



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

PROCEEDINGS  
ELEVENTH MEETING OF THE  
PLANTS COMMITTEE

Langkawi, Malaysia  
3-7 September 2001



*Cycas clivicola*

Photo: Victoria ZENTILLI

Rapporteur  
Jacqueline Roberts

Prepared by the CITES Secretariat

May 2002

# CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	5
— Closed session of the Plants Committee .....	7
— Open session of the Plants Committee .....	8
 CLOSED SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE .....	 19
1. Opening of the meeting .....	21
2. Terms of Reference of the Plants Committee .....	21
3. Background of the work of the Plants Committee .....	21
4. Division of work between the members of the Plants Committee .....	21
5. Action points of the ninth meeting of the Plants Committee .....	22
6. Budget of the Plants Committee .....	22
7. Agenda of 11th meeting of the Plants Committee .....	23
8. Time and venue of the 12th meeting of the Plants Committee .....	23
 OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE .....	 25
1. Opening of the meeting .....	27
2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure .....	27
3. Adoption of the Agenda and the Working programme .....	27
4. Admission of observers .....	27
5. Regional reports and reports on regional meetings .....	27
6. Regional directories [Resolution Conf. 11.1, Annex 2, paragraph e)] .....	28
7. Review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 .....	29
7.1 Meeting with the Chairmen in Geneva .....	29
7.2 Second meeting of the Criteria Working Group .....	29
7.2 Report of the Standing Committee meeting (plants issues) .....	29
8. Follow up of CoP11 Decisions .....	29
8.1 <i>Harpagophytum</i> spp. ....	29
8.2 <i>Guaiacum sanctum</i> .....	30
8.3 <i>Aquilaria</i> spp. ....	30
8.4 Mahogany Working Group .....	32
9. Technical proposals for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties .....	32
9.1 Harvesting techniques of <i>Galanthus</i> in Georgia .....	33
9.2 Decision 11.155 .....	34
9.3 Standard exemptions for Appendix-II plant species .....	34
9.4 Definitions of the technical terms used in the annotations .....	34
9.5 Exemptions for flaked seedlings .....	34
9.6 Exchange of scientific herbarium specimens of certain plant taxa listed in Appendix II .....	35

<b>10. Species proposals for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</b> .....	35
10.1 Delisting of leaf-bearing cacti (Pereskioideae and Opuntioideae) .....	35
<b>11. Significant trade in plants</b> .....	36
11.1 Problems and inconsistencies in Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) and Decision 11.117 .....	36
11.2 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) (cf. Decision 11.117) .....	38
11.2.1 Trade in plants from Madagascar .....	38
11.2.2 Cycads .....	39
11.2.3 Selection of taxa for review .....	39
<b>12. Medicinal plants</b> .....	40
12.1 Trade in <i>Prunus africana</i> .....	40
12.2 Possible future activities .....	40
<b>13. Review of the Appendices</b> .....	41
13.1 Review of Orchidaceae spp. ....	41
13.2 Appendix-I Cactaceae .....	41
13.3 Tree species (Decision 11.116) .....	42
<b>14. Checklists and nomenclature</b> .....	43
14.1 Progress report .....	43
14.2 Issues referred to the Nomenclature Committee .....	43
14.3 <i>Masdevallia</i> .....	44
14.4 <i>Bulbophyllum</i> .....	44
14.5 Nomenclature of <i>Cedrela odorata</i> .....	44
<b>15. Strategic planning</b> .....	44
<b>16. Identification materials for plants</b> .....	45
16.1 Progress report .....	45
<b>17. Guidelines for transport of live plants</b> .....	45
<b>18. Tree species evaluation: progress report by the Netherlands</b> .....	46
<b>19. Issues resulting from PC10, not included elsewhere in the Agenda</b> .....	46
<b>20. Training initiatives</b> .....	46
20.1 Standard slide package: progress report .....	46
<b>21. Trade in Mexican cacti</b> .....	47
21.1 Trade in seeds of Cactaceae included in Appendix II .....	47
21.2 Cacti sales through Internet .....	48
<b>22. Review of the genus <i>Taxus</i></b> .....	49
<b>23. Time and venue of the 12th Plants Committee meeting</b> .....	50
<b>24. Any other business</b> .....	50
24.1 Relationship between <i>ex-situ</i> breeding operations and <i>in-situ</i> conservation programmes (Decision 11.102) .....	50
24.2 Report on the Global Strategy for Plants (CBD) .....	51
24.3 Annotation to <i>Cistanche deserticola</i> .....	51
24.4 Illegal trade in <i>Paphiopedilum</i> spp. ....	51
24.5 Implementation issues related to Appendix-III timber species .....	52

**Closing remarks** ..... 52

ANNEX 1  
Opening speeches ..... 53

ANNEX 2  
List of participants ..... 63



Photo: Victoria ZENTILLI





Photo: Victoria ZENTILLI

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<b>CLOSED SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE</b>	
<p><b>2. Terms of Reference of the Plants Committee</b></p> <p>Participants to consider the need for any proposed amendments to the Terms of Reference or Decision 11.110, for further discussion under 'Any other business' if necessary.</p>	Parties, regional representatives
<p><b>3. Background of the work of the Plants Committee</b></p> <p>No action.</p>	
<p><b>4. Division of work between the members of the Plants Committee</b></p> <p>All regional directories should, as complete as possible, be submitted to the Secretariat for formatting and inclusion in the CITES website.</p>	Regional representatives
<p><b>5. Action points of the tenth meeting of the Plants Committee</b></p> <p>Working group to discuss any necessary amendments to the proposed Rules of Procedure as presented in document PC11 Doc. 2.</p>	Regional representatives of Africa (Luke), Asia (Zul), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Forero), North America (von Arx), Chairman, Secretariat
<p><b>6. Budget of the Plants Committee</b></p> <p>The Chairman to meet with the delegates from the United States of America to discuss the use of any remaining funds from their generous donation of USD 45,000 made at the latest meeting of the Plants Committee.</p>	Chairman
<p><b>7. Agenda of the 11th meeting of the Plants Committee</b></p> <p>Adopted.</p>	
<p><b>8 Time and venue of the 12th meeting of the Plants Committee</b></p> <p>The regional representative of Europe, on behalf of the Government of the Netherlands, offered to host the next meeting in Leiden, the Netherlands in May 2002.</p>	Chairman, regional representative of Europe (de Koning)

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<b>OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE</b>	
<p><b>2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure</b></p> <p>The Plants Committee adopted the Rules of Procedure as revised by the working group and presented in document PC11 Doc. 2 Annex (Rev.)</p> <p>The main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– proceedings to be presented in the same format as for previous PC meetings;</li> <li>– submission of documents to the Secretariat 75 days before a PC meeting;</li> <li>– distribution of documents to the members 40 days before a PC meeting;</li> <li>– the role of the alternate representatives.</li> </ul>	Plants Committee
<p><b>3. Adoption of the Agenda and the Working programme</b></p> <p>The Agenda and Working Programme were adopted.</p>	Plants Committee
<p><b>4. Admission of observers</b></p> <p>All observers were formally admitted.</p>	
<p><b>5. Regional reports and reports on regional meetings</b></p> <p>The Plants Committee revised their duties as defined in Decision 11.110. They removed unrealistic duties and also strengthened the need to contact countries non party to CITES.</p> <p>The revised duties to be included in the Chairman's report to the CoP proposing amendments to Decision 11.110.</p>	Chairman
<p><b>6. Regional directories</b></p> <p>Regional representatives of Africa and Central and South America and the Caribbean to submit written proposals to the Secretariat to obtain funding (see item 15 'Strategic planning').</p> <p>Secretariat to request Management Authorities to provide still lacking information to the regional representatives.</p>	<p>Regional representatives of Africa (Luke) and Central and South America and the Caribbean (Forero)</p> <p>Secretariat</p>

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p><b>7. Review of Resolution Conf. 9.24</b></p> <p><b>7.1 Meeting with the Chairmen in Geneva</b> No action.</p> <p><b>7.2 Second meeting of the Criteria Working Group</b> No action.</p> <p><b>7.3 Report of the Standing Committee meeting (plants issues)</b> No action.</p>	
<p><b>8. Follow-up of CoP11 Decisions</b></p> <p><b>8.2 <i>Guaiacum sanctum</i></b> Project to continue by way of a survey of the Mexican population. Mexico to submit an estimated budget to TRAFFIC and the Secretariat by the end of this meeting. Mexico to submit a formal proposal to the Secretariat by the end of the month. TRAFFIC to seek funds to support all or part of a population survey.</p> <p><b>8.3 <i>Aquilaria</i> spp.</b> The agarwood working group document was approved and adopted.</p>	<p>Mexico</p> <p>Mexico</p> <p>Mexico</p> <p>TRAFFIC</p>
<p><b>9. Technical proposals for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</b></p> <p><b>9.1 Harvesting techniques of <i>Galanthus</i> in Georgia</b> Regional representatives to act as focal points for the collation of information pertaining to the various plant production processes. Vice-Chairman of the Plants Committee to communicate with the Secretariat to establish a mechanism to share information and collaborate with Animals Committee.</p>	<p>Regional representatives of Africa (Luke), Asia (Zul), Central and South America and the Caribbean, (Forero) North America (von Arx), Europe (de Koning), Oceania (Leach) Vice-Chairman of the Plants Committee (von Arx), Secretariat</p>

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>The authorities of Georgia and the Secretariat to look for a solution regarding source code to be included in export permits for <i>Galanthus woronowii</i>. It agreed that the bulbs currently harvested from agricultural fields are to be regarded as being of wild origin.</p> <p>The Plants Committee encouraged continuous cooperation between Georgia and Germany and also the assistance from any other countries with regard to the sustainable management and harvest of <i>Galanthus woronowii</i>.</p> <p>Text prepared by the Regional representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Forero) and Oceania (Leach) was approved for inclusion in the summary document.</p>	<p>Secretariat, Georgia (MA and SA)</p> <p>The observers from Georgia and Germany, Parties</p>
<p><b>9.2 Decision 11.155</b></p> <p>Collation of information on the definition of different production systems, source codes for silvicultural techniques and the certification of sustainably managed forests and their compatibility with the scientific approach to making a non-detriment statement.</p> <p>Preparation of a document for presentation and discussion at the next meeting of the Plants Committee.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p>
<p><b>9.3 Standard exemptions for Appendix-II plant species</b></p> <p>The Committee approved the proposed text for standard exemptions for plant species.</p> <p>The United States of America and the Secretariat to discuss bilaterally, concerns regarding the revised text presented on flaked seedlings.</p>	<p>United States of America, Secretariat</p>

