, but explained that these problems had not been experienced in the Plants Committee. He suggested that this issue be discussed further at a later time since it was not important for the running of this Committee.

The Chairman then moved on to Rule 20 and explained that the amendment recommended for this rule was that the 40 day requirement should be replaced by 120 days so that draft proceedings could be sent to the Chairman for necessary revision. In any case, at the end of each meeting an executive summary would be provided.

Mr von Arx explained that Rules 11 and 16 apply to members in the Standing committee rather than to the Plants Committee.

The Chairman agreed with the fact that the Standing Committee regulations for the quorum are not the same as for the Plants Committee. It was decided that a small working group be organized so that these details could be clarified. The Secretariat was requested to provide a revised version for discussion in the open meeting. Mr von Arx pointed out that Rule 17 needed to be clarified in terms of the method of agreement when there is a tie on decisions made by the representatives. Mrs Clemente clarified this by explaining that in the unusual event of a tie, the vote of the Chairman would be decisive.

4. Budget

The Secretariat (Mr van Vliet) briefly explained that after the eighth Plants Committee, the Secretariat obtained additional funds after consultation with the Standing Committee, and in particular funds for significant trade studies. He informed the representatives that this budget was successfully spent.

5. The use of budget of the previous year for regional meetings

The Chairman explained that the Plants Committee had not been held in the previous year, and because of this those funds had not been spent. She stated that she had asked the Secretariat whether it was possible to use the unspent Plants Committee Meeting budget to hold regional meetings. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained the importance of holding regional meetings since these meetings permitted a better communication between Regional representatives with the Parties in their regions and among themselves in case of regions that have more than one representative.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that it had not been possible to use last year's budget for this purpose. He explained that in principle the idea was supported, but that funds could have been used for logistics and not for travel. The second element that he pointed out was that the Secretariat had received three requests from two regions only, and even these were not well defined. He explained that at the last meeting of the Parties the Plants Committee had already asked for additional funding, but this was not approved. A formal request should be presented to the Conference of the Parties.

Mr Armstrong (Secretariat) stressed the importance of the Secretariat's recommendations, and explained that getting a strong cohesion from both the Plants and Animals Committee to seek specific budget lines to assist in the conduct of regional meetings was important to form a strong argument.

The Chairman agreed with Mr Armstrong and explained that a full regional meeting would be preferable to several smaller subregional meetings, to avoid problems with the budget, and that every effort should be made to ensure the participation of all countries.

Mr Hong (representative for Asia) supported the statements made by the Chairman in light of the problems in Asia.

Mrs Clemente summarised by stating that the Plants and Animals should present a strong and cohesive recommendation to the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to seek a specific budget line to assist in the conduct of regional meetings.

6. Registration fee for NGOs

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) stated that she was approached by the Secretariat about asking NGOs to pay registration fees, and explained that this was an important requirement implemented by the Animals Committee. She suggested the possibility of exempting IUCN, TRAFFIC, WCMC and perhaps other NGOs from developing countries.

Mr Donaldson (representative for Africa) expressed his concern that by charging a registration fee, some groups would be excluded from participating.

The Secretariat explained that it was an important as a matter of principle that NGOs be charged at the Committee of Plants and Animals. He stated that the Parties end up paying for NGOs through their contribution.

It was unanimously agreed that from the tenth meeting of the Plants Committee onward a registration fee of USD 100 would be charged to NGOs with the exception of certain NGOs and national NGOs at the discretion of the Chairman.

The EU should neither pay the registration fee.

7. Standing Committee items: Strategic Plan, Action Plan and Terms of Reference for the review of the criteria

The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) informed the meeting about a meeting of the Strategic Plan Working Group of the Standing Committee in May, in Washington. She had not been able to participate in this meeting because of a communication problem. Nevertheless, she had sent all the members the relevant documentation on this subject, so that they could consider the subject before the meeting. The draft document resulting from the Washington meeting had also been distributed, and she expected to be able to work in a constructive manner to produce the comments from the Plants Committee.

Mrs Clemente explained that Mr Armstrong, Deputy Secretary General of the CITES Secretariat, would introduce the draft document in the open session. She stressed the importance of the preparation of an Action Plan, with new millennium approaching, and asked for support from all the members and an extra

effort during the meeting for the production of comments on the report and the preparation of an Action Plan for the Plants Committee. She suggested that this be done in working groups that should start their work immediately, and draft texts would be discussed later in the meeting. She added that the draft texts should be ready by July. Because of the urgency she proposed that all the ideas and comments from the working groups be discussed in the plenary session, and that she would combine this in a single document that would be sent to the Standing Committee, the Animals Committee and the Strategic Plan Working Group before the first of July.

Regarding the Terms of Reference for the Review of the Criteria for the Amendment of Appendices I and II, she explained that the Chairman of the Animals and Plants Committees must prepare a draft of these to be presented to the 42nd meeting of the Standing Committee in September. A document on the subject would be prepared during this week, and once it was finished she would welcome comments from the members.

8. Agenda of the ninth meeting of the Plants Committee

The draft agenda was adopted with a few modifications.

9. Time and venue of the 10th meeting of the Plants Committee

The Chairman explained that a formal invitation had not yet been received, but that China had expressed interest in hosting the next meeting.

10. Any other business

There being no further items for discussion, the Chairman thanked the members, the observers and the Secretariat for their participation and comments and closed the session.



Photo: Kathy WILLIAMS

OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE

Representatives:	Mr J. Donaldson (Africa), Mr D.Y. Hong (Asia), Mr W. Thitiprasert (alternate Asia), Mrs L.H. de Oliveira (Central and South America and the Caribbean), Mrs D.E. Mora Monge (Central and South America and the Caribbean), Mr B. von Arx (North America; Vice-Chairman), Mrs M. Clemente (Europe; Chairman), Mr J. de Koning (Europe), Mr G. Leach (Oceania)
CITES Secretariat:	Mr J. Armstrong, Mr. G. van Vliet, Miss V. Zentilli
Countries	Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands Papua New Guinea, Poland, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States Chairman of the Animals Committee, Vice-Chairman of the ID-Manual Committee
NGOs:	AIMEX (Brazil), ASSOERBE (Italy), ATIBT (France), Australian Network for Plant Conservation (Australia), Cámara Forestal de Bolivia (Bolivia), Greenpeace International (The Netherlands), Groupe Fournier (France), IAFWA (United States), IHPA (United States), Mount Cameroon Project (Cameroon), TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa (Kenya), TRAFFIC North America (United States), TRAFFIC Oceania (Australia), WCMC (United Kingdom)
Total participants:	72

1. Opening of the meeting

The Opening Ceremony was chaired by Dr Mike Reed (Deputy Chief Minister and Minister of Parks and Wildlife). Speeches were given by the Deputy Chief Minister and Minister of Parks and Wildlife, Dr Mike Reed, and Dr Margarita Clemente, Chairman of the Plants Committee (Annex 1). The speakers were introduced by Dr Bill Freeland, Director of Parks and Wildlife Commission of the Northern Territories.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was approved with the following changes:

17.2 was moved and included under 10.1.8

9.1.8 on Bulb trade in Turkey was added

3. Preliminaries

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) thanked Oceania for hosting and Mr Leach (representative for Oceania) and his team for organising the ninth Meeting of the Plants Committee. She introduced Mr van Vliet (Plants Officer, CITES Secretariat), Mr Jim Armstrong (Deputy Secretary General, CITES Secretariat), and the rapporteurs, Ms Roberts and Ms Salgado Kent. The Chairman welcomed all delegates and specially the Chairman of the Animals Committee and the Vice-Chairman of the Identification Manual Committee. She then introduced the regional representatives of the Plants Committee. Finally she expressed her great satisfaction to be able to have simultaneous interpretation into the three working languages of the Convention, a development she had strongly supported during her Chairmanship.

The Chairman reminded the participants in the meeting that members can speak and vote and that the Plants Committee usually adopts decisions by a consensus. She also explained that, if so required, the Rules of Procedure contained provisions on voting procedures. The observers and NGOs can also express opinions, but decisions are exclusively made by the members. The Chairman explained that the priority for giving the floor was first to the members and the Secretariat, followed by Parties, and then by NGOs.

4. Rules of Procedure

The Chairman explained that in the Plants Committee in Pucón, Chile, Rules of Procedure were drafted and adopted. In the closed meeting, amendments were discussed to adapt these to the current Rules and Procedures of the 41st Standing Committee. She explained that there would be minor differences between those of the Animals and Plants Committees and those of the Standing Committee. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that the Secretariat had harmonised the Rules and Procedures with some minor amendments, and that the revised version would be submitted to the members of the Committee for approval.

Mr de Koning (representative for Europe) recommended that the Secretariat have help from one or two representatives to proceed with these amendments. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) agreed to meet with Mr Jenkins (Chairman of the Animals Committee), Mrs Clemente and Mr von Arx (representative for North America) for the purpose of incorporating minor amendments before submitting the final document to the Plants Committee for adoption.

The Rules of Procedure were adopted, including the amendments proposed later in the week. Mr Armstrong (Secretariat) suggested that the Rules of Procedure possible be synergised with the Animals Committee so that there would be one set of Rules and Procedures for the two technical committees.

The Chairman explained that the needs of the Animals Committee had already been taken into account and that all suggestions made by Mr Jenkins had been incorporated.

Mr Jenkins explained that the documents prepared by the Secretariat would be presented to the Animals Committee. If there would be changes, he explained that they would not be substantial and that he would communicate these to the Plants Committee. It was agreed that an endorsement would then be obtained through the Plants Committee and then those changes would be made by the Secretariat.

5. Regional reports and reports on regional meetings

5.1 Africa

Mr Donaldson (representative for Africa) explained that he had only taken the position as representative four weeks prior to the meeting and had nothing to report on the Region.

5.2 Asia

Mr Hong (representative for Asia) explained that they had not had regional meetings for a couple of years, and explained that Mr Shaari (Representative for Asia) had not been present and since he had been very busy there had been little communication with countries of the region.

Mr Thitiprasert (alternate representative for Asia) apologised for not having a written report. He proceeded to explain that he was the alternate representative, and that his personal feeling was that he hoped that there would be improvement in regional communication and co-operation between Parties in the region.

5.3 Central and South America and the Caribbean

Mrs de Oliveira (representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean) presented the report, explaining that she had many problems communicating with her region.

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) expressed his concern that the most significant problem was that of communication; in particular communication from members to Parties and Parties to members.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that this was indeed a matter to consider seriously, and to consider it bearing in mind that the Chairman must report to the Conference of the Parties. She said that at the end of the Plants Committee, the regional representatives could submit proposals to the Chairman on actions that could improve the situation.

Mr von Arx further suggested that in fact a closed meeting should be organised to clarify the role of the representatives and alternates representatives. The Chairman agreed that these functions needed to be defined, and a small working group was formed to discuss this issue.

5.4 Europe

The Chairman stated, as a representative for Europe, that they were extremely grateful to the European Parties who had regularly responded to communications (27 out of 33). She explained that in the report the fluent communications were evident.

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) asked whether item 4.2 in the European report, on Madagascar, was a new general report by Switzerland.

Mr Lüthy (Switzerland) replied that the third mission to Madagascar was executed by the Swiss Scientific Authority.

Mrs Núñez Román (Spain) intervened and explained that, regarding this item, Switzerland had problems with the sale of small cacti in the airports and tourists bought these without appropriate

CITES documents, but the Management Authority of Spain had already established contact with shops in airports in Spain about the required permits.

