



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

**SUMMARY RECORD
THIRTEENTH MEETING OF THE
PLANTS COMMITTEE**

**Geneva, Switzerland
12-15 August 2003**



Photo: Pascale Unger

Epipactis palustris

Rapporteur
Matthew Mustard

Prepared by the CITES Secretariat



CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
– Closed session of the Plants Committee	7
– Open session of the Plants Committee	8
CLOSED SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE	15
Participants	17
1. Opening of the meeting	17
2. General introduction on the operation of the Plants Committee	17
2.1 Rules of Procedure	17
3. Adoption of the Agenda and working programme	19
3.1 Agenda	19
3.2 Working programme	19
4. Admission of observers	19
5. Regional issues	19
6. Budget of the Plants Committee	19
7. Report on the 49th meeting of the Standing Committee	20
8. Working programme for the Plants Committee until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties	20
9. Strategic planning (PC): Action Plant of the Plants Committee	20
10. Time and venue of the 13th meeting of the Plants Committee	20
11. Any other business	21
OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE	23
1. Opening of the meeting	25
2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure	25
3. Adoption of the Agenda and the working programme	25
3.1 Agenda	25
3.2 Working programme	25
4. Admission of observers	25
5. General introduction to the operation of the Plants Committee	25
6. Regional reports and updated regional directories	25
6.1 Africa	25
6.1.1 Regional report	25
6.1.2 Regional directory	26
6.2 Asia	26
6.2.1 Regional report	26
6.2.2 Regional directory	26



6.3	Central and South America and the Caribbean	26
6.3.1	Regional report	26
6.3.2	Regional directory	26
6.4	Europe	26
6.4.1	Regional report	26
6.4.2	Regional directory	26
6.5	North America	26
6.5.1	Regional report	26
6.5.2	Regional directory	27
6.6	Oceania	27
6.6.1	Regional report	27
6.6.2	Regional directory	27
7.	Report on the 49th meeting of the Standing Committee	28
8.	Working programme for the Plants Committee until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties	28
8.1	Resolutions and Decisions directed or related to the Plants Committee	28
9.	Follow up of CoP12 Decisions	30
9.1	<i>Harpagophytum</i> spp.	30
9.1.1	Implementation of Decisions	30
9.1.2	Implementation of Decisions in Namibia	30
9.2	<i>Guaiacum</i> spp.	31
9.3	<i>Aquilaria</i> spp.: progress report	31
9.4	Review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12)	32
10.	Technical proposals from the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties	33
10.1	Definitions of the technical terms used in the annotations of medicinal plants	33
10.2	Artificially propagated orchid hybrids	34
10.3	Review of Resolution on plants and plant trade	34
10.4	Determination of the definition of <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> plywood	34
11.	Species proposals for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties	35
11.1	Annotations for certain artificially propagated orchid hybrids	36
11.2	Specimens in international trade under exemption	36
11.3	Proposal to include <i>Caesalpinia echinata</i> in the Appendices	37
12.	Significant trade in plants	39
12.1	Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade	39
12.2	Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.8	40
12.2.1	Trade in plants from Madagascar	40
12.2.2	Cycads	40
12.2.3	Taxa review	41
12.2.3.1	<i>Prunus africana</i>	41
12.2.3.2	<i>Aquilaria malaccensis</i>	41



12.2.3.3	<i>Pericopsis elata</i>	41
12.2.3.4	<i>Aloe</i> species from East Africa used as extracts	41
13.	Review of the Appendices	41
13.1	Timber species	41
13.2	Artificially propagated plants traded in great quantities	42
13.3	Periodic review of animal and plant taxa in the Appendices	42
14.	Review of heavily traded non-CITES species	42
14.1	Review of heavily traded non-CITES species	42
14.2	Evaluation of tree species	42
14.3	Project report on <i>Dalbergia melanoxylon</i>	43
15.	Checklist and nomenclature	43
15.1	Progress report	43
15.2	Checklist of Succulent <i>Euphorbia</i> , new edition	44
15.3	Checklist of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants, new edition	44
15.4	Preparation of CITES checklist for <i>Bulbophyllum</i> (Orchidaceae)	44
16.	Strategic Planning (PC): Action Plan of the Plants Committee	44
17.	ID Manual: progress report	44
18.	Guidelines for transport of live plants	44
19.	Relationship between <i>in situ</i> conservation and <i>ex situ</i> production in plants	44
20.	Links with industry and traders to promote projects on sustainable use	45
21.	Role of Appendix II	45
22.	Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (CBD): Analysis and links with CBD	45
23.	Other issues resulting from PC12	45
24.	Training initiatives	45
24.1	Standard slide package: progress report	45
24.2	Master's Course in Baeza, Spain, 2003	45
25.	Production systems involving CITES-listed species and their impact on wild populations – source code designations	46
25.1	Plant production systems	46
26.	Time and venue of the 14th Plants Committee meeting	46
27.	Any other business	46
27.1	Annotations of parts and derivatives	46
27.2	Artificially propagated <i>Tillandsia xerographica</i> from Guatemala and the Philippines	46
28.	Closing remarks	46



ANNEX 1

Opening speeches 47

ANNEX 2

List of participants 51

ANNEX 3

Working groups reports 65



Photo: Pascale Unger

Villa Cassel, Aletsch, Switzerland

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY





ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
CLOSED SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE	
1. Opening of the meeting No action.	
2. General introduction on the operation of the Plants Committee 2.1 Rules of Procedure Adopted as amended.	
3. Adoption of the Agenda and working programme 3.1 Agenda Adopted as amended. 3.2 Working programme Adopted.	
4. Admission of observers List of observers agreed.	
5. Regional issues Secretariat to ensure regional representatives are invited to meetings taking place in their regions. Regional representatives to speak to their Governments and Management Authorities to try to obtain more financial assistance support to regional representatives.	Secretariat Regional representatives
6. Budget of the Plants Committee Secretariat to provide information on the costs of recent Plants Committee meetings.	Secretariat
7. Report on the 49th meeting of the Standing Committee 8. Working programme for the Plants Committee until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties 9. Strategic planning (PC): Action Plan of the Plants Committee The PC decided to consider these three agenda items during the open session.	
10. Time and venue of the 14th meeting of the Plants Committee Concern over the time period between CoP12 and CoP13. PC to prepare statement for the CoP.	Plants Committee
11. Any other business Concern expressed over the lack of scientific basis for recent Malagasy proposals to include various plant taxa in the Appendices. Committee to prepare official statement recommending that the provisions of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) be followed.	Plants Committee