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p><b>9.4 Definitions of the technical terms used in the annotations</b></p> <p>Colombia, France, Germany, Spain and the United States of America to collaborate and produce a document for presentation and discussion at the next meeting of the Plants Committee. This collaboration is to be coordinated by France.</p> <p><b>9.5 Exemptions for flaked seedlings</b></p> <p>It was agreed that there was no urgent need to change the text of the current exemptions.</p> <p><b>9.6 Exchange of scientific herbarium specimens of certain plant taxa listed in Appendix II</b></p> <p>The proposal for an additional mechanism of exchange of herbarium material was not supported and the Committee wished to encourage the use of the current system of registration of scientific institutions.</p>	<p>Colombia (MA), Ecuador, France (coordinator), Germany, Spain (MA), United States of America, IUCN, TRAFFIC</p>
<p><b>10. Species proposals for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</b></p> <p><b>10.1 Delisting of leaf-bearing cacti (Pereskioideae and Opuntioideae)</b></p> <p><b>10.1.1 Draft proposal by Switzerland</b></p> <p>and</p> <p><b>10.1.2 Comments from Mexico on document PC11 Doc. 10.1.1</b></p> <p>The Plants Committee recommended that the proposal by Switzerland be postponed pending further co-operation between range states and Switzerland.</p>	<p>Range states, Switzerland</p>

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p><b>11. Significant trade in plants</b></p> <p><b>11.1 Problems and inconsistencies in Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) and Decision 11.117</b></p> <p>Consolidation of the Resolution and associated Decisions with regard to the Significant Trade Process.</p> <p>Establishment of a working group to collaborate with the equivalent working group convened by the Animals Committee.</p> <p><b>11.2 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) (cf. Decision 11.117)</b></p> <p><b>11.2.1 Trade in plants from Madagascar</b></p> <p>The Plants Committee supported the project proposal.</p> <p>The Plants Committee recommended that, to the extent possible and depending on available funding, <i>Prunus africana</i> and medicinal plants will be considered when the project is underway.</p> <p><b>11.2.2 Cycads</b></p> <p>The Plants Committee supported the concept outlined in document PC11 Doc. 11.2.2. However, it was recognized that the process would need to be divided into a series of stages to make it more manageable.</p> <p><b>11.2.3 Selection of taxa for review</b></p> <p>Working group established in order to provide guidance for the possible selection of taxa for review.</p> <p>The working group provided a list of taxa which the Secretariat will review, in consultation with UNEP-WCMC and appropriate experts.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>Coordinator of the Significant Trade Process for plants (McGough) and the regional representatives of Asia (Zul), Africa (Akpagana), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Forero) and North America (von Arx)</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Coordinator of the Significant Trade Process for plants (McGough); regional representatives from Asia (Singh), Africa (Luke, Akpagana), Europe (de Koning), Oceania (Leach) and observers from Chile, Mexico, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, UNEP-WCMC, TRAFFIC, IUCN and the Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat and working group</p>

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>The Secretariat will then consult the Committee members in order to prioritize taxa for review.</p> <p>The Secretariat will then initiate the significant trade process for selected taxa.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p>
<p><b>12. Medicinal plants</b></p> <p><b>12.1 Trade in <i>Prunus africana</i></b></p> <p>The regional representative of Africa (Akpagana) supported the concept of document PC11 Inf. 9, but felt that it required additional information to provide a global view of the situation.</p> <p><b>12.2 Possible future activities</b></p> <p>The Plants Committee supported the document PC10 Inf. 10, that was presented for information only.</p> <p>Secretariat to try to find external funding for the proposal outlined in document PC11 Inf. 10.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p>
<p><b>13. Review of the Appendices</b></p> <p><b>13.1 Review of Orchidaceae spp.</b></p> <p>The consensus was that the long lists of orchid genera outlined in document PC11 Doc. 13.1 would be unworkable and it was agreed to keep the entire family in the Appendices.</p> <p>Working group to carry out a process similar to that which produced the list of Cactaceae commonly referred to as 'supermarket plants' and currently exempted from the provisions of the Convention.</p> <p>The United States of America and the representative of the American Orchid Society (AOS) to produce a proposal to be presented at the next Plants Committee meeting.</p>	<p>Plants Committee's coordinator for Significant Trade Studies (McGough), the Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States of America, the American Orchid Society, UNEP-WCMC, Secretariat</p> <p>United States of America and the American Orchid Society</p>

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p><b>13.2 Appendix-I Cactaceae</b> Switzerland and Mexico to collaborate and produce a new document. The regional representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Forero) to assist in contacting Brazil, Bolivia and Paraguay to ask their opinion.</p> <p><b>13.3 Tree species (Decision 11.116)</b> All Parties and observers to send up-to-date data to the regional representative of Europe (de Koning), noting that <i>Gonostylis</i> spp. and <i>Cedrela odorata</i> would not be included in the report for presentation to CoP12.</p>	<p>Mexico, Switzerland</p> <p>Regional representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Forero)</p> <p>Parties and observers</p>
<p><b>14. Checklists and nomenclature</b></p> <p><b>14.1 Progress report</b> No action.</p> <p><b>14.2 Issues referred to the Nomenclature Committee</b> No action.</p> <p><b>14.3 <i>Masdevallia</i></b> No action.</p> <p><b>14.4 <i>Bulbophyllum</i></b> Austria to prepare detailed proposal for 2nd phase of project for presentation to PC12 and to continue to seek funds.</p> <p><b>14.5 Nomenclature of <i>Cedrela odorata</i></b> Chairman to submit to the Management Authority of Argentina the conclusions in paragraph 8 of document PC11 Doc. 14.5.</p> <p><b>PC11 Inf. 18 A preliminary review of the application of the Convention to Fungi</b> The Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee and the Secretariat to prepare a document requesting the CoP to decide on whether, in its opinion, the word 'flora' covers both Fungi and Plantae.</p>	<p>Austria, in consultation with the Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee (McGough) and the Secretariat</p> <p>Chairman</p> <p>Vice Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee, Secretariat</p>

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p><b>15. Strategic planning</b></p> <p>Chairman and Vice-Chairman to take note of ideas from all participants.</p> <p>Chairman and Vice-Chairman to prepare a new document for presentation at PC12.</p> <p>In order to complete all the regional directories, it was agreed, in consultation with the United States of America, to allocate USD 5,000 to both the regional representatives of Africa (Luke) and of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Forero).</p> <p>The Secretariat to provide the regional representatives (above) with a standard format for the application of funds.</p> <p>The regional representatives of Africa (Luke) and Central and South America and the Caribbean (Forero) to present their regional directories to PC12.</p>	<p>Chairman, Vice-Chairman</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Regional representatives of Africa (Luke) and of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Forero)</p>
<p><b>16. Identification materials for plants</b></p> <p><b>16.1 Progress report</b></p> <p>No action.</p>	
<p><b>17. Guidelines for transport of live plants</b></p> <p>Vice-Chairman, possibly in collaboration with the Secretariat and Dr Irina Sprotte, to contact IATA with regard to guidelines for air transport of live plants.</p> <p>Vice-Chairman to review the guidelines presented in light of the comments received during the meeting.</p> <p>It was agreed that the guidelines would not become regulations, i.e. mandatory.</p>	<p>Vice-Chairman, Secretariat</p> <p>Vice-Chairman</p>
<p><b>18. Tree species evaluation: progress report by the Netherlands</b></p> <p>All Parties and observers to provide up-to-date information to Harriet Gillet at UNEP-WCMC (including data for <i>Gonostylus</i> spp. and <i>Cedrela odorata</i>).</p>	<p>Parties, observers</p>
<p><b>19. Issues resulting from PC10, not included elsewhere in the Agenda</b></p> <p>There were no such issues.</p>	

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p><b>20. Training initiatives</b></p> <p><b>20.1 Standard slide package: progress report</b></p> <p>The updated slide pack to be published immediately after CoP12.</p> <p>The updated slide pack to be included on the website of the Scientific Authority of the United Kingdom with a link to their website from the Secretariat's.</p> <p>New slide packs to be prepared in hard copy and CD-ROM, with numbers of each to be determined.</p> <p>Examples of training exercises to be sent to the Scientific Authority of the United Kingdom.</p>	<p>United Kingdom</p> <p>United Kingdom, Secretariat</p> <p>United Kingdom</p> <p>Parties</p>
<p><b>21. Trade in Mexican cacti</b></p> <p><b>21.1 and Inf. 16 Trade in seeds of Cactaceae included in Appendix II</b></p> <p>Mexico, in collaboration with Austria and the United States of America, to prepare a proposal on sustainable harvesting and artificial propagation of seeds. This should include a budget and indication of funding source.</p> <p>The Czech Republic to provide to Mexico relevant information concerning cacti species grown in the Czech Republic and their origin.</p> <p><b>21.2 and Inf. 17 Cacti sales through the internet</b></p> <p>Mexico to continue with their study and provide the updated information to relevant Parties.</p>	<p>Austria, Mexico, United States of America</p> <p>Czech Republic</p> <p>Mexico</p>
<p><b>22. Review of the genus <i>Taxus</i></b></p> <p>China, India and the United States of America, in collaboration with France, to produce a document addressing the recommendations in paragraphs 20-22 of document PC11 Doc. 22.</p> <p>The Plants Committee recognized that the issue of <i>Taxus</i> and trade in its finished products was one of great concern.</p>	<p>China, France, India, United States of America</p>

ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p><b>23. Time and venue of the 12th Plants Committee meeting</b></p> <p>The Plants Committee accepted the offer from the Management Authority of the Netherlands to host the next meeting of the Plants Committee in Leiden, the Netherlands, 13-17 May 2002.</p>	The Netherlands, Secretariat
<p><b>24. Any other business</b></p> <p><b>24.1 Relationship between <i>ex-situ</i> breeding operations and <i>in-situ</i> conservation programmes (Decision 11.102)</b></p> <p>The Plants Committee agreed to support the process established by the Secretariat.</p> <p>One representative from each region to collaborate in the process and collect information at the regional level, especially from the Management Authorities.</p> <p><b>24.2 Report on the Global Strategy for Plants (CBD)</b></p> <p>The Plants Committee members, Parties and other observers to send comments on the CBD document to the Chairman before the beginning of October.</p> <p><b>24.3 Annotation to <i>Cistanche deserticola</i></b></p> <p>No action.</p> <p><b>24.4 Illegal trade in <i>Paphiopedilum</i> spp.</b></p> <p>The Plants Committee adopts the recommendations.</p> <p>The United Kingdom, United States of America and Secretariat will collaborate and prepare a document for the next Plants Committee meeting.</p> <p><b>24.5 Implementation issues related to Appendix-III timber species</b></p> <p>The Plants Committee recommended that Parties bring this matter to the attention of the Standing Committee.</p>	<p>Regional representatives of Africa (Luke), Asia (Singh), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Forero), Europe (Clemente), North America (von Arx), Oceania (Leach)</p> <p>All</p> <p>United Kingdom, United States of America and Secretariat</p>





Photo: Victoria ZENTILLI

## CLOSED SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE

Participants: Mr K. Akpagana and Mr Q. Luke (Africa), Mr Z. Shaari and Mr N.P. Singh (Asia), Mr E. Forero (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), Mr G. van Vliet (CITES Secretariat)

## **1. Opening of the meeting**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) welcomed all participants to the meeting and thanked the hosts and the organizing committee for their excellent arrangements and warm welcome to Malaysia.