5.5 North America

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) explained that this report was oriented towards different activities in the countries in the region rather than a regional report. The Chairman expressed her concern that although there are only three Parties, there was no communication with Mexico.

Mr Landazuri (Mexico) explained that the alternate representative for the region had departed which caused this failure in communication, but that communication would be re-established.

5.6 Oceania

Mr Leach (representative for Oceania) explained that the report was brief because there had not been any meetings in Oceania. However, he confirmed the interest of non-Parties and pointed out that two non-Parties and NGOs were participating in the current meeting. Mr Leach expressed the fact that Oceania was working towards organising a meeting. He added that this was in fact the first time that Oceania had prepared a report, and asked whether the new format devised in Pucón had been useful.

The Chairman confirmed by stating that the format was useful for reports to the Plants Committee. She then explained that the format could be amended as appropriate and any information should be given to the Vice-Chairman or to the Chairman herself.

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) asked for clarification on problems on herbarium specimens addressed in the report by Oceania.

Mr Leach explained that he was approached by herbaria at Royal Botanic Gardens Kew to see if there were any problems presented in the movement of specimens, however he explained that Australian herbaria do not experience the same problems.

Mr McGough (United Kingdom) explained that their approach to Oceania was because they were acting with a small number of regulated scientific institutions to try to encourage regional representatives to encourage institutions in their region to register and ensure that they are all acting legally. He explained that persuading governments to operate this system was especially important in Asia and Latin America.

The Chairman pointed out that it depends on the individual country and explained that several countries preferred to follow the normal procedure.

6. Follow-up to the eighth meeting of the Plants Committee (Action points from the eighth meeting not treated under other agenda items)

The Chairman explained that every item had been resolved or incorporated into other items, and therefore it was not necessary to go through each action point in detail.

6.1 Communication with Nepalese authorities on the deletion of species included in Appendix III

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that this issue was the centre of a long story, which began with her predecessor, and that although attempts have been made to resolve this issue, the Nepalese Authorities still had not responded. She explained that in the absence of a response nothing had changed. Therefore there was nothing to report on the issue.

6.2 Directories of regional Management and Scientific Authorities

6.2.1 Europe

Mr Lüthy (Switzerland) explained that the European directory was useful and asked about the procedure for updating it; in particular when and how updates are made. He explained that it was the old Swiss version that was in the directory presented at the meeting.

Mrs Clemente (as representative for Europe) explained that normally a copy of the relevant data was distributed each year for appropriate changes. At the third European regional meeting Switzerland had given a page with the changes to the rapporteur of the meeting, this last person had transmitted the information to Mrs Clemente just after the last revision of the directory was made. Mrs Clemente added that another major problem encountered when collecting information for the directory, was the difficulty in sorting out and understanding the data received, she then requested that the forms should be filled using a typewriter or if filling it by hand, use capital letters, and she suggested to inform directly the regional representatives of changes.

Mr Schürmann (Vice-Chairman, ID-Manual Committee) asked whether it would be possible to put the directory on the CITES Web site so that the updates could be provided electronically rather than on paper.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that in principle it would be a good idea, but that a lot of work was required for the Secretariat to amend all the context of its Directory to include this regional information on Scientific and Management Authorities

Mr McGough (United Kingdom) explained that there was a lot of information in the directory and a fast rate of change in information. He explained that the Management Authorities were attempting to establish an Internet site where it might be appropriate to include a directory and updates. He explained that he would have to ask if it would be possible to include people's names on the Internet site.

6.2.2 North America

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) said that because the directory is an important tool, other kinds of links or information that would be needed and distributed should be discussed. He then asked if the directory would go to everyone, and suggested that it be used as a vehicle to people in the regions. He explained that there would be guidelines or procedures needed for frequent updating since there would be wide distribution. He suggested the consideration of the possibility of having someone arrange this. He also said that countries should be encouraged to use e-mail because it is a fast, easy, and safe method of communication.

Mr de Koning (representative for Europe) asked whether the directories should only be for Scientific and Management Authorities or for all specialists. He suggested that the order of priority would be to first complete the directories of the Management and Scientific Authorities, and then add a list of plant experts. He also stated, in relation to document Doc. PC9-Inf. 7 on information from the 3rd European meeting, that CITES should provide this information on the accepted recommendation to the European region in a loose-leaf binder and possibly also to include useful Internet sites.

Mr Leach (representative for Oceania) pointed out that one of the problems in conducting the review of the appendices was trying to get data from people in other regions. Mr Schippmann (Germany) added that when preparing non-detriment statements, in several cases he had tried to contact other countries and had not received answers.

Mr de Koning suggested that the process might be facilitated by asking people involved in Systematic Agenda 2000 to produce a list of all people involved in flora projects all over the world.

Mr Donaldson (representative for Africa) inquired as to whom was responsible for getting the information, and explained that in his region it would be an exhaustive process to find the appropriate people. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) replied that it was the regional representatives.

Mr de Koning asked whether the Secretariat could be possibly involved. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) responded that the Secretariat has a different responsibility in relation to the Management and Scientific Authorities, and that it was not possible to take on others. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that the Secretariat had no resources, and that in her case a budget approved by the government covered this work.

Mr von Arx suggested that perhaps a definition of the responsibilities for each region was needed, to which the Chairman agreed and stated that responsibilities of the representatives should be discussed when preparing the action plan.

Mrs de Oliveira (representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean) explained that she had asked over the phone for lists of people, but that only Panama, Guatemala, and the Dominican Republic replied.

The Chairman stressed the need for persistence when contacting Parties. She recommended that this work be distributed between the two representatives for Central and South America.

Mr Leach stated that it would be fine for Oceania to do this, but that it would be extra work to get down to the taxonomic specialists. He suggested that perhaps Australia or another Party could have a main web site.

Mr van Vliet added that the Secretariat could provide addresses for the Scientific and Management Authorities nominated by Parties for newcomers. The Chairman thanked the Secretariat for the offer.

Mrs Clemente summarised by explaining that there were two objectives:

- 1) Regional directories should be prepared for inclusion in the report of the Chairman of the Plants Committee to the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties. These should at least include the names and addresses of plant experts in the Management and Scientific Authorities; and
- 2) Consider methods of inclusion of the information in Web sites or any other mechanism for information exchange. The Chairman will then inform the Plants Committee of the process to follow.

7. Technical proposals for the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

7.1 Harmonisation of annotations to plant species traded for medicinal properties; report

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced this document and referred to section A, d) and e) on which the Committee should express their thoughts on what would be the best choice and whether to support the Secretariat's proposal.

Mr de Koning (representative for Europe) explained that under item 9.1.3 pertaining to Significant Trade, annotations would also be discussed, and suggested that these two documents should be discussed together, to which the Secretariat had no objection.

Mr Kiehn (Austria) pointed out that only annotations 2 and 8 on page 4 of document Doc. PC9-Item 9.1.3 could be easily harmonised. He explained that he felt that item 7.1 was an independent issue that should be discussed further. The Chairman agreed.

Mr Leach (representative for Oceania) explained that when he first read document 7.1 he felt that e) was very loose, and that d) was much more precise.

Mr Schippmann (Germany) referred to the table on page 4 of document Doc. PC9-item 9.1.3 and asked for a clarification on why only those 3 species had been identified for this process and.

Mr van Vliet explained that *Panax quinquefolius* was not selected because it is traded as roots which have a very specific annotation, and *Pterocarpus santalinus* was not because annotation refers only to basic materials and materials processed to a certain level, like drum sticks, were already exempted.

The Plants Committee agreed to support the proposal by the Secretariat and agreed that paragraph d) should be amended to read, "chemical derivatives and finished pharmaceutical products".

8. Species proposals for the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

8.1 Rain sticks

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that some documents on the topic are informational only. She reminded the participants that the topic was the centre of a long story which began in Tenerife, and that delegates of Chile had given a presentation on the issue in the last Plants Committee Pucón. Chile now recommended the preparation of a proposal to exempt rain sticks, and specifically up to 3 units of this product when sold to tourists as long as the tourists had the product with them. She explained that Chile had not yet arrived to the meeting, but that she agreed with the proposal as there was no conservation problem but wondered why the proposal was limited to three specimens per person.

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) agreed with the proposal, but did not agree with only three pieces per person. He requested more information on the rationale upon Chile's arrival. He explained that probably not all of the rain sticks are made from Cactaceae and requested clarification on wording of the exemption.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that the text in the proposal under A), should clarify any uncertainties, however if the Secretariat were requested to re-word the exemption this could be done so that Chilean species in particular would be mentioned.

Mr von Arx expressed his concern on how the border control can distinguish rain sticks made of other species. He explained that previous discussions had suggested to exempt of all rain sticks.

The Chairman explained that Chile was being very prudent and dealing only with Chilean species.

Mr Kiehn (Austria) stated that Chile was looking at the control of mass produced products, and agreed with postponing the debate until Chile arrived.

Mrs Clemente agreed, but stressed that in principle she felt that the Committee should support Chile's proposal. She suggested that Chile might like to exempt all rain sticks and that Mexico might like to do the same.

Mr von Arx expressed his full agreement, but explained that Peru should also be contacted by the regional representatives. The Chairman stated that if such would be the case, Mrs de Oliveira would be in touch with Peru to do this.

Mr Perez Ramírez (Mexico) explained that they quite often had what people think are rain sticks, but in fact is bamboo, and therefore also supported the idea to exempt all rain sticks.

The Plants Committee agreed to support the proposal by Chile and requested the consideration for the exemption of all rain sticks.

8.2 *Araucaria araucana*

The Chairman explained that the proposal on *Araucaria araucana* was very detailed and well drafted.

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) pointed out that it was much easier to have the taxa in one Appendix only, but wondered whether listing under Appendix I would solve the problem.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) replied that in principle it would, because the main problem related to trade in seeds. Mr Kiehn (Austria) explained these problems by stating that *A. araucana* seeds are already impossible to obtain from Chile because of their listing in Appendix I, so seeds are obtained from Argentina. However, there are difficulties with distinguishing seeds from Chile and Argentina.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) clarified the reasoning for Argentina's proposal by explaining that he had received a letter from Argentina explaining that it wanted to include seeds in Appendix II, and that the Secretariat had suggested that Argentina could also consider the transfer of the species to Appendix I. He explained that Argentina does not want to export seeds, and that Argentina's legislation is directed at not permitting any trade and is looking for a control mechanism through CITES.

The Chairman asked whether this species was reviewed in the study by the Netherlands. Mr de Koning (representative for Europe) replied that it had been included in the document, and that the populations are restricted and highly threatened and met the criteria for inclusion in Appendix I. He added that in the Andes seeds are an important source of nutrition.

Mr von Arx explained that he thought that there were still big differences in listing under Appendix I and Appendix II. He inquired about the quota for seeds to which Mr van Vliet stated that a zero quota would not help because seeds were not subject to the Convention. He then referred to the Resolution Conf. 9.24 which stated that split-listing should be avoided when possible.

Mr McGough (United Kingdom) agreed that getting rid of this split-listing should be encouraged, and that if a species meets a criteria for Appendix I it should go forward.

The Plants Committee agreed to support the proposal by Argentina.

8.3 *Kalmia cuneata*

Mrs Lyke, (United States) corrected the common name to "White Wicky". After introducing the document, Mrs Lyke explained that more information would be appreciated, particularly of specimens collected from the wild in recent years.