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE	
1. Opening of the meeting No action.	
2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedures 2.1 Rules of Procedure PC confirmed the adoption of the RoP as amended in closed session. Secretariat to inform AC of changes.	Secretariat
3. Adoption of the Agenda and the working programme PC confirmed the adoption of the Agenda, as amended in closed session, and of the working programme.	
4. Admission of observers No action.	
5. General introduction on the operation of the Plants Committee No action.	
6. Regional reports and updated regional directories Committee to take action to ensure that the Vice-Chairman's position be financially supported. CITES Secretary-General to assist in this matter. Vice-Chairman of the Plants Committee to clarify exactly the support he requires. Brainstorming group 1 to continue working on ideas to improve communication between Parties in a region and between Parties and their regional representatives. The group's Chairman to present the groups findings at AC19 and to elaborate a proposal for PC14, in order for the Plants Committee to consider preparing a proposal on this issue for CoP13. Secretariat to investigate provision of financial support to regional representative of Africa to maintain regional directory.	Plants Committee, CITES Secretary-General Vice-Chairman of the Plants Committee Brainstorming group 1 (China, Hungary, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, the Netherlands, Slovenia and the Secretariat) Secretariat
7. Report on the 49th meeting of the Standing Committee Committee to comment on reports from the Export Quota Working Group and to be kept informed about its progress.	Plants Committee, Export Quota Working Group
8. Working programme for the Plants Committee until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties 8.1 Resolutions and Decisions directed or related to the Plants Committee Recommendations of working group 1 (see document PC13 WG1 Doc. 1) adopted as amended. Secretariat to send document to regional representatives and any observers who request it. Working group 2 established to clarify the language and terms used in Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11. Working group 2 to prepare draft revisions of Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11 for consideration at PC14.	Plants Committee, Secretariat Working group 2 (Chile, France, Mexico, United States of America and the Secretariat)



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>9. Follow up of CoP12 Decisions</p> <p>9.1 <i>Harpagophytum</i> spp.</p> <p>9.1.1 Implementation of Decisions</p> <p>Representative of Africa to present document for consideration at PC14 on biology and socio-economic importance of <i>Harpagophytum</i> spp.</p> <p>Secretariat to remove one sentence from press release on CITES Website.</p> <p>9.1.2 Implementation of Decisions in Namibia</p> <p>Germany and Namibia to provide summary of their research to the Secretariat for inclusion in its report for PC14.</p> <p>9.2 <i>Guaiaacum</i> spp.</p> <p>Mexico to contact Cuba about possible cooperation and sharing of information regarding research on <i>Guaiaacum</i> spp. and to send it the Research Protocol of the Mexican Study.</p> <p>PC encouraged Mexico to continue researching on Mexican <i>Guaiaacum</i> sanctum.</p> <p>9.3 <i>Aquilaria</i> spp.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>9.4 Review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12)</p> <p>Spain, United Kingdom and United States to work with Secretariat to propose linguistic changes to document CoP12 Com. I. 3 (CWG Chair's text).</p> <p>Spain, United Kingdom and United States to compile manual on conducting the review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12). United States to translate these guidelines into Spanish and to request France's assistance to translate them into French.</p> <p>Committee and Parties detailed in document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev.1) to test criteria with plant taxa.</p> <p>Regional representatives of South and Central America and the Caribbean and observer from Chile to invite Argentina to conduct reviews on <i>Araucaria araucana</i> and <i>Morchella</i> spp. If Argentina does not agree, species to be deleted from the review.</p> <p>Chairman to coordinate the review.</p> <p>Secretariat to post document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev.1) on CITES website as well as subsequent comments received by the agreed deadline and results of criteria reviews on CITES Website.</p>	<p>Representative of Africa (John Donaldson)</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Germany, Namibia, Secretariat</p> <p>Mexico</p> <p>Mexico</p> <p>Spain, United Kingdom, United States and Secretariat</p> <p>France, Spain, United Kingdom, United States</p> <p>Plants Committee, Parties outlined in document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev.1).</p> <p>Representatives of South and Central America and the Caribbean, Chile</p> <p>Chairman</p> <p>Secretariat</p>



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>10. Technical proposals from the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</p> <p>10.1 Definitions of the technical terms used in the annotations of medicinal plants</p> <p>Secretariat to prepare document for consideration at PC14 outlining amendments needed to clarify the annotations. Secretariat to consult range States of species possibly affected by such amendments in the preparation of the document.</p> <p>Supervisory group 1 to identify specific problems in current CITES Appendices for medicinal plants.</p> <p>10.2 Artificially propagated orchid hybrids</p> <p>PC to continue looking for alternatives to the current listing.</p> <p>10.3 Review of Resolutions on plants and plant trade</p> <p>This agenda item was covered in the discussion of agenda item 8.1</p> <p>10.4 Determination of the definition of <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> plywood</p> <p>PC <u>adopted</u> proposed interim definition of <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> plywood as outlined in document PC13 Doc. 10.4 and <u>advised</u> that the square metre was the preferred unit of measure to report such shipments of <i>S. macrophylla</i>, but that the cubic metre was also acceptable.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>Members of supervisory group 1 (representatives of North America and South and Central America and the Caribbean, and observers from Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States)</p> <p>Plants Committee</p> <p>Plants Committee, Chairmen of working groups 1 and 2</p> <p>All Parties</p>
<p>11. Species proposals for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</p> <p>PC statement on listing proposals to be communicated to AC and SC. Secretariat to ask AC whether it wishes to join the statement.</p> <p>Secretariat to suggest to the SC and AC that plant proposals be considered before animal proposals at CoP13.</p> <p>11.1 Annotations for certain artificially propagated orchid hybrids</p> <p>Switzerland to continue working on preparation of annotations.</p> <p>11.2 Specimens in international trade under exemption</p> <p>Switzerland to take into account points raised in discussion and to prepare a further revision of its proposal for consideration at PC14.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>Switzerland</p> <p>Switzerland</p>



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>11.3 Proposal to include <i>Caesalpinia echinata</i> in the Appendices</p> <p>Regional representatives of South and Central America and the Caribbean to consult Brazilian Management and Scientific Authorities about the possible listing of <i>C. echinata</i>.</p> <p>Germany to wait for response from Brazil before deciding on whether to present a draft proposal to list <i>C. echinata</i> for discussion at PC14.</p> <p>Regional representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean to keep Chile informed of future discussions on this matter.</p>	<p>Regional representatives of South and Central America and the Caribbean</p> <p>Germany</p> <p>Regional representatives of South and Central America and the Caribbean</p>
<p>12. Significant Trade in Plants</p> <p>Secretariat to make available its presentation on <i>Plants Committee and the Resolutions</i> for downloading from the CITES website.</p> <p>12.1 Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade</p> <p>United Kingdom to act as the link between the PC and the AC in order to finalize of the Terms of Reference for the Review.</p> <p>12.2 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.8</p> <p>12.2.1 Trade in Plants from Madagascar</p> <p>Secretariat to distribute proceedings of the workshop on the Review of Significant Trade for Madagascar to PC13 participants.</p> <p>Secretariat to clarify current situation with regard to the issuance of CITES export permits by Madagascar.</p> <p>Secretariat to support attendance of regional representatives at workshops on significant trade or other CITES-related topics in their regions.</p> <p>12.2.2 Cycads</p> <p>Consultant to submit final report on the review of significant trade in Cycads to the Secretariat by the end of September 2003.</p> <p>12.2.3 Taxa for review</p> <p>12.2.3.1 <i>Prunus africana</i></p> <p>Secretariat to select consultants to conduct a review of significant trade in <i>Prunus africana</i>.</p> <p>12.2.3.2 <i>Aquilaria malaccensis</i></p> <p>TRAFFIC to submit final report of the review of significant trade in <i>Aquilaria malaccensis</i> to Secretariat by the end of September 2003.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>United Kingdom</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Mr John Donaldson</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>TRAFFIC</p>