## **2. Terms of Reference of the Plants Committee**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) welcomed Mr Akpagana, the alternate representative for Africa (Togo), to his first meeting of the Plants Committee and drew his attention to the CITES Manual distributed to all members. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) briefly referred to the mandate and explained that although all Parties, NGOs and IGOs could participate in discussions, only the Regional Representatives were eligible to vote.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) asked the participants to consider whether there should be any amendments made to the Duties, in which case there could be some further discussion under Any Other Business.

The Plants Committee revised their duties as defined in Decision 11.110. They removed unrealistic duties and also strengthened the need to contact countries non-Party to CITES.

The revised duties to be included in the Chairman's report to the COP proposing amendments to Decision 11.110.

## **3. Background of the work of the Plants Committee**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) asked the Regional Representatives to present their activities since the last meeting.

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

The regional representatives gave a brief outline of the division of work and the tasks they had undertaken.

Mr Luke (representative of Africa) reported that there had been no activity in his region, but he had recently received a report on the orchid trade in South Tanzania. He explained that his co-representative (Mr Donaldson) had been working on the Regional Directory, but had received a very poor response from the Parties.

Mr Singh (representative of Asia) reported that there were 21 countries in the region for which he was responsible. He had only received contact details from 14 of those countries. He added that an Identification Manual of the Plants of India had been prepared and brought to the meeting.

Mr Shaari (representative of Asia) explained that a written report would be prepared for the main meeting. He said that most of the activity had taken place in the two months preceding this meeting, in particular with regard to Ramin. He stated that he had been in discussion with Singapore, Indonesia and TRAFFIC and had given talks on the workings of Appendix III. He also said that plant issues had been discussed in other meetings such as the 4th ASEAN Members Group of Herbal and Medicinal Plants, the Research and Development of Forest Products (3rd meeting) and the 4th Meeting of Senior Officials of Forestry. Mr Shaari also distributed the Regional Directory.

Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) explained that the work of the region was divided between him and Mrs Werkhoven. He stated that the response to requests for contact information for the Directory in Mrs Werkhoven's countries had been poor. He had attended three meetings and discussed CITES issues and had participated in the Criteria Working Group meeting in Spain earlier in the year. He added that the Scientific Authority in Colombia had held their second meeting.

Mr de Koning (representative of Europe) drew attention to the European report included as document PC11 Doc. 5.4. He added that the regional directory had been updated and could be accessed by the web pages of the University of Córdoba ([www.uco.es/organiza/servicios/jardin/address/marcdirec.htm](http://www.uco.es/organiza/servicios/jardin/address/marcdirec.htm)) and was also available on CD-ROM. It had also been agreed at the last European Regional meeting, in Turkey, to send the European Directory to the Secretariat for inclusion in the CITES website.

Mr von Arx (representative of North America) drew attention to the report included as document PC11 Doc. 5.5 and added that the regional directory had been updated.

Mr Leach (representative of Oceania) drew attention to the report included as document PC11 Doc. 5.6. He added that the regional directory had been updated and was available electronically, and asked to hear from any Parties that required a hard copy. With regard to regional meetings, Mr Leach explained that there had been none, however he felt that this was not a problem as CITES and plants issues could be discussed at other meetings such as the Wildlife Enforcement Course, South Pacific Regional and Environmental forum.

Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) and Mr Luke (representative of Africa) felt that they shared the same problems in their respective regions: 1) lack of communication among the scientific community, 2) lack of knowledge regarding CITES in the scientific community, 3) economic problems, e.g. the costs involved in organising regional meetings.

With regard to the regional directories, it was agreed that all directories, no matter how incomplete, should be submitted to the Secretariat for formatting and inclusion in the CITES website.

## **5. Action points of the tenth meeting of the Plants Committee**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) asked if there were any problems with the Rules of Procedure as presented in document PC11 Doc. 2.

There were a few comments and it was agreed that a small working group comprising representatives of each region, together with the Secretariat and the Chairman, would meet to discuss any necessary amendments. The working group would present their results to the main meeting.

## **6. Budget of the Plants Committee**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) reported that at least one country had commented that the budget presented to the Standing Committee was very high. The Secretariat clarified that there had been an overspend of USD 10,000, due in the most part to external translation costs.

Mrs Clemente stated that whilst she would continue to operate the Plants Committee within the budget presented to the Standing Committee, any proposals to save money

would be welcomed and that these savings could be used to fund the work of the Regional Representatives. Mrs Clemente also stated that she would be meeting with the delegates from the United States of America to discuss the use of any remaining funds from their generous donation of USD 45,000 at the tenth meeting of the Plants Committee.

**7. Agenda of the 11th meeting of the Plants Committee**

The Agenda was approved.

**8. Time and venue of the 12th meeting of the Plants Committee**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) informed the participants that the Netherlands had kindly offered to host the next meeting of the Plants Committee.





## OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE

Representatives:	Mr K. Akpagana and Mr Q. Luke (Africa), Mr Z. Shaari and Mr N.P. Singh (Asia), Mr E. Forero (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 M. Lindeque, Mr J. Barzdo and Ms V. Zentilli
Countries:	Austria, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, China, Czech Republic, France, Georgia, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America, Zimbabwe
UNEP:	UNEP-WCMC
IGO:	IUCN-The World Conservation Union
International NGOs:	International Investigation Agency, TRAFFIC Network
National NGOs:	American Orchid Society, Comurnat, Synkem, Telepak Indonesia, WWF Malaysia
Total participants:	58

## **1. Opening of the meeting**

Welcoming addresses were given by the Directory-General of Forestry of Peninsular Malaysia and Chairman of the Organizing Committee, Mr Datuk Zul Mukhshar bin Dato' Md Shaari, followed by the Chairman of the Plants Committee, Professor Margarita Clemente Muñoz, who thanked the host country and all the organizers for their excellent arrangements for the meeting and the warm welcome to Malaysia.

Mrs Clemente also made a special dedication to the memory of Dr Dora Mora de Retana, a previous Regional Representative for Central, South America and the Caribbean.

The Honourable Chief Minister of Kedah Darul Aman, Mr Dato' Seri Syed Razak Syed Zain, welcomed participants to Malaysia, outlined the country's approach towards ecosystem conservation and management and then opened the meeting by sounding the gong.

## **2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that the Rules of Procedure had been slightly modified at the request of the Animals Committee and that it had been decided during the Working Session, that a small working group would be formed to discuss any necessary amendments to them. The working group would comprise representatives of each region together with the Chairman and a member of the Secretariat. Mrs Clemente invited the participants to submit to members of the working group, any suggestions for amendment to the Rules of Procedure. The working group would present their results later in the meeting.

The Plants Committee adopted the Rules of Procedure as revised by the Working Group and presented in document PC11 Doc. 2 Annex (Rev.).

The main points:

- Proceedings to be presented in the same format as for previous PC meetings
- Submission of documents to the Secretariat 75 days prior to a PC meeting
- Distribution of documents to the members 40 days prior to a PC meeting
- The role of the alternate representatives

## **3. Adoption of the Agenda and the Working programme**

The Agenda and Working Programme were adopted.

## **4. Admission of observers**

Following an explanation of some of the acronyms used by observers, there were no objections from the members of the Committee or representatives of Parties, and all organizations listed in document PC11 Doc. 4 were admitted.

## **5. Regional reports and reports on regional meetings**

The regional representatives of Asia (PC11 Doc. 5.3b), Europe (PC11 Doc. 5.4) North America (PC11 Doc. 5.5) and (PC11 Doc. 5.6) presented written reports.

An oral report was presented by Mr Luke (representative of Africa), who explained that few activities had been undertaken in his region. He added that every effort had been made to gather information in order to produce a regional directory, however, it was still incomplete due to a limited response from Parties.

Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) also provided an oral report and explained that although no regional meeting had taken place, there would be an opportunity for a workshop on CITES issues to be conducted at the 8th Latin American Botanical Conference, 13-18 October 2001. Mr Forero drew attention to the problems of holding a meeting in such a large region.

The observer from Mexico added that there had been a meeting in Central America to discuss mahogany issues, prior to the Mahogany Working Group meeting to be held in Bolivia. The observer from Mexico said that he would seek authorisation to circulate the minutes of this meeting to the Plants Committee.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) remarked on the concern by the regional representatives, that some of them were unable to facilitate regional meetings. After some discussion it was agreed that the obligation to hold a regional meeting should be deleted from the tasks of the regional representatives. Mr van Vliet further explained that Mrs Clemente would have to propose changes to Decision 11.110 in her report to the Conference of the Parties.

The Plants Committee revised their duties as defined in Decision 11.110. They removed those duties that were unrealistic and strengthened the need to contact countries non-Party to CITES.

The revised duties to be included in the Chairman's report to the CoP proposing amendments to Decision 11.110.

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

All regional representatives had compiled regional Directories to varying levels of completeness. However, Mr Luke (representative of Africa) and Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) explained that they were experiencing problems, due to the geographical extent of their regions and the lack of funding to support their work in this task. After some discussion, it was agreed that they should submit written proposals to the Secretariat to obtain funding to enable consultants to undertake this work up to the next meeting of the Plants Committee. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that with their agreement, some of the funds from the donation of the United States of America could be used for these proposals. It was agreed that the regional representatives of Africa and Central and South America and the Caribbean should submit proposals to the Secretariat to obtain funding.