The Chairman asked if the United States had specific legislation, national, federal, or state, for this species. Mrs Lyke replied by stating that the species was considered endangered in North Carolina and therefore protected at the state level.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) stated that all relevant information about this issue should be sent to the United States.

Mr de Koning (representative for Europe) stated that if there was no more data available, he felt the United States should be supported in their proposal for delisting.

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) expressed his agreement, and explained that he felt that the Committee should warmly support de-listing of a species not in trade and congratulate a state that had done good work.

The Plants Committee agreed to support the proposal of the United States to prepare a proposal for delisting.

8.4 *Guaiacum sanctum*

Mrs Lyke (United States) introduced this document by explaining that available information showed that it meets criteria for Appendix I. She requested any available information on this issue.

Mr Schippmann (Germany) stated that this species was also included in the review of medicinal plants, and referred to the table on page 34 of document Doc. PC9-item 9.1.3.

Mr de Koning (representative for Europe) explained that the study by the Netherlands indicated that *G. sanctum* does not meet the criteria for listing under Appendix I, but does meet that for Appendix II where it is currently.

Mr Jenkins (Chairman of the Animals Committee) and Mr de Koning expressed their puzzlement. Mr de Koning stated that he personally felt that with more studies the species would meet Appendix I criteria.

Mr Kiehn (Austria) explained that for inclusion in Appendix I, one of the biological criteria was a population size of less than 5000. With a population of 2500 mature specimens *G. sanctum* in fact meets the criteria for Appendix I. He also stated that the taxon is being studied in Costa Rica, and perhaps the representatives for Central and South America and the Caribbean had more information.

It was agreed that information, including that contained in the Netherlands/WCMC study regarding the evaluation of tree species using the new CITES Listing Criteria and information from a current study in Costa Rica, would be provided to the United States if they still wished to consider the submission of a proposal for up-listing.

8.5 Review of *Swietenia macrophylla* with respect to CITES Appendix-II listing criteria

Mrs Lyke (United States) explained that a definitive position on this issue had not been reached yet, and that comments and additional information were sought.

Mr Cantu (Greenpeace International) explained that the Mexican population was included in Appendix III last year and that export of *S. macrophylla* timber from Mexico was banned. He stated that they had additional information and would be pleased to provide this to the United States Authorities.

Mr Avila (Cámara Forestal de Bolivia) explained that the discussion on mahogany in Bolivia was a very old one and that the arguments used to include it in Appendix II were still the same. He stated that a report by Dr Logo was recent and comprehensive, and that recognising this report, almost all of the range states have taken measures for conservation of the species. He explained that Bolivia is the first of tropical countries with certified timber, and that for the first time it was proposed that Bolivia take measures to guarantee conservation and management of the species. There has been much discussion on supposedly illegal trade between Bolivia and Brazil, but he explained that this was not true. He stated that the market for timber products was poor in Bolivia since there was no economic incentive for business with timber. He explained that the illegal operations are caused by incursions by farmers, but that there are no exports. Mr Avila added that there had been talks in Sao Paulo to put an end to incursions by Bolivian farmers in Brazilian territories, and that this was placed into the hands of the regions within the range states. He added that this work had begun but that there were

still steps to take. He explained that until the working group recommends inclusion in Appendix II, it is not appropriate to discuss the issue.

The Chairman thanked Mr Avila for his intervention and said that she was sure the Authority of the United States would be happy to receive all the information and learn of these initiatives. The Plants Committee agreed that all information on the subject should be submitted to the United States.

8.6 *Panax ginseng*

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that the Russian Management Authority had sent the proposal for distribution to all Parties with reference to this item. The Russian Authorities requested comments and input that the Chairman could then relate back to them.

Mr Cheong (Republic of Korea) added to the information document Doc. PC9-Inf.10 provided by the Korean Authorities the following statements:

"The second observation of my delegation relates to page 1 of the said document. In paragraph 2.1, the name of the sea between the Korean peninsula and Japanese Archipelago is quoted as 'the Sea of Japan'. For recent several centuries, this specific sea area has been referred to in a variety of names, including 'Sea of Korea', 'Eastern Sea', 'Oriental Sea' or 'Sea of Japan', and the Korean people now refer to it as 'Eastern Sea'. In the first place, the naming of the sea as 'Sea of Japan' can not be justified in the light of the historical precedents.

Moreover, the resolutions adopted at the United Nations Conference on the Standardisation of Geographical Names at its 6th and 7th meeting recommended that it should be a general rule that the names used by each of the countries concerned will be accepted pending an agreement on a common name. The corollary of these resolutions at the pertinent international organisations is that at the moment both names of 'Eastern Sea' and 'Sea of Japan' have to be used in parallel.

Having said that, my delegation feels it important for the Secretariat not to adversely prejudice the legitimate claims of one Party to the Convention, and take appropriate corrective measures in order to avoid the recurrence of this situation."

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) stated that he had already taken note of this following discussions with the Korean representatives had already been made and that he would inform the Russian Authorities of this.

Mr Robbins (TRAFFIC) explained that Appendix II might be appropriate in this case, because although Russia intends not to export, under Appendix II trade could be permitted. He stated that results from an investigation by TRAFFIC Germany would be given to the Russian Management Authority once complete. Mr Robbins also mentioned that the United States has much experience with this species and so could share their experiences on management of the species within the United States with Russia.

Mr Hong (representative for Asia) confirmed receipt of the proposal in April and explained more information would be collected and then an official reply would be given on the subject. Because of high pressure in trade, the Asian representative agreed that the species should be added to Appendix II, but because most export is from cultivation rather than wild plants, the issue needed to be discussed further.

Mr Schippmann (Germany) confirmed that trade of wild-collected plants was quite restricted and only in areas on the boarder of East Russia and China. He explained that the intent of the Russian proposal was to solve this trade of wild-collected plants, but that placement on Appendix II would affect all trade. He suggested the possibility of including only wild plants on Appendix II since wild

plants enter trade as whole roots with a scar. He explained that if wild plants were to be chopped into pieces they would resemble artificially propagated plants and would fetch a considerable lower price.

Mr Hong expressed his agreement and explained that ginseng had been distributed all through China (North Korea and Korean peninsula also), but had disappeared in the last 50 years. Through genetic studies currently underway, it is apparent that there is great diversity between wild and cultivated plants, and therefore wild plants are under strong pressure and need to be conserved. He expressed agreement with the Russian Authorities, and explained that they had the greater pressure and therefore placement in Appendix II should be considered. He added that wild and artificially propagated plants needed to be distinguished.

Mrs Lyke (United States) expressed concern for the ability of the Parties to enforce laws on trade of wild-collected roots even though the experts can identify the differences. She asked whether this might promote masking and trade of wild-collected specimens.

The Chairman reminded the participants of remarks made by the representative of China and Germany stating that these two were readily distinguishable.

Mr Cheong agreed that artificially propagated and wild plants are readily distinguishable. He explained that it is believed that the wild plants have been under high collection pressure, but have never been at a point of extinction. He stated that local people plant seeds in the mountain area, so there are also semi-wild populations present. Mr Cheong explained that there was a need for further consultation before a universal decision could be made that would effect range States.

It was agreed that the Secretariat would write formally to the Russian Federation and ensure that future documents will refer to East Sea/Sea of Japan. The concerns and comments expressed by the Republic of Korea during the debate on this agenda item will also be communicated by the Secretariat to the Russian Federation. The Secretariat will request the Russian Federation to communicate with the Republic of Korea.

8.7 Review of *Aniba rosaeodora* and *Aniba duckei* developed in response to a request to propose CITES Appendix-II listing

Mrs Lyke (United States) presented this issue by explaining that a review of current information had been prompted by requests from citizens of the United States to include the two species in Appendix II. Mrs Lyke explained that a decision to present an amendment proposal had not been made, and that comments and further information were sought.

Mr Allain (France) expressed his desire that these species be listed, but that he first would like to hear the opinion of other EU Member States. He explained that despite the use of these plants in the entire region, the French Forestry Department has stated that it is still present along the coast of Guyana. Mr Allain explained that because the species' essential oils are progressively being replaced by other ingredients for the production of perfumes, their use should decline.

Mr Zerbini (Brazil) stated that Brazil did not support this proposal.

8.8 *Camptotheca acuminata*

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) expressed his hope that if the proposal on the inclusion of *Camptotheca acuminata* in Appendix II intended to control all parts and derivatives, that it also included trade names of the parts and derivatives.

8.9 *Cistanche deserticola*

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) explained, referring to the document on the inclusion of *Cistanche deserticola* in Appendix I, that most of what is traded seems to be seeds and pharmaceutical products, and asked whether seeds would be included in the proposal. Mr Jia (China) replied affirmatively.

Mr von Arx inquired as to how much of the plant or its products were legally exported. Mr Jia explained that there would be more information available upon his return to China.

9. Significant Trade

9.1 Progress reports

9.1.1 Orchid trade in Thailand (CITES Project S-57); report of Phase II

Mr McGough (United Kingdom) outlined the process of significant trade and explained that it was a positive mechanism for helping parties to implement the Convention. He explained there was a good working relationship between Royal Botanic Gardens Kew and the Management Authorities of Thailand, which are the major exporter of wild orchids in the world. He explained that one of the major problems was the lack of good quality information on current status, but that available information was summarised in the report of 700 pages. Mr McGough explained that currently, export is prohibited for all wild orchids, and that a second phase of the project needed to be discussed with Thailand. Mr McGough explained also that it was a need to discuss about how to publish the report so that it could be used by other Parties.

Mr Thitiprasert (alternate representative for Asia) thanked Mr McGough and his staff and the Secretariat for help and funding. In reference to Phase II, he explained that plans for some of the taxa are in consideration. He added that a survey will be proposed for some species like *Vanda coerulea* where more data on the wild population in Thailand and Myanmar is needed before a proposal can be submitted for down-listing to Appendix II. He explained that internal control was also being considered for further controlling illegal wild orchid trade, and by increasing wild populations hopefully trade could occur internationally again.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) congratulated Mr McGough and Mr Thitiprasert for the exemplary project and stated that it could be a model of co-operation to many of those present.

9.1.2 Trade in *Dendrobium* (CITES Project S-56); report

Mr McGough (United Kingdom) explained that there is extensive trade in artificially propagated plants and hybrids. He expressed the need to consult with the Secretariat about the next phase of the project and also on how to use the information to help Parties. Mr McGough explained that there might be a possible consideration for de-listings and for publication of the material so that it may be available to scientific communities and individual Parties. He requested information as to how the data could be used.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that the two projects had turned out to be more work than initially thought. In reference to *Dendrobium*, Mr van Vliet stated that because most projects being considered at present should lead to a resolution on trade in wild plants, he suggested that a mechanism for following up on *Dendrobium* and publishing the information should be further considered.