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>12.2.3.3 <i>Pericopsis elata</i> FFI to submit final report of the review of significant trade in <i>Pericopsis elata</i> to Secretariat by the end of September 2003.</p> <p>12.2.3.4 <i>Aloe</i> species from East Africa used as extracts FFI to submit final report of the review of significant trade in <i>Aloe</i> species from East Africa used as extracts to the Secretariat by the end of September 2003.</p>	<p>FFI</p> <p>FFI</p>
<p>13. Review of the Appendices</p> <p>13.1 Timber species Committee to offer assistance to any Party wishing to propose a change to the listing of any timber species on the Appendices. United States to proceed with study on annotation and report at PC14</p> <p>13.3 Periodic review of animal and plant taxa in the Appendices Contact Group on Review of the Appendices of the Animals and Plants Committees to review document PC13 Doc. 13.3 and to present a revised version at PC14.</p>	<p>Plants Committee, Parties wishing to propose changes to the listing of timber species on the Appendices United States</p> <p>Contact Group on Review of the Appendices (representatives of Africa and Oceania, observers from the United States and UNEP-WCMC, observer from Spain at the AC, and AC and PC Chairmen)</p>
<p>14. Review of heavily traded non-CITES species</p> <p>14.1 Review of heavily traded non-CITES species PC to consider at PC14 draft proposals from Parties concerning heavily traded non-CITES species.</p> <p>14.2 Evaluation of tree species The Netherlands to report on its work on this subject PC14. United States to assist the Netherlands in organizing a workshop in North America and to work with the Netherlands to find funding for this.</p> <p>14.3 Project report on <i>Dalbergia melanoxylon</i> No action.</p>	<p>Plants Committee, Parties wishing to submit draft proposals concerning heavily traded non-CITES species for consideration at PC14.</p> <p>The Netherlands</p> <p>The Netherlands, United States</p>
<p>15. Checklists and nomenclature</p> <p>15.1 Progress report PC to assist the NC in identifying experts to assist in the production of certain draft checklists of CITES-listed plant taxa. Botanist of NC to work with Mexico and Switzerland to resolve the issue regarding the clarification of the Terms of Reference for the NC.</p>	<p>Plants Committee</p> <p>Botanist of Nomenclature Committee, Mexico, Switzerland</p>



ACTION POINTS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
<p>24. Training initiatives</p> <p>24.1 Standard slide package: progress report Contact group 2 to develop directory of capacity-building materials.</p> <p>24.2 Master's Course in Baeza, Spain, 2003 No action.</p>	Contact group 2 (observers from Germany, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States, and the Secretariat)
<p>25. Production systems involving CITES-listed species and their impact on wild populations – source code designations</p> <p>25.1 Plant production systems This item was discussed together with item 19.</p>	
<p>26. Time and venue of the 14th Plants Committee meeting</p> <p>Offer to host the PC14 made by Namibia. PC to look into feasibility of holding PC15 in country other than Switzerland.</p>	Namibia Plants Committee
<p>27. Any other business</p> <p>27.1 Annotations of parts and derivatives This agenda item was covered in the discussion of agenda item 10.1.</p> <p>27.2 Artificially propagated <i>Tillandsia xerographica</i> from Guatemala and the Philippines Regional representatives of Asia and of Central and South America and the Caribbean, and the Netherlands to contact the Management Authorities of Guatemala and the Philippines about this issue.</p>	Regional representatives of Asia and of Central and South America and the Caribbean, the Netherlands
<p>28. Closing remarks No action.</p>	



Photo: Victoria Zentilli

Plants Committee members

CLOSED SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE





Participants

Plants Committee members: Mr J. Donaldson and Mr Q. Luke (Africa); Mrs Irawati and Mr N.P. Singh (Asia); Mr E. Forero and Mrs F. Mereles (Central and South America and the Caribbean); Mrs M. Clemente (Chairman) and Mr G. Frenguelli (Europe); Mrs P. Dávila Aranda (North America); and Mr G. Leach (Oceania).

Observer Parties: Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chile, China, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, the Netherlands, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Thailand, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

CITES Secretariat

1. Opening of the meeting (no document)

The Chairman welcomed all participants to the meeting. She then thanked the Secretariat for organizing the meeting and the Swiss Government for organizing the excursion planned for the end of the meeting.

2. General introduction on the operation of the Plants Committee

2.1 Rules of Procedure (PC13 Doc. 2.1)

The Chairman reminded participants that the Rules of Procedure (document PC13 Doc. 2.1) had been reviewed at PC12 and asked the Committee whether it had any amendments to recommend.

Mr Leach (representative of Oceania) asked to what extent the Rules of Procedure were harmonized with those of the Animals Committee (AC) and whether the written proceedings of the meetings were harmonized between the two committees. The Secretariat informed Mr Leach that the Rules of Procedure of the AC and the Plants Committee (PC) were basically the same text.

Mrs Dávila Aranda (representative of North America) recommended that the deadline outlined in Rule 17 be changed from 75 days to 60 days. She highlighted that this amendment would give more time to those preparing documents for the next Committee meeting.

The Secretariat advised the Committee that the deadline in Rule 17 was 90 days for the AC. It reminded the Committee that this deadline was in place to give the Secretariat sufficient time to translate submitted documents, but agreed with the proposal under the exceptional circumstances of the 12th and 13th meetings of the Conference of the Parties (CoP12 and CoP13) being so close to each other. The Secretariat requested that those who submit documents keep them as concise as possible in order to reduce the translation workload. The Secretariat recommended amending Rule 17 just for the period between PC13 and PC14. The Committee adopted this proposal.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that Rule 18 was written in the days when Parties were unable to obtain material from the Secretariat on the Internet and asked the Committee whether it was still necessary to provide documents to "all members and alternate members of the Committee, to all Parties that may be directly affected by any discussion of the documents and to all Parties that have informed the Secretariat of their intention to be represented at the meeting".

Mr Frenguelli (representative of Europe) remarked that probably not all Parties needed printed copies. He called for comments from other representatives on the fact that not all Parties had Internet access or sufficient stocks of paper to print the documents. He commented that some



decisions of the PC affected all Parties (such as the review of the listing criteria) and in those cases all Parties should be notified.

Mr Gabel (observer from the United States of America) asked whether it would be better to send out only printed copies of documents to those who need them. He recommended that the Secretariat develop a list of Parties that would rather receive documents via email.

Mr Luke (Vice-Chairman of the Plants Committee and representative of Africa) told the Committee that working documents were intended to raise as many responses as possible. He suggested that notifying Parties by letter of a new working document may be better than sending the document itself, but noted that such a procedure may be slower than sending documents to Parties. He added that sending a printed copy to some Parties was necessary, as they were unable to obtain them in any other way.

Mr Singh (representative of Asia) advised the Committee that the Secretariat should continue to distribute printed copies in compliance with Rule 18 because it was still unclear whether all Parties had Internet access.

The Secretariat stated that for the time being all Parties were receiving printed copies but advised the Committee that it was looking into alternatives. The Secretariat explained that it was compiling a list of Parties that required printed copies to be sent to them. It suggested that another option would be to include a distribution list in documents that were submitted to the Secretariat.

The Chairman agreed that the latter option would be practical. She also agreed that the Committee could refine the process. She suggested that all Parties in the official OECD Aid to Development list receive printed copies of documents, noting however that this may miss out Parties with economies in transition that may still require printed copies. She stated that it would be useful if the Secretariat kept a record of Parties with easy Internet access but recommended that the current system remain for the time being. The Committee agreed to retain Rule 18 without changes.

With regard to Rule 22, the Chairman recommended the admission of observers from intergovernmental organizations to closed sessions of the Committee. The Secretariat agreed and added that Parties, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations could all contribute to the discussions held in closed sessions. Mr Leach queried the need for closed sessions as no contentious issues were ever raised. Mrs Dávila Aranda asked how an amendment to this rule would affect other rules relating to observers, such as Rule 16. The Secretariat responded that submitting documents and attending the closed sessions were separate issues. He suggested changing the last sentence of Rule 22 from "Alternate members and Parties present at the meeting as observers shall be entitled to be present at closed sessions" to "Alternate members, Parties, and Intergovernmental Organizations present at the meeting as observers shall be entitled to be present at closed sessions". The Committee adopted this proposal.

The Chairman advised the Committee of a change in the implementation of Rule 23, stating that the executive summary would no longer be presented in tabular form. She explained that the draft executive summaries would be examined for review and adoption by the Committee following the daily session they covered. The executive summary would then be translated into the other working languages of the Convention and distributed to the participants.

The Secretariat recommended a change to Rule 24 in order to harmonize the process of communicating a summary record of each meeting to all Parties between the AC, PC and Standing Committee (SC). The Secretariat recommended that the term "as soon as possible" in Rule 24 be changed to "within 60 days", in line with the Rules of Procedure for the AC and to give a clear deadline. The Committee adopted this proposal and the revised Rules of Procedure [(see document PC13 Doc. 2.1 (Rev.1)].



3. Adoption of the Agenda and working programme

3.1 Agenda [PC13 Doc. 3.1 (Rev. 6)]

The Chairman suggested removing agenda item 25.2 "Evaluation of certification schemes" and adding agenda item 24.2 "Master's Course in Baeza, Spain, 2003". The Secretariat suggested adding a new agenda item 27.2 on "Artificially propagated *Tillandsia xerographica* from Guatemala and the Philippines" following the submission by the Netherlands of the document PC13 Doc. Inf. 5. The Committee adopted these amendments.

The Secretariat advised the Committee that the Chairman of the AC would attend the meeting on 13 and 14 August and suggested that the Committee consider issues relevant to the AC on those days.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that *Prunus africana* had been selected for a review of significant trade and that this would be discussed under agenda item 12.2.3.1. The Secretariat advised the Committee that it was looking into hiring consultants to carry out the review and that suggestions on possible candidates were welcomed. The Chairman informed the Secretariat that France was likely to know of potential consultants as it had been in contact with several *P. africana* experts. She invited France to recommend suitable consultants to the Secretariat.

3.2 Working programme (PC13 Doc. 3.2)

The Committee adopted the working programme.

4. Admission of observers (PC13 Doc. 4)

The Chairman reported that this was the first time she had rejected applications from non-governmental organizations (NGOs). She explained that the Secretariat had received no responses to letters sent to these NGOs requesting their reasons for wishing to attend the meeting and that as a result she had decided not to invite them. The Secretariat invited the Committee to adopt the list of observers from IGOs and NGOs who had been invited in compliance with Rules 5 and 6 as contained in document PC13 Doc. 4. The Committee agreed to admit these observers to the meeting.

5. Regional issues (no document)

The Chairman invited the regional representatives to voice any special concerns regarding regional issues that would not be covered in the open session.

Mr Donaldson (regional representative of Africa) reported that the lack of communication between regional representatives and Parties within their regions was a problem. He highlighted that representatives should be informed of and invited to CITES meetings in their regions. He quoted the recent workshop on the review of significant trade held in Madagascar as a meeting to which the regional representatives had not been invited. The Chairman reported that she had requested that the Secretariat comply with Decision 12.13 and informed regional representatives of CITES workshop held in their regions.

Mr Luke announced that he was resigning from his position of Vice-Chairman of the Plants Committee because the support he was promised had not been provided. The Chairman stressed that it was logical to rotate chairmanship of the Committee between the regions but that this would be impossible if representatives did not receive the necessary support. The Secretariat reported that this was a problem that had been noted by both scientific committees. It recommended that regional representatives speak to their Governments and Management Authorities to try to obtain assistance.

6. Budget of the Plants Committee (no document)

The Chairman asked the Secretariat whether hosting the PC meeting in Geneva resulted in substantial savings and how local costs compared to those of meetings hosted by a Party.



The Secretariat stated that the relative costs depended on the venue but that hosting the meeting in Geneva resulted in significant savings in terms of travel expenses, logistical costs and interpretation costs. It also advised the Committee that the budget allocated to organizing PC13 had been sufficient.

Mr Gabel commented that it would be useful for the Parties to have information on the relative costs of the meetings and on the savings that would be made by holding a meeting back to back with the AC. Mr Schürmann (observer from the Netherlands) concurred and recommended comparing the expenses of the latest three PC meetings, PC13 included. The Secretariat said that it would collate this information and evaluate the savings made by holding the AC and PC meetings back to back in Geneva.

The Chairman noted that a hosting Party would often cover some of the costs of a meeting. She also queried whether the interpreters needed to travel business class as savings could be made if they travelled economy class, as advised by the interpreters themselves.

Mr Schürmann remarked that holding PC13 in Geneva resulted in many people having to travel to an expensive country, and that although the Secretariat may make savings, the overall costs were much greater once taken into account the expenses of the participants. He added that there were few problems with the implementation of CITES in Switzerland and it would be much more preferable to host the meeting in countries that faced more problems.

The Secretariat noted that it was because of budget constraints that it was now organizing a PC meeting in Geneva every other year. It agreed that the costs of travelling to Geneva now befell to the Parties and expressed concern that Parties with limited resources might have great difficulties in participating in these meetings.

Mr Leach asked the Secretariat whether it would be possible to divert the savings made by having the PC meetings in Geneva to support the work of the Vice-Chairman of the Committee. The Chairman, after consulting the Secretariat, informed the Committee that this would not be possible as the budget for holding the Committee meetings could not be reallocated to other purposes.

Mr Luke requested clarification from the Secretariat on the requirement to purchase business class tickets for PC members who travelled for longer than a certain number of hours. The Secretariat advised that this was the case for UN staff only and not for PC members. The Secretariat also informed the Committee that interpreters were hired in compliance with the Rules and Regulations of the United Nations. It reiterated that UN contractors travelling over nine hours were entitled to business class tickets. The Secretariat expressed its deep concern about not being able to provide sufficient financial support to countries that faced problems implementing the Convention but stated that it had to cut costs given the budget adopted at CoP12. The Secretariat reminded the Committee that the budget of the Secretariat was decided by the Conference of the Parties.

7. Report on the 49th meeting of the Standing Committee (PC13 Doc. 7)

8. Working programme for the Plants Committee until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (PC13 Doc. 8)

9. Strategic planning (PC): Action Plan of the Plants Committee (PC13 Doc. 16)

The Chairman recommended that these three agenda items be discussed in the open session. The Committee agreed to this proposal.

10. Time and venue of the 14th meeting of the Plants Committee (no document)

The Chairman informed the Committee that she was awaiting confirmation from Namibia that it was willing and able to host the 14th meeting of the Plants Committee in 2004 and mentioned that South Africa had also offered to host the meeting. She added that South Africa would like to host a CITES capacity-building workshop on plants before or after the meeting. She also advised the Committee that the AC planned to have its 20th meeting in April 2004 but that this would be too late to hold



PC14 given that proposals and reports for CoP13 had to be submitted by 5 May 2004. She asked the Committee whether they thought they should submit a statement to the Parties expressing concern over the short period of time between CoP12 and CoP13.