The observer from IUCN-World Conservation Union stated that the organisation would be happy to provide the regional representatives with the names of experts from their specialist groups.

Addressing the problem of communication within regions, Mr Barzdo (Secretariat), offered to request Management Authorities, through a Notification to the Parties, to provide outstanding information to the regional representatives, to enable them to compile the regional directories. Mr Barzdo (Secretariat) also asked that the directories be provided to the Secretariat in electronic format in order that they could all be standardized for inclusion on the CITES website.

## **7. Review of Resolution Conf. 9.24**

### **7.1 Meeting with the Chairmen in Geneva**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that there had been a meeting in Geneva from 17 to 20 April 2001. Together with Mr Hoogmoed (Chairman of the Animals Committee), Mr Jenkins (Chairman of the Criteria Working Group) and the Secretariat, she had worked on the preparation a draft report on the revision of the criteria, for circulation to the Parties. This report had been sent with Notification to the Parties No. 2001/37 of 31 May 2001.

### **7.2 Second meeting of the Criteria Working Group**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) asked for the opinions of those regional representatives who had participated as experts in the Second Meeting of the Criteria Working Group. It was generally agreed that there had been some lively discussions on the definitions, resulting in a consensus. However, Mr Forero (representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean) expressed his disappointment with regard to the lack of inclusion and discussion of comments submitted by Colombia as a result of an earlier national meeting.

### **7.3 Report of the Standing Committee (plants issues)**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) referred to the report she had presented to the Standing Committee. She drew attention to two points in particular: the budget and *Araucaria araucana*. With regard to the budget, the Chairman explained that one Party at the Standing Committee had questioned the size of the budget for the Plants Committee. Mrs Clemente added that it was one of the reasons that she was suggesting the deletion of certain duties from the Terms of Reference.

With regard to *Araucaria araucana*, Mrs Clemente explained that the Standing Committee had included the item on its main agenda, with the result that Argentina's proposal gained four votes in favour (from North America, Oceania and two representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean), but that votes against and abstentions had not been counted.

## **8. Follow-up of COP11 Decisions**

### **8.1 *Harpagophytum* spp.**

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced document PC11 Doc. 8.1.

The observer from Namibia explained that the Namibian Devil's Claw working group intended to hold a workshop to discuss issues outlined in document PC11 Doc. 8.1 paragraph 5, but had so far been unable to secure the necessary funds for this. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that the Secretariat would not be able to find the USD 20,000 required.

Mr de Koning (regional representative of Europe) reported that Germany were under contract to review the import figures in Europe and would make a report available to the Secretariat, however, they were unable to provide funds for the workshop.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) suggested that Namibia could contact consumers of *Harpagophytum*, and other potential sources of funds to see if together they could support the workshop.

## 8.2 *Guaiacum sanctum*

The observers from the United States of America and Mexico reported on the work undertaken since the last meeting of the Plants Committee. They drew attention to the document PC11 Doc. 8.2, and the conclusion that the species *Guaiacum sanctum*, *Guaiacum coulteri*, *Guaiacum coulteri* var. *palmeri* and *Guaiacum unijugum* are distinguishable based on morphological features, but not by their wood, which was the main commodity in trade.

Mr de Koning (representative from Europe) reported that Germany would be undertaking a project concerning the identification of timber in trade, and would try to clarify if *Guaiacum coulteri* was in international trade.

After some discussion, particularly with regard to the original scope of the project, it was generally considered that the project should be continued by way of a survey of the population status of the Mexican species only.

The observer from TRAFFIC offered to seek funds for all or part of the survey.

In conclusion, it was agreed that Mexico would submit an estimated budget to TRAFFIC and the Secretariat by the end of the week, followed by a formal proposal to the Secretariat following this meeting. The observer from TRAFFIC estimated that it would take a month before he would have an answer as to the amount of funds available if any.

## 8.3 *Aquilaria* spp.

The observer from TRAFFIC explained that their intention to assist with the implementation of Decisions 11.112 and 11.113 had been met with two constraints, namely a lack of funding and a lack of time. As a consequence, the observer from TRAFFIC asked the Plants Committee to propose that a small working group be convened to discuss priorities.

Mr Leach (representative of Oceania) drew attention to an information report compiled by TRAFFIC Oceania (document PC11 Inf. 11) concerning Agarwood harvest and trade in Papua New Guinea. He considered that the tasks to implement Decision 11.113 could be completed in terms of determining additional species for inclusion in Appendix II and thus a document could be available for presentation at CoP12.

With regard to paragraph 4 in document PC11 Doc. 8.3, Mr de Koning (regional representative of Europe), speaking on behalf of Germany, suggested that the option of using DNA markers for species identification could also be used with regard to *Guaiacum* spp. and that this could also be funded from money available for the Identification Manual. The Secretariat noted that this was an option that could be considered, after successful completion of the work on *Aquilaria*.

Mr de Koning (regional representative of Europe) made a request on behalf of the German Scientific Authority, for samples to be added to the drug collection, used in

training exercises with customs officers. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) replied that if the blocks were big enough, the Secretariat might consider exchanging some of the material for some of the samples in Germany's collection.

It was agreed to convene a working group comprising the Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature committee, regional representatives of Asia and Oceania and the observers of TRAFFIC and IUCN.

The Plants Committee approved and adopted the report of the Working Group:

With respect to Decision 11.112 and 11.113 directed to the Plants Committee:

11.112 a)

The working group supports the ongoing work with DNA analysis conducted by the Netherlands to establish whether products in trade can be identified to species level. If successful, options for identification centres could be considered, perhaps at the point of import. Assistance from range States is required to provide vouchered agarwood samples.

11.112 b)

The working group considered identification of material at the source of extraction but several range States indicated this would be logistically difficult due to the dispersed village based extraction.

More detailed knowledge of the species distribution could also provide improved product identification using point of origin information. Indonesia uses this as the basis for implementing two different species export quotas.

11.112 c)

The working group noted that agarwood is known to be sourced from the taxa *Gyrinops* and *Aextylon sympetalum/santalum* and recommends that all future studies now include these taxa.

The inclusion of other species in the Appendices will require further information. The Annex to PC11 document Doc. 8.3 includes a number of activities proposed by TRAFFIC to gather this information.

Priorities identified by range States were:

- The development of standard methods of determining populations status for the purpose of setting quotas for agarwood producing taxa.
- Detailed information on distribution, population and conservation status for each species in trade.

These tasks should be given highest priority should any funding become available.

It will be time-consuming to acquire these data in sufficient detail to allow consideration of listing additional taxa onto the Appendices. The time-frame will extend beyond COP12.

In addressing the other activities proposed by TRAFFIC, the working group noted:

- The assistance offered by UNEP-WCMC with compilation and analysis of CITES trade data
- The assistance offered by IUCN with a re-evaluation of agarwood producing taxa according to the 2000 IUCN criteria
- The intention of Malaysia to include *Aquilaria* in future forest resource inventories on Peninsular Malaysia. It was recognised that this was an extremely useful step in the acquisition of population data.

#### 8.4 Mahogany Working Group

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) reported that Mr von Arx (Vice-Chairman) would represent the Plants Committee at the Mahogany Working Group meeting. Mr von Arx clarified that his attendance would be that of an observer.

### 9. Technical proposals for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

#### 9.1 Harvesting techniques of *Galanthus* in Georgia

As a result of discussions in the Animals Committee and its conclusion that sub-source codes would add further complications to the implementation of CITES, the Secretariat informed the meeting that it would not be appropriate for Georgia to use the source code 'Wt' as suggested in document PC11 Doc. 9.1a.

There was substantial discussion relating to the various plant production techniques including that for *Galanthus woronowii* in Georgia. This resulted in a general agreement with the need to collate information on the various production techniques prior to further discussion of the relevant source codes to be used on permits.

It was agreed that the populations of *Galanthus woronowii* in Georgia were wild and to indicate this with a 'W' on the export permits as in this particular instance it was a good illustration of sustainable management. In order to avoid any concern from the importing countries it was also suggested that some text could be included in box 5 of the permit to highlight the sustainable trade of the species.

It was agreed that the Regional Representatives from North America, Oceania, Asia, Africa (Kenya), Central and South America and the Caribbean (Colombia) and Europe (Netherlands) would act as focal points in order to collate information pertaining to the various plant production processes. Mr von Arx (Vice-Chairman) would then communicate with the Secretariat and establish a mechanism to share and collaborate on this information. The result of these discussions would form part of a document to be presented to the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

It was also agreed that the authorities of Georgia would communicate directly with the Secretariat in order to establish which source code should be currently used on permits for the export of *Galanthus woronowii*.

With regard to document PC11 Doc. 9.1b, the Plants Committee congratulated Germany and Georgia for their efforts with regard to the sustainable management and harvest of *Galanthus woronowii* and encouraged assistance from any other countries.

It was considered that there should be some amendments to the seven recommendations in the document and it was agreed that the regional representatives of Oceania and Central and South America and the Caribbean would prepare some text for inclusion in the summary document of this meeting.

The conclusions of the Plants Committee with regard to trade in *Galanthus* from Georgia were:

The Plants Committee commends the efforts of Georgia and acknowledges the positive collaboration between Georgia and Germany in clarification of the *Galanthus* bulb trade. The Plants Committee also acknowledges the willingness of Germany to continue its collaboration with Georgia.

There are clear indications that Georgia has the potential for high and sustainable production of *Galanthus woronowii* bulbs in the existing agricultural fields.

The Plants Committee considered in detail, the seven recommendations proposed by Germany in PC11 document Doc. 9.1b.

The Plants Committee agrees that:

- There is a need to develop a system that monitors the current wild transplanted production system from collection to export to avoid unsustainable trade levels
- A standard is needed to evaluate the present bulb productivity of *Galanthus woronowii* from the fields
- There is a need to examine the methods of establishing quotas
- The members of the Georgian Botanical Commission have considerable knowledge and expertise. However, the Georgian MA and SA require additional funding and technical support to implement the above tasks.

The Plants Committee expressed concern at the development of artificial propagation that may shift the trade to artificially propagated material outside Georgia to the detriment of the Georgian economy. The Plants Committee therefore considers this to be a lower priority activity compared with the improvement of the existing production system, marketing and monitoring.

## 9.2 Decision 11.155

The Secretariat introduced document PC11 Doc. 9.2 and explained that due to the complexities already discussed with regard to *Galanthus*, the issue of source codes had not been discussed. However, the Secretariat had begun to gather information on the different production systems and certification of sustainably managed forests and their compatibility with the scientific approach to making a non-detriment finding.

Mr von Arx (representative of North America) added that he had discussed various certification schemes with forestry colleagues in Canada and he would provide the information to the Secretariat.

The observer from the United States of America advised caution that an eco-label was not a guarantee of sustainable harvest and should not be used in place of a non-

detriment finding made by the relevant Scientific Authority. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) clarified that the idea was merely that of an information gathering exercise and that there was no intention of replacing the requirement of CITES for a non-detriment finding.

The observer from TRAFFIC North America reported that his organization was undertaking an evaluation certification project with regard to Ginseng and hoped that the information obtained could feed into the Secretariat's review of certification schemes.

It was agreed that subsequent to the collation of this information, a new document could be presented for discussion at the 12th meeting of the Plants Committee. It was also agreed that the different forestry production systems would be discussed in the working group as discussed in Agenda Item 9.1 in relation to document PC11 Doc. 9.1a.

### **9.3 Standard exemptions for Appendix-II plant species**

The Secretariat presented the amended text in document PC11 Doc. 9.3 and asked for agreement from the Plants Committee to prepare a document for presentation at the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The observer from the United States of America had some concerns with the revised text presented and the Secretariat agreed to discuss this bilaterally.

### **9.4 Definitions of the technical terms used in the annotations**

The Plants Committee thanked the United States of America for their work on this issue. However, it was generally agreed that the list was too large and would need a lot of refinement to take account of the different nuances particularly with regard to translation of terms.

The observer from France explained that there was a need to draw attention to the differences between customs definitions and CITES definitions. He also stressed the importance of semantics in the three languages of the Convention.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) noted the differences between mainland Spanish and Latin American Spanish. In response, Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) reported that a project addressing this issue, supported by TRAFFIC, was already underway.

It was agreed that the observers from the United States of America, France, Germany, Colombia and Spain would collaborate in order to produce a document for presentation and discussion at the next meeting of the Plants Committee. This collaboration would be co-ordinated by France.

### **9.5 Exemption of flaked seedlings**

The Plants Committee agreed with the position of the Secretariat outlined in paragraph 8, of document PC11 Doc. 9.5, that there was no urgent need to change the text of the current exemption.

## 9.6 Exchange of scientific herbarium specimens of certain plant taxa listed in Appendix II

The observer from Switzerland introduced document Doc. PC11 Doc. 9.6.

Mr de Koning (representative of Europe) reported that Germany supported the proposal in principle but would like the exemption restricted to mounted herbarium sheets. However, Mr Leach (representative of Oceania) pointed out that it was quite common for duplicate specimens to be distributed unmounted to other organizations.

The observer from the United Kingdom felt that there was some confusion in the understanding of the Swiss proposal and the registration system. He added that there were still many countries that did not have the registration system in place, and that the system proposed by Switzerland was to facilitate the exchange of Appendix-II specimens in such instances.

Mr Luke (representative of Africa) noted that the exchange of often undescribed Appendix-II orchids or cacti often slowed down scientific work and put a burden on the scientific exploration of biota. He agreed with Mr Leach (representative of Oceania), that it would be necessary to change some of the wording (as currently in paragraph 14, bullet points) in order to avoid some loopholes. The observer from Mexico echoed these views.

In response to suggestions by the observer from Austria and the representative of Africa, the observer from the United States of America pointed out that with the registration system already in existence, the trade in specimens outside the system would be inconsistent with the Treaty and would provide an opportunity for abuse of the system. He added that it would also put a burden on the importing countries to evaluate whether or not the exchange was for scientific purposes. The observer from the United States of America concluded by suggesting the encouragement of the use of the current registration system by more organizations.

The Plants Committee thanked Switzerland for preparation of the document PC11 Doc. 9.6, but it did not support the proposal for an additional mechanism of exchange of herbarium material and wished to continue working with, and encouraging, the system of registration of scientific institutions.

## 10. Species proposals for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

### 10.1 Delisting of leaf-bearing cacti (Pereskioideae and Opuntioideae)

The observer from Switzerland introduced document PC11 Doc 10.1.1 and opined that Pereskioideae and Opuntioideae cacti were not traded in high volumes and therefore it was unnecessary to keep the two families listed in Appendix-II.

The observer from Mexico pointed out that Mexico was not the only range State for Pereskioideae and Opuntioideae cacti and that although the taxonomic information was good, there was a great lack of population data. With regard to *Opuntia*, the observer from Mexico pointed out that the lack of trade data was due to the fact that collection of the plant was almost forbidden in Mexico. The observer from Chile supported the views of Mexico with regard to leaf-bearing cacti, adding that there is a subgenus of *Pereskioideae* in South America, for which there was limited taxonomic information available.

The observer from the United States of America thanked Switzerland for the document, but stated that more than 80 species of *Opuntia* had a distribution in the United States of America, including one species with an IUCN red listing of 'Endangered'. The United States of America wished to continue to monitor the species by means of an Appendix-II listing.

Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) supported the views of the observer from Mexico, adding that there was a tremendous lack of information on cacti in South America and it was therefore difficult to assess the population status and apparent illegal trade.

Mr de Koning (representative of Europe) referred to the earlier discussion on *Guaiacum sanctum* and the fact that the Plants Committee had decided that trade could continue until the population data had been collected. For this reason, Mr de Koning felt that there was no reason why Pereskioideae cacti should not be deleted from the Appendices. He suggested that Mexico and Switzerland would carry out a study and prepare a proposal for delisting.

The observer from Austria agreed with the suggestion that Switzerland work with Mexico, and also Argentina and Chile, in order to delete those species for which sufficient information was available, and which were not in trade.

The observer from TRAFFIC felt that it was necessary to continue to monitor *Opuntia* in case of an increase in trade, particularly due to the size of the family and the fact that some species were threatened.

Mr Singh (representative of Asia), felt that there were still a lot of gaps in the document prepared by Switzerland and therefore supported Mexico.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) suggested that the Plants Committee could suggest to Switzerland that it should distribute a new document to Parties under the consultation procedure - with a Notification to all Parties 330 days before the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) felt that to be fair, Mexico should also circulate its document.

The observer from Mexico felt that it was clear that the three range States (Chile, United States of America and Mexico) were opposed to Switzerland's proposal and therefore suggested that it was rejected for the time being, whilst seeking alternative co-operative methods.

The Plants Committee recommended that the proposal by Switzerland be postponed pending further co-operation between range States and Switzerland.

## 11. Significant trade in plants

### 11.1 Problems and inconsistencies in Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) and Decision 11.117

Mr Lindeque (Secretariat) introduced document PC11 Doc. 11.1. He explained that the document was an attempt to summarise the experience of the Animals Committee with the Significant Trade Review, whilst recognising that the mechanism for the process was different in that the Plants Committee. Mr Lindeque reminded the

participants that at the last meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Resolution was amended to apply to the Plants Committee.

Mr McGough (Co-ordinator, Significant Trade Process) explained the process as followed on plants projects to date. He explained the triage system used in facilitating the Reviews: 1) analysis of trade data, 2) analysis of internet/catalogue data, 3) view of the country concerned. Mr McGough agreed that it was important to include the plants process in the Resolution and asked for the views of the countries involved, including opinions on how to implement CITES by training, identification material, listing on the Appendices and quotas.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) expressed concern that implementing the process 'by country' could become too political and that some countries could feel almost persecuted. She stressed that there must be absolute agreement with the country or countries concerned. Mr Lindeque (Secretariat) agreed with the Chairman, adding that the Significant Trade Process should assist rather than punish countries, and therefore full co-operation was necessary.

Mr Lindeque (Secretariat) suggested that the harsher system used by the Animals Committee sometimes acted as a means to strengthen political momentum to implement and attain funding for action. He felt therefore that this could also be useful to the Plants Committee.

The observer from Austria referred to the flow diagram in the Annex of document AC17 Doc. 7.4. He noted that there were some procedures that were not suitable for plants, such as the production of a list of species for which net trade is greater than safe trade.

The observer from Mexico expressed concern regarding the use of trade data. Mr McGough (Co-ordinator, Significant Trade Process) agreed with the concerns, noting that historically, implementation for plants had been relatively poor and that problems had arisen with large plant groups such as with cacti and orchids, where the trade was often recorded just at family or genus level. Mr McGough explained that in order to try to address these problems, a working group had taken a sample of trade data and studied it to see how well it reflected real trade. He further explained that in the past taxa were put into four categories - Data Rich (species for which the data were reliable on which to make recommendations); Species Rich - e.g. orchids and cacti (identified by experts and range States); Species Traded for Special Reasons such as medicinal (with no real knowledge of how to implement because of parts and derivatives etc) and New Listings (to identify any problems with implementation without having to wait 5 years for trade data).

The observers from Mexico and the United States of America expressed concern with regard to the co-operation with range States, noting that the current process was based on voluntary co-operation. The observer from Mexico added that in certain cases the country based studies would have repercussions for the management of Appendix-I and Appendix-III listed taxa.

In response to the first point, Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) clarified that if a range State did not co-operate, Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) provided the legal basis on which the process could be continued. In response to the second point, Mr van Vliet reminded the participants that no commercial trade was permitted for Appendix-I species and

non-detriment statements were not required for Appendix-III species. He clarified that any sanctions would be against specific taxa and not against the country.

Mr Lindeque (Secretariat) responded to the statements of Mexico and Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) and agreed that there were problems with country-based studies, due to a variety of reasons such as, lack of submission of annual reports, problems with national legislation, scientific knowledge etc. He explained that the Animals Committee had addressed such problems by making recommendations to address issues beyond scientific and non-detriment findings and to take a more holistic approach targeted to suit the particular country.

Mr Lindeque (Secretariat) suggested that rather than going through each point in the Annex in document PC11 Doc. 11.1, it would be preferable to form a working group to discuss the options.

The Plants Committee concluded that in order to make the process more transparent, there was a definite need to consolidate the Resolution and associated Decisions with regard to the Significant Trade Process.

With a mandate to ensure recognition of the different requirements of the review for animals and plants, a working group was established to collaborate with the working group convened by the Animals Committee. The working group will comprise the Co-ordinator of the Significant Trade Process for plants and the representatives of North America, Africa (Togo), Asia (Malaysia) and Central and South America and the Caribbean.

## **11.2 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) (cf. Decision 11.117)**

### **11.2.1 Trade in plants from Madagascar**

The observer from Madagascar apologised for the postponed discussion of this item, explaining that he had been unable to contact Madagascar by fax and therefore had no document for distribution.

Mr McGough (Co-ordinator, Significant Trade Programme), in response to a request from Germany, suggested that as the Plants Committee was thinking about a more integrated country-based approach, it would be a pity not to include *Prunus africana*. The observer from Madagascar agreed with this suggestion. However, Mr Leach (representative of Oceania) was concerned, particularly with reference to points 5 and 8, that it would make the project too large. He also pointed out that point 8 referred to endemic species and therefore the inclusion of *Prunus africana* would be inconsistent.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that the only legal basis for a study on *Prunus africana* was under Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.).

Mr Luke (representative of Africa) suggested that as resources were limited, it would be a good opportunity just to gather information on the Malagasy species of *Prunus africana* and integrate it into the Significant Trade Review. Mr von Arx (representative of North America) supported this suggestion and added that it would also be a good idea to gather information on non-CITES listed species that are in heavy trade.

The Plants Committee supported the project proposal and recommended that, to the extent possible, and depending on available funding, *Prunus africana* and medicinal plants would be considered when the project was underway.

### 11.2.2 Cycads

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced document PC11 Doc. 11.2.2 and asked for comments on the process and in particular the concerns of Mr Donaldson (representative for Africa) with respect to trade in artificially propagated species and wild Appendix-I seeds traded illegally and subsequently re-entered in trade as artificially propagated specimens.

The Plants Committee supported the concept outlined in the document. However, it was recognized that the process would need to be divided into a series of stages to make it more manageable.

### 11.2.3 Selection of taxa for review

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced document PC Doc. 11.2.3 and asked whether a working group should be established to make recommendations for 'safe levels' for each taxa, i.e. to consider if the quantities in trade per taxa could be detrimental or not to the species.

The observer from Mexico was concerned that it would be very difficult to establish a number that represented a 'safe level' for all plant groups and suggested that the process be undertaken in several stages to assess the significance of safe levels for certain groups. The observer from Austria agreed, adding that it was also difficult to assess levels due to trade being recorded in different units.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman), speaking on behalf of Spain, also cautioned that the use of an 'average' trade figure would not take account of a huge rise or drop in trade.

In order to provide guidance for the establishment of 'safe-levels' for each plant group and the subsequent selection of taxa for review, a working group was established comprising: Co-ordinator of the Significant Trade Process for Plants; regional representatives from Africa, Europe, Asia, Oceania and observers from the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Mexico, Chile, UNEP-WCMC, TRAFFIC, IUCN and the Secretariat. The working group would also discuss the selection of taxa in respect of the Cycad project outlined in Item 11.2.2 above.

The Working Group provided a list of taxa that the Secretariat would review, in consultation with UNEP-WCMC and appropriate experts. The Secretariat would then consult the Committee members in order to prioritize taxa for review and then initiate the Significant Trade Process for selected taxa agreed upon by the Committee.

## 12. Medicinal Plants

### 12.1 Trade in *Prunus africana*

As the observer from Cameroon was not present at the meeting, Mrs Clemente (Chairman) asked Mr Akpagana (representative of Africa) to introduce document PC11. Inf. 9.

Mr Akpagana (representative of Africa) stated that he supported the concept of the document, but felt that it required additional information to provide a global view of the situation.

### 12.2 Possible future activities

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced document PC11 Inf. 10, for information only, and asked for advice on which aspects of the proposal might need to be changed.

Mr Luke (representative of Africa) felt that this was a good proposal with regard to research on sustainable harvest, but felt that the research should be undertaken prior to trade taking place. He pointed out that the trade figures were also from Kenya, not just Cameroon, and added that harvesting was taking place in protected areas and was not sustainable.

With regard to the process of evaluation of species for Significant Trade Studies, Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) explained that Resolution 8.9 (Rev.) had been revised at the last meeting of the Conference of the Parties and therefore a legal basis existed for the Plants Committee to evaluate the trade in any plant species. He added that if *Prunus africana* was included in the process of evaluation then the Plants Committee would be able to make recommendations to the Standing Committee.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) stated that she felt that there was a very clear problem of sustainable use, that could be managed in one way by the correct harvesting of the bark. She explained that the Secretariat had prepared a project, but that it would just be a pilot project to monitor the use of quotas and sustainable use.

Mr Luke (representative of Africa) agreed with Mrs Clemente that sustainable management and harvesting was possible, but stressed that it was not being carried out. He also reported that he had attempted to facilitate a small study on the subject in order to bring a document to the meeting, however more funding was required for TRAFFIC to undertake this.

The observer from France reported that Cameroon had not presented any export permits for *Prunus africana* in 2001. He saw that as a good sign that there had been no cutting of the bark during the year. He reported that there was an ongoing study on the stripping of bark from *Prunus africana* and that hopefully the results would be available within the next 12-18 months, in which case there would be a scientific basis on which to make decisions.

Mr de Koning (representative of Europe), supported by Mr Leach (representative of Oceania) felt that the proposal outlined in the document should be supported and suggested that it could be used as a test case and later applied to other countries and other non-wood forest species. Mr de Koning also suggested that *Prunus africana* should be discussed further in terms of the Significant Trade Review for Madagascar.

Mr von Arx (representative of North America) supported the intent of the proposal and suggested that a link with industry should also be included.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) took note of all the comments. The Plants Committee supported the document and the Secretariat agreed to try to find external funding for the proposal outlined in document PC11 Inf. 10.

### **13. Review of the Appendices**

#### **13.1 Review of Orchidaceae spp.**

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced document PC11 Doc. 13.1 and drew attention to paragraph 18 and the suggestion to maintain the current listing. He then referred to paragraph 19 and asked the Plants Committee if it would agree to progress with the review.

The Plants Committee agreed with the opinion of the Secretariat, that the long lists of orchid genera outlined in document PC11 Doc. 13.1 would be unworkable. It was also agreed that another mechanism was needed in order to free the Appendices of taxa for which a CITES listing had no conservation benefit. It was suggested that a process be carried out similar to that which produced the list of Cactaceae commonly referred to as 'supermarket plants'.

In order to discuss the issue further, a working group was established, comprising: Co-ordinator of the Significant Trade Process, the Netherlands, the American Orchid Society, UNEP-WCMC and the Secretariat.

Statement from the Working Group:

"The Working Group considered that it would be very useful to produce a proposal for the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The aim of the proposal would be to eliminate from the Appendices those orchid hybrids produced on an industrial scale and having no effect on wild populations of Orchidaceae.

Nurseries producing orchid hybrids are now found in Thailand, China, Costa Rica, as well as Malaysia and many more countries that have the right climatic conditions. It would be a great help for nurseries and Management Authorities of the producer countries if the very unnecessary CITES burden could be lifted. The Scientific Authority of the United States of America, with AOS, with the help of the Secretariat and supported by various specialists, will work on that proposal, and a draft will be presented to the next PC meeting. We ask for support for what has been proposed here."

#### **13.2 Appendix-I Cactaceae**

The observer from Switzerland introduced document PC11 Doc. 13.2 and drew attention to the conclusions and recommendations to the Plants Committee.

The observer from Mexico also introduced document PC11 Inf. 15, which outlined their comments on the proposal by Switzerland.

Comments by the observers from the United States of America, Austria and Chile were made in support of the comments outlined in the Mexican document. However, The Plants Committee felt that the Swiss had produced a very comprehensive document of good quality and science although it was lacking in some data that could be provided by Mexico.

At the suggestion of Mr Akpagana, (representative of Africa), the Plants Committee agreed that Switzerland and Mexico should collaborate and produce a new document and Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) would assist with the information gathering by contacting Brazil, Bolivia and Paraguay to ask for their opinions.

### 13.3 Tree species (Decision 11.116)

Mr de Koning (representative of Europe) introduced document PC11 Doc. 13.3 and commented on each species.

Mr Shaari (representative of Asia), supported by the observer from Malaysia, commented on the process that had occurred in Malaysia following Indonesia's inclusion of *Gonostylus bancanus* in Appendix-III. He explained that Malaysia had been concerned about the lack of time in which to prepare for the listing. They also did not want to regulate finished products and this had prompted them to put forward a reservation.

The observer from Indonesia explained that as a result of the pressure of logging, Indonesia had decided to inform the Secretariat immediately, without giving prior information to the Management Authorities of other range States, and wished to apologise for the inconvenience that this may have caused. The observer from Singapore supported Indonesia in its inclusion of *Gonostylus* spp. in Appendix III.

Addressing further worries about the possible inclusion of *Gonostylus bancanus* in Appendix-II, Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) pointed out that the Review of the Appendices did not relate to Appendix-III species, but that the information had just been included for completeness of a review of all CITES species. He stressed that the Plants Committee was not recommending *Gonostylus* spp. for inclusion in Appendix-II.

With regard to *Prunus africana*, Mr Luke (representative of Africa) did not agree with the conclusion that the species should not be liable to any CITES controls, due to the lack of recent trade data and the problem of sustainable harvesting.

There was some general confusion with some Parties thinking that the Netherlands wished to include *Prunus africana* in Appendix-I. However, Mr de Koning (representative of Europe) clarified that the document was merely a way of tabling information and that there were no proposals. He added that with regard to *Prunus africana*, the confusion was that IUCN appeared to have misapplied the category of Appendix-I however, without this category, the species would not appear to need a CITES listing at all.

With regard to *Aquilaria malaccensis*, Mr Shaari (representative of Asia) reported that since its inclusion in Appendix-II, Malaysia had been wondering how to conduct a non-detriment survey as required by all range States. He asked to hear if any other range States had conducted such a study and also suggested that it might be a good idea to conduct such studies prior to the listing.

It was agreed that all Parties and observers should send up-to-date data to the regional representative of Europe (Mr de Koning), noting that *Gonostylus* spp. and *Cedrela odorata* would not be included in the report to the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties as they had not been included in the Appendices at the time of Decision 11.116.

## 14. Checklists and nomenclature

### 14.1 Progress report

Mr McGough (Vice-Chairman, Nomenclature Committee) introduced document PC11 Doc. 14. Mr McGough then made a plea for help in finding experts to participate in the review process for the preparation of CITES Orchid Checklist Volume 4. He also added that it was planned to put all the CITES Orchid Checklists on the World Wide Web, at least in a basic format and in the meantime Checklists were available free directly from the Conventions and Policy Section at the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, United Kingdom.

Mr de Koning (representative of Europe) reported that the German Scientific Authority would be interested to hear whether anyone was proposing to prepare a checklist of *Dicksonia* spp.

There were no further comments.

### 14.2 Issues referred to the Nomenclature Committee

Mr McGough (Vice-Chairman Nomenclature Committee) introduced document PC11 Doc. 14.2 and asked for comments.

The observer from Austria reported that he had received no material or response to his offer at the last meeting, to distinguish plants in trade by molecular work.

The observer from Mexico referred to point 6 of the document. He reported that the draft list of the subgenus *Opuntia* was 95% complete and had been presented to UNEP-WCMC for comment. The observer made a request for support for publishing.

Mr Singh (representative of Asia) reported that he had supplied the Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee with information on *Taxus wallichiana* and stressed that *Taxus yunnanensis* should also be included in Appendix-II. With regard to *Picrorhiza kurrooa*, Mr Singh stated that *Picrorhiza scrophulariiflora* should be considered as a separate species.

The observer from the United States of America referred to point 23 of the document and requested guidance on how to address the problem of identification of material in trade by enforcement officers.

Mr Singh (representative of Asia) agreed that there were problems with identification, however, in the case of *Taxus* spp. there were clear differences between *Taxus wallichiana* and *Taxus baccata*. He added that he would be happy to provide detailed information.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) clarified that the main problem was to differentiate in terms of taxonomy, which species was intended for control by CITES and that the only

means in the near future would be to follow the Checklist published by Aljos Farjon, if it was adopted at the next Conference of the Parties.

Mr McGough (Vice Chairman, Nomenclature Committee) suggested that this would have to be considered in terms of priority when the Plants Committee made its decision on Significant Trade.

There was no further action to be considered.

#### **14.3 *Masdevallia***

Mr Forero (representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) reported that the expert who had originally agreed to participate in the Checklist process for *Masdevallia* had retired and was now unwilling to help.

There was no further action.

#### **14.4 *Bulbophyllum***

The observer from Austria introduced document PC11 Inf. 19 and asked for contact details of experts to co-operate in discussions on doubtful nomenclature. He added that a more elaborate proposal for the budget of the second phase of the project would be prepared for the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties and that he would continue to seek funds.

#### **14.5 Nomenclature of *Cedrela odorata***

It was agreed that the Chairman of the Plants Committee would submit to the Management Authority of Argentina, the conclusions in paragraph 8 of document PC11 Doc. 14.5

#### **Document PC11 Inf. 18 A preliminary review of the application of the Convention to Fungi**

Mr McGough (Vice-Chairman, Nomenclature Committee) explained that this document was the result of a request from the Plants Committee to see if Fungi were included in CITES. He briefly explained that it appeared that the Fungi and plant world had parted between 1961 and 1971 and therefore before the Convention was established. However, it now seemed necessary for the Secretariat to assist in establishing the original intent of CITES in this context.

The Plants Committee agreed that Mr McGough (Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee) and the Secretariat would prepare a document requesting the Conference of the Parties to decide on whether, in its opinion, the word 'flora' covers both Fungi and Plantae.

### **15. Strategic planning**

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) reported that she and Mr von Arx (Vice-Chairman) had discussed issues and priorities and Mr von Arx had drawn up several priorities.

Mr von Arx (Vice-Chairman) apologised for not providing a document and outlined the priorities for action.

It was agreed that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman would prepare a new document for presentation at the 12th meeting of the Plants Committee.

In order to complete all the regional directories, it was agreed, in consultation with the United States of America, to allocate USD 5,000 to both the regional representatives of Africa and of Central and South America and the Caribbean. The Plants Committee expressed their thanks to the United States of America for this generous offer. The Plants Committee agreed that the Secretariat would provide the regional representatives with a standard format for the application of funds. And the regional representatives of Africa and Central and South America and the Caribbean would present their regional directories to the next meeting of the Plants Committee.

## 16. Identification materials for plants

### 16.1 Progress report

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced document PC11 Doc. 16.1, stating that he would be grateful to receive additional identification materials.

The observer from Chile reported that the Chilean Management and Scientific Authority had produced a guide on the identification of Chilean tree species - *Araucaria*, *Fitzroya*, and *Pilgerodendron* that was available on CD-ROM. He added that it would be also be included on the Chilean web site. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) congratulated Chile for the excellent work they had undertaken.

There were no further comments.

## 17. Guidelines for transport of live plants

Mr von Arx (Vice-Chairman) introduced document PC11 Doc. 17.

There was general support for the concept of the guidelines and participants felt that certain aspects included in them would make trade of live plants much easier.

The observer from Mexico suggested that there were two factors requiring guidelines - packaging and specimens. The observer suggested that each specimen should have a label attached to it detailing information on the scientific name, CITES Appendix, CITES certificate number and a plant health certificate. However, after several interventions, it was clear that this would be a huge and unworkable task for Management and enforcement authorities.

The observer from the United States of America supported the document, adding that many plant deaths were usually as a result of delays caused by missing documents. He offered to submit specific comments directly to the Vice-Chairman, but also recommended that the guidelines be included in Resolution Conf. 10.2, as they would be of benefit to Management Authorities when issuing permits to importers.

Mr Lindeque (Secretariat) explained that the original guidelines were concerned with the transport of live animals and they were not obligatory. He pointed out that should the guidelines become obligatory, they would have an effect on all involved in trade. Mr Lindeque also pointed out that most trade in live animals occurred by air and suggested that if that were also the case with plants, it would be worth consulting with IATA on the provisions already in place.

There followed some discussion as to whether or not these proposed guidelines should be advisory or compulsory and the observer from TRAFFIC suggested that if the guidelines were to serve any conservation value then they should be applied to wild live plants only. The observer from the United States of America felt that there were some points in the document that should be compulsory to meet the requirements of the Treaty.

The Plants Committee felt that the document was a useful summary that would help those in plant industry to check that requirements had been fulfilled in order to process plants as quickly and safely as possible.

The Plants Committee agreed that the Vice-Chairman, possibly in collaboration with the Secretariat and Dr Irina Sprotte, should contact IATA with regard to guidelines for air transport of live plants.

The Plants Committee agreed that the Vice-Chairman would review the guidelines presented in light of the comments received during the discussions and that the guidelines would be advisory rather than mandatory.

## **18. Tree species evaluation: progress report by the Netherlands**

Mr de Koning (representative of Europe), speaking on behalf of the Netherlands, introduced document Doc. PC11 Doc. 18 and asked for comments. He added that he had only received comments from Uganda and urged all authorities to send comments to UNEP-WCMC in order to compile a comprehensive report.

In response to a query of the observer from Malaysia, Mr de Koning confirmed that *Gonostylus* spp. would not be included in the report on the review of the Appendices. However, the observer from UNEP-WCMC explained that it was one of 250 species in the green book (*Contribution to an evaluation of tree species using the new CITES Listing Criteria. UNEP-WCMC. December 1998*) and therefore any information would be appreciated.

The Plants Committee agreed that all Parties and observers should provide up-to-date information to Harriet Gillet at UNEP-WCMC (including data for *Gonostylus* spp. and *Cedrela odorata*).

## **19. Issues resulting from PC10, not included elsewhere in the Agenda**

There were no other issues outstanding from the 10th meeting of the Plants Committee.

## **20. Training initiatives**

### **20.1 Standard slide package: progress report**

The observer from the United Kingdom gave a brief summary of the progress to date. He also asked the Parties if they would prefer that the slide packs were produced on CD-ROM and added that they would be available on the website of the Scientific Authority of the United Kingdom.

After some discussion, the general conclusion was that the Parties wanted everything as there were different uses for slide and CD-ROM as well as the fact that some Parties did not have the necessary equipment to use CDs. Mr Shaari (representative of

Malaysia) suggested that it might be more convenient to distribute one slide pack to each Management Authority, with extra CDs included in it.

The observer from the United Kingdom also asked that participants send in their existing training exercises for inclusion in the new slide packs.

The Plants Committee accepted the report and agreed that the slide pack would be included on the website of the Scientific Authority of the United Kingdom with a link to their website from the CITES website. It was also agreed that new slide packs would be prepared in hard copy and CD-ROM, with numbers of each to be determined.

The Plants Committee also requested examples of training exercises to be sent to the Scientific Authority of the United Kingdom.

## 21. Trade in Mexican cacti

### 21.1 Trade in seeds of Cactaceae included in Appendix II (and document Inf. 16: Proposal submitted by Mexico on seeds of Mexican Cactaceae listed in Appendix II)

The observer from Mexico introduced document PC11 Inf. 16 and concluded that there was a need to supply artificially propagated material in order to minimise the bootlegging of cactus seeds, however Mexico could not fulfil this role due to a lack of infrastructure and economic support. For this reason Mexico felt strongly that Mexican cacti should remain in Appendix-II.

Mr Leach (representative of Oceania) thanked Mexico for the clearer picture provided by the document and made a comparison with crocodile ranching. He also referred to a project whereby trials were being carried out on controlled seed harvests to monitor the effects of regeneration on the population.

The observer from Mexico explained that a few years ago a project had begun which involved local communities in a management and sustainable use programme, but that resources had been limited for the necessary time involved, training and awareness raising. He added that such trials would need to be carried out on a case by case basis.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) asked the Secretariat whether Mexico could work on two or three projects to see if harvesting could be sustainable. She suggested a small pilot project on some species. The observer from Mexico agreed that it would be possible to conduct such projects on certain species of a high demand and suggested that it would be of great motivation if the Secretariat could find some funds for this.

The observer from Austria suggested that in light of the fact that paragraph 4 i) of the document referred to a lack of knowledge of 90% of the population, then there was still data for 10% of the population. He thus suggested that it might be possible to start programmes on seed collection and artificial propagation for those 10% so that potential threats could be established. The observer from Austria also said that he believed Mexico should be the primary exporter of its own biodiversity in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity and that seeds artificially propagated outside Mexico could be repatriated to fulfil the demands of the market.

The observer from TRAFFIC reported that they were completing a report on the Chihuahua desert cactus trade, including promoting propagation and sustainable management of their native cacti and that its recommendations might help guide Mexico.

The observer from the United States of America, offered to provide Mexico with information from recovery plan projects in place in the United States of America, in respect of artificial propagation and transplantation.

The observer from the Czech Republic reported that she had already spoken to Mexico and had promised to prepare a list of cacti grown and sold in the Czech Republic.

The Plants Committee agreed that Mexico, in collaboration with Austria and the United States of America, would prepare a proposal on sustainable harvesting and artificial propagation of seeds. This should include a budget and indication of funding sources. It was also agreed that the Czech Republic would provide Mexico with relevant information concerning cacti species grown in the Czech Republic and their origin.

## **21.2 Cacti sales through the Internet (and document Inf. 17: *Detección de traficantes cactáceas en México*)**

The observer from Mexico introduced document PC11 Doc. 21.2 and drew attention to tables 1, 2 and 3. The observer from Mexico explained that the data was only up to date until June 2001 and invited Parties to submit any further information on trade and origin.

The observer from Mexico then introduced document PC11 Inf. 17 and invited comments.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman), speaking on behalf of Spain, thanked Mexico for their work. Mrs Clemente also recommended that the study was broadened to account for more suppliers and collate information from other sources such as the internet and from catalogues. She added that following a confiscation in Spain the person concerned had achieved his cactus collection purely from seeds distributed from several countries not from Mexico by mail.

The observer from Austria referred to the issue of pressure on wild populations, stating that the question could not be solved by the data in document PC11 Doc. 21.2. He added that Mexico had stated correctly that there was a high demand for seeds, but that the demand was partly fulfilled by artificial propagation, including that undertaken outside Mexico for re-introduction. Referring to the artificial propagation of these cacti, the observer from Austria expressed concern that if the range State was not in a position to undertake this, the market might expand again for illegally collected material.

The Plants Committee agreed that Mexico should continue with their study and provide the updated information to relevant Parties.

## 22. Review of the genus *Taxus*

The observer from the United States of America introduced document PC11 Doc. 22 and drew attention to the recommendations in points 19-22.

The observer from China reported that the Chinese government had paid much attention to the protection of all species of *Taxus* and in 1998 China had included in their Harmonized System Customs codes to ensure that all species and derivatives were monitored and controlled and all commercial use was prohibited. He explained that all *Taxus* specimens were taken from stock, from material acquired before 1998 when the system was developed, and that only stocks checked by the government could be used. He then explained that the Chinese have taken a very active attitude towards artificial propagation with large plantations in Yunnan. The observer from China added that the products of *Taxus* were mainly exported to the United States of America and to Europe, but that there was still some illegal activity, mostly due to the difficulties of identifying the finished products.

The observer from China recommended that the Plants Committee conduct a project concerning *Taxus*, to include information on population, trade and enforcement issues. He concluded by saying that the Chinese Management Authority would make every effort to co-operate with the Plants Committee and the Secretariat in this matter.

Mr Singh (representative of Asia) concurred with the comments of China and added that although the original proposal prepared had been for *Taxus wallichiana*, it should also include *Taxus yunnanensis*.

The observer from TRAFFIC stated that the problem appeared to be with the trade in finished products and that the pharmaceutical extracts were excluded from CITES controls. The observer from TRAFFIC thus felt that the Plants Committee should recognize this problem. Mrs Clemente (Chairman) agreed that it was difficult to assess the impact of trade on a species if the finished products were exempted.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) reminded participants that India proposed the current annotation to *Taxus wallichiana* when they wanted to include the species in the Appendices. However, in response to a statement by TRAFFIC that because most of the trade in the species was in pharmaceutical products, then it was difficult to see the conservation value of the listing perhaps the listing had been taken too far away from the original species. Mr van Vliet suggested that the Plants Committee should recommend to India that it changes the annotation or delete the species from the Appendices.

Mr von Arx (representative of North America) referred to the problem of identifying the species in finished products and pointed out that some of the biggest companies making the products were in the United States of America and thus there must be some trade in the raw material. He also suggested that it might be a good idea to look at populations and trade in other range States, recognizing that two species of *Taxus* occurred in Canada.

There were several interventions concerning the problem with identification of species in pharmaceutical products and the conservation role of monitoring trade in such products. The observer from France also felt that cultivated plants in Europe used in pharmaceutical products should not be excluded and that there was a need to work with chemists as well as to study nomenclature and international trade.

The Plants Committee agreed that China, India and the United States of America, in collaboration with France would produce a document addressing the recommendations in paragraphs 20-22 of document PC11 Doc. 22. The Plants Committee also recognized that the issue of *Taxus* and trade in its finished products was one of great concern.

### 23. Time and venue of the 12th Plants Committee meeting

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) informed participants that she had received an invitation from the Netherlands to host the 12th meeting of the Plants Committee.

Mr de Koning (representative of Europe), speaking on behalf of the Netherlands, added that the meeting would be held in Leiden - the literal translation of which means 'to suffer'! Mr de Koning said that meeting was likely to place from 13 to 17 May 2002.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman), speaking on behalf of the Plants Committee, thanked the Netherlands for their offer, which was gratefully accepted.

### 24. Any other business

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

Mr Lindeque (Secretariat) introduced document PC11 Doc. 24.1 and AC16.9.2 the referred to the recommendations that the Animals Committee had supported and asked the Plants Committee if it wished to participate in the projects.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) agreed that the matter was very important and expressed surprise that at the last meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Plants Committee had overlooked the fact that plants had not been mentioned with regard to this issue.

Mr Luke (representative of Africa) expressed his support for the proposal, adding that he had already expressed concern to the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, UK with regard to the large amount of money being spent on the storage of seeds, rather than conservation *in situ*. He felt that not enough funding was being assigned to the conservation of plant habitats.

The observer from the United Kingdom spoke of the need to combine sustainable harvest from the wild, with species targeted for propagation - recognizing that lack of trade in some species equalled a huge economic loss to particular countries. With regard to the Millennium Seed Bank at the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, he explained that in accordance with the Convention on Biological Diversity there were very tight agreements between RBG Kew and the developing countries, including a large commitment to capacity building.

Mr Akpagana (alternate representative of Africa), Mr Singh (representative of Asia) and the observer from Mexico voiced support for the proposal, agreeing that in some regions there was an imbalance between *ex situ* and *in situ* conservation and the need to repatriate *ex situ* material.

The Plants Committee agreed to support the process established by the Secretariat. One representative from each region should collaborate in the process and collect information at the regional level, especially from the Management Authorities.

## 24.2 Report on the Global Strategy for Plants (CBD)

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) explained that this was a proposal developed in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity. She explained that the document had only been distributed to the members of the Plants Committee, with a summary to participants, but that the conclusions from SBSSTA would be presented to all participants at the 12th meeting of the Plants Committee.

Mrs Clemente referred to target number 9 for CITES - that there should be a reduction of a certain percentage of illegal trade and stated that she had cautioned that illegal trade was very difficult to measure but that the main targets of the Strategic Plan should be mentioned instead.

The Plants Committee agreed that the members, Parties and other observers would send all comments on the CBD document to the Chairman before the beginning of October.

## 24.3 Annotation to *Cistanche deserticola*

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced the document PC11 Doc. 24.3 and drew attention to point 5 - the Secretariat's intention to co-operate with China in preparing an amendment proposal to correct the current annotation.

There were no further comments.

## 24.4 Illegal trade in *Paphiopedilum* spp.

The observer from the United States of America introduced document PC11 Doc. 24.4 regarding the concern that newly described species of *Paphiopedilum* spp. were in trade for hybridization.

Mr von Arx (representative of North America) felt that the first step should be to produce a list of newly described species in order to assist countries to look more closely. He added that this would also be useful for newly described cacti species. Mr von Arx also suggested that a list of countries that do and do not allow exploitation of the species would be useful. The observer from Switzerland reported that the Swiss Management Authority had produced a list of *Paphiopedilum* species newly described in the last 5 years (document PC11 Inf. 8).

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) stated that there should be no trade in Appendix-I listed species and that it would not be useful to send out a Notification requesting information on whether or not the species were artificially propagated. He also reminded participants that it was not the Plants Committee, but each individual country that was responsible for its enforcement.

The observer from the United Kingdom considered the recommendations to be very useful and that there were a number that could be worked with, adding that many countries would like the help of the Plants Committee, for example Thailand and China.

The Plants Committee adopted the recommendations in document PC11 Doc. 24.4 and agreed that the United Kingdom, United States of America and the Secretariat

would collaborate and prepare a document for the 12th meeting of the Plants Committee.

#### **24.5 Implementation issues related to Appendix-III timber species**

The observer from the United States of America introduced document PC11 Doc. 24.5 and drew attention to the recommendations.

Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) made comments on the following recommendations:

Rec. 6 a). This is part of Resolution 9.25 and clearly outlined in paragraph a) iv) under the first Recommends. The Secretariat feels that it is more forceful than a recommendation by the Plants Committee.

Rec. 6 b). The Secretariat always asks for samples and distributes them immediately.

Rec. 6 c). The Plants Committee can ask the Secretariat to do things, but not direct them.

Rec. 6 d). Reports have to be presented to all Parties anyway, and identification sheets on *Cedrela* have already been requested

Rec. 6 e). One can simply ask the Party concerned for their requirement for the annotation.

The observer from Malaysia reported that the listing of Ramin in Appendix-III had caused Malaysia great difficulties with the time for putting a mechanism in place, preparing documentation, informing agencies etc and it was due to this that Malaysia put in a reservation for parts and derivatives. He felt that an Appendix-III listing presented a real problem for those Parties that did not list the species, but were directly affected by the listing. The observer from Singapore agreed with these comments, adding that there was also the problem of storage as timber is very bulky.

Mrs Clemente (Chairman) recommended that the United States of America and Malaysia should raise the issue with the Standing Committee. She went on to congratulate Malaysia on their admirable efforts with volunteering to solve the problem.

The Plants Committee recommended that Parties bring this matter to the attention of the Standing Committee.

#### **Closing remarks**

Before closing the meeting, Mrs Clemente (Chairman) thanked the organizers of the meeting, in particular Dr Zulmukshar Shaari and his staff, for the excellent venue they had elected to host the meeting and for the smooth way in which the meeting was run. She further thanked the members of the Committee for their excellent work and all participants for their contributions to the discussions.