9.1.3 Trade in medicinal plants (CITES Project S-109); report

Mr Schippmann (Germany) introduced the document and pointed out that there was an overlap with some of the other agenda items. He stated that he hoped that the information was helpful, and that this was what the role of the document should be. One of the problems encountered during the preparation of the document was the lack of scientific data used to make non-detriment findings, and in some cases missing trade data. He then referred to Pages 68 and 69 in reference to detrimental trade, and explained that the annual reporting data was insufficient in most cases for exporting countries and even more so for importing countries. He further explained that one other problem was the fact that many countries still report on permits issued rather than used. He stated that also there still was a high percentage of non-reporting on the importing side which could be because the plants are not recognised or the parts traded not readily recognizable. He added that it was also difficult to assess the size of export when quantities were reported as boxes or cartons. Therefore, he pointed out that there were two basic needs: 1) given that much trade is non-documented which results in non-awareness, the greatest need is in the training of CITES officials, customs officers and traders, and 2) the preparation of ID sheets, which he indicated would surely be discussed later. For the first need, Mr Schippmann explained that the information must be improved and then subsequent recommendations could be made.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that the Committee would discuss the document, but would not adopt its recommendations. She, and later in the discussion this was supported by other members of the Committee, was of the opinion that discussion of the recommendations could not be done without having consulted all the countries involved in the trade in the species concerned.

Various observers and members of the Committee complimented Germany on the work done to obtain all the details on the trade in the species under investigation. However, it was also pointed out that trade data for some of the species were not correct and that these needed to be amended. During this discussion, various observers and NGO's commented on the details in which trade in medicinal plants should be reported in order to obtain an accurate picture of the trade.

Concern was also expressed that some of the recommendations were directed at Parties without these having been consulted before hand. Several members explained that they felt that the Committee could not approve the document as it was presented.

Following this discussion Mr Schippmann (Germany) proposed that all recommendations be removed and that the Secretariat be requested to distribute the report in form of Notification to the Parties.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) replied by explaining that this would require even more work because the whole document would have to be translated, and that he felt that this would be ineffective since countries rarely respond to notifications.

He further explained that if the Secretariat were to be involved it would have relevant parts of the document translated, which would take time. But if no response was needed immediately, then the Secretariat would be happy to help.

Mr Jenkins (Chairman of the Animals Committee) stated that he supported the approach advocated and stressed the power achieved by collaborating with range states. He explained that range states can correct problems before they reach the Plants Committee. He expressed his thought that it was wise that the document be circulated to range states for comments and corrections and that this information can be taken into account for the formulation of

recommendations. Mr von Arx (representative for North America) expressed his agreement with Mr Jenkins and added that it was important that Parties properly report on their trade.

The Chairman supported the suggestion by Mr Jenkins and asked whether the Plants Committee would agree to further updating of the report. She then requested the Secretariat, in its time, to support the committee in seeking input from range states.

Mr van Vliet confirmed that he would communicate the information compiled by Germany to the Parties concerned requesting their comments. He would report back on this to the 10th meeting of the Plants Committee.

The Plants Committee, in summary, agreed to request the Secretariat to circulate the relevant parts of the report to the range states concerned, asking for comments and additional information.

9.1.4 Trade in Chinese orchids

Mr McGough (United Kingdom) introduced this item by explaining that it was a new project and the first report.

Mr Jia (China) stated that it was very pleasant to co-operate with Royal Botanic Gardens Kew. He explained that the report was divided into four parts. In reference to the second part of the report, he explained that now 10 orchids were being reviewed rather than the 5 indicated in the report. In reference to the third part he explained that difficulties were encountered due to needed fieldwork. In the fourth part, he explained that the paperwork was finished but needed translating from.

Both the Chairman and Secretariat stated that they were pleased with the project. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) stated that in reference to the first part of the project, a workshop in China was intended to take place later in the year so that adequate recommendations could be made and capacity building provided to China once the project ends.

9.1.5 Implementation of trade controls for *Nardostachys* and *Picrorhiza*

Mrs Marshall (TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa) introduced the document and explained that there were taxonomic questions remaining in regards to trade from Nepal. Because of this the CITES listing had been largely ineffective. She welcomed comment from the Committee on recommendations in the report.

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) stated that although there was little data available, the recommendations were useful. He suggested that the recommendations should be reviewed to identify those that were most useful. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) agreed to this.

Mr Hong (representative for Asia) referred to an Interim Report for part of the significant trade review published in *Opera Botanica* in 1984, which suggested that although the genus was separate, morphologically the species are very similar.

The Secretariat requested that the Plants Committee support intentions of the recommendations, rather than to adopt them and explained that they would serve as a good basis for further research.

Mr von Arx stated that although it was not the final report, he felt that it needed strengthening. He also pointed out that there were problems relating to the trade data.

The Chairman summarised by stating that the Plants Committee accepted and supported the Secretariat and TRAFFIC in its efforts and encouraged the continuation of the research. The Chairman suggested that the Plants Committee request the Secretariat to provide it with the final report so that the final recommendations can be considered.

The Secretariat stated that he would follow up on recommendations once the report was submitted (end June/July).

9.1.6 Implementation of trade controls for *Aquilaria malaccensis*

Mrs Marshall (TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa) introduced the document and explained that there were problems with identifying products in trade. She explained that there were at least 6 species threatened with exploitation for agar-wood and that the trade data were incomplete and inaccurate. The recommendations were preliminary, but she requested the committee's comments.

Mr Gideon (Papua New Guinea) explained that this industry was just starting in Papua New Guinea and he believed that this was also true for Indonesia and Irian Jaya. He stated that with the co-operation of other range States there was the possibility of supporting the consideration for Appendix-II listing of other species. He explained that there is much uncontrolled trade between the western part of his country and Irian Jaya.

Mr Zerbini (Brazil) explained that he would like to know initiatives of CITES, range states and imports since 1995 when the species was include in Appendix II.

Mrs Marshall stated that only the initiatives listed on pages 5 and 6 required efforts of range states and that more information would be available in the final report.

Mr Thitprasert (alternate representative for Asia) explained that there were frequent requests from TRAFFIC for information on trade records in Thailand. He explained that since 1997, Thailand had not issued any permits for export because the species has been threatened by habitat destruction.

9.1.7 Bulb trade from Georgia

Mr Schürmann (Netherlands) explained that there were flaws in the infrastructure caused in part by a poor mail system, little electronic mail available, and possibly poor transportation. He explained that overall there was a lack of legislation. The system had been copied from the Turkish quota system, but although there was a positive start there was still much to be desired. He explained that much of the problem was attributed to Georgia's financial needs.

Mr McGough (United Kingdom) agreed with these comments and explained that although Georgia had imported the framework from Turkey, it did not have the capacity to implement it because of the lack of Scientific Authority. He stressed the need to supply Georgia with the capacity to work and to build up a relationship with major importers like the Netherlands and the EU. Mr McGough added that there was little information available on the conservation status of bulbs because few outside botanists had been able to work within the country. He expressed the importance of supporting Georgia, but also giving a firm message that trade must be sustainable.

9.1.8 Bulb trade from Turkey

Mr Schürmann (Netherlands) introduced the document, and stated that the current quota system works well and suggested that it could be used as a model of sustainable use of plants

in the wild. He stated that the results would be available at the end of the year, but welcomed the representatives for Europe to visit Turkey for more information on the bulb trade.

The Chairman stated that she was very pleased with the results, and that co-operation with Turkey was good.

Mr McGough (United Kingdom) expressed support for comments by the Netherlands, and explained that Turkey had come a long way in the utilization of geophytes. He stated that a very good system was in place from individual collectors to traders and main exporters, and that there was an effective Scientific Authority which included people who check field sites on a regular basis. He expressed Turkey's interest to monitor more sites and stated that future co-operation was anticipated. He expressed his interest to see the work more widely published within the CITES committee, and suggested possible papers or presentations on the management systems in place.

The Chairman and Mr von Arx (representative for North America) both agreed.

Mr Leach (representative for Oceania) stated that one of the individuals in the working groups for the strategic Plan had recognised the need for positive example of the use of Appendix II. The Chairman stated that they had also addressed this in the Spanish group.

Mr Donaldson (representative for Africa) stated that there seemed to be two issues; 1) the need to publicise and 2) assess the components that have made the project successful.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that the Secretariat has possible useful contacts that would aid in the compilation of information for *Galanthus* and *Cyclamen*, which would help assess those components that have made the project work. He then stated that certainly the full co-operation between Scientific and Management Authorities in Turkey has been important.

The representative of Mexico explained that the Plants Committee should not only discern success in regard to the sustainable management of flora Species, but that the terms and concepts with which the Committee should work, should also be defined. He pointed out that in the Animals Committee ranching activities were very well refined, but this was not so for plants.

The Chairman stated that this had been discussed in the Strategic Plan workshop. She then requested that the delegates of the European Union who went on the mission to report and prepare a management model which can be disseminated.

Mr Schürmann stated that one of the delegates had stayed in Turkey for 2 extra weeks to look at other sites, and that he had prepared a final report which would be distributed to the Plants Committee and the Conference of the Parties. He explained that this could be a good basis to develop a management model.

The Plants Committee recognised the quality of the management program in place in Turkey and encouraged those who have participated in this to collate their knowledge and develop a model for the sustainable use of natural resources by other range states.

9.2 Medicinal plants

9.2.1 Definition of future working priorities regarding significant trade studies, taking into account the report of CITES project S-109 and priorities established at PC8

The Secretariat suggested that this item receive a short debate and requested that Parties provide input on medicinals, but to defer action until after comments.

The Chairman agreed and requested that the Secretariat consult with the range states on the relevant parts of the project S-109 before further actions will be determined. The Plants Committee agreed to this.

9.2.2 Trade in *Prunus africana*; report

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) introduced this topic by explaining that in the eighth Plants Committee meeting in Chile there had been a presentation on the problems in the implementation of control mechanism, and subsequent working group had discussed the issue. She explained that the main problems identified by the working groups was with the regions of Congo and Madagascar.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) stated that the information he had received was summarised in the document. He explained that there was a lack of response from range states, and that only Kenya and Madagascar had responded, and that he had received documents from Cameroon only this morning. He added that the Secretariat intends to continue monitoring trade of *Prunus africana*.

Mr Allain (France) explained that France is an importer and exporter of *Prunus africana*. He felt that the available trade data did not reflect the actual harvest. Bark was collected for other purposes as well.

He further explained that in France there is one company that purifies extracts for sale to countries in the EU and elsewhere, one company that processes bark to obtain the extracts, and one company that produces the final products. He also referred to the difference between the east coast of Africa and Madagascar in the manner in which *Prunus* trees respond to partial debarking. On Madagascar the regeneration of the bark is more difficult and many parasites attack the newly grown bark.

Mr Ravelomanantsoa (Madagascar) explained that the figures in the document were not correct. He explained that he was in the business of trade of medicinal plants including *Prunus africana*, and that he had come to the meeting to support the sustainable use of *P. africana* in Madagascar. He referred to the socio-economic importance of *P. africana* in Madagascar and stated that the revenue was worth millions of dollars in foreign currency. He expressed his wish to improve Madagascar's relationship with the Secretariat of CITES.

Mrs Núñez (Spain) explained that Spain imports *P. africana* from Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea and that it is then re-exported as an extract. She explained that control methods for trade have been implemented.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman), speaking on behalf of the Scientific Authority of Spain, that in the Masters Degree course offered in Spain, one of the Scientific Authorities of Equatorial Guinea had participated and selected *P. africana* to carry out the required research.

Mrs Corbetta (Italy) referred to Italy's 1995 and 1996 data within the report explaining that these were probably not correct but she would be sure to check. She stated that in 1996 *P. africana* was not imported directly from Madagascar but through France.

Mr Acworth (Mount Cameroon Project) stated that Cameroon's use of available data to come up with sustainable quota had been executed well. He explained that Cameroon would welcome guidance from the Secretariat in reference to the quota setting and non-detriment findings. He stated that many countries that produce *P. africana* have been discussing possible methods for reporting and monitoring exchange programs. Mr Acworth expressed the importance of collaboration with governments, communities, non-government organisations and trade entities for the control of exploitation, and that benefits must be shared fairly between partners. He added that the most critical issue is that communities at a local level should have the opportunity to participate. The Chairman stated that she fully supported his ideas about what a working co-operative project should be.

Mr Acworth indicated that some of the available methods had been implemented in Cameroon. He suggested that more assistance was needed to evaluate the population status. Mr Acworth explained that studies had been conducted with the Ministry, the industry, and the community in reference to yield of bark and that those results were available. He explained that research to assess the recovery of exploited trees requires long-term studies, and that data from the last 25 years are difficult to obtain. He stated that problems also arise because of differences in regeneration of the bark in different regions. Mr Acworth stated that there was also a project to compile all information available on *P. africana* to produce a monograph, and although this wouldn't be finished until the following year there was some information available already.

Mr Allain expressed his concern about trade in *P. africana* and explained that he had been searching for funds to begin studies on bark reconstitution, impact of debarking, reserves and long term survival. He stated that 4 to 5 years were needed before results of de-barking studies would be available and then he would be able to present recommendations in reference to future exploitation.

Mrs Clemente expressed her desire that the Secretariat continue monitoring the topic. She then requested that the Plants Committee support a project where all groups currently working on *P. africana* would be involved in developing a model on sustainable use within 3 to 5 years.

Mr van Vliet explained that if the project directly involved all people working on *P. africana*, the project would be very large. He suggested that since the Secretariat is working on a mechanism for non-detriment findings that could be a first step to address the issue.

Mrs Corbetta expressed her interest in participating in such a project and stated that some finances could be sought.

Mr Acworth suggested that he could contact co-ordinators of the present study to see if they could be invited to discuss the project.

The Chairman explained that there were two possibilities; 1) that the Secretariat co-ordinate this by including it in the work on non-detriment findings, and 2) that the project be established with the direct involvement of different parties.

Mr van Vliet explained that it was not clear how many trees could be harvested or what quantities could be extracted that would be non-detrimental, and expressed the need to develop a mechanism to determine this. He then addressed the issue of funding for a large project involving different parties, and explained that he felt that discussions to co-ordinate such a project would be long and on-going.

Mr Allain explained that there was much more data than realised, and that these data are scattered. He suggested that the data needs collating by companies and scientific entities which would be a large project.

Mr McGough suggested that the first stage of the project could be to look at the non-detriment finding as the Secretariat had suggested and then a second stage could be discussed at a later time. He explained that the reports on non-detriment findings could be used in the second stage of the project involving collaboration among Parties.

Mr Acworth explained that it was important that government and local managers, and exploiters agree on approaches to inventory populations and establishing quotas. He recommended the acceptance of the support from the Secretariat to develop and test methods. He suggested that these methods then be endorsed and used more widely.

The Plants Committee agreed to support further action in two phases:

1. Develop a project to assist Parties in evaluating the population status and to make recommendations on the mechanism to establish quotas.
2. Use the information from phase 1 and bring together the experiences of all parties involved in order to develop and test the methodology for use in other areas.

9.3 Priorities for the Review of Significant Trade as approved at the 10th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

Mr McGough (United Kingdom) introduced the document and explained that the priority for the Review of Significant Trade was to address the resolution on significant trade which parallels that of the Animals Committee.

9.4 Draft resolution on trade in wild-collected plant specimens

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced the document. In reference to legal aspects of the resolution he stated that in principal they should be exactly the same as those for the Animals Committee, and recommended that the Plants Committee only discuss the proposed new text that is specifically appropriate to plants. He stated that these discussions would then be communicated by the Secretariat to the Animals Committee.

Mr Jenkins (Chairman of the Animals Committee) explained that the Animals Committee would subject the current Resolution Conf. 8.9 to a detailed analysis in light of the six years of implementation. He expressed his doubt that this would result in the weakening of the intent, but instead would strengthen the process. He explained that the terminology might be addressed and no differentiation between primary and secondary recommendations made and a reporting timeframe for each recommendation incorporated. He indicated that there were problems experienced with regard to lack of data in certain faunal groups where data were not useful for making non-detriment finding. Mr Jenkins continued by stating that some Plants Committee text may be appropriate to the Animals Committee, and that it was important to present a universal document applicable to both plants and animals at the Conference of the Parties. He explained that the Animals Committee would also consider a "plain English guide" for Parties to easily understand the process.

Mr Donaldson (representative for Africa) inquired as to the Animals Committee's recommendation for a time limit for responses. Mr Jenkins replied by explaining that past experience in formulating recommendations to be submitted to Parties had proved the need to be very explicit so that Parties are clear on what is needed. He suggested that the time frame could be as short as one month if it is only for the provision of data, but that the time limit take into account the content of the recommendations.

Mrs Lyke (United States) expressed their support for the recommendation to contain time frames depending upon the time required rather than a generic time frame, and suggested that specific recommendations could be drafted to reflect urgency in reference to particular countries.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) addressed the issue involving the paragraphs differentiating the resolution for plants and animals, and expressed her concern that if there was no agreement on this issue that the text might continue to read differently for the plants and animals section. She then explained that some Parties might want to know their proposed time-frame in advance.

Mr van Vliet stressed the importance that the resolution should apply to all species covered by CITES.

Mr Jenkins referred to page 4, paragraph d), and explained that this did not need to be a prescribed paragraph, but that it could be a recommendation. He explained that the Animals Committee had considered it a recommendation in the past, and that if the Plants Committee concludes that there is insufficient data, then conclusion could be that one or more range states undertake a study within a certain time frame.

Mr van Vliet agreed and explained that if the Plants Committee could agree to the principle associated with the recommendations on fixed time frames, then paragraphs b, c, and d could be combined into one paragraph. This would then apply to both plants and animals and would make the resolution easily applicable. The Chairman requested that the Secretariat give the Plants Committee a draft of this after the Animals Committee meeting.

Mr Donaldson expressed his support of reconciliation as the Secretariat had suggested, and suggested certain administrative procedures in reference to the time frame. Mr Leach (representative for Oceania) stated that he felt it important to maintain flexibility in setting time frames. Mr Hong (representative for Asia) agreed.

Mrs Marshall (TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa) expressed concern for two issues; 1) how species are selected for the review and suggested that guidance might be included in the resolution, and 2) that some indicators in reference to timing of review of species in the appendices might be different for plants and animals.

Mr Fragoso (WCMC) suggested that the species should be selected on the basis of certain criteria, and that wording could be included in reference to the timing of the review of species on Appendices.

The Secretariat agreed with Mrs Marshall and referred to the example offered by the WCMC analysis, and explained that in the past it was not possible to have a figure for guidance on selection of plants to be reviewed. He explained that an important issue to be considered was whether more information is needed to develop a guideline. In reference to the second concern expressed by Mrs Marshall, he explained that this issue would be revisited at the Animals Committee.

Mr Schippmann (Germany) asked the Secretariat for clarification and suggested that in reference to page 4, e) that to satisfy the Secretariat "and Chairman of the Plants Committee" it include "and/or co-ordinator of Significant Trade Review Process" to give a wider assessment.

Mr van Vliet stated that the remark made by Mr Schippmann was noted and would be considered after the Animals Committee. However, he pointed out that it would not be appropriate to involve the co-ordinator who has no direct involvement in the decisions of the Committee.

Mr Schippmann inquired as to the possibility of better defining what is understood with the Primary Review. Mr van Vliet replied by explaining that the words could refer to average trade data after a period of time, however, that there was reference on page 1 and 2 to the number of sources of

information. He added that the text on the top of page 2 could be taken to account for the meaning of "primary review".

Mr Schippmann referred to problems in defining Significant Trade in terms of numbers of specific taxa, and explained that bad reporting could account for much of the missing data. He stated that there was a choice to either go into Significant Trade Process or delete the species from the Appendices. He stated that he would be satisfied to have it included in the Primary Review.

Mr McGough (United Kingdom) stated that the development of some criteria was needed. He referred to criteria on page 6, and explained that bearing in mind the comments made previously, preparing a single document for both animals and plants would make the process more transparent. He suggested the possibility of perhaps including a flow diagram in an annex.

Mr Jenkins agreed with the transparent process as it is seen in the best interest of exporting Parties. He expressed his reluctance however, from the standpoint of the Animals Committee, of more additions in the form of annexes.

The Plants Committee approved the preparation of a single Draft Resolution for both plants and animals, and requested the Secretariat to communicate to the Plants Committee the results of the relevant discussions at the forthcoming meeting of the Animals Committee.

9.5 Threats to plant population in Poland because of trade as medicinals

Mrs Werblan-Jakubiec (Poland) introduced the document and explained that there were problems presented by the lack of detailed data.

Mr Schippmann (Germany) agreed with Mrs Werblan-Jakubiec. He added that Germany and Poland have a long border, and that Poland is Germany's source of medicinal plants which are not listed. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) stated that it would be possible to add the plants under Annex D of the EU Regulation if Germany has concerns.

10. Review of the Appendices

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) introduced this document and explained that it would be submitted to the Conference of the Parties. She explained that the working group organised in the eighth Plants Committee had concluded that the Appendices of CITES were overloaded with plants and the number of species included needed to be reduced by de-listing the "weeds" and concentrating on plants that needed attention. The working groups had met and established certain procedures to do this. The priority issues agreed upon were:

1. Timber species (Decision 10.87 to Plants Committee).
2. Taxa included in Appendices in 1973 and during the 1st meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 1976. This did not consider large groups like orchids, cacti, and cycads, however some species of orchids and cacti were examined.
3. Taxa included in 1979 at the 2nd meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
4. Taxa included in 1983 at the 3rd meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
5. Item concerning tree fern issue which was already addressed at the Tenerife meeting (1996).

The Chairman explained that for each issue one or several Parties or individuals from Parties carried out a review and applied criteria from Resolution Conf. 9.24. The protocol was prepared by the Chairmen, the Secretariat, and Mrs Sandison (United Kingdom).

It was agreed that after consideration of reports from each group, two working groups would be established; one to recommend which species should be submitted to the Conference of the Parties, and the second group could carry out a self analysis of difficulties met in carrying out the review.

10.1 Progress report

10.1.1a Carnivorous plants

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) introduced this topic explained some difficulties with the review process because of lack of communication from range states. He explained that in most cases, there was little biological information available from the range states on taxa reviewed. Most of the information was from IUCN which indicating that all species were threatened, but this was mostly due to habitat destruction and not from trade.

In reference to *Dionaea*, Mr von Arx explained that the information, received after the preparation of the document, suggested that there was an increase in trade in wild specimens. He therefore had changed the recommendation and the species should not be deleted from the appendices.

Mr von Arx explained that with regard to *Darlingtonia* there was also some new information since the preparation of the document. Most trade is in artificially propagated plants and the species is widely distributed between California and Oregon which includes a substantial amount of remote habitat. He explained that because there is little threat it is not relevant for Appendix II listing.

Mr von Arx continued on to *Sarracenia*, and explained that there are some identification problems because the plant loses its leaves in the winter. He stated that the species needs to remain on Appendix I because of its small populations. He explained that some other subspecies of *Sarracenia rubra* should be placed on Appendix I for the same reasons. He added that recent data show that there is not much international trade in other species. Other considerations, such as rhizome trade, could possibly be addressed in the working groups.

Mr von Arx further explained that it was difficult to obtain information on *Nepenthes*, and that most of the information came from the IUCN SSC groups. There are 10-15 species that should be in Appendix II, and close to 70 that do not meet criteria for Appendix II and 6 that qualify for Appendix I. Mr von Arx explained that most of the trade in *Nepenthes* was in artificially propagated specimens, and pointed out that again there was new information which suggested that there were problems with identification due to look-alikes.

The Chairman thanked Mr von Arx and requested to update the report so that it could be distributed to the working group for discussion on specific proposals.

10.1.1b *Byblis*

Mr Leach (representative for Oceania) introduced this issue by explaining that there had been similar problems with communication. He explained that since there were no specific population numbers, the review had had to rely on field knowledge. He pointed out that there were contradictory opinions between Australian state conservation agencies and one taxonomic expert, and that there was also recognition of some subspecies. Mr Leach explained that there hadn't been a specific recommendation made, but that he did not believe that any of the species met criteria for Appendix listings. He pointed out that localities in Indonesia and Papua New Guinea are so remote that it is unlikely for collectors to go there, and that there is very little horticultural value. In regard to *Cephalotus*, Mr Leach explained that the Australian Authorities had already submitted a formal proposal to the Conference of the Parties.

10.1.2 *Ceropegia* spp.

Mr de Koning (Netherlands) referred to the trade data and stated that there was no international or illegal trade. He explained that there were more than 200 species but no complete taxonomic revision had been undertaken in about 50 years. He added that threat was due to habitat destruction or local use, and that 98% of plants traded were artificially propagated specimens. He suggested that *C. armandii* could be maintained on the Appendices.

10.1.3 United States species

Mrs Lyke (observer from the United States) stated that each species assessment would be posted on the web site and that it was also available to anyone interested. She explained that there were some difficulties in getting new data, and also on the nomenclature.

10.1.4 Didiereaceae

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) introduced this topic and explained that there was information available from the field work for the project on succulents in Madagascar. He expressed his disappointment in not having communication with the Authorities of Madagascar, but would try to obtain more information from Scientific Authorities of Madagascar if needed.

Mr von Arx stated that threats were due to habitat destruction and local use and that because of this the whole family did not belong on the Appendices.

10.1.5 Three succulent species

Mrs de Angelis (Italy) referred to the document for details, and stated that it recommended that *Pachycereus militaris* should remain in Appendix I.

10.1.6 *Frerea indica*

Although Mr de Koning (Netherlands) had not received any information from India on this issue, de-listing was recommended.

10.1.7 *Cyclamen*, *Dioscorea* and *Dypsis*

Mr McGough (United Kingdom) introduced this item and explained that there were problems with contact with the range states and with the postal system and civil war. In reference to orchids, he stated that there was not enough information so it was not included. In reference to the *Cyclamen*, he stated that trade from Turkey may be sustainable, but that *Cyclamen* should still be kept on Appendix II. He further explained that in reference to *Dioscorea*, there was information from German trade studies indicating that there was some trade within the region. He suggested that perhaps trade was in derivatives rather than timber. He explained that the report suggested de-listing, but that this should be reconsidered on the basis of Germany's study. He pointed out that there was little trade in *Dypsis*, but that it should be maintained on Appendix II.

10.1.8 Report on the initiative of the Netherlands on the evaluation of tree species

Mr de Koning (Netherlands) referred to the document and explained that the purpose of Phase I had been to test the usefulness of the CITES criteria for timber species. He explained that the Plants Committee needed to decide on the document's use and methods for utilising it.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) thanked and congratulated the Netherlands for their work and stated that she believed that it is extremely useful. She explained that perhaps for some species the information is incomplete. The Chairman expressed her wish that the Plants Committee support the use of the document, to which Mr Hong (representative for Asia) expressed agreement.

Mr Fullerton (Canada) explained that because it is a document that will be widely used, he suggested the possibility for the provision of additional information to improve the document. The Chairman suggested that the document be adopted as a point of reference and improvements made progressively. The Plants Committee agreed on this.

Mr Hendricks (United States) stated that the document was useful for listing proposals, but expressed his concern that it should be made clear that it is not a scientific authority who decides on whether a species should be listed or not.

Mr Donaldson (representative for Africa) requested clarification in reference to updates, and whether this pertained only to existing species in the document or other species as well. Mr de Koning replied by stating that any contribution on species, including others, were very welcome.

The Chairman explained that once the document was adopted and updated it must be decided to whom the document should be distributed. Mrs Mora explained that she felt it relevant to distribute it to the experts in different countries.

The Chairman replied by stating that this could be difficult, and suggested that it might be more appropriate if it were distributed to Management and Scientific Authorities of Parties which can then distribute it to appropriate entities and experts.

Mr Donaldson agreed with Mrs Mora (representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean) because it might result in obtaining more information, but he also stated that it would be useful to user groups. He expressed his support that it go to Management and Scientific Authorities so that they could use it as well.

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) pointed out that the document was a useful tool to help Management Authorities begin their work on non-detriment findings. He added that he felt it important to enclose a letter explaining what the document was, its purpose, and who might use it. Mrs Clemente agreed and stated that the document should then be distributed to Management and Scientific Authorities, and that they should be requested to include a letter prepared on behalf of the Plants Committee explaining what is expected from its distribution. To insure that it is not static, more information could be gathered from experts and countries. The Chairman offered to draft a letter for this purpose.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) suggested that perhaps he could meet with Mr de Koning and identify the most effective method of distribution and handling of responses received.

Mr Leach (representative for Oceania) addressed the need for a method to communicate future updates and suggested the possibility of doing this in some electronic format. In response, the Chairman requested the Secretariat to communicate with the Netherlands to identify to whom the documents should be sent.

Mr de Koning indicated that perhaps WCMC could be of help in distribution of the document. Mr Fragoso assured that WCMC had the intention to distribute the document as widely as possible.

Mr Kiehn (Austria) expressed his concern that it should be made clear that the document is an initial source document and that recommendations should be only made on data available, and suggested that a statement explaining this be included in the cover letter. Mr Hendricks (observer from the United States) supported this idea.

The Chairman summarised the discussion by stating that the Plants Committee recognised the report as an extremely valuable and useful document to be used in the framework of CITES. The Plants Committee welcomed all comments and additional data that would improve the report and keep it updated to form a dynamic source of information.

Later in the week, following the presentation of the report of a small working group, the Committee recommended that the report be distributed to the Management and Scientific Authorities of the Parties, and to relevant international organisations and experts. It also recommended that the report be distributed with a notification, explaining the purpose and contents of the report, to prevent confusion or misunderstanding and with suggestions for further distribution on a national level. Furthermore the report should be made available in electronic form on the Web, and should be updated with additional data provided by parties, institutions and experts. The Plants Committee requested the Netherlands to co-ordinate the implementation of the recommendations above.

10.2 Taxa for next period of the review

Mr Lüthy (Switzerland) introduced the document with the following intervention:

In document PC 8 10.2, review of the Appendices, it is stated that the Cactaceae listed in Appendix I have second priority in the Review process. Switzerland has some reservations concerning Cactaceae listed in Appendix I. Four *Melocactus* species and the genus *Discocactus*, with only *D. horstii* treated as an Appendix I species. Switzerland is in a process of reviewing its reservations quite intensively. The Scientific Authority of Switzerland therefore would like to have a further prioritisation within the Cactaceae and request whether *Melocactus* spp. and *Discocactus* spp. could be reviewed with priority.

Later in the week, the Plants Committee recommended that the following list of species be adopted for the next phase of the Review of the Appendices:

Orchidaceae spp.

Some Appendix-I Orchidaceae spp. from the first phase as well as some *Aloe* spp. In addition the following Appendix-I Cactaceae:

Coryphantha werdermannii

Mammillaria pectinifera

Mammillaria solisioides

Strombocactus spp.

Obregonia denegrii

Aztekium ritteri

Astrophytom asterias

Discocactus spp.

Melocactus spp.

10.3 Tree ferns

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) introduced the document. Mr Leach (representative for Oceania) stated that if the entire family were to be de-listed there could be problems with a few taxa. The Chairman asked whether it was acceptable to maintain *Dicksonia sellowiana*, *Cibotium barometz* and *Cyathea* on the list, as suggested in the document prepared by the Secretariat.

Mrs Mora (representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean) stated that as a result of information from communication with Guatemala on *Cyathea* trade, she felt that it should be kept in the Appendices.

Mr Kiehn (Austria) stated that implementation of identification of tree ferns and parts was a major problem in the whole discussion. He explained that it would be quite easy to distinguish material from Central and South America as *Dicksonia* spp., but that the problem was in distinguishing material of *Cyathea* from other members of the family. He stressed the fact that the entire family should either be included or excluded and that otherwise enforcement would be impossible.

Mr Schippmann (Germany) stated that he supported the Secretariat's view of revisiting some taxa at a genus level and maintaining others at the species level.

The issue was referred to the working group on the review of the appendices.

Before closing the discussion on the subject, Mrs Clemente requested that a working group composed of co-ordinators be established with the purpose of: 1) analysing what had been submitted and what the Plants Committee should request as a depository in order to draft de-listings or transfers, 2) analysing difficulties encountered during this process, and self analysis of procedural approach and reliability of process, and 3) identifying the groups that should be dealt with in the next review of the Appendices. The Chairman also requested that Switzerland, TRAFFIC, Germany, and the Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee attend.

Later in the week, the Committee approved the recommendations of the working group. These recommendations are contained in Annex 3.

11. Checklists and nomenclature

11.1 Progress report

Mr McGough (Vice-Chairman, Nomenclature Committee) introduced the report and requested comment, particularly from the range states, on the use of the checklists. He referred to Volume 3 of the Orchid Checklist and explained that printing would be done on demand no longer requiring large stocks. He explained that prints could also include updates and amendments. He stated that by printing on demand, production would be cheaper. He indicated that there was still a larger number of copies of Checklist Orchids Volume 2 in stock which could be distributed free of charge to those that need them.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) stated that work on the checklists should be continued and that it was useful not only to scientists, but also to Management Authorities. She explained that new production methods were useful, but suggested that not all copies should be sent out. She indicated that in Spain, photocopies would be sent to all customs people, and other appropriate entities. She suggested that entities requesting copies be prudent and ask for 1 or 2 copies only.

Mr McGough explained that at present there was a large stock of checklists and that it was preferable to distribute these rather than making photocopies. He explained that as the production costs in future decrease, outside funding for distribution costs could be encouraged. The Chairman suggested that at the present time the receiver pay for delivery of large numbers of the checklists.

12. Identification materials for plants

12.1 Progress report on identification sheets, ID Manual

Mr Schürmann (Vice-Chairman of the Identification Manual Committee) introduced the document and explained that also alternative approaches to encourage Parties to send identification material were being considered.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) expressed her appreciation for the work on the Identification Manual. Mr von Arx (representative for North America) also complimented the work and suggested the possibility of developing a mechanism that Parties would be encouraged to send identification material. Mrs Clemente agreed and explained that when a proposal is submitted it would be compulsory to submit an identification sheet at the same time.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that there was already a Resolution requiring this. He stated that this Plants Committee could suggest to the Parties to provide Identification Material. Mr Schürmann suggested a possible change in the current Resolution to obtain more identification materials.

Mrs Clemente (Spain) asked Mr Schürmann whether the publication on the identification of timber species from the material prepared and sent to the Secretariat by Spain almost two years ago had already been prepared. Mr Schürmann responded that he had no such material. Mr van Vliet informed that this material was in his hands.

12.2 Vernacular names of timber species

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that this item was for information only, and that the Notification to the Parties only included CITES species for which updates would be circulated.

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) suggested the possibility for placing the information on the CITES web-site, and explained that if it were to be updated only once a year it would not be difficult. The Secretariat replied by stating that the notifications were already the web-site. He added that efforts would be made to try to get everything useful on the web-site.

12.3 Progress under priorities proposed by the Identification Manual Committee

12.3.1 National identification material sent to the Secretariat; update

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that he had received nothing on the subject. The Chairman expressed her concern and suggested that a request be made to Parties to send material to the Secretariat. The Plants Committee supported this.

12.4 Guide for identification of timber

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) stated that work had been initiated, concentrating on macroscopic identification, in format similar to earlier Identification Manuals used by customs in Canada. He explained that a final draft would be ready by autumn of 1999, and that all Appendix I timber species and those within Appendix II at the genus or species level would be included. He explained that non-CITES look-alike species would be addressed also.

12.5 *Hydrastis* and *Panax*

Mr Gabel (observer from the United States) introduced the issue and explained that it had been addressed at the eighth meeting of the Plants Committee which gave the United States the responsibility to provide identification sheets. The observer stated that they were currently working with the Scientific Authorities of Germany to prepare these.

Mr Schippmann (Germany) added that Germany was focussing on the German version of the handbook and that English translations would be provided.

13. Other projects on plants

13.1 Progress reports on CITES projects

13.1.1 *Aloe vera* var. *vera* (CITES Project S-93); progress report

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) stated that he had current contact with Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, Italy and Mr Rejdali (representative for Africa) and was waiting on their response to prepare the contract.

13.2 New projects

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) stated that at the moment there were no new projects but that work on the project on *Prunus africana* would be picked up as soon as possible.

The Chairman then closed the session, to allow Mrs Robinson (Australia) to give a demonstration of the CD ROM database on CITES enforcement. She explained that the CD has a link to the Internet which includes links to relevant treaties. She added that it included links to environmental newsletters and international newspapers, and also included a tutorial to help surf the Internet. Mrs Robinson explained that one issue that needed to be addressed before copies could be made was that of updating the information. However, she pointed out that the links would go directly to the latest versions.

Mr von Arx (Vice-Chairman) stated that it was very useful, and indicated that the links would be useful for all the regions.

14. Technical issues

14.1 Trade in seeds of Mexican cacti: update on implementation and explanatory document to be distributed

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) introduced this topic by explaining that at the seventh Plants Committee meeting, the Mexican delegate had submitted a proposal requesting the Plants Committee to support efforts in reference to conservation of Mexican cacti and to support inclusion of Mexican cactus seeds in Appendix II. The Plants Committee had agreed to support the Mexican efforts, knowing that it was impossible to detect seeds when going through customs, but had requested the Mexican Authority to start implementing a mechanism through which nurserymen in other parts of the world could be supplied with legal transportation of the material. She explained that the Mexican Management Authority had stated that they had begun work on a mechanism, but she expressed her concern that 2 years had passed and still there were no results.

Mr Pérez Ramírez (Mexico) explained that he hoped that with the documents submitted, the situation would be clarified. He explained the progress made by Mexico which was indicated within the document and emphasised many different aspects of efforts made by the Mexican Authorities to meet their responsibility. He explained that there were two important points to consider in the national policy to form economic incentives for the local community; 1) establishment of units of local communities for wildlife utilization, and 2) provide management plans and the capacity to implement these. He stated that they were working to revise Web pages for different parties interested in Mexican cacti, and to clear certification procedures so that the producers could legally take material to their markets. He added that they were promoting the signing of agreements with local communities and enforcement authorities on this issue.

Mr de Koning (representative for Europe) congratulated Mexico for its efforts, but expressed his concern that the report presented did not respond to the conditions set forth in the seventh Plants Committee meeting.

In response to the status of Mexico's establishment of mechanisms through which other countries could be supplied with legal the material, Mr Pérez Ramírez stated that in Mexico there is currently a mechanism in place that allows for collecting of seeds for scientific purposes for foreigners. An official decree is being prepared to regulate this. The documents concerned will be sent to the Chairman before the meeting of the Animals Committee.

Mr Allain (France) expressed his concern that CITES seemed to be applying rules rather than conserving plants only because Mexico had not been able to apply the rules. Mr Pérez Ramírez stated that after the eighth Plants Committee, the Mexican Management Authority had serious problems with the legal export of wild seeds from Mexico. He stated that Mexico still has a legislation dating back to the 1930's and 40's that prohibits export of wild seeds. He explained that both cactus experts and NGOs had submitted a petition that this project be delayed until these problems had been resolved.

Mr Robbins (TRAFFIC-USA) recognized that Mexico had problems in the control of exports of Mexican seeds. The observer explained that sometimes it is easier to detect smuggling by identifying the presence of specimens in consumer markets. In previous Plants Committees, delegates indicated that by listing seeds in Appendix II, authorities could follow-up on the sale of rare or endemic newly discovered cacti in catalogues, journals, and other documents. The observer from TRAFFIC would like to know whether market investigations had been carried out to identify plants perhaps grown from seeds of dubious origin.

Mrs Clemente (representative for Europe), stated that in some nurseries irregularities had been detected with some of the Appendix-I seeds. She explained, however, that the central issue was the sustainable use of Appendix-II species many of which were not a conservation problem and to this end Mexico had promised to begin implementing measures to achieve this. Mrs Clemente explained that many cacti enthusiast would like to acquire material from Mexico in a legal manner. She expressed concern about the absence of this legal method, because that would increase illegal trade. Mr Kiehn (Austria) added that an individual in Austria had applied for seeds from Mexico, but that Mexico had not issued an export permit yet.

Mr Pérez Ramírez explained that the sustainable use of key resources must be based on scientific and technical studies and that Mexico does not have a list yet of what can be traded. He emphasised the fact that Mexico was making real efforts. He offered an invitation to the Chairman so that she could witness efforts made in conservation and management for sustainable use.

The Chairman explained that Mexico had stated in the seventh meeting of the Plants Committee that listing of seeds in Appendix II would be of value and needed appropriate management. The Plants Committee agreed that a mechanism was needed to facilitate the legal movement of seeds. She explained that she fully agreed that each country has sovereignty over their resources, but pointed out that Mexico had offered to facilitate the movement of this material.

Mr Pérez Ramírez explained that Mexico had submitted a proposal in Costa Rica which made it clear that trade in wild material was prohibited. He explained that the problem had occurred because NGOs supported the proposal to include seeds in Appendix II as a method of regulating illegal trade. He stated that in Pucón the proposal was submitted and that TRAFFIC had opposed it because it overlooked the national legislation. He explained that TRAFFIC had requested that action be delayed until this problem was solved, and requested that a new proposal be submitted for inclusion of artificially propagated plants in Appendix II. The Chairman clarified the fact that the issue was in reference to Appendix II inclusion of seeds rather than artificially propagated plants.

Mr Armstrong (Secretariat) stated that the treating of some taxa in CITES seemed to contain a basic conflict. He explained that if a Party precludes all trade in wild-collected material, then the inclusion of plants or seeds on Appendix II is questionable. He pointed out that Mexico had done this even though it was not consistent with national legislation. He stated that a resolution must be made in cases where national legislation conflicts with the Appendix listing.

Mr Donaldson (representative for Africa) stated that this issue could also be of concern for his region in reference to species of Cycads in Africa, and expressed his confusion about the pressure placed on Mexico by Europe. He inquired as to whether Europe would still want Mexico to supply seeds by some other channel even if the proposal in Pucón had been withdrawn. In response, Mrs Clemente explained that the issue had in fact been raised because of problems in illegal trade in Europe, and that Europe was searching for a method to co-operate and establish technical links with Mexico at the same time avoiding illegal trade.

The Chairman then requested that Mexico give a written statement that a procedure can be established to institute an agreement. Mrs Mora (representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean) suggested that Mexico should establish a deadline for sending a progress note. Mr Perez Ramirez responded that he would send a very clear official note to the Chairman and the Secretariat before 1st July 1999.

14.2 Trade in pitcher plants

Mr Torbett (United States) explained that they had reviewed the documents and said that there were discrepancies present when gathering the information. He explained that a shipment of 13,000 plants had been counted twice and it was believed that no plants were exported without CITES permit. No illegal international trade was detected.

14.3 Export quotas for plants

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) suggested that this item be moved to the agenda for the next meeting, but ensured the Committee that the quota mechanism related to non-detriment findings was working well.

14.4 *Turbinicarpus* in Mexico

Mr Kiehn (Austria) stated that this was an information document only and that the project had not been started yet. He explained some of the problems mentioned in the document.

Mr Perez Ramírez, (observer from Mexico) stated that a section on habitat protection in Mexico had been incorporated in the legislation. He explained that in 1996 Mexican legislation had been amended and now included a chapter on environmental activities, and because of this anyone infringing this law is subject to a prison sanction of a maximum period of six years.

15. Training initiatives

15.1 Standard slide package on CITES plant issues; progress report

Ms Sandison (United Kingdom) introduced the slide pack by explaining that training materials in reference to plants was needed and therefore the idea of developing a slide pack had been endorsed. She stated that the first guide was ready to be published. Ms Sandison thanked Mrs Clemente, Mr de Koning, Mr Sajeva, and the respective Parties for contributions to the development of the slide pack. She explained that they were produced in English, Spanish, and French, and that interest had been expressed during the meeting to have it translated into Chinese, Italian, German, and Polish. She stated that it was financed by the Secretariat and the Management Authority of the United Kingdom, and that a copy would be sent by the Secretariat to each Party. She suggested that it be distributed to users.

Mr Schippmann (Germany) pointed out that this resource would be useful in training seminars. The Chairman stated that the small working group established to develop the first edition was invited to Spain to work on another edition.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) congratulated the United Kingdom for its initiative and stated that it was extremely useful. She suggested that the Plants Committee should support development of new titles and seek assistance for producing them. The Plants Committee agreed to this.

15.2 Regional training session on CITES issues

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) introduced this topic by explaining that Mr Rejdali (representative for Africa), sent a fax asking for the development of more training seminars in the African Region. In reference to the Masters program in Spain, she explained that a course had been held last year for three months (including 57 experts) and had had the participation of 25 individuals from 14 different countries (12 Latin American and Equatorial Guinea). She stated that there would be a second Masters degree course that would begin in October and would consist of 500 hours. She explained that the financial support for the II Master course (4 October - 17 December 1999) was provided by the Foundation of Biodiversity in Spain. Mrs Clemente requested the participants to disseminate the information on the Masters program. She added that the Spanish government was interested in organising the masters program on an ongoing basis and to also run it in English and French. Mr Landázuri (Mexico) congratulated Spain for this excellent initiative and explained that several people from the CITES authorities had participated in the first course and had received excellent teaching. Mrs Mora (representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean) requested the Plants Committee to support the masters program.

The Plants Committee congratulated Spain on its initiative for the Master's course and agreed to strongly support the continuation of further courses.

15.3 Training initiatives in Poland

Mrs Werblan-Jakubiec (Poland) stated that the first training course for Customs officers for the identification on succulent and carnivorous plants had been organized in her country. She expressed desire to organize similar seminars in co-operation with Russian Federation, Belarus and other eastern European countries. She also expressed interest for working with Germany to organize a training course in Germany or Poland.

16. Public awareness

16.1 Information exchange between Management Authorities; update of information received

The Chairman stated that at last this information had been submitted.

16.2 Information for the public on the significance of Appendix II; progress report

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) stated that she, Mrs Marshall (TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa), and Mr von Arx (representative for North America) had had discussions on the issue, but that structured ideas had not been developed. Mr von Arx stated that there was no report, and suggested the possibility for considering another method to proceed with the item so that progress could be made. The Chairman suggested that a campaign be organising with appropriate NGOs involved in the next Plants Committee.

Mrs Marshall suggested that because the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties would be in Africa perhaps TRAFFIC Africa could put together a draft which could be circulated within the next six months.

The Plants Committee agreed to charge TRAFFIC with the preparation of a draft on this issue to be submitted to the Secretariat, within the next six months, for distribution to the members of the Committee for comments.

16.3 Information exchange between Management Authorities and Custom offices

Mr Hong (representative for Asia) introduced the topic by explaining that work on this issue had begun in 1996 and just been finished. He explained that reference to CITES species had been included in the Chinese version of the Harmonized System of the World Customs Organization.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) indicated that there had been discussions with the World Custom Organization. The observer from TRAFFIC stated that it was a useful initiative and would be beneficial for other countries to have a complete list of the 307 items for which codes had been assigned.

Mr Chong (Republic of Korea) stated that he would pass the information to customs authorities in Korea and that he would seek for close co-operation on the subject with China.

16.4 Timber brochure

Mr Hendricks (United States) introduced this issue by explaining that in the eighth Plants Committee and the 10th meeting of the Conference of the Parties discussions had been made on the benefits of the timber brochure for offering a better understanding of CITES and its partnerships. The observer explained that a draft brochure had been prepared targeted at specific entities such as timber traders and producers. He proposed that the brochure be distributed at the meeting and was willing to take comments to finalise it. He could help with finishing, translating and publishing it with co-operation with others but was also looking for funding. Mr Leach (representative for Oceania) offered to look into possibilities for providing funding. Mr Fullerton (Canada) also offered help in drafting, and expressed his support for including an Insert so that importers and exporters could be informed. Mrs Baer (observer from IHPA) pointed out that the brochure was an important reference for public education, and expressed interested in co-operating in the drafting and seeking funds for production, at least in its current form.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that the Secretariat was also interested to be involved in the process, and suggested that the United States could write a short introduction to the document for inclusion in CITES World.

Mr Hendricks (observer from the United States) expressed their interest to organise a group to discuss how the pamphlet could be used collaboratively. The Chairman agreed that it was very useful because of the amount of information on the topic and suggested that it needed to be widely distributed to NGOs and Parties.

The Plants Committee congratulated the United States on their initiative and requested that all offers of support for drafting and production of the final brochure be submitted to the United States.

17. Timber issues

17.1 Report on the working group on *Swietenia macrophylla*; progress report

Mr Zerbini (Brazil) presented the topic by explaining that the report of the meeting of the working group would be sent to the CITES participants and the Committee. He clarified for Mr de Koning (representative for Europe) that the biological information indicated in the report referred to parameters such as the distribution, population, population trends, and conservation status of the species in trade.

18. How to improve CITES implementation for plants, report of discussion with Animals Committee

No discussion on this subject.

19. Issues from the Standing Committee

19.1 Strategic Plan of the Convention

Mr Armstrong (Secretariat) introduced the topic by explaining the objectives of the Action Plan. He explained that the effectiveness of the Plan had been assessed by consultants who had suggested that it include a Strategic Plan. A recommendation for development of the Strategic Plan was made in the Standing Committee in 1998 which moved to develop the Strategic Plan in a working group composed of the Chairman, Secretariat, Colombia, France, Japan, United Kingdom, United States and Zimbabwe and representatives of the Animals and Plants Committee.

Mr Armstrong (Secretariat) presented the aims and implementation of the draft of the Strategic Plan. He explained that the Strategic Plan have approved activities directed at the purpose of the mission of the Convention. Mr Armstrong explained that sustainable use had also been introduced into the wording. He referred to the structure of the plan and explained that comments were requested on the goals, objectives and actions by the Standing Committee in the plan itself. He added that the document unified the focus of the Parties and Secretariat, and recognised the need for a very successful delivery of the Strategic Plan through various action plans. Mr Armstrong indicated that it was his understanding that the Chairman would suggest the organization of a number of working groups which would assess all goals and objectives and develop some pertinent actions through problem analysis.

The participants were divided into working groups chaired by the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the representative for Oceania. The working groups held several meetings and the following topics were discussed: Comments on the draft of the Strategic Plan; Action Plan to be implemented by the different bodies, and the Action Plan to be implemented by the Plants Committee. The committee agreed that the Chairman would combine the documents prepared by the working groups. The Chairman would submit this document before July 1999 to the Plants Committee members, the Secretariat and to the Chairman of the Animals Committee for information of the meeting of the Animals Committee. It would also be sent to the Chairmen of the Strategic Plan Working Group and the Standing Committee. The resulting documents are attached as Annexes 4a and 4b.

19.2 Action Plan of the Plants Committee

It was agreed that the Chairman would amalgamate the documents prepared by the Chairs of the working groups and submit to the Secretariat to present at the meeting of the Animals Committee in July 1999 (attached as Annex 4c).

19.3 Terms of Reference for the Review of the Criteria

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) referred to document Doc. PC9-Item 19.3 on this issue and stated that comments from the Plants Committee would be welcome. She explained that the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees should prepare a draft of the Terms of Reference for consideration at the 42nd meeting of the Standing Committee in September.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that this document had been presented to the 41st meeting of the Standing Committee for their consideration. However, the Standing Committee moved the responsibility to the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committee.

Mr Jenkins (Chairman of the Animals Committee) stated that the Plants Committee was ideally suited to identify elements of Resolution Conf. 9.24 criteria where there were problems in their

application. He explained that comments were needed in reference to developing Terms of Reference which comply with the requirements in Resolution Conf. 9.24 and a process to do this.

Mr Fullerton (Canada) stated that the Terms of Reference clearly needed to fit into a time line since it called for a full review. He suggested that since the Terms of Reference needed to be comprehensive expertise would need to be brought on board. He then expressed his concern that the participation to the review process was rather restricted.

Later in the week Mr Jenkins (Chairman of the Animals Committee) introduced the draft of the Terms of Reference and explained that elements of the process of the review of the appendices would also be part of the review of the criteria. In this respect the Plants Committee was well ahead of the Animals Committee, since the latter still had to initiate the review of the appendices for fauna. He also referred to Annexes 1 and 2 and explained that this format had been adopted by the Plants Committee in its review of appendices, but that some minor modification had been made. He further referred to the request that the Conference of the Parties created a budget line for this work, and also explained the timetable (from the 41st meeting of the Standing Committee to the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in 2002). He explained that he would present this draft to the 15th meeting of the Animals Committee as a product agreed by both the Chairmen of the Plants and Animals Committees.

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) stated that his region had met in reference to this and indicated that one major concern was that all groups of plants be properly addressed. He added that there was concern in reference to the precision of the timetable.

Mr de Koning (representative for Europe) suggested the possibility for including not only the representative for each of the six regions for the plants section, but also other participants as duties of representatives were already quite big.

The Chairman explained that the representatives of each committee must participate but that experts could be rotated according to the taxa under discussion. She stated that further details would be decided by the new Plants Committee representatives and not by the present Committee. She then stated that only the general process needed to be considered by the present Committee.

Mr Jenkins (Chairman of the Animals Committee) indicated that in the process of the review there would be plenty of opportunity for consultation, and suggested that consultation should be as broad as possible so that the work is done well. He agreed with the Chairman and stated that the responsibility of the Committee is only to consider the frame work for the process.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) then explained that the next Standing Committee would consider the document, make a decision, and agree on a process. He explained that the final decision about the proposal would be made at the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

The Plants Committee supported the process outlined in the draft Terms of Reference prepared by the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees.

20. Rescue centres

Mrs Werblan-Jakubiec (Poland) introduced the topic by explaining that Polish rescue centres are able only to keep specimen alive but can not propagate them.

Mr Kiehn (Austria) referred to Information document 7, pages 10, 25, and 26 and stated that the main intention was to seek clarification on the legal position of rescue centres to ensure survival and breeding of Appendix-I taxa. He suggested that the Plants Committee support the European Region to gather more information on rescue centres and the capability of dealing with Appendix-I specimens.

Mr Lüthy (Switzerland) stated that one rescue centre had been formally recognized in Switzerland one month prior to the meeting and that it receives generous compensation for keeping rescued plants.

Mr Donaldson (representative for Africa) explained that in South Africa this issue also arises because confiscation are the property of the courts, and that Gardens are not interested in becoming rescue centres.

Mr Kiehn explained that there is a willingness of International Association Botanic Gardens as well as European botanical gardens to fulfil the obligations. He suggested that this be resolved by obtaining information such as that provided by Switzerland. He stated that there was the added difficult of funding.

The Secretariat explained that finances depend upon the legal position in each country and the willingness of Management Authority to resolve the issue. He stated that the Plants Committee could only stimulate individual Parties to work to resolve these problems.

The Plants Committee agreed to express concern at the lack of rescue centres in many regions and that therefore Parties are encouraged to adopt national measures to implement Resolution Conf. 10.7, Annex 3 by stimulating that botanic gardens and other appropriate institutions to act as rescue centres for CITES plants and to network in order to optimise *ex-situ* conservation.

21. Time and venue of the 10th Plants Committee meeting

The Chairman stated that an official invitation had not yet been received, but that China had expressed interest to host the tenth Plants Committee meeting.

Mr Jia (China) explained that he was waiting for the approval of his government, and that he would contact the Secretariat when he received news on the issue.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that the need for a joint meeting following adoption of the Terms of Reference for Review of Criteria might be possible in which case the Secretariat would organise the meeting.

22. Any other business

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) stated that the report from the working group on the responsibilities of representatives and alternate representatives was available for distribution.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) requested that any comments be sent to the Secretariat before mid-July so that a document could be prepared which would be submitted at the next Standing Committee. She then stated that if an individual wishes to submit their name as a new regional representative, a *curriculum vitae* must be submitted, formally supported by their country of origin.

Mr Olave Ortiz (Chile) explained that in some countries there were not enough funds for regional activities and suggested that a percentage of funds for each country be placed into a trust fund of CITES that could then be allocated for regional operations.

The Chairman stated that if this was agreed upon that it probably could be included in the Chairman's report to the Conference of the Parties and included in the Finance Committee.

Mr Armstrong (Secretariat) replied that this indeed could be included at the next Finance Committee of Standing Committee.

Mr Kiehn (Austria) gave very warm thanks to all member of the Plants Committee and to the Chairman. He stated that it was a deep sentiment that many achievements had been made due to the present composition of the Committee.

Mr von Arx (representative for North America) gave thanks for the efficiency, clarity, foresightedness, and avoidance of frictions. Speaking in French, he explained that he especially appreciated having the documents translated in French and French interpreters for French speaking delegates. He emphasised the importance that this communication continues after the Conference of the Parties and with the change of the membership.

The Chairman thanked all for their participation and stated that the work would not be possible without their marvellous co-operation and contributions.



Photo: Victoria ZENTILLI