Mr Gabel agreed that a statement would be a good idea because the time-frames involved left very little time to do the required scientific work. He added that PC14 should be held before the next SC meeting scheduled for March 2004. Mr Benítez asked whether it would be possible to postpone CoP13 until a later date, and whether the Secretariat had considered such a possibility. The Secretariat replied that the date for CoP13 was fixed. Mr Donaldson (representative of Africa) suggested that PC14 be held in late February 2004 or possibly early March 2004.

The Chairman said that she would consider this suggestion and reminded the Committee that she had to report to the SC in March 2004. The Committee agreed to prepare a statement for the Conference of the Parties expressing concern over the restricted time period between CoP12 and CoP13.

11. Any other business

The Chairman recommended that a working group be set up to discuss priorities for the working programme of the Plants Committee. The Committee agreed and the Working Group was formed by the PC representatives and the Secretariat. The PC Vice-Chairman acted as Chair.

The Chairman raised the issue of the Malagasy palm species included in the Appendices at CoP12. She stated that these species had been listed despite a severe lack of supporting scientific information and suggested that the Committee make an official statement to the CoP requesting that similar situations not be repeated. Mr Benítez (observer for Mexico) requested clarification from the Secretariat regarding the adoption of these proposals. The Secretariat explained that there were two issues. Firstly, the proposals had been submitted before the deadline but by a Government that was not officially recognized by the UN at the time. The UN had officially recognized that Government after the deadline and proposals had then been accepted. The second issue regarded the quality of the proposals, which varied considerably. The Secretariat agreed that the quality of the proposals was not what Parties had come to expect, and that their adoption was a unique event that should not be repeated. Mr Gabel added that the Parties had been reluctant to debate these issues at CoP12 and that they should have been more diligent. Mr Lüthy (observer from Switzerland) enquired about the wording of the statement from the Committee regarding this issue. The Chairman requested that Mr Leach coordinate the wording of the statement and present it to the Committee later in the meeting, for inclusion in the final report of the meeting. The Committee agreed to prepare an official statement strongly recommending that a similar situation be not repeated.





Photo: Victoria Zentili

Group photo, Friday 15 October 2003

OPEN SESSION OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE



**1. Opening of the meeting (no document)**

The CITES Secretary-General opened the meeting and welcomed all participants. The Chairman also welcomed all participants and reminded them of the importance of prioritizing the workload resulting from the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP12). She suggested to the Committee that it provide ideas on the implementation of some Decisions directed to the AC and PC. These would be conveyed to the Animals Committee the following week to ensure similar or compatible approaches.

2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure [PC13 Doc. 2 (Rev. 1)]

The Secretariat explained to participants that the Rules of Procedure had been modified in the closed session and that there had been discussions about Rules 18 and 23 without amendments to those rules. The Committee confirmed the adoption the Rules of Procedure as amended in the closed session. The Chairman requested the Secretariat to communicate the adopted changes to the AC to let them consider making similar changes to their own Rules of Procedure. She added that although the PC and the AC had tried to harmonize the Rules of Procedure as much as possible, some rules could be different between the two Committees.

3. Adoption of the Agenda and working programme**3.1 Agenda [PC13 Doc. 3.1 (Rev. 7)]**

The Secretariat explained the changes to the Agenda that were adopted in the closed meeting. The Committee confirmed the adoption of the Agenda as amended in the closed session.

3.2 Working programme (PC13 Doc. 3.2)

The Chairman introduced the working programme that was adopted in the closed meeting.

4. Admission of observers (PC13 Doc. 4)

The Secretariat introduced the observers from NGOs that were admitted to the meeting. Mr Schürmann requested that the Committee allow the NGOs to give a short spoken introduction about their organizations. This was agreed by the Committee and was followed by a brief spoken introduction by an observer from each NGO present at the meeting.

5. General introduction to the operation of the Plants Committee (no document)

The Chairman gave a presentation on the composition and main functions of the PC, as well as on the Resolutions and Decisions adopted at CoP12 and addressed or related to the PC.

6. Regional reports and updated regional directories**6.1. Africa****6.1.1 Regional report (PC13 Doc. 6.1.1)**

Mr Luke presented the regional report for Africa.

The Chairman expressed concern about the inability of the Vice-Chairman to fulfil his duties owing to the lack of support, because this had significant implications for the actual participation of developing countries in the Committees, especially to serve as chairman or vice-chairman. The Chairman informed the Committee that she and the Secretariat would discuss ways of financially supporting the work of the Vice-Chairman. The Committee rejected the resignation of the Vice-Chairman announced during the closed session and agreed to take action to ensure that the Vice-Chairman's position be financially supported, accepting the offer of the Secretary-General to assist in this matter. The Secretariat requested Mr Luke to clarify exactly the support that he required so that the issue could be raised at the next SC meeting.



- 6.1.2 Regional directory (no document)**
- Mr Luke explained that the regional directory for Africa had been presented at PC12 and had not yet been updated.
- 6.2 Asia**
- 6.2.1 Regional report [PC13 Doc. 6.2.1(Rev. 1)]**
- Mrs Irawati and Mr Singh presented the regional report for Asia. They emphasized that there was a need to improve the communication between Parties and their regional representatives.
- 6.2.2 Regional directory (no document)**
- Mrs Irawati and Mr Singh explained that the regional directory for Asia had been presented at PC11. They needed to ask Mr Shari (former representative) for the electronic version of that directory and to update it.
- 6.3 Central and South America and the Caribbean**
- 6.3.1 Regional report (PC13 Doc. 6.3.1)**
- Mr Forero presented the regional report for Central and South America and the Caribbean. He emphasized that there was a lack of communication between the Scientific Authorities, Management Authorities and regional representatives within his region.
- 6.3.2 Regional directory (no document)**
- Mr Forero presented the regional directory for Central and South America and the Caribbean as prepared for PC12. He added that the lack of communication between the Scientific Authorities, Management Authorities and regional representatives within his region had made it difficult to update the regional directory.
- 6.4 Europe**
- 6.4.1 Regional report (PC13 Doc. 6.4.1)**
- Mr Frenguelli presented the regional report for Europe. He informed the Committee that there were to be two European regional meetings in the near future, and emphasized the need to improve communication between Parties and regional representatives, especially eastern European Parties.
- 6.4.2 Regional directory (no document)**
- Mr Frenguelli presented the updated regional directory for Europe.
- Mr. Boljesic (observer from Slovenia) remarked that the format of the questionnaires that had been circulated to Parties in the European region to compile regional reports was user-friendly. The Secretariat agreed and advised to recommend this format to the AC. The Committee agreed with this recommendation.
- 6.5 North America**
- 6.5.1 Regional report (PC13 Doc. 6.5.1)**
- Mrs Dávila Aranda presented the regional report for North America.

**6.5.2 Regional directory (PC13 Doc. 6.5.2)**

Mrs Dávila Aranda presented the updated regional directory for North America.

6.6 Oceania**6.6.1 Regional report (PC13 Doc. 6.6.1)**

Mr Leach presented the report for Oceania.

6.6.2 Regional directory (PC13 Doc. 6.6.2)

Mr Leach presented the updated regional directory for Oceania.

Mr Schürmann commented that only 31 out of 162 Parties responded to requests for information for the regional report. He stated that regional representatives were therefore not properly representing the opinions of their regions. Mr Gabel recommended to the Committee that it investigate why Parties were not responding to their regional representatives' requests for information.

Mr Donaldson stated that Parties became more actively involved in CITES issues when they were included in CITES activities and projects within their region. He recommended to the Secretariat that it favour hiring local consultants over non-local consultants when contracting out CITES projects.

Mr Jorge Alvarez (observer from Mexico) also stressed the need for PC members to attend CoP meetings.

The Chairman concurred with the concern expressed over the lack of response by Parties to requests from the regional representatives and the lack of effective communication within some regions. She recommended to the Committee that it establish a contact group to develop ways of improving communication between Parties and regional representatives. The Committee agreed to this proposal and established a "brainstorming group" (BG1) comprising China, Hungary, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, the Netherlands (Chairman), Slovenia and the Secretariat.

Mr Forero commented that regional directories were maintained on a voluntary basis and suggested that financial support for their maintenance would result in better responses from Parties. Mr Luke commented that regional directories for some regions may change dramatically every year, making it difficult for regional representatives to keep the regional directories up to date. He reported that although he had been promised financial support to maintain the regional directory for Africa, he was yet to receive all the money and asked the Secretariat to check whether this money was still available. The Secretariat responded that it would investigate the situation.

The Chairman stated that it was necessary to harmonize the format of the regional directories and make them easily available on the CITES website. She added that although it was the responsibility of the regional representatives to update regional directories, it may be more useful if Parties were made responsible for sending the changes to the representatives every year.

Later in the meeting the Committee noted the report by the Chairman of Brainstorming Group 1 (see document PC13 BG1 Doc. 1). The Committee encouraged the group to continue working on ideas to improve communication between Parties. It also instructed the group's Chairman to present its findings at AC19 and to elaborate a proposal for PC14, in order for the Plants Committee to prepare a decision proposal on this issue for CoP13.



Mr Singh commented that communication was a big problem in Asia and recommended that any documents produced by contact group 1 be sent to the embassies of Parties. This suggestion was not adopted.

7. Report on the 49th meeting of the Standing Committee (no document)

The Chairman explained that there were two main issues discussed during the 49th meeting of the Standing Committee (SC49) relevant to the PC and that they were covered by agenda items 9.4.3 and 13.3. The Secretariat briefly summarized two additional items discussed at SC49 that were also relevant to the Plants Committee, and introduced two documents that the Plants Committee could consider at the present meeting in this regard: documents AC19 Doc. 7.1 and AC19 Doc. 7.2.

Mr Benítez commented that scientific aspects were crucially important in the setting of harvesting quotas. He asked the Secretariat why the Expert Quota Working Group did not consider these aspects. The Secretariat responded that the working group were only dealing with the technical issues of managing quotas. It informed the Committee that the scientific aspects had been dealt with already by another working group. Mr Gabel concurred with the Secretariat that two documents on export quotas had been submitted at CoP12, one of which outlined the scientific aspects of setting quotas. He added that establishing and managing quotas were quite separate and that any further work should be limited to management issues. The Committee agreed to discuss these issues again later in the meeting.

Later in the meeting the Secretariat introduced document AC19 Doc. 7.1 and encouraged members of the Committee to consider how best to collaborate with the Working Group on Technical Implementation Issues.

Mr Althaus (AC Chairman) reminded the Plants Committee that the scientific committees should only present ideas on how to address the technical implementation issues. The PC Chairman requested that the Management Authorities represented at the meeting suggest technical issues that the Committee could assist in. Mr Benítez suggested that a small group be set up with representatives of the AC and PC to look at the issues. Observers with expertise in this subject offered to send to the Chairman a list of ideas on how to achieve good collaboration with the Working Group on Technical Implementation Issues.

The Secretariat introduced document AC19 Doc. 7.2 for information. The Committee offered to comment on reports from the Export Quota Working Group and requested to be kept informed about its progress.

8. Working programme for the Plants Committee until the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

8.1 Resolutions and Decisions directed or related to the Plants Committee (PC13 Doc. 8.1)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and emphasized the deadline for submitting documents to the Secretariat for discussion at CoP13 (5 May 2004). It recommended to the Committee that it elect a representative to join the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group, pursuant to Decision 12.21. The Committee agreed that one of the representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean would participate in this working group on behalf of the Plants Committee.

The Chairman noted that the Committee should consider all the Decisions directed to it, and the short time-frame available to deal with those decisions. She recommended to the Committee that it decide on realistically achievable goals within the time-frame set, prioritize its workload, and explain to the Parties at CoP13 its reasons for choosing those priorities. She recommended that the Committee establish a working group to prioritize the decisions directed to the PC. The Committee established a working group (working group 1) to produce at the present meeting a prioritized working programme for the period until CoP13. This working group comprised all members of the Plants Committee and the Secretariat, and the Vice-Chairman acted as Chair.



Later in the meeting the Chairman of working group 1 reported its recommendations as outlined in document PC13 WG1 Doc. 1. Following discussions, the Committee adopted the group's recommendations with the following amendments:

- a) Give a high priority to identifying activities as requested in Action Point 4.6.1 of the PC Action Plan; and
- b) Give a low priority to Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP12), Annex 2, paragraph h) (Action Point 2.1.2 of the PC Action Plan).

The Committee requested that the Secretariat send the amended document to each regional representative. It also agreed that this new document would be available to observers at the meeting on request.

Mr. Leach asked the Secretariat to clarify exactly what Resolutions were referred to in Decision 12.11, paragraph e). The Secretariat explained that it referred to two Resolutions: Resolution Conf. 9.19 on Guidelines for the registration of nurseries exporting artificially propagated specimens of Appendix-I species and Resolution Conf. 11.11 on the Regulation of trade in plants. The Chairman recommended to the Committee that it establish a working group to clarify the language and terms used in Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11. She added that the group should prepare materials to explain clearly these Resolutions to enforcement agencies and should comprise equal representation from Management and Scientific Authorities, and equal representation of speakers in the three working languages of the Convention. The Committee established a working group (working group 2) comprising a representative of the Management Authority of Chile, representatives of the Management Authority and Scientific Authority of France, a representative of the Scientific Authority of Mexico, representatives of the Management Authority and Scientific Authority of the United States of America (Chairman), and the Secretariat, to work on this task.

Later in the meeting the Chairman of working group 2 made the following oral report:

The Plant Resolutions Working Group held a brief organizational meeting on 13 August 2003 to establish terms of reference and a framework. The group decided that its terms of reference would be to:

- a) *limit its review to Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11;*
- b) *focus primarily on clarification of current wording rather than substantive changes to the text; and*
- c) *report at PC14.*

The Chairman of the working group (the Scientific Authority of the United States) will contact the other members of the group (Management Authority of Chile, Management and Scientific Authorities of France, Scientific Authority of Mexico, Management Authority of the United States and Mr Ger van Vliet of the Secretariat) by e-mail shortly after the conclusion of PC13 to obtain initial suggestions for revisions. The Chairman will incorporate these suggestions into draft revised documents and circulate to the working group. Through an iterative process, the working group will refine the revised documents and submit them at PC14.

The Committee agreed that working group 2 would prepare draft revisions of Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11 for consideration at PC14, and that it would decide at that meeting whether to submit amendments to these Resolutions at CoP13.



9. Follow-up of CoP12 Decisions

9.1 *Harpagophytum* spp.

9.1.1 Implementation of Decisions (PC13 Doc. 9.1.1)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item.

Mr Donaldson remarked that although *Harpagophytum* spp. were not CITES-listed they generated more interest in Africa than many CITES-listed species. He reported on the study by South Africa of the biology and social importance of *Harpagophytum* spp. He agreed to present, within the deadlines provided in Decisions 12.63 and 12.64, a document for consideration at PC14 on the biology and socio-economic importance of *Harpagophytum* spp. Finally, he added that a sentence on *Harpagophytum* spp. in the on-line press release was misleading and recommended its removal. The Chairman concurred that it should be removed if it was inaccurate. The Committee agreed with this recommendation.

9.1.2 Implementation of Decisions in Namibia (PC13 Doc. 9.1.2)

Mrs Hamunyela (observer from Namibia) reported on the work done pursuant to Decisions 12.63 to 12.65.

Mr Schippmann commented that few other population studies of wild-collected plants involved nationwide surveys, and that Namibia had set a good example with their study. He added that Germany had recently supported two projects in Namibia, a national survey of the distribution of *Harpagophytum* spp. and a model project on sustainable collection. He added that Germany was very concerned about the potential financial impacts on the San people of Namibia of the development of a market for artificially propagated *Harpagophytum* spp.

Mr. Kathe (observer from TRAFFIC) reported that TRAFFIC and WWF-Europe had compiled a report for the Food and Agriculture Organization looking at all aspects of the trade in *Harpagophytum* spp. He stated that their findings were that i) the actual quantities of *Harpagophytum* spp. consumed were not clear, ii) that most German companies did not believe that certification of sustainably harvested *Harpagophytum* spp. was a big market, and iii) that artificial propagation of *Harpagophytum* spp. would threaten the livelihoods of the San people.

Mr Ó'Críodáin (observer from the European Commission) reported that the European Union (EU) would address the issues identified by TRAFFIC and that it agreed in principle to listing *Harpagophytum* spp. on Annex D of the European Union. He stated that this would allow the monitoring of imports into the European Union by means of EU import notifications.

Ms Oldfield (observer from Fauna and Flora International, FFI) reported that FFI would soon publish its findings on the trade in *Harpagophytum* spp. She added that the study had focused on the financial returns to the harvesters and encouraged the Committee to look at the draft report when available.

Mr Kiehn (observer from Austria) remarked that links between CITES and the CBD would be discussed later in the meeting, and that the *Harpagophytum* spp. scenario was a good example of how the two Conventions could be closely linked.

The Committee congratulated Namibia, Germany and South Africa on their population study, harvest management and market development for *Harpagophytum* spp. The Committee agreed that this was a model example of how range States, regional representatives and consumer countries could work together to provide recommendations on how to exploit a wild resource sustainably. The Committee cited



this particular case as a model example of the implementation of Decision 12.11, paragraph k), and of how sustainable trade could be developed. The Chairman requested Germany to convey the support of the Committee to German companies trading in sustainably collected specimens of *Harpagophytum* spp.

Mr Berney (observer from IWMC) recommended that there be a press release by the CITES Secretariat outlining the studies of *Harpagophytum* spp. discussed at the meeting.

The Committee recommended that Germany and Namibia provide a summary of their research to the Secretariat for inclusion in its report for PC14, with the intention of presenting it as a case study at CoP13.

9.2 *Guaiaicum* spp. (PC13 Doc. 9.2)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and invited the Committee to decide on how to address Decision 11.114 (Rev. CoP12). It also drew the attention of the Committee to document PC13 Inf. 7 in which Cuba requested support to implement this Decision.

Mr Benítez summarized the progress of current research on the population status and management of *Guaiaicum sanctum* in Mexico, as outlined in document PC13 Inf. 2. He stated that Mexico would be willing to cooperate and share information with Cuba regarding studies of *Guaiaicum* spp. and that he would send Cuba the Project Research Protocol.

Mr Schippmann clarified that the financial support from the German Government to carry out population studies of wild *Guaiaicum* spp. was to fund the current research project on the population status of *Guaiaicum sanctum* in Mexico.

The Committee congratulated Germany, Mexico and the United States of America for their work on this project. The Committee encouraged Mexico to develop and to implement this project so that it can serve as a model to other range States of *Guaiaicum* spp. of how to make non-detriment findings, and especially to Cuba who was seeking financial support to study *Guaiaicum* spp. in its territory, as outlined in document PC13 Inf. 7.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that Decision 11.114 (Rev. CoP12) had not been addressed specifically to Mexico and requested the Secretariat to provide information on possible sources of funding to support a project in Cuba.

Following a query from Mr Jorge Alvarez regarding the status of a request for financial support to study *Guaiaicum*, Mr Ó'Críodáin reported that the European Union had called for proposals to study CITES timber species but had no record of receiving a proposal from Mexico. He advised the Committee that three proposals were in consideration but could not reveal any more information until a final decision had been made as to acceptance. The Chairman asked Mr Ó'Críodáin to look into this matter and the latter agreed.

9.3 *Aquilaria* spp.: progress report (PC13 9.3)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item.

Mr Kathe reported on the research of TRAFFIC, in collaboration with IUCN, on the sustainable utilization of *Aquilaria* spp. in Indonesia. He encouraged Parties to provide additional funding for this project.

Mr Leach reported on anecdotal evidence that the quality and quantity of agarwood of Papua New Guinea had been declining and that some traders had been looking for new sources. He commented that a forthcoming *First International Agarwood Conference* in Vietnam would be an excellent opportunity for Parties to promote CITES involvement in this issue. Finally, he stated that some Parties may wish to consider proposing the listing of agarwood producing species on Appendix III at CoP13. He advised Parties to consider whether an Appendix III-



listing would be useful, and whether enforcement agencies could identify the different species of agarwood.

Following discussions, Mr Amarjit Singh (observer from Malaysia) submitted the following statement.

Thank you Madam Chairman for permitting us to provide comments on a concluded agenda item. With regard to the view of the representative of Oceania to include other species of Aquilaria in Appendix III, Malaysia is of the view that this should only be considered after the conduct of a proper scientific study. This is because not all Aquilaria spp. are in danger of extinction.

9.4 Review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) (PC13 Docs. 9.4.1-9.4.3)

The Chairman introduced this agenda item and outlined a proposed approach for completing the review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12). She stated that the proposed review should be carried out between the current meeting and PC14, and that, if possible, the AC and the PC should have at least one joint working day on the review. Mr Leach added that it was critical for the PC to not diverge too much from the work of the AC on this matter. The Chairman agreed and stated that if the proposal was adopted then the PC should strongly recommend the AC to follow the same process.

Mr Donaldson expressed concern over the large range of plant life histories in the list of taxa chosen to review Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12). He recommended that some Parties look at taxa with subtly different life histories, allowing them to identify problems with the application of the criteria. The Chairman replied that the list could be changed and it was up to Parties to decide on the taxa they would choose. Mrs Davila observed that species with some different life forms were missing, like palms and species from *Yucca* spp. and *Nolina* spp.

Mr Javier Alvarez (observer from the United States of America) recommended to the Committee that it establish a working group to revise document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3. He reminded the Committee that there were several issues that the PC and AC had to address together and commented that a single day of joint meetings between the two Committees may not be enough to cover all the necessary issues.

The AC Chairman informed the Committee that he had not had the opportunity to discuss document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 with the AC. He added that the AC intended to refine the text of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) before testing the criteria with taxa, in contrast to the proposed approach of the PC. Mr McGough (observer from the United Kingdom) stated that the review process of the PC required less work than that of the AC approach. He urged the PC to follow the approach proposed by the Chairman. This was supported by Mr Leach, Mr Jorge Alvarez, who stressed the importance of including taxa about which enough information is available, Mr Javier Alvarez, and Mr Ó Críodáin.

The Committee adopted the proposed approach for completing the review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12), as outlined in document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3. It established a working group (working group 3) to decide on the taxa that would be used to review the listing criteria in the Chair's text (document PC13 Doc. 9.4.2) and to look at the timetable for this exercise. Working group 3 comprised one PC representative from each of the five regions as well as the observers from Canada, China, Mexico, the United Kingdom, the United States (Chairman), the European Commission, Fauna and Flora International, IUCN, TRAFFIC, and the Chairman of the Animals Committee. The Committee recommended that the Animals Committee follow the same approach as much as possible.

Later in the meeting the Chairman of working group 3 reported on the progress of the group. He introduced document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev. 1) and invited the Committee to adopt the revised proposed approach for completing the review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12).



There was general discussion on the taxa that should be used in the criteria review and on the Parties that should be responsible for conducting the review. The PC Chairman asked the United States, the United Kingdom and Spain to refine the Chair's text (document CoP12 Com. I. 3) with the help of the Secretariat, and that it then be posted on the CITES website.

Mr McGough informed the Committee that the United Kingdom would compile guidelines on conducting the criteria review, and offered to make them available in the form of a manual. Mr Javier Alvarez said that he would assist the United Kingdom with this task and offered to translate the document into Spanish. He requested the assistance of France with translating the document into French.

Mr Gabel recommended that the Secretariat send a Notification to the Parties requesting their comments on document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev. 1). However the Chairman favoured posting it on the CITES website and setting up a permanent page detailing results of the criteria review without further ado.

The Committee adopted the approach proposed by working group 3 for completing the review of the listing criteria and the proposed list of taxa to evaluate the draft revised criteria, as outlined in document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev.1). It instructed Mr Forero and Mrs Mereles (regional representatives of South and Central America and the Caribbean) and Mr Martínez, Mr Olave and Mrs Saavedra (observers from Chile) to invite Argentina, as it was not represented at the meeting, to conduct the reviews on *Araucaria araucana* and *Morchella* spp. Should it not be possible for Argentina to do so, the Committee agreed that these species be eliminated from the review. The Committee decided that the Chairman would coordinate the whole process with the assistance of the Secretariat. The Committee instructed the Secretariat to post document PC13 Doc. 9.4.3 (Rev. 1) on the CITES website as well as the taxonomic reviews, in the language in which they would be submitted, by the agreed deadline. Translations of these reviews would be posted as soon as possible thereafter. Subsequent comments received by the agreed deadline would also be posted.

10. Technical proposals from the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

10.1 Definitions of the technical terms used in the annotations of medicinal plants ... (no document)

The Committee noted the presentation by Mr Schippmann on *What parts and derivatives are controlled for a plant without # annotation*. The Committee noted that it was not widely understood that when a plant species was included in Appendix II or III with no annotation, parts and derivatives were not covered by the provisions of the Convention.

Mr. McGough reported that he had stated at CoP12 the importance of including the seeds of Malagasy palm species in any listing on the CITES Appendices, but that his recommendation had not been adopted. He recommended to the Committee that it find ways of increasing the time available for considering plant issues at the CoPs to allow all Parties to consider fully the implications of a proposal.

Mr Berney stated that the meaning of annotating species listings had become unclear and recommended that the Secretariat review the annotations in the Appendices. Mr Ó'Críodáin said that any amendment to the annotations would have to be adopted at CoP13. He recommended that the Secretariat draw this issue to the attention of the SC.

The Chairman reported that Customs officers sometimes had difficulty in understanding the annotations to the Appendices. She recommended that the Secretariat prepare a document for consideration at PC14 that would outline the amendments needed to clarify the annotations. She also recommended to the Secretariat that it consult the range States of the species that may be affected by such amendments in the preparation of the document. The Committee agreed with these proposals.

Mr Berney requested clarification from the Secretariat on whether it would consider proposing amendments to the annotations of medicinal plant taxa on the Appendices, including adding



details to the annotations. The Chairman confirmed that additional annotations would also be considered as part of the review.

The Committee noted the presentation by Mr Schippmann on *Annotations for CITES Medicinal Plants*.

Mr Kiehn commented that Mr Schippmann had highlighted two related issues: the need for better definitions of terms referring to medicinal plant parts and derivatives and the need to harmonize the language used in the annotations.

Mr Allain (observer for France) stated that the pharmaceutical profession did not use clear terminology for medicinal plants. He added that some enforcement agencies already had a harmonized coding system in English, French and Spanish for medicinal plant derivatives, although this terminology differed from that used in CITES.

The Chairman added that funding should be sought to fund work on clarifying the terminology used for medicinal plants, and suggested that TRAFFIC be hired to do this study.

Mr Schippmann stressed that Customs officers were the user group who had to understand the terms used. He said that Customs officers probably did not need the full interpretation of the terminology used in the pharmaceutical industry. He supported the proposal to contract a consultant to work on the problem and suggested that the IUCN Medicinal Plants Specialist Group may be able to assist in such a project.

Mr Ó'Críodáin added that the judiciary also needed to interpret the medicinal plant annotations. He advised that the terminology also needed to include more elaborate definitions so that all courts would use the same definitions.

The Committee recommended that a consultant be contracted to identify problems that may arise through unclear annotations to CITES medicinal plants. It also established a supervisory group (supervisory group 1) including the representatives of North America and South and Central America and the Caribbean, and the observers from Canada, France (Chairman), Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States to identify specific problems in the current CITES Appendices for medicinal plants.

10.2 Artificially propagated orchid hybrids (no document)

The Chairman introduced this agenda item. She invited the Committee to recommend improvements to the annotations relating to *Phalaenopsis* hybrids and also requested comments from the floor on this issue.

Mr Benítez recommended that the Committee wait until there was more information on the effects of the current annotation on levels of trade in *Phalaenopsis* hybrids before making any more recommendations to change it.

The Committee agreed that the current inclusion of artificially propagated orchid hybrids in Appendix II was unsatisfactory and that it should continue looking for alternatives to the current listing.

10.3 Review of Resolutions on plants and plant trade (no document)

This agenda item was covered in the discussion of agenda item 8.1.

10.4 Determination of the definition of *Swietenia macrophylla* plywood (PC13 Doc. 10.4)

Mr Gabel introduced this agenda item and proposed an interim definition for *Swietenia macrophylla* plywood.

Mr McGough reported that he had received comments from the timber traders in the United Kingdom to support comments by ATBIT as outlined in Document PC13 Inf. 1.



The Secretariat said that it saw no problems with the proposed definition of *S. macrophylla* plywood but recommended that the attendees review document PC13 Inf. 1 which proposed an additional element to the definition of plywood proposed by the United States.

The Committee agreed to delay the decision on whether to adopