



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

**PROCEEDINGS
TENTH MEETING OF THE
PLANTS COMMITTEE**

**Shepherdstown, United States of America
11-15 December 2000**

Rapporteurs
Jacqueline Roberts
Steffanie Brainerd
Patricia Ford

Prepared by the CITES Secretariat

July 2001



CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
WORKING SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE	15
1. Opening	17
2. Terms of Reference of the Plants Committee	17
3. Background of the work of the Plants Committee	17
4. Division of work between the members of the Plants Committee	17
5. Action points of the ninth meeting of the Plants Committee	18
- Tasks of regional representatives	18
- Rules of Procedure	19
- The use of the budget of the previous year	19
- Registry for NGOs	19
6. Budget of the Plants Committee	19
7. Agenda of 10th meeting of the Plants Committee	19
8. Time and venue of the 11th meeting of the Plants Committee	20
OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE	21
1. Opening of the meeting	23
2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure	23
3. Adoption of the Agenda and the Working programme	24
4. Admission of observers	24
5. Regional reports and reports on regional meetings	24
5.1 Africa	25
5.2 Asia	25
5.3 Central and South America and the Caribbean	25
5.4 Europe	25
5.5 North America	26
5.6 Oceania	26
6. Regional directories [Resolution Conf. 11.1, Annex 2, paragraph e)]	26
7. Follow up of CoP11 Decisions	27
7.1 Mahogany Working Group	27
7.2 <i>Harpagophytum</i> spp.	27
7.3 <i>Guaiacum sanctum</i>	29
7.4 <i>Aquilaria</i> spp.	30
8. Technical proposals for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties	31
8.1 Definition of "artificially propagated" in relation to timber	31
8.2 Standard exemptions	32
8.3 Definitions of the technical terms used in the annotations	32
8.4 Annotations for medicinal plants included in Appendix II	32



9. Species proposals for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties	33
9.1 <i>Araucaria araucana</i>	33
9.2 <i>Cimicifuga</i> spp., <i>Sclerocactus</i> spp. and <i>Tricholoma magnivelare</i>	36
9.3 <i>Ligusticum porteri</i>	36
10. Significant trade in plants	36
10.1 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) (cf. Decision 11.117)	36
10.1.1 Selection of taxa for review	36
10.2 Significant trade plant projects pre-CoP11	38
10.2.1 Trade in medicinal plants (CITES project S-109): progress report	38
10.2.2 Trade in Chinese orchids (CITES project S-114): progress report	38
10.2.3 Implementation of trade controls for <i>Nardostachys grandiflora</i> and <i>Picrorhiza kurroo</i> : progress report	39
11. Medicinal plants	40
11.1 Trade in <i>Prunus africana</i>	40
11.2 Possible future activities	42
12. Review of the Appendices	42
12.1 How to proceed with the review of Orchidaceae spp.	42
12.2 Appendix-I Cactaceae	43
13. Checklists and nomenclature	43
13.1 Checklist: progress report	43
13.2 Nomenclature problems	43
13.3 <i>Taxus wallichiana</i>	44
14. Strategic planning	44
14.1 Implementation of the CITES Strategic Vision – Actions directed to the Plants Committee	45
14.2 Decisions directed to the Plants Committee	47
14.3 Establishment of priorities	47
15. Identification materials for plants	47
15.1 Progress report	47
16. CITES projects	48
16.1 <i>Aloe vera</i> var. <i>vera</i> (CITES project S-93)	48
17. Issues resulting from PC9, not included elsewhere in the agenda	48
- PC9 agenda item 10.1.8: Contribution to an evaluation of tree species using the new CITES listing criteria	48
- PC9 agenda item 14.1: Trade in seeds of Mexican cacti	49
- PC9 agenda item 16.2: Information for the public on the significance of Appendix II	49
- PC9 agenda item 16.4: Timber brochure	49
- PC9 agenda item 20: Rescue centres	50
18. Training initiatives	51
18.1 Standard slide package: progress report	51
18.2 Report on the 3rd Master's course on Management, conservation and control of species in international trade	52
19. Time and venue of the 11th Plants Committee meeting	52



20. Any other business 53

 20.1 Presentation by Germany of "Conservation and Sustainable Use
 of *Adonis vernalis*, a Medicinal Plant in International Trade" 53

 20.2 Relationship between *ex-situ* breeding operations and *in-situ*
 conservation programmes (Decision 11.102) 53

Closing comments 53

ANNEX 1
 Opening speeches 55

ANNEX 2
 List of participants 63

ANNEX 3
 Regional responsibility for Africa 73

ANNEX 4
 Letter from the Plants Committee to the Standing Committee,
 regarding *Araucaria araucana* 77



Photo: Victoria ZENTILLI





EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
WORKING SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE	
<p>5. Action points from the ninth meeting of the Plants Committee It was suggested that a small working group look at the Rules of Procedure in order to make some clarifications.</p>	Representatives of Oceania (Australia) and Africa (South Africa)
<p>6. Budget of the Plants Committee The Plants Committee should consider areas in which savings in the Secretariat's 2001 budget could be used to facilitate the duties of the regional representatives.</p>	Regional representatives, in particular of Africa; Central and South America and the Caribbean; and Asia
<p>7. Agenda for the 10th meeting of the Plants Committee Adopted.</p>	Chairman
<p>8. Time and venue of the 11th meeting of the Plants Committee The representative of Asia, on behalf of the Government of Malaysia, offered Malaysia as the next host country. The meeting would take place in the first week of September 2001.</p>	Representative of Asia (Malaysia)
OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE	
<p>2. Rules of Procedure Adopted. The Plants Committee supported the continued work on this document except for the suggested change in Rule 23. The Secretariat to circulate the revised Rules of Procedure document to the members of the Committee, together with a letter to explain the inclusion or not of amendments.</p>	Rules of Procedure working group Secretariat
<p>5. Regional reports Representatives can send regional reports and directories to the Secretariat for inclusion in meeting documents on the new CITES website. Representatives of African region to discuss how to split the duties in their region.</p>	Regional representatives Representatives of Africa



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>Representatives of Asia to discuss how to split the duties in their region. Representatives of Central and South American and the Caribbean to discuss how to split the duties in their region.</p>	<p>Representatives of Asia Representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean</p>
<p>7. Follow-up of CoP11 Decisions</p> <p>7.1 Mahogany Working Group The Chairman to be a member of Mahogany Working Group meeting.</p> <p>7.2 <i>Harpagophytum</i> spp. Range States to provide data through the Secretariat to the regional representative of Africa. Germany to provide updated research results for inclusion in a report for further discussion at PC11.</p> <p>7.3 <i>Guaiacum sanctum</i> Costa Rica, Mexico and United States of America to cooperate on solutions to continue studies. Germany to contribute to process of distinguishing species when in trade. Netherlands to obtain funds to contribute to process. Secretariat to coordinate process and possibly seek permission to use some of the funds provided by the United States of America, should additional funding be required.</p> <p>7.4 <i>Aquilaria</i> spp. Secretariat to cooperate with TRAFFIC on how to respond to Dec. 11.112, and report to PC11.</p>	<p>Chairman</p> <p>Parties, regional representative of Africa</p> <p>Germany</p> <p>Costa Rica, Mexico, United States of America</p> <p>Germany</p> <p>Netherlands</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat, TRAFFIC</p>
<p>8. Technical proposals for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</p> <p>8.1 Definition of "artificially propagated" in relation to timber Secretariat to continue this work and present the results to PC11.</p> <p>8.2 Standard exemptions Secretariat to prepare documentation for consideration at PC11.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p>



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>8.3 Definitions of the technical terms used in the annotations and</p> <p>8.4 Annotations for medicinal plants included in Appendix II Working group established to address the recommendations in document Doc. PC10.8.4, point 7 iii), iv) and v), for discussion at PC11. Recommendations 7 i) and ii) to be the second stage. Representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Colombia) to enlist the help of members of the Andean Pact countries.</p>	<p>China, France, Germany, United States of America, Representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Colombia), TRAFFIC, Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p>
<p>9. Species proposals for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</p> <p>9.1 <i>Araucaria araucana</i> The definition of 'naturalized populations' to be discussed in the Criteria Working Group. Representative of Europe and observer from Chile to draft letter for the Chairman on behalf of the Plants Committee. This letter to be sent to the Standing Committee requesting a quick decision to instruct the Secretariat to send out a Notification reflecting the original interpretation of the proposal, supporting the position of Argentina and Chile, "to include the species in Appendix I".</p> <p>9.2 <i>Cimicifuga</i> spp., <i>Sclerocactus</i> spp. and <i>Tricholoma magnivelare</i> Data concerning these species to be sent to the United States of America. The Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee to assess the position of the fungal kingdom in relation to CITES and the Plants Committee.</p> <p>9.3 <i>Ligusticum porteri</i> Data concerning these species to be sent to the United States of America.</p>	<p>Criteria Working Group</p> <p>Representative of Europe, Chile</p> <p>Parties</p> <p>Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee</p> <p>Parties</p>



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>10. Significant trade in plants</p> <p>10.1 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) Noel McGough (United Kingdom) re-elected as coordinator of the significant trade process for plants. Discussions to be continued in next session.</p> <p>10.1.1 Selection of taxa for review The priorities outlined in document 10.1.1 were supported by the Plants Committee. Secretariat to give Madagascar project first priority for funding. Secretariat to also consider funding for Cycads, but perhaps for a small part of the project at first. Secretariat to ask UNEP-WCMC to provide an output of their trade database for PC11 so that the Committee can make an assessment with regard to <i>Pericopsis elata</i> and other species.</p> <p>10.2 Significant trade plant projects pre-CoP11</p> <p>10.2.1 Trade in medicinal plants (CITES project S-109) progress report Germany to i) send electronic version of report to the Chairman for distribution, ii) to investigate the possibility of including it on its agency's website; and iii) to provide 300 copies to the Secretariat to distribute to Management Authorities by mail. Link to Germany's website to be included in the new CITES website.</p>	<p>United Kingdom</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Germany</p> <p>Secretariat</p>



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>10.2.2 Trade in Chinese orchids (CITES project S-114) progress report Secretariat developing contract with the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (United Kingdom) to develop manual regarding significant trade analysis. It is hoped to present it at PC11.</p> <p>10.2.3 Implementation of trade controls for <i>Nardostachys grandiflora</i> and <i>Picrorhiza kurrooa</i>: progress report Postponed pending further information from the Nomenclature Committee. (See item 13.)</p>	<p>Secretariat, United Kingdom</p> <p>Nomenclature Committee</p>
<p>11. Medicinal plants</p> <p>11.1 Trade in <i>Prunus africana</i> Secretariat to draft letter on behalf of the Plants Committee to the Management Authority of Cameroon requesting their assistance to enable continuation of the research being undertaken by France. Secretariat to contact Kenya to encourage them to involve the Scientific Authority when making non-detriment findings for the export of medicinal plants.</p> <p>11.2 Possible future activities Postponed until PC11 pending further research by France as above.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p>
<p>12. Review of the Appendices</p> <p>12.1 How to proceed with the review of the Orchidaceae The Secretariat to coordinate a working group that will continue process between meetings of the Conference of the Parties.</p>	<p>Representatives of Africa (South Africa), Asia (Alternate - China), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Suriname), Europe (Netherlands), Oceania (Australia), the observer from United States of America, American Orchid Society, Coordinator of the significant trade process, Secretariat</p>



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>The Secretariat to obtain printouts of trade data from UNEP-WCMC. It is hoped that a draft with proposals on how to continue with the work will be available at PC11.</p> <p>12.2 Appendix I Cactaceae Mexico to check status of reply and send response to Switzerland.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>Mexico</p>
<p>13. Checklists and nomenclature</p> <p>13.1 Checklist: progress Representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean offered cooperation with the genus <i>Masdevallia</i>. Austria offered government support of CHF 5000 for the preparation of a checklist for the genus <i>Bulbophyllum</i>. Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee to co-ordinate. Agenda item regarding additional funding of <i>Bulbophyllum</i> checklist to be included in Agenda for PC11.</p> <p>13.2 Nomenclature problems</p> <p>Cactaceae Amended list to be prepared for PC11.</p> <p><i>Aquilaria</i> spp. Researchers on <i>Aquilaria</i> to be provided with list of key points raised in the meeting of the Nomenclature Committee.</p> <p>Valerianaceae Draft annotation to be prepared for PC11.</p> <p>Scrophulariaceae Proposal to include only <i>Picrorhiza kurrooa</i>. The recommendation in point 22 of document Doc. PC.10.13.2 to be deleted.</p> <p>13.3 <i>Taxus wallichiana</i> Exact status of species at time of listing to be assessed and document prepared for discussion at PC11. China offered to work with the United States of America on the review of this species.</p>	<p>Representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Colombia)</p> <p>Austria</p> <p>Vice-Chairman of Nomenclature Committee</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Vice-Chairman of Nomenclature Committee</p> <p>Vice-Chairman of Nomenclature Committee</p> <p>Vice-Chairman of Nomenclature Committee</p> <p>Vice-Chairman of Nomenclature Committee</p> <p>Vice-Chairman of Nomenclature Committee</p> <p>China, United States of America</p>



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>14. Strategic planning</p> <p>14.1 Implementation of the CITES Strategic Vision – Actions directed to the Plants Committee</p> <p>Chairman and Vice-Chairman to consolidate proposals made by a working group, to produce a series of proposals to circulate to members of the Committee, and then to contact the United States of America to discuss use of their funds.</p> <p>Secretariat to prepare proposal for support of objectives 1.7.2 and 1.7.3.</p>	<p>Chairman, Vice-Chairman</p> <p>Secretariat</p>
<p>16. CITES Projects</p> <p>16.1 <i>Aloe vera</i> var. <i>vera</i> (CITES project S-93)</p> <p>Plants Committee agreed that the project was no longer a priority. Secretariat to write to the Italian Government with a request to reallocate the funds set aside for this project.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p>
<p>17. Issues resulting from PC9, not included elsewhere in the agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PC9 agenda item 10.1.8: Contribution to an evaluation of tree species using the new CITES Listing Criteria <p>The Plants Committee supported the approach of the Netherlands. Comments invited for inclusion in the review to be evaluated before inclusion in the website.</p> <p>Lists of tree species per country will be distributed to relevant parties for their comments.</p> <p>Progress report to be presented to PC12.</p> <p>With respect to a Decision from CoP10, the Secretariat and the Netherlands to prepare document for PC12 in support of review of these species.</p>	<p>Plants Committee</p> <p>Parties</p> <p>Netherlands</p> <p>Netherlands</p> <p>Netherlands, Secretariat</p>



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PC9 agenda item 14.1: Trade in seeds of Mexican cacti Chairman to provide the representative of North America and the observer from Mexico with copies of correspondence with the Mexican authorities. 	Chairman
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representative of North America to work with Mexico and report to PC11. - PC9 agenda item 16.2: Information for the public on the significance of Appendix II This item to be deleted but discussion to continue under PC10 agenda item 14 – Strategic Plan. - PC9 agenda item 16.4: Timber brochure Parties encouraged to discuss use of brochure, for timber, but also to customize for other plant groups and to make then available in sufficient quantities. Brochures should also be distributed to relevant specialist groups. - PC9 agenda item 20: Rescue centres No new information available. Item deleted from the Agenda. 	<p>Representative of North America (Canada), Mexico</p> <p>Strategic Plan working group</p> <p>Parties</p>
<p>18. Training initiatives</p> <p>18.1 Standard slide package Preparation of the slide packs to continue. Secretariat to provide each regional representative with copy of slide pack on the understanding that it will be used and not given away. Information will also be included in the CITES website. Spain, the Netherlands and Austria offered their cooperation with the preparation of future slide packs.</p>	<p>United Kingdom</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Austria, Netherlands, Spain</p>
<p>19. Time and venue of the 11th Plants Committee meeting The 11th meeting of the Plants Committee will take place in Malaysia, in the first week of September 2001. Exact venue and time to be confirmed.</p>	Malaysia



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>20. Any other business 20.1 Presentation by Germany of "Conservation and Sustainable Use of <i>Adonis vernalis</i>, a Medicinal Plant in International Trade" Germany reported that copies were available to all who would request them.</p>	
<p>20.2 Relationship between <i>ex-situ</i> breeding operations and <i>in-situ</i> conservation programmes (Decision 11.102) Deferred to Agenda for PC11.</p>	



Photo: Victoria ZENTILLI





Photo: Victoria ZENTILLI

WORKING SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE



Participants: Mrs M. Clemente (Chairman and Europe), Mr J. Donaldson and Mr Q. Luke (Africa), Mr Z. Shaari and Mr N.P. Singh (Asia), Mr E. Forero and Mrs M. Werkhoven (Central and South America and the Caribbean), Mr J. de Koning (Europe), Mr B. von Arx (North America), Mr G. Leach (Oceania), Mr G. van Vliet (CITES Secretariat)



1. Opening

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) welcomed the regional representatives, in particular the new members of the Committee, to the working session and commented that the workload of this meeting was lighter than that of the previous meeting as it was the first one since the Conference of the Parties.

2. Terms of Reference of the Plants Committee

3. Background of the work of the Plants Committee

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) had prepared a PowerPoint presentation in order to provide the members of the Committee, and especially the new regional representatives, with information concerning the Terms of Reference, the work of the Committee and the division of work among the members of the Committee.

Mr von Arx (representative of North America), speaking on behalf of the Plants Committee, congratulated Mrs Clemente on having been re-elected at the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, as Chairman of the Plants Committee. He added that he was looking forward to a fruitful session and joked that he had been slightly worried following the discovery in the New York Times, of the definition of a meeting: "A group of the unwilling, picked from the unfit to do the unnecessary"! Not a description to have ever pertained to the Plants Committee.

Mr von Arx stressed two important points for the success of the Plants Committee:

1. Work at the regional level should be taken seriously, as it is the main method of gaining the information needed.
2. Hard work on pertinent items, between meetings.

4. Division of work between the members of the Plants Committee

Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) stated that it was a source of great pleasure to be a member of the Plants Committee. He then made a plea for all documentation to be circulated early enough for consultations in large areas such as his region.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) thanked Mr Forero for his comments, adding that in most cases documents were distributed as soon as possible. She then urged Parties to send in their documents to the Secretariat earlier than usual, explaining that the 60 days requirement was necessary for the Secretariat to do the translations.

Mr Luke (representative of Africa) said that he was delighted to join the Plants Committee as a new member. He congratulated Mrs Clemente (Chairman) on her clear presentation, but wished to point out that with regard to the duties of the representatives, things did not always run smoothly in a region like Africa and it was not always possible to acquire the necessary information. He then asked if there was any help available to facilitate these duties.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) responded that it was a matter of insistence and that the job of the representative was to try as hard as possible to obtain all the information necessary for



the work of the Plants Committee. Noting that the regions of Asia and Central and South America and the Caribbean had the same problems, she added that during the Budget item it would be possible to discuss options regarding provision of support.

Mr Shaari (representative of Asia) reported that there were 41 Parties in his region and that communication was always a problem. He explained that the representative of Asia, Mr Singh, and himself had tried to find a way to split the region, however, they still needed to communicate with the new alternate (China) before making a decision. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) suggested that in the interests of efficiency and continuity it would be preferable if Mr Jia (alternate representative of Asia) worked with the representative for which he is alternate, that is with Mr Singh (representative of Asia).

Mr Shaari added that a regional report would be submitted by the end of the meeting and that work was progressing on the Directory, which it was hoped would cover the Asian region as a whole.

Mr Leach (representative of Oceania) pointed out the problem regarding contact with non-Parties in his region. He explained that Oceania had a predominance of non-Parties and small island states that would probably never become Parties. He added that there would never be sufficient funds to run regional meetings unless they could be linked with training and capacity building, and suggested that this would be an area to improve synergy. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) replied that she understood the difficulties as she had experienced similar problems with contacting the Eastern European countries. However, it was important that all the representatives tried their best and used different means of communication where necessary.

In response to a question by Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean), there was a short discussion regarding the course of action to be taken when a member of the Committee was no longer active. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that in the first instance, their alternate would take the duties of the representative and then the region would have to elect another representative. This consultation would normally be done by the Secretariat.

With regard to support for the work of the representatives, Mr Luke and Mr Donaldson (representatives of Africa) felt that although the region nominated representatives, the region did not always provide support for their work. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) recognized this problem but felt that the representatives had the responsibility to remind the Parties that they had been elected and therefore required support. She suggested that in the case where Committee representation was required at the meeting of the Conference of the Parties, then they could ask the Standing Committee for support.

5. Action points of the ninth meeting of the Plants Committee

- Tasks of regional representatives

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) reported that a document had been prepared on the Tasks of the Representatives and sent to the Standing Committee. It had then been adopted as a Decision at the Conference of the Parties.



- **Rules of Procedure**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) reported that the Rules of Procedure had been adopted, with a few minor amendments. However, she added that the Chairman of the Animals Committee still had some small concerns with the clarity of the document and had requested that some members of the Plants Committee and Animals Committee form a small Working group in order to finalize the text. It was agreed that Mr Leach (representative of Oceania) and Mr Donaldson (representative of Africa), together with Mrs Clemente, would join this group.

- **The use of the budget of the previous year**

At the last Plants Committee meeting there had been a strong recommendation to present at the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties a request for budget items to support the work of regional representatives, especially for the facilitation of regional meetings. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) reported that this had been undertaken and that she had also met with the Standing Committee to request ways in which the Plants Committee could use any money remaining from its budget.

- **Registry for NGOs**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) reported that for this meeting of the Plants Committee, the Secretariat had asked for a contribution of USD 100 from NGOs, with a few exceptions such as TRAFFIC. She explained that this money would be used to contribute to the cost of photocopying and other various expenses related to the organization of the meeting.

6. Budget of the Plants Committee

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that there was a budget of CHF 90,000 (approximately USD 60,000 at the time of the meeting). He further explained that the budget was to cover interpretation and rental of equipment, travel and subsistence for members without sufficient government support, room rental, equipment rental, offices, rapporteurs and preparation of proceedings. He stated that the United States of America had been very generous as hosts to the Plants Committee meeting.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) added that situations are always different and depend on the ability of the host countries. She drew attention to Resolution Conf. 11.1, Annex I, paragraph c) iii), that contained an appeal to the Parties to pay for the travel of members of the Committee. She explained that this was a good saving for the Plants Committee and would allow use of funds for the regions that need it most, for example the representatives of Africa, Asia and Central and South America and the Caribbean. Mrs Clemente asked for comments on how to use such savings and reminded the members that the Secretariat would need to close its books in December and therefore proposals would need to be organized well in advance.

7. Agenda for the 10th meeting of the Plants Committee

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) felt that there would be an easy agenda for this meeting and stated that it would have to be completed by Thursday.

A few changes were made and the agenda was adopted.



8. Time and venue of the 11th meeting of the Plants Committee

Mr Shaari (representative of Asia), offered Malaysia as the host of the next meeting.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) thanked Mr Shaari for his kind offer on behalf of Malaysia and proposed that the Plants Committee accept and extend its deepest gratitude to the Malaysian Government. She added that the meeting would take place in approximately the first week in September.

The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) thanked the members of the Committee and stated that it was her honour to preside over the meeting.



Photo: Victoria ZENTILLI

OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE



Representatives:	Mr J. Donaldson and Mr Q. Luke (Africa), Mr Z. Shaari and, Mr N.P. Singh (Asia), Mr E. Forero and Mrs M. Werkhoven (Central and South America and the Caribbean), Mrs M. Clemente; (Chairman) and Mr J. de Koning (Europe), Mr B. von Arx (North America), Mr G. Leach (Oceania)
CITES Secretariat:	Mr G. van Vliet, Mr W. Wijnstekers, Ms V. Zentilli
Countries:	Austria, Bahamas, Chile, China, Costa Rica, France, Germany, Honduras, Mexico, Namibia, the Netherlands, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom, the United States of America
UNO:	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre
IGO:	European Union, IUCN-The World Conservation Union
International NGOs:	Bennett, Turner and Coleman, European Bureau for Conservation and Development, International Association of Wildlife Agencies, International Wildlife Coalition, International Wood Products Association, Nature Conservancy, TRAFFIC Network
National NGOs:	American Orchid Society, Comurnat
Total participants:	55



1. Opening of the meeting

The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) thanked the United States of America for hosting the meeting, welcomed the participants and thanked the Secretariat for the preparation of documents. She then welcomed Mr Willem Wijnstekers, noting that it was the first time the Secretary-General had taken part in a Plants Committee meeting.

The Secretary-General (Mr Wijnstekers) congratulated the Chairman (Mrs Clemente) on her continued work with the Plants Committee. Comparing the workings of the Plants Committee with the Animals Committee, he joked that the Plants Committee worked in a more serene environment. He added that he hoped this was due to the high quality work of the Committee rather than a lack of importance applied to plants. He was pleased to note the adoption of the Strategic Plan. Mr Wijnstekers recognized the problem of regional representation in both Committees and hoped that the respective governments had provided, and would continue to provide, enough time and resources for the representatives to carry out their duties. He added that it was the responsibility of the Parties to inform their regional representatives of any problems.

The Secretary-General (Mr Wijnstekers) stressed the need for CITES implementation to be made simpler and reminded the participants not to lose sight of species conservation and thus ensure that priority is given to any problems in producer countries. He reported the new additional resources in the Secretariat, including a strengthened Enforcement Unit and two new staff in Capacity Building. However, he suggested that NGOs and Parties should also seek voluntary contributions and sponsoring of projects, as support for the Secretariat was often dependent on external funding.

The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) thanked the Secretary-General for his comments, but added that she did not agree with everything he said! Referring to the alleged serenity of the Plants Committee, she stressed that the Plants Committee documents had been so well prepared for the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP11), that there had hardly been any need for debate and almost all of the plants proposals had been adopted by consensus. She thanked the Secretary-General once again and stated that his comments would be taken as a challenge to the Plants Committee. The Chairman also took the opportunity to thank the observers and NGOs for their participation, stating that without them the Committee could not do its work.

2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

At the request of the Chairman of the Animals Committee (Mr Hoogmoed), a small working group met to discuss some suggested amendments to the Rules of Procedure. Mr Fleming (observer from the United Kingdom, Animals Committee) was charged with incorporating the amendments into the Rules of the Procedure. At the end of the meeting, the working group proposed the following amendments:

- Rule 3, 18, 19 and 21 – to make clear the role of the alternate representative.
- Rule 4 – to address the concern that observers should either belong to a Scientific or Management Authority or have a mandate from them to attend Plants or Animals Committee meetings.
- Rule 7 – to ensure that the Chairman is involved with the drafting of the agenda for the relevant meeting.



- Rule 14 – the possibility of inserting another Rule regarding the posting of meeting documents on the CITES website in the original language in which they have been submitted as soon as possible after they are received.
- Rule 15 – documents submitted by NGOs should follow Rule 14 – submission to the Chairman, with copies to the Secretariat and regional representatives.
- Rule 23 – to change the number of days for preparation of the meeting reports from 120 to 60 days.
- Rule 28 – as 'classified' has a particular meaning in the United States, it should be changed to 'confidential'.

The Plants Committee supported the continued work on the Rules of Procedure, except for the suggested change in Rule 23, as the Plants Committee felt that more time was needed in order to prepare a detailed report of the meeting. At the suggestion of Mr von Arx (representative of North America), it was agreed that Rule 23 could include the necessity for an Executive Summary to be produced immediately following a meeting. This would preclude the need for a shortened time frame to receive the full report.

The observer from the European Union asked about the procedures of the Committee in the application of Rule 12: Choice of the time and place of meetings of the Plants Committee. The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) explained that while the rule stipulated that that was a decision for the Chairman, in fact within the Plants Committee the question was discussed with the members in the working session and if an offer was made, it was accepted.

The observer from the European Union considered the way of proceeding in the Plants Committee to be very democratic and suggested that if possible, it should be incorporated into the Rules of Procedure for both Committees. He also requested that his remarks be included in the minutes.

The Secretariat agreed to circulate the revised Rules of Procedure document to the members of the Committee, together with a letter explaining the amendments.

3. Adoption of the agenda and the working programme

The agenda and working programme were adopted.

4. Admission of observers

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) added the Nature Conservancy to the list of observers.

5. Regional reports and reports on regional meetings

The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) introduced the item. She noted that it was the first Plants Committee meeting since the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP11) and consequently there had been little time in which to do a lot of work, both for the reappointed members of the Plants Committee and those who had been newly nominated at CoP11.



5.1 Africa

Mr Donaldson explained that this meeting was the first opportunity in which he and Mr Luke had had the chance to discuss the division of their responsibilities. He added that the report in document Doc. PC.10.5.1 was biased towards the southern African countries.

5.2 Asia

Mr Shaari commented that communication within the region was always a problem for Asia. He explained that he and Mr Singh were currently making decisions on how best to share the work of the region. Mr Shaari then introduced document Doc. PC.10.5.2.

5.3 Central and South America and the Caribbean

Mrs Werkhoven explained that since both regional representatives were new to the Committee, they had very little to report. However, the first regional meeting had taken place in Ecuador in February/March 2000, convened by Argentina and Panama. The meeting had concentrated on *Araucaria*, *Vicuña* and the hawksbill turtle, and delegates had signed the Quito declaration.

Mr Forero thanked the Management Authority of Colombia for their cooperation. He then read out a report of the regional meeting in Quito. Mr Forero reported that he and Mrs Werkhoven had discussed the division of work within the region and that she would probably be responsible for the English- and French-speaking countries and he would be responsible for the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking ones.

5.4 Europe

Mr de Koning introduced document Doc. PC.10.5.4. He reported that there were 37 Parties and 10 non-Parties in the region. He added that it was difficult to estimate the number of Parties responding to communications given that the CoP was in April 2000 and the representatives were just starting to work on the next Regional European meeting in Turkey in April 2001. This meeting will be the fourth meeting in five years. These meetings have proved to be an excellent tool in exchange of ideas on CITES plants issues between the European countries. Mr de Koning recognized it was certainly not easy to arrange for such meetings, but they have proven to be very effective and worthwhile. He encouraged other regions to organize similar meetings.

The regional directory has been continuously updated, and has been included in the Web pages of the University of Cordoba.

(<http://www.uco.es/organiza/servicios/jardin/ingles/address/marcdirec.htm>)

A CD-ROM has been produced, including the full list of Management and Scientific Authorities involved in CITES Plants issues. This CD-ROM has been distributed to the members of the Plants Committee at its 10th meeting.

Regarding the European Regional newsletter on CITES plants issues, it was reported that issue No. 7 has been produced in English, Spanish and French, and distributed within and outside the region. This newsletter included the results of CoP11, as well



as articles on CITES plants issues that were discussed and elaborated in the European Region.

Amongst the activities undertaken regarding CITES plants issues by the European Parties, the following were mentioned: revision of the Appendices; the significant trade process; issues dealing with medicinal plants; evaluation of tree species; identification manual for timber; the two international Master's Courses (500 teaching hours each), especially addressed to CITES Scientific and Management Authorities (62 participants from 32 countries attending); courses in several countries addressed to enforcement bodies; participation in the Criteria Working Group and checklists.

5.5 North America

Mr von Arx drew attention to document Doc. PC.10.5.5 and thanked the countries in his region for their help. Referring to the second paragraph under the heading 'Mexico', he clarified that CONABIO would be the new Scientific Authority. He then asked the Secretariat if it would be possible to include the regional reports on the CITES website. The Secretariat replied that all documents would be available on the website for the next few months.

In response to the suggestion by the representative of North America, the Secretary-General (Mr Wijnstekers) took the opportunity to inform the delegates of the new CITES website that was under construction. He hoped that this new website would be more accessible and informative and welcomed any recommendations for inclusion or improvement to the site. He added that he would like to include the regional directories, including links to other relevant websites. He then asked the delegates to make available any photographs for inclusion in the list of Appendices. Recognizing that not all Parties had access to the Internet, Mr Wijnstekers gave assurance that the information would also be included on CD-ROM. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) congratulated the Secretariat and the staff involved in implementing the much improved website.

5.6 Oceania

Mr Leach reported that no regional meeting had been held, mostly due to the large distances between Parties in the region and the subsequent expense for arrangements. He was therefore very pleased to hear about the offer of Malaysia to host the next Plants Committee meeting as it would also facilitate a meeting of the Parties from Oceania, especially if it was in conjunction with training.

Mr Wijnstekers (Secretary-General) reported that following on from the Small Island States meeting for the Caribbean, the Secretariat would be organizing another meeting for the Pacific region. The representatives of Oceania and Asia would be informed of these meetings.

6. Regional directories [Resolution Conf. 11.1, Annex 2, paragraph e]

Mr Shaari reported that Mr Singh (representatives of Asia) and himself were currently preparing a regional directory for the whole region and they hoped to present it at the next Plants Committee meeting.



The representatives of North America (Mr von Arx) and Oceania (Mr Leach) had submitted regional directories – documents Doc. PC.10.6.1 and Doc. PC.10.6.2. Mr Leach drew attention to the inclusion of website addresses in the regional directories.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) thanked the regional representatives for their reports. She noted that work was progressing well, particularly with the directories.

Mrs Clemente also took the opportunity to thank the United States of America for their very generous offer of USD 45,000 to be used for plants projects.

7. Follow up of CoP11 Decisions

7.1 Mahogany Working Group

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) reported that the Secretariat had been charged with the establishment of a Mahogany Working Group and that Parties should nominate one representative to participate in the working group meeting that was provisionally scheduled for July 2001. At the Chairman's (Mrs Clemente) suggestion, it was agreed that the Chairman of the Plants Committee, or in her absence, the Vice-Chairman (Mr von Arx), should participate in the meeting of the working group. Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) also agreed, but wished to have on record that a representative of Colombia must participate in the meeting.

In response to a question from the observer from the European Union, the Secretariat explained that a decision on which representatives of the principal importing countries should join the group would be taken after confirmation of a venue and dates for the meeting.

The observer from the United States of America drew attention to the fact that there would be a meeting of the Association of Tropical Biology from 15 to 18 July 2001, and therefore suggested that the Mahogany Working Group avoid these dates for its meeting.

7.2 *Harpagophytum* spp.

The observer from Germany presented document Doc. PC.10.7.2 concerning the decision taken at the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP11). He then outlined the subsequent provision of funds from the German Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, and two recently commissioned projects to be carried out in collaboration with the authorities and institutions in the countries concerned.

As one of the range States concerned, the observer from Namibia made the following statement:

"As mentioned at CoP11, Namibia has formed a National Working Group which includes the CITES Management Authority and stakeholders, and deals with all issues concerning *Harpagophytum*. This group meets on a monthly basis. A policy outlining a permitting and registration system for harvesters and dealers has been developed and implemented, including a harvesting season. There is also a campaign to educate harvesters on sustainable harvesting methods.



Namibia is preparing to conduct a full situational analysis which is aimed at identifying the critical features of occurrence, harvesting of and trade in *Harpagophytum* in order to develop effective resource management and utilization strategies and also to put in place mechanisms to ensure that Namibia's trade in *Harpagophytum* is conducted in a sustainable manner, and in a way which ensures that communities obtain the most benefit from this national resource.

During the year 2000, Namibia experienced a decline in the level of exports. Whereas exports reached levels of over 600 tons in 1998 and 1999, by the end of November 2000, exports amounted to 311 tons. We have heard from exporters that they have had difficulties finding markets, and this decline is therefore not considered a reflection of depleting resources. There has also been a shift in the importing countries, away from France and South Africa. Currently the principle importer from Namibia is Germany.

I feel the need to raise my concerns on the increased interest in artificial propagation/cultivating experienced in the past few months. Although I realize that this is a valid strategy for protecting a species – the potential adverse effect on our marginalized communities, which currently depend on this resource, cannot be emphasised enough. If the decreased demand experienced this year is due to alternative sources elsewhere in the world, then I fear that the case is already lost for communities.

I would like to obtain some clarity as to the process, and exactly what information is required, for the Plants Committee to be able to prepare the report required under the Decision taken at CoP11".

The observer from Namibia further explained that they collaborated closely with Germany, but that a strategy was also needed to obtain information on legislation, trade and management from the other range States. She suggested that the representatives of Africa coordinate the gathering of this information.

Concerns regarding the process for the report requested in Decision 11.64 were further expressed by the representative of Europe (Mr de Koning), and the observer from Germany, who confirmed that the research planned was not directly connected to the Decision of the Conference of the Parties. Mr van Vliet explained that the Secretariat would be glad to cooperate with the representatives of Africa and could contact the range States on their behalf. However, he hoped that the biological information gathered in the projects commissioned by Germany would be available before the next meeting of the Plants Committee. He added that the Secretariat could seek funding to obtain this information if necessary. The observer from Germany agreed to provide the necessary biological information.

Mr Donaldson (representative of Africa) reported that he was aware of propagation in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa, but had not been so successful in contacting the other countries in the region. However, he was sure that he would be able to provide the necessary biological information before the next meeting of the Plants Committee.

It was agreed that the regional representatives would gather the necessary data from the range States and provide it to the Plants Committee via the Secretariat. Germany



would also provide its updated research results for inclusion in a report for discussion at the next meeting of the Plants Committee.

7.3 *Guaiacum sanctum*

The observer from the United States of America introduced document PC 10.7.3 and asked for recommendations on how to continue the treatment of this species in respect of Decision 11.114.

The representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Forero) asked for suggestions on how to resolve the problems relating to taxonomy.

The observer from Mexico, speaking as a range State for *Guaiacum sanctum*, referred to the high standard report prepared and presented by students of the United States of America. She felt that the use of students for this kind of work should be adopted as a precedent and proposed that Mexico and the United States of America collaborate in their research on the subject.

The representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean agreed with the suggestion and felt that the use of post-graduate students would result in the projects progressing more quickly, but that funding should be considered for this. The Chairman referred to an excellent Costa Rican student who had undertaken studies on *Guaiacum* and encouraged Costa Rica to share this information with Mexico and the United States of America.

The observer from Costa Rica, explained that *Guaiacum sanctum* was the only *Guaiacum* species in her country and was protected by law, but Costa Rica felt that it should have more protection. She felt sure that Costa Rica would be delighted to collaborate with Mexico and the United States of America.

The observer from Mexico clarified that Mexico would be willing to help where necessary, but had no intention of interfering with the excellent work already being undertaken by the United States of America. However, the observer from the United States of America explained that there were no further plans to continue this work as the students had all been volunteers. The United States of America would therefore be delighted to work with Mexico and Costa Rica on solutions to continue the work.

The observer from Germany, stated that as Germany was involved in the trade of *Guaiacum sanctum* and *Guaiacum coulteri*, they had been considering a project to distinguish the species on wood anatomical characteristics. He added that this information could be provided as Germany's contribution to the process described in Decision 11.114 1.a) ii).

The observer from the Netherlands stated that the Netherlands were also involved in the trade and would therefore seek funds from their budget to facilitate a project by Costa Rica, Mexico and the United States of America. He clarified that he had not yet received a firm offer, but was quite positive that this would occur.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) suggested that the Secretariat coordinate the project on behalf of the Plants Committee. He added that if the Netherlands could not secure funding for the project, the Secretariat would ask the United States of America for permission to use some of the funds they had provided for the facilitation of the



Plants Committee's projects. The observer from the United States of America was in agreement with this suggestion. The observer from the Netherlands clarified that the funds from the Netherlands would probably not be sufficient to cover all aspects of the project.

It was agreed that Costa Rica, Mexico and the United States would cooperate on solutions to continue studies on *Guaiacum* species and that Germany would contribute to the process of distinguishing species when in trade. The Secretariat would coordinate this process and seek funds.

7.4 *Aquilaria* spp.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) reported that preceding the adoption of Decisions 11.112 and 11.113, a report had been published by the TRAFFIC Network on the use of and trade in agarwood (*Aquilaria malaccensis*) and the implementation of CITES for the species. This study was, in part, financially supported by the Secretariat.

The representative of Asia (Mr Singh) congratulated TRAFFIC and suggested that priority should be given to the six threatened species.

The representative of Oceania (Mr Leach) drew attention to the trade in *Aquilaria* from Papua New Guinea and explained that, as it was traded illegally through Indonesia, it did not appear in any export data from Papua New Guinea. He also felt that as this trade was a relatively recent activity, there was no historical experience in harvesting regimes. It was therefore unlikely that the harvesting was under any sustainable regime. He congratulated TRAFFIC on their report but asked for Papua New Guinea to be specifically noted as a range State for *Aquilaria*. It was also worth noting that there was still taxonomic confusion as to the identity of the material in Papua New Guinea with some recent suggestions that two species may be involved, including *A. malaccensis*. Mr Leach continued that the Oceania alternate to the Plants Committee, Mr Gideon, had reported that Papua New Guinea wished to control the trade in *Aquilaria*, but felt that the mechanisms to do this were too difficult to put in place. Mr Leach reported that WWF and Australian research organizations such as CSIRO or ACIAR were interested in research into *Aquilaria*, and TRAFFIC Oceania would like to be involved with further study. With regard to the recommendations in the report, Mr Leach stated that Papua New Guinea had indicated they would probably support the inclusion of all species of *Aquilaria* in Appendix II.

Referring to the offer from the Netherlands to seek funding for studies into *Guaiacum* spp., Mr Leach suggested that, given the primarily Malaysian distribution of *Aquilaria*, the Netherlands could also try to find some funds for taxonomic studies into *Aquilaria*.

The observer from TRAFFIC reported that they would continue to work on this topic and were seeking funds to undertake studies in Papua New Guinea as well as some other countries in Southeast Asia. She added that a number of issues would be looked at for Papua New Guinea, such as dynamics of trade, benefit flows and economic incentives to communities to sustain populations of *Aquilaria*. Referring to Decisions 11.112 and 11.113, she stated that TRAFFIC and IUCN would be happy for the Plants Committee to act as the compiler of information and present it at the next meeting. The observer added that a workshop should also be convened for stakeholders to address their concerns.



In response to a request from the Chairman (Mrs Clemente), Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) suggested that the project could be included in the Secretariat's fund-raising programme. In the meantime, he suggested that the Secretariat work with TRAFFIC to see how to respond to Decision 11.112 until the next meeting of the Plants Committee, at which a budget and funding could be discussed.

The observer from TRAFFIC expressed their willingness to work with any other agencies to submit proposals, and could start collating information on additional species immediately.

8. Technical proposals for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

8.1 Definition of "artificially propagated" in relation to timber

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced the document and explained that Decision 10.127 had arisen as a result of recommendations made by the timber working group. Mr van Vliet referred to the two suggestions in the document: 1) to prepare a draft resolution with regard to 'ranching' in terms of forestry, or 2) to consider the creation of a special source code.

The observer from the United States of America disagreed with many of the statements in the document. For example, he did not agree that guided natural regeneration necessarily guarantees sustainable exploitation, as stated in paragraph 39 of the document, and he felt that the purpose of creating an additional source code for timber was not clear. He added that the current definition of "artificially propagated" in Resolution Conf. 11.11 was sufficiently flexible to accommodate the usual practices with regard to timber species.

From an enforcement standpoint, the observer from the United States of America said that it was difficult to differentiate wild vs. artificially propagated trees or lumber at the time the wood is imported. In particular, he was concerned that enforcement is problematic for the importing country if the wood from artificially propagated specimens was from a range country.

Concern was expressed that, if an additional source code was created for 'guided natural regeneration of timber species,' other industries may rightly claim similar treatment.

The observer from the United States of America, recommended against the development of an intermediate source code for the purpose outlined here.

The Plants Committee supported the continuation of the work by the Secretariat and the representative of North America (Mr von Arx) stated that his colleagues in the Forestry Services in Canada would be happy to cooperate. The representative of Oceania (Mr Leach) also pointed out that this would be a useful process as the concept of ranching was applicable to all plants and not only timber species.

Concerns were expressed by the observers from the European Union, Germany and the International Wildlife Coalition, all of whom considered that it would be inappropriate and unnecessary to have a new source code because it could have a knock-on effect on the making of a non-detriment statement. However, it was agreed



that the Secretariat should present a document on its findings at the next Plants Committee meeting.

8.2 Standard exemptions

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced document Doc. PC.10.8.2 and drew attention to the proposed wording to replace the section regarding flaked seedlings.

There was some discussion concerning the inclusion of the terms 'pollinia' and 'solid and liquid media', but the Committee supported the preparation of a document for consideration at the next Plants Committee meeting.

The observer from the United States of America also agreed with the Committee but suggested that the proposed language in paragraph a) should be consistent with the language of paragraph b).

8.3 Definitions of the technical terms used in the annotations

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced the document and pointed out that the Decision 11.118 was directed to the Plants Committee.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that the document referred specifically to annotations for medicinal plants because they can be traded in many different forms. She suggested continuing the discussion under Item 8.4.

8.4 Annotations for medicinal plants included in Appendix II

The observer from Germany introduced the document and drew attention to Tables 1 and 2. He explained that Table 1 summarized the major commodities identified in trade and that any annotation should reflect the actual trade situation; Table 2 was an attempt to identify the terms that might be considered ambiguous and need clear definition for Customs officers and Management Authorities. For example, terms such as 'derivatives' could be used in a pharmaceutical sense to mean 'parts' as well.

Mr von Arx (representative of North America) explained that in order to try and solve this problem, he had searched the Internet for some commonly used terms and had come up with many pages of definitions. He wondered whether it would be useful to try to use existing definitions such as the ones of the Harmonized System Customs Codes that could be applied to the plants included in the Appendices. The observer from Austria pointed out that it was important to ensure that terminology was botanically correct as well as easy to understand for enforcement officers.

After some discussion a working group was established to address the recommendations in two stages. The first stage would address recommendations 7 iii), iv) and v), for discussion at the next meeting of the Plants Committee. The working group would comprise observers from China, France, Germany, the United States of America and TRAFFIC, and the representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Colombia) – who would enlist the help of the members of the Andean Pact countries.

The second stage of the process would address recommendations 7 i) and ii).



9. Species proposals for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

9.1 *Araucaria araucana*

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) provided some background information to the document.

The observer from Chile explained the difficulties in Chile with the implementation at border controls of populations of both Appendix-I and Appendix-II species. He pointed out that he was not aware of all the correspondence between Argentina and the Secretariat and therefore could not comment on it, but Chile had informed Argentina of their agreement by and large, and support for their document.

With regard to the distribution of the species, the observer stated that Chile had no knowledge of a distribution outside Chile or Argentina, but would study further literature on this. He added that after the Conference of the Parties, Switzerland had been in consultation with the Secretariat regarding an introduced and subsequently naturalized population in Switzerland and it had been decided that the population would remain in Appendix II.

The observer from Chile considered that there were three important points that the discussion should focus on:

1. **The scientific (biological) aspect**, relating to the records contained in the specialized literature on the species *Araucaria araucana*, in which – as far as they were aware – there are no records revealing the existence of other populations of this species anywhere in the world, except for those recorded in the southern hemisphere, specifically in Chile and Argentina.
2. **The procedural aspect**: Referring to the mechanisms under the Convention for discussion of these topics, the observer from Chile made explicit mention of the history of this issue, and in particular of what was discussed and resolved at the meeting of the Plants Committee held in Darwin, Australia, and subsequently what was discussed and resolved at CoP11 in Nairobi, Kenya, where the proposal was approved, to include the Argentinian populations of *Araucaria araucana* in Appendix I, listing the entire species in that Appendix.
3. **The sovereignty of the Parties**: The observer from Chile mentioned that from the viewpoint of Chile this was the most sensitive point, since they felt that the Secretariat had gone beyond its mandate, and that to some extent it had infringed on an agreement of the Parties, which make up the supreme decision-making body of the Convention. Evidently this had to be resolved, since if this was not done it would call into question the credibility of the Convention and of its dispute-resolution mechanisms as well as, most critically of all, the sovereignty of the Parties.

The observer from Chile believed in the necessity of the Secretariat assisting in resolving the issue, by accepting that it had in fact gone beyond its mandate and seeking, from that starting point, a simple way of resolving the problem. In the view of Chile, this could be achieved by returning to the original intent of the official communication made by the Secretariat in Notification to the Parties 2000/034 of 15 June 2000 on Amendment of Appendices I, II and III, which in their view



accurately reflected the decision of the Parties adopted at CoP11, namely that all of the populations of *Araucaria araucana* should be included in Appendix I.

The observer from Chile believed that the dispute should be resolved in a harmonious manner, not by creating embarrassment for the Secretariat, inasmuch as this was not the intention of his country, particularly in the light of the tremendous relationship which they have had historically with the Secretariat, and that the most important thing was to aid in resolving the dispute. This should be cleared up in any event during the meeting, and obviously before the next meeting of the Plants Committee.

Mr von Arx (representative of North America) agreed that the position was very strong at a regional level, however, he recognized the European problem. He recalled that the original intention was to include the whole species in Appendix I to a) eliminate the split-listing between populations of Chile and Argentina and b) to protect seeds as they are not protected by an Appendix-II listing. He then stated that there was only one wild population of *Araucaria araucana* – that of Chile and Argentina and that there was no doubt at all that the whole species should be included in Appendix I. He stated that trees called *Araucaria araucana* originally came from Chile and Argentina in the 1700s or 1800s and are widely planted in gardens. They have offspring but he did not think that this could be considered as “populations”. However, he felt that there was a need to define naturalized populations such as the one in Switzerland.

The representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean agreed that the whole species should be included in Appendix I and stated that procedure had already been discussed in an informal working group.

The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) felt that the issue of definitions was important, especially with regard to introduced populations, and that it should be addressed by the Criteria Working Group. She added however, that the issue of definitions for introduced species was not directly relevant to conservation of wild resources. She reminded the Committee that the original intention of the proposal referred to the whole population and it had been strongly supported by the Plants Committee.

In response to the suggestion by the representative of Africa (Mr Luke) that the main problem was that of a procedural mistake by the Secretariat, Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) stated for the record that the Secretariat was embarrassed by the use of the word 'mistake'. He explained that the listing of the species in the Appendices sent with the first Notification to the Parties was incorrect and therefore it had been changed. He clarified that the current listing in the Appendices was correct and based on the title of the proposal. He agreed however, that it was an ongoing issue because the intent of the proposal was different.

The observer from Chile reiterated that the problem was not that of an incorrect title, moreover he considered that the title was correct, but the problem was one of implementation. He stressed that there should have been a working group to resolve this issue immediately, rather than waiting until the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The observer was anxious to give assurance that Chile did not want a conflict with the Plants Committee or the Secretariat, but felt strongly that there should be an amendment to the procedure in such instances as this.



Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) reminded the Committee that the proposal referred to the population from Argentina. He explained that in the text of the Convention there was a definition of 'species' and that one element of the definition was a 'geographically separate population', which was applicable in this case. However one of the difficult elements was that in most cases a whole species was included in Appendix I and consequently all specimens of that species. He referred to *Swietenia macrophylla* as an example where this was not the case and explained that when the listing was made it referred to populations in the Americas and therefore any species outside the Americas were not included in the Appendices. With *Araucaria araucana*, only Chile's population was included in Appendix I and the rest of the species remained in Appendix II. Following the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, only the Argentine population was included in Appendix I. Although the intent was to solve the split-listing, the outcome could only have been different had the title of the proposal referred to all remaining populations in Appendix I.

The representative of Africa (Mr Donaldson) felt that this was a situation in which there was obvious concern with the outcome, however, he stated that the Plants Committee should take collective responsibility for misinterpreting the Argentine proposal and should not come between the countries concerned and the Secretariat. He asked the members of the Committee whether it should choose to remain with the outcome or if it should produce some guidelines that reflect the original intention. He then asked if Switzerland would be opposed to including all the populations in Appendix I.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) reported that Switzerland had already stated that they would be prepared to remain with all populations in Appendix I. However, she wished to defend Switzerland, explaining that they had only raised this issue as a concern and that it had just been a question through email exchange and that they would follow the normal procedures for trade with Switzerland.

The representative of Europe (Mr de Koning) felt that it was all a question of interpretation and that the correct interpretation had been reflected in the first Notification sent by the Secretariat. He suggested therefore that the Plants Committee draws this to the attention of the Standing Committee.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) asked whether Mr de Koning was asking to return to the first Notification. This was confirmed with the support from the observer from Chile.

After further discussion on how to proceed, the Chairman (Mrs Clemente), with the support of the Plants Committee, asked Mr de Koning (representative of Europe) to liaise with the observer from Chile and to put the proposal in writing. The representative of Europe (Mr de Koning) and the observer from Chile agreed to draft a letter for the Chairman on behalf of the Plants Committee. This letter would be sent to the Standing Committee requesting a quick decision to instruct the Secretariat to send out a Notification to reflect the original interpretation of the proposal – supporting the position of Argentina and Chile "to include the species in Appendix I" (see Annex 4).



9.2 *Cimicifuga* spp., *Sclerocactus* spp. and *Tricholoma magnivelare*

The observer from the United States of America introduced the document and thanked the Management Authority of Switzerland for the information they provided on cacti.

It was agreed that any data concerning these species should be sent to the Scientific Authority of the United States of America.

The representative from Europe (Mr de Koning) noted with pleasure that the document included fungi. This resulted in a short discussion concerning the taxonomic status of fungi and it was agreed that the Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee would assess the position of the fungal kingdom in relation to CITES and the Plants Committee.

9.3 *Ligusticum porteri*

The observer from the United States of America introduced the document and, as with the previous item, requested that any information on species and trade be sent to their Scientific Authority. This was agreed.

10. Significant trade in plants

10.1 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) (cf. Decision 11.117)

The Secretariat provided some background to the Significant Trade Process.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) asked if there were any objections to Mr McGough being re-elected as coordinator for the Significant Trade Process. There were no objections and Mr McGough was therefore re-elected.

10.1.1 Selection of taxa for review

The coordinator of the Significant Trade Process (Mr McGough) introduced the document and drew attention to the Outstanding recommendations on page 5 and the Recommendations on page 6 (English version). He then asked the Committee how to proceed and decide on the priorities.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) reported that money was available in the budget for the suggested projects and that the Committee could make a decision on the work that should be initiated at the beginning of 2001.

Mr van Vliet referred to the recommendation regarding trade in plants from Madagascar and reported that as the Animals Committee had also flagged up this country, it would be a good opportunity for the Animals and Plants Committees to combine activities. Mr van Vliet said that the Secretariat, in cooperation with UNEP-WCMC, would try and arrange a printout of the analysis for all the species in the recommendations, but that it would take some time and therefore the Committee should concentrate on making a decision on the first activity.



The representative of Oceania (Mr Leach) suggested that work should be continued on the second stages of the projects already initiated. He supported the work in the order presented in the document, with Cycads as the top priority. This view was supported by the representative of Africa (Mr Donaldson), who explained that the Cycad Specialist Group was in the final stages of writing its Cycad Action Plan, which included some analysis of trade and the status in the wild. This information could be useful in the project of the Plants Committee.

With regard to trade in Cactaceae, the observer from Mexico reported that she had been in touch with the Mexican Management Authority and had been informed that the illegal trade of cacti was increasing. She therefore agreed that this was a group that needed further investigation.

Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) requested that medicinal plants be given a high priority. The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) explained that decisions so far had been based on the trade data from UNEP-WCMC and the problem was that medicinal plant data was not always apparent. She agreed that it was an important topic, and must be dealt with carefully. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) agreed with the comments from the Chairman and added that he would obtain a printout from UNEP-WCMC for the next Plants Committee meeting and then there could be a discussion on which plants were significantly traded for medicinal purposes.

Mr von Arx (representative of North America) reported that some fieldwork had begun in Madagascar but was unfinished. He referred to the review of Dideraceae that had been completed before the previous Plants Committee meeting, and suggested that the work could be linked to the review of orchids. Mr McGough responded that a large family listing could actually result in a block to the process, but he suggested that a project could be undertaken to look at non-CITES data in terms of non-detrimental trade. He stated that he would prepare a summary document before the next meeting.

The observer from Austria reported that Vienna University was undertaking some studies in Madagascar and therefore Austria offered to participate in the Madagascar plant review.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) summarized that there had been strong support to begin the analysis of significant trade in plants from Madagascar and the Secretariat would give the project first priority for funding. Mr van Vliet also agreed that the Secretariat would fund part of the project on Cycads and would consider further funding in 2002. He suggested that a summary paper be prepared regarding medicinal plants and a sample analysis prepared on the trade in Cactaceae. Mr van Vliet stated that the Secretariat would request trade data outputs from UNEP-WCMC in order to consider further analysis, such as the trade in *Pericopsis elata* and other species. He concluded that the Secretariat should be in a good position to report at the next meeting.



10.2 Significant trade plant projects pre-CoP11

10.2.1 Trade in medicinal plants (CITES project S-109): progress report

The observer from Germany provided some background on the report presented for adoption at this meeting. The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) added that the document had been presented at the previous meeting and Germany had been asked to consult with more countries and collect further data on the 16 species included in the report. Unfortunately very few countries had responded.

The observer from China noted that there were many Chinese species in the report. He explained that some work had recently been completed in China and hoped that it could be included in the report. The observer from Germany explained that it would be too late in the current phase, but that of course the Significant Trade reviews were ongoing and he would be happy to include the Chinese data at a later stage.

The Committee and delegates congratulated Germany on the high quality of the document and it was agreed that an electronic version of the report should be sent to the Chairman for distribution by email. The report would also include a small amendment from Malaysia, concerning *Panax quinquefolius*. The observer from Germany said that he would investigate the possibility of including the report in the website of his agency and, in the meantime, would provide 300 copies of the report to the Secretariat for distribution to all Management Authorities. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) stated that a link to the German agency website (see www.bfn.de and www.wisia.de) would be included in the new CITES website.

10.2.2 Trade in Chinese orchids (CITES project S-114): progress report

Mr McGough (United Kingdom) introduced the document and explained that it was a collaborative project between the United Kingdom Scientific Authority for plants and the Management Authority of China. He added that it was the most comprehensive review of trade in orchids in China to have ever been undertaken.

The Committee and delegates congratulated China and the United Kingdom for their work and Mrs Clemente (Chairman) commented that the cooperation between the two countries had been exemplary.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) reminded the delegates that a similar collaborative project had previously been undertaken with the United Kingdom and Thailand. He then referred to the vast amount of knowledge that had been gained from both the projects and drew attention to the need to use it and not store it away. Mr van Vliet reported that the Secretariat was developing a programme to assist Scientific Authorities in their work, and that as part of this, the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, United Kingdom, had been contracted to develop a manual on how to conduct analysis of this kind. The idea being that the manual could be used by all Scientific Authorities and incorporated in training courses. He hoped that it would be available for the next meeting.



The observer from the United States of America congratulated the United Kingdom and China, but expressed concern about the availability of information on the distribution of species and about the recommendation for the development of small-scale orchid production nurseries. He felt that this could facilitate the laundering of wild-collected specimens and asked what sort of monitoring, inspection and other controls would be utilized. He asked if any information on this had been gained from the previous project in Thailand. Mr McGough (United Kingdom) explained that the project was still in the early stages and that there was now a huge amount of data and recommendations. He added that the next stage was to address any problems, such as those mentioned by the observer from the United States of America.

With regard to the Thailand project, Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that it was not a comparable issue because of the Thai Government's complete ban on the export of wild orchids. He added that there were, however, recommendations that would be used in a later stage.

With regard to the possibility of controlling small nurseries, Mrs Clemente (Chairman) stressed that it was very important to develop propagation techniques both *in-situ* and *ex-situ*. She referred to the successful cycad projects in Mexico, noting that the local communities had become the best managers of their resources.

10.2.3 Implementation of trade controls for *Nardostachys grandiflora* and *Picrorhiza kurrooa*: progress report

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) presented the document, explaining that the two species had been included in Appendix II at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Secretariat had then asked TRAFFIC to look at the issue of implementation of trade controls.

The observer from TRAFFIC reported that their main findings were the ineffective implementation of the Appendix-II listing for these species because of the lack of regulation for the bulk of the trade (in rhizomes) and serious problems with trade controls in the range States.

Mr Singh (representative of Asia) pointed out that there were some problems with the taxonomy and that the description of a new *Picrorhiza* species had been published and that that of three or four more species would follow soon after. With regard to the legislation in the range States, he felt that it was a sensitive issue that could only be addressed at a political level.

The observer from Austria offered to undertake some taxonomic studies of *Picrorhiza*, in association with the Nomenclature Committee. He also suggested that it would be a good idea to search the Internet for the species offered for sale and to trace back the source of the material.

It was agreed to discuss the topic further in a meeting of the Nomenclature Committee. (see item 13.2).



11. Medicinal plants

11.1 Trade in *Prunus africana*

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced the document and explained that at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties it had been agreed that the Secretariat would explore possibilities to carry out studies to determine if trade was sustainable. The Secretariat had since been in contact with Cameroon, who were developing a project that would result in a procedure to allow Parties to make an assessment on population status and determine the amount of bark that could be traded in a sustainable manner. It was hoped that the project could be finalized in January/February 2001, however USD 90,000 was needed to fund the project.

Mr Luke (representative of Africa) reported that there had been no non-detriment findings for the issuance of permits from Kenya and that harvesting was taking place in protected areas. He hoped that the Secretariat could assist the Kenyan Scientific Authority to undertake a study on this trade.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) referred to the mention, in a German report, of Kenyan plantations and asked Mr Luke if they really were plantations. Mr Luke considered that these 'plantations' referred to some 100 ha about 40 years old that were partly harvested. He also added that there had been reports of more planting but that he had no details of the whereabouts of this.

The observer from France, on behalf of the Scientific Authority, provided the following information (translated from French):

"At the last meeting of the Plants Committee (Darwin, Australia, June 1999), the Scientific Authority informed the Committee that it was seeking funds to study the physiology of *Prunus africana*, in particular with respect to the consequences of debarking on the reserves of the plants, and their recovery. Various private and governmental sources have signed a cooperative research agreement for four years, including a scientific annex. The scientific institutes involved are the Laboratory for Tree Physiology of the University of Paris and the 'Service de Cultures' of the National Museum of Natural History.

As a first step, Mount Cameroon (Cameroon) was selected because harvesting of *Prunus africana* has been operating there for a long time, and there was good knowledge available on the various periods in which bark was harvested from the trees. In order to carry out the mission adequately, help was solicited from the Botanical Garden of Limbe, the Mount Cameroon project and botanists of the former company Plantecam, to organize at the end of June 2000, the stay of three scientists, two from the university and one from the museum. Two days were spent on the mountain, and 200 samples were collected.

With a letter dated 19 June, the Scientific Authority of France requested the Minister of Environment and Forestry of Cameroon for an export permit. Returning to Yaounde on 21 June no export permit was available, nor was one received after having sent a reminder on 13 November. The samples are still in Cameroon.



The Scientific Authority of France is therefore formally requesting the Chairman of the Plants Committee to help to solve this issue, to ensure that the samples can be sent to France for this important study to obtain greater knowledge of *Prunus africana*.

Since the ninth meeting of the Plants Committee in Darwin, Australia, two important things have happened.

Since January 2000, Plantecam has ceased its activity and dismantled its factory. The policy of the mother company (Fournier) is to maximize the diversity of its sources on the basis of opportunities offered in the various countries in the distribution range of this species. It has therefore reduced its pressure on Mount Cameroon and reduced its purchase to 100 tons a year only. In many cases, the bark offered for sale is coming from areas that are cleared for agricultural purposes, and the offer is larger than that which the industry wants to buy from Cameroon.

In December 1999, the company Indena bought the SODIP factory in Madagascar. The manner in which *Prunus africana* is exploited in Madagascar is being reviewed following the implementation of a profit tax to enable studies on *Prunus*".

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) referred to the factory in Cameroon that had been pulled down, and asked the observer from France if he had any information about the situation of exports from Equatorial Guinea, to which he responded negatively.

The observer from France stated that the intention was to complete the study and that it would also include some research in Madagascar. He felt that despite a new source of *Prunus africana* since the closure of the Plantecam factory, the trade would remain stable due to the large enough supply of the synthetic product.

Mr Luke (representative of Africa) noted that the observer from France had made no mention of the trade from Kenya. He reported that he had received information that all bark from Kenya was exported to France. The observer from France replied that this was correct but that there was now little demand for the bark in France. Mr Luke was concerned that the bark producing trees continued to be cut down nevertheless.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) felt that the problem was that of the harvesting process and that it was important not to harvest so much bark that it would cause the death of the tree. She asked what the Plants Committee could do in order to help France obtain the permit from Cameroon in order to continue their studies.

The Plants Committee agreed that the Secretariat would draft a letter to Cameroon, on behalf of the Plants Committee, stating the importance of continuing the work being undertaken by France.

It was also agreed that the Secretariat would write to the Kenyan Management Authority to encourage them to enlist the help of one of the Scientific Authorities to examine the sustainability of trade.



11.2 Possible future activities

The Plants Committee agreed to postpone discussions on this item until the next meeting of the Plants Committee, pending further research from France and Kenya. (see above).

12. Review of the Appendices

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) provided some background to this item and urged the cooperation of range States with the review of relevant taxa.

There was some discussion on the problems with communication between the Parties and range States and Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) expressed his disappointment that some Parties had failed to respond to communications in respect of the review. For example, the Secretariat had written to 30 Parties, of which only a few had responded.

The Plants Committee agreed that there had been a positive response from those Parties that had participated and that it was important to continue with the review. It was agreed to continue the process between meetings of the Conference of the Parties.

A working group was established, coordinated by the Secretariat and comprising: representatives of Africa (Mr Donaldson), Asia (Alternate, Mr Jia), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mrs Werkhoven), Europe (Mr de Koning), Oceania (Mr Leach), the observer from the United States of America (Mr Gable), the American Orchid Society (Mr Nash), the coordinator of the Significant Trade Process (Mr McGough). This group will review Appendix-II orchids.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) stated that with regard to orchids, he would ask UNEP-WCMC to provide a trade data printout for discussion within the working group.

The observer from the United Kingdom reported that the Scientific Authority of the United Kingdom had received funding from the Management Authority to undertake some research on this topic and that the results of the preliminary review could be made available to the working group in early 2001.

In response to a short discussion regarding the listing of the complete family of orchids, the observer from Austria reported that he had received a letter from IAHP in Germany, with the emphasis that approximately 90% of orchids in trade are hybrids, and offering assistance to assess the trade in markets.

12.1 How to proceed with the review of Orchidaceae spp.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) reported that the working group had agreed to continue the process by trying to separate taxa included in the Appendices into groups depending on the quantity and purpose of trade. The Group would also consider those taxa for which checklists were required and those taxa for which there was no significant trade.

Mr van Vliet hoped that a report with proposals on how to continue with the review would be available for presentation at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. However, he was not certain that all the work would be completed by then.



12.2 Appendix-I Cactaceae

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) reported that this was an item for information only. He expressed concern that although he had written to the range States, he had not received a response. He requested the regional representatives to contact the range States in their region and obtain a response.

The observer from Mexico reported that she had contacted the Mexican Management Authority the previous day and was informed that the Secretariat's letter had been answered, however, she did not have any evidence of this. She said that on return to Mexico she would try to find a copy of the letter or instruct the Management Authority to respond immediately.

13. Checklists and nomenclature

13.1 Checklist: progress report

The Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee introduced the document. As has become traditional at meetings of the Plants Committee and the Conference of the Parties, he made a plea to the regional representatives to provide contacts of relevant experts in the range States of the genera to be included in the checklists. He also thanked the IUCN Carnivorous Plants Specialist Group for the draft copy of the carnivorous plant checklist.

The representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Colombia) offered to provide assistance with the genus *Masdevallia*.

In response to a question from the observer from Austria, regarding future requirements for checklists, Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) said that he thought that this would be an agenda item at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

The observer from Austria offered government support of CHF 5,000 for the preparation of a checklist for *Bulbophyllum* and would discuss it further with the Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee. Mr van Vliet thanked Austria for their generous offer and added that if further funds were required from the CITES Trust Fund, a budget decision by CoP12 would be required.

The observer from Austria requested that additional funding for checklists be included as an item on the agenda for the next meeting of the Plants Committee.

13.2 Nomenclature problems

The Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee presented the outcomes of the earlier discussion of the Nomenclature Committee:

1. Cactaceae: the working group concluded that a number of lists were available that included species in the subgenus *Opuntia* spp. It was agreed that these would be useful for implementation officers and an amended list would be presented to the Secretariat. Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) reported that a taxonomic study of Cactaceae was due to be published by Timber Press in 2001.



2. Thymeleaceae: the working group agreed that the review of *Aquilaria* spp. would continue with research, including the nomenclature. This would be coordinated by the Secretariat. The working group would provide the researchers with a list of the key points raised in the meeting of the Nomenclature Committee.
3. Valerianaceae: the working group felt that there had been confusion owing to the use of a misapplied name (*Valeriana jatamansi*), and that if this was taken into account then the original intent of the proposal for *Nardostachys grandiflora* would be clear. A draft annotation would therefore be prepared for the next meeting.
4. Scrophulariaceae: the working group agreed that the original intent of the proposal had been to include *Picrorhiza kurrooa* only and therefore point 22 of document PC 10.13.2, referring to *Picrorhiza scrophulariiflora*, was not applicable.

13.3 *Taxus wallichiana*

The Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee (Mr McGough) gave some background to the document and explained that the original listing proposal was for *Taxus baccata*, but was changed to *Taxus wallichiana*. Mr McGough stated that the exact status of the species at the time of listing would be assessed and a document prepared for discussion at the next meeting.

Mr Singh (representative of Asia) expressed concern that any decisions should be taken in consultation with the range States. Mr McGough stated that expertise was very welcome from all regions. He said that input from taxonomists would be very valuable at this stage. Mr McGough confirmed that he would of course be in contact with the relevant members of the Plants Committee.

The observer from the United States of America referred to trade in *Taxus wallichiana* taking place outside CITES controls and requested guidance on how to deal with this problem. The observer from China stated that the same problem occurred in China and that a review of the issue was planned for 2001. The observer from China offered to cooperate with the United States of America on the review of this species. The United States of America agreed.

The representative of North America (Mr von Arx) stated that there would also be a study on the Pacific yew, undertaken by the Pacific Forestry Centre. He suggested therefore, that if there was to be a review of the yew, it might also be useful to add other species of *Taxus*.

It was agreed that the United States of America would continue their work, with the help of China.

14. Strategic planning

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced the document and Mrs Clemente (Chairman) referred to the goals and objectives in Annex 1, pointing out that some objectives were directed to the Plants Committee only. She explained that the Committee should look at how to establish priorities, activities and projects in order to promote these goals. Mrs Clemente



suggested the formation of a working group to begin discussions, starting with a review of the list for priority. A working group was established comprising: the Chairman, Mr Donaldson (representative of Africa), Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean), Mr de Koning (representative of Europe), Mr von Arx (representative of North America), Mr Leach (representative of Oceania), the observer from the United States of America (Mr Gabel), the coordinator of the Significant Trade Process (Mr McGough) and the Secretariat (Mr van Vliet).

14.1 Implementation of the CITES Strategic Vision – Actions directed to the Plants Committee

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) reported that the working group had met to discuss the decisions directed to the Plants Committee, for work to be completed before the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and with a view to utilizing the generous donation from the United States of America.

Mr von Arx (Vice-Chairman) explained the approach the working group had followed in making priorities and stated that they had tried to focus on the two most important factors of urgency and importance for the Plants Committee.

- Items 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 1.4.5 and 1.7.1 were considered important but not so urgent as there was a clear decision for the Secretariat to take action on these.
- Items 1.7.2 and 1.7.3 were considered very important and urgent and had already been implemented.
- Item 1.7.3 – The working group considered it useful to continue the process of informing Parties through the Plants Committee and it was also considered useful for regional representatives to ensure information was made available to the Parties on a regular basis.
- Items 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 – The review of the Appendices and significant trade projects were ongoing.
- Item 2.1.4 – Some work has been implemented, for example a tree project coordinated by the Netherlands.
- Item 2.2.2 – With regard to consultation with the Plants Committee when preparing proposals, the working group felt that this was an opportunity for regional representatives to intervene to ensure availability of proper information. The group also considered it important for the Secretariat to assist via a Notification to ensure effective collaboration.
- Item 2.2.3 – The working group considered this to be a very urgent priority of medicinal importance, and recognized the need for work to be undertaken on the definitions.
- Item 2.3 – the Working Group agreed on the need to improve the scientific basis when making non-detriment statements.
- Item 2.3.2 – The working group saw the need for regional representatives to participate in workshops and to bring local examples to training.



- Item 2.3.5 – The working group considered that this should probably be developed more at a regional level and would therefore not be an urgent priority for the Plants Committee as a whole.
- Item 2.4.1 – The working group felt that it was difficult to tackle this subject, as they did not feel there was such a need for innovative technology. The Group did not feel that it should be given high priority on importance or urgency for the Plants Committee.
- Item 4.3.2 – It was agreed that this was a very important issue and that there were many ways proposed in order to infiltrate the scientific community with a greater knowledge of CITES. The group agreed that it would be useful to hold CITES workshops in scientific meetings and to have a calendar of botanic meetings per year in order for CITES staff to attend either formally or informally and raise awareness of CITES. Tools already available included websites and PowerPoint presentations that could be adapted for more specific examples. It would also be useful to create an index or library of available material.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) thanked Mr von Arx for the summary and asked the Committee for their comments on how to implement the decisions. She added that if there were no further comments, she would work with Mr von Arx to produce a priority proposal on how to move forward.

The observer from the Netherlands was concerned that item 2.3.5 had not been given a high priority. He explained that he had had difficulties in communicating with other Scientific Authorities, for example he only received four answers to 40 communications and they were all from Management rather than Scientific Authorities.

The observer from the United Kingdom referred to the availability of training and capacity building. He stated that there were many Parties with a lot of information available to a limited number of individuals. He felt that people would like raw data to use and interpret and suggested that existing information such as the text and exercises used in the Master's Course be adapted and a demonstration presented to the next meeting. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) supported the latter suggestion and suggested that the new Head of the Capacity Building Unit should contact the observer from the United Kingdom to avoid duplication of work.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) offered the assistance of Spain for the provision of information from the Master's course.

The observer from Mexico, referring to item 1.7, brought up the need for improved coordination between Management and Scientific Authorities. She suggested that the Secretariat might be able to notify the Scientific Authorities if there were any items that the Management Authorities should be informing them of. The Chairman explained that this was not possible, as the Management Authority was the control authority, however, she suggested that this could be a role for the regional representatives.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) agreed that items 1.7.2 and 1.7.3 were very important, but that there was a problem with funding and that he could not provide a solution. He explained that the United Nations had strict guidelines on the use of funds, but that



he would consider this problem and prepare a proposal for possible financial support for the objectives in items 1.7.2 and 1.7.3.

The representative from Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mrs Werkhoven) reported that Mr Forero and herself were unsure who the Scientific Authorities were in their region. She asked the Secretariat for any solutions to this problem. Mr van Vliet referred to the development of regional directories and stated that he would try to think of a solution.

The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) proposed that the Committee allowed herself and the Vice-Chairman (Mr von Arx) to prepare a series of proposals to circulate amongst the members, prior to contacting the authorities of the United States of America to discuss how to utilize their generous donation. This was agreed.

14.2 Decisions directed to the Plants Committee

14.3 Establishment of priorities

15. Identification materials for plants

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) reported that part of the timber ID manual had been completed in English and that the French version was in preparation. He stated that the most interesting part was the key to cacti on the basis of vegetative form and congratulated Mr Supthut (Switzerland) for that. Mr van Vliet reported that a similar key for orchids was also being considered.

15.1 Progress report

The observer from Germany reported that a full set of draft ID sheets were included in the training handbook. He drew attention to page 2 of the document and reported that two species, *Panax quinquefolius* and *Rauwolfia serpentina*, were missing from the list of species. He added that over half of the inclusions were very recent, such as *Adonis vernalis*, *Hydrastis* and *Panax*. The observer from Germany invited comments on the document and explained that the handbook was directed at Customs officers and contained morphology descriptions, drugs in trade and colour photographs. Information had already been received concerning *Hydrastis*, *Panax* and *Dendrobium*.

The observer from China stated that the handbook would be very useful and thanked Germany for its preparation. He also added that China had finished the preparation of an ID sheet for *Cistanche deserticola* and would send it to the Secretariat after the meeting (note from the Secretariat: received in January 2001).

The observer from the United States of America thanked Germany for their work, in particular on *Hydrastis* and *Panax*.

The observer from Germany reported that five extra ID sheets had been prepared for the German version of the ID Manual and offered to provide these for inclusion in the CITES ID Manual. However, he recognized that this could be controversial as they were for species on the EU annexes rather than the CITES Appendices. After a short discussion, it was suggested that Germany should include these species on the website of their agency.



The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) congratulated Germany on their work and thanked them for including the extra information on their website. She added that the work sent by Spain on timber ID sheets was also included in the website of Cordoba Botanic Garden (<http://www.uco.es/organiza/servicios/jardin/cd1/Maderas%20CITES/principal.htm>). She thanked the timber experts for their input and also those people who had provided her with their web links. She explained that the timber ID sheets contained information on family, species, name, authority, trade names, common names in the original English, French or Spanish language, plus what is in control, characteristics for trade, distribution, range, macroscopic characteristics for wood and photographic data. Mrs Clemente reported that there was also a section of similar species, including range, use and characteristics. She welcomed any additional information for inclusion in the website and hoped that the Secretariat could include a link to the website in the CITES pages.

The observer from Austria congratulated the Spanish authorities on their web page and stated that it had been used in training and education in the Austrian University.

16. CITES projects

16.1 *Aloe vera* var. *vera* (CITES project S-93)

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) asked the Committee if it still felt it relevant that money should be spent to find any plants of this variety in its distribution area, or if perhaps the Committee considered it futile.

The Committee agreed that the Secretariat should write to the Italian Government to ask permission to reallocate the funds for projects with a higher priority.

17. Issues resulting from PC9, not included elsewhere in the agenda

- **PC9 agenda item 10.1.8: Contribution to an evaluation of tree species using the new CITES listing criteria**

The observer from the Netherlands reported that the website was available almost immediately after the ninth meeting of the Plants Committee. He then said that he would ask UNEP-WCMC to inform him of the number of hits the site had received, in particular after the Notification had been sent out from the Secretariat. He suggested that the site could be advertised more widely. He explained that all data received were first evaluated by Mr de Koning and then posted on the Web. He added that the site would be translated into French and Spanish.

The Plants Committee supported the proposal by the observer from the Netherlands to make a species list to send to individual countries, requesting their comments directly. The observer from the Netherlands would report at the next meeting of the Plants Committee to discuss future progress.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) reminded the Committee that a Decision at the 10th meeting of the Conference of the Parties directed the Plants Committee to review the timber species included in the CITES Appendices. He therefore suggested that the Secretariat, in cooperation with the Netherlands, prepares such a document to allow the Plants Committee to complete its task to review. This was agreed.



- **PC9 agenda item 14.1: Trade in seeds of Mexican cacti**

For the benefit of the observer from Mexico, Mrs Clemente (Chairman) presented a brief history of this issue. Mr von Arx (representative of North America) stated that the issue needed to be re-evaluated and that he would work with Mexico and report back at the next meeting of the Plants Committee.

Mrs Clemente agreed to send both the observer from Mexico and Mr von Arx copies of all the correspondence with the Mexican authorities. She stated that she would also send a note to the Mexican authorities to advise them of this.

- **PC9 agenda item 16.2: Information for the public on the significance of Appendix II**

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) reported that TRAFFIC had volunteered to provide information on this issue. However, they regretted that no progress had been made and asked for clarification as to the requirements – specifically as to whether the audience was to be perceived as general public or industry.

After some discussion, it was agreed that the item had been included in the agenda for historical reasons and it was suggested that the item be deleted, but that the issue be included for discussion in PC10 agenda item 14 – Strategic planning.

- **PC9 agenda item 16.4: Timber brochure**

The observer from the United States of America made the following statement:

“At the second timber working group meeting it was agreed that the general public and many stakeholders have little or poor understanding of CITES and its objectives. He added that he had just heard that 95 per cent of medicinal plant traders had never heard of CITES. The second timber working group agreed that CITES should do a better job of making information available, in an easily digestible way, to stakeholders and policy makers. The consequences of not improving understanding of CITES, its objectives, and how it works may be fear and resistance to CITES and its work – this is already evident in the forestry and marine fisheries trade.

To partially address this need, the United States Forest Service, in collaboration with the CITES Secretariat, TRAFFIC, International Hardwood Products Association and the US Fish and Wildlife Service, produced the brochure *CITES and the Timber Trade*. The intended audience for the brochure is timber importers, major buyers of imported timber, and policy makers. The brochure is designed to be non-country specific with the idea that very inexpensive country specific inserts could be added by countries. 30,000 copies of the brochure were printed in English, French, Spanish and Portuguese and sent to the Parties' Management Authorities.

Since no country received enough brochures for practical use, a letter that accompanied the brochures explained that it would be on the Web. A CD would also be available on request, with the document plus the files needed to redo the brochure in the country's language. We are pleased that two countries have asked for the CD, one to redo it into another language, another simply to reprint it. (Slovakia, Australia).



The United States are concerned however, that this response indicated the brochure be used in only a few countries. It may be that countries have not had enough time to respond to the brochure or the brochure got lost in the mail. Therefore, we request that the Plants Committee encourage member Parties to make an appropriate version of the brochure widely available within their country and encourage its use.

The brochure can be used in many ways:

- Reprint
- Redo in another language
- Used for communication with other non timber user groups by simply changing the title and pictures

If expense is an issue, perhaps groups of countries could collaborate to reprint the brochure in the quantity needed. The contact for getting copies of the CD for the brochure is: rhendricks@fs.fed.us."

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) thanked the observer from the United States of America, noting the considerable progress. She then invited members of the Plants Committee to comment and also asked for the reactions of the Parties with regard to availability to use this tool.

The representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Mr Forero) stated that he had received the brochure from the Colombian authorities, but without any explanation. He suggested therefore that perhaps a letter could be included with an explanation of how to use the brochure. The observer from the United States of America replied that there had been a letter for inclusion, but that he was going to distribute another batch.

The representative of Africa (Mr Donaldson) congratulated the United States of America on the excellent and valuable product. However, he had some concerns with regard to the distribution process and suggested that it might be more profitable to distribute the brochures to target audiences such as timber trade associations, rather than through the CITES network. The observer from the United States of America agreed with the suggestion and said that common sense was required concerning the best means to communicate the information.

It was agreed that Parties should be encouraged to discuss the use of the brochure for timber, but also to customize it for other plant groups and make it available in sufficient quantities. The brochures should also be distributed to relevant specialist groups.

- **PC9 agenda item 20: Rescue centres**

As there was no further information available on this item, it was deleted from the agenda.



18. Training initiatives

18.1 Standard slide package: progress report

The observer from the United Kingdom made the following statement:

“The final version of the Standard slide pack for plants, titled 'CITES and Plants – A User's Guide' was presented at the last meeting of the Plants Committee. The pack was well received and over 600 copies were distributed by the CITES Secretariat and the UK Scientific Authority for plants. In total 360 English copies, 120 French and 120 Spanish copies were sent out. There are currently no more English and Spanish packs left for distribution, but another batch will be printed next year. However, copies of the French version are still available and currently being held at Kew. The Secretariat has a few copies of each version, but these are principally for new Parties.

The United Kingdom Management Authority has confirmed funding of GBP 100,000 over four years and the next phase will focus on the development of further slide packs. Titles under consideration include:

- CITES and Orchids (wild versus artificially propagated and potential detrimental trade)
- CITES and Succulents (ditto)
- Training Exercises to be used by the CITES Parties.

Once these packs have been developed the next stage will be to produce CD-ROM versions of all the packs that will be made available to CITES parties.

The United Kingdom Scientific Authority would like to ask for cooperation from all Parties with the development and production of the new packs and would welcome any suggestions for future packs.”

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) stated that the slide packs were in demand as soon as they were shown and therefore this was an important issue as it addressed the problem that had been reported on many occasions, that it was sometimes difficult to get information to the right people. He agreed that the Secretariat would look at the remaining slide packs and distribute to members on the proviso that they would use the packs and not give them away. He also suggested that directors of botanic gardens promote the use of both the existing packs and those that were to be developed. Finally, he stated that he would include the information on the CITES website.

The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) congratulated the United Kingdom on their work and offered her personal cooperation as well as that of the University of Cordoba, as the Scientific Authority of Spain. She added that she was sure that the observer from the Netherlands and Mr Sajeve (Italy, non present at the meeting) would also be willing to cooperate again.

The observer from Austria stated that the slide pack was a very useful tool to teach CITES at university level. He added that it was used in Austria, in combination with websites on timber by Cordoba and tree evaluation by the Netherlands. He concluded that such resources were indispensable.



18.2 Report on the 3rd Master's course on Management, conservation and control of species in international trade

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) gave a PowerPoint presentation on the 3rd Master's course.

The 3rd Master's Course on "Management, conservation and control of species in international trade" was held from 3 October to 15 December 2000 in Spain. The course was given at the International University of Andalusia (at the Antonio Machado campus, in Baeza), simultaneously in Spanish and English, and amounted to 500 hours of tuition. Thirty-four people took the course, from Scientific and Management Authorities as well as non-governmental organizations of 25 countries: Bolivia, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Greece, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Mozambique, Namibia, Peru, Slovakia, Slovenia, Saint Lucia, Spain, Thailand, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe. The participants were given a grant which fully covered their tuition and accommodation. In addition, nine inspectors from the Spanish Management Authority attended various weekly modules.

The 3rd Master's Course was given by 57 experts from 10 countries. Together with the experts from the Spanish Scientific Authority (Ministry of the Environment) and Management Authority (Ministry of the Economy), representatives from the Scientific or Management Authorities of Argentina, Australia, Cuba, France, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the CITES Secretariat, the Commission of the European Union, the Phytogenetic Resources Secretariat of the FAO, the University of Granada, the Polytechnical University of Madrid, the Spanish Environmental Police (SEPRONA), the Spanish Customs authorities, the Forensic Laboratory of the USA, IUCN, African Resources Trust, Adena-WWF and others also participated.

Holding of the 3rd Master's Course was made possible by the International University of Andalusia which organized it, by the generous sponsorship of the Fundación Biodiversidad and by the assistance of the University of Córdoba, the Spanish Ministries of the Environment and the Economy, the CITES Secretariat, the Botanical Gardens of Córdoba and the zoos of Barcelona and Jerez. The contribution made by Spain in the year 2000 to finance the course amounted to USD 170,000.

Over the three consecutive years (1998, 1999 and 2000) this course has been given under the direction of Dr. M. A. Clemente to 87 participants. It provides a solid training for the implementation of CITES and for future work and communication among countries. The participants have come from 35 countries (Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Italy, Kenya, Mexico, Mozambique, Namibia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe). Additionally, there have been a further 50 participants from the Management Authority of Spain who over the three years have attended various weekly modules to enhance their training.

19. Time and venue of the 11th Plants Committee meeting

The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) was very pleased to report the generous offer from Malaysia, to host the next meeting of the Plants Committee. She added that an offer had also been received from Germany, however at that stage the offer from Malaysia had already been



accepted. Mrs Clemente thanked Malaysia for their offer and stated that the decision was that of the Plants Committee members and not just of the Chairman.

The representative of Asia (Mr Shaari) extended a welcome to all members and participants to attend the meeting in Malaysia. He hoped that everyone would be happy for the meeting to take place in the first week of September 2001, but he would discuss further details with the Secretariat and confirmation of the time and venue would be communicated later.

In response to a question from the representative of Africa (Mr Donaldson), the Secretariat (Mr van Vliet) explained that the meeting had been proposed for September as it did not conflict with any local holidays or other activities. Mr van Vliet accepted that regional representatives may have other commitments for that period, however the alternates could attend the Plants Committee in their place.

20. Any other business

20.1 Presentation by Germany of "Conservation and Sustainable Use of *Adonis vernalis*, a Medicinal Plant in International Trade"

The observer from Germany stated that a full report had been prepared and was available to all participants.

20.2 Relationship between *ex-situ* breeding operations and *in-situ* conservation programmes (Decision 11.102)

The Secretariat (Mr van Vliet) explained that this item related to an IUCN document on draft guidelines and suggested that the issue be postponed for discussion at the next meeting.

The observer from Austria stated that every Party to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) is responsible for reporting on invasive plants and therefore the Plants Committee should establish contacts with the CBD before the next meeting, to get some feedback on this process. The Chairman (Mrs Clemente) agreed that the suggestion from Austria was appropriate and the item was postponed until the 11th meeting of the Plants Committee.

Closing comments

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) thanked the United States of America for their kind invitation to the National Conservation Training Center. She thanked all the staff involved for making all the participants feel welcome. She added that she was sure that most people were envious of the facilities. On behalf of herself and the Secretariat, she hoped that the representatives of the United States of America would transmit their deep gratitude to the Management and Scientific Authorities of the United States of America.

Mrs Clemente concluded by thanking everyone who had been involved with the preparation, organization and running of the meeting. She also took the opportunity to highlight the excellent contributions from all observers, intergovernmental organizations and NGOs.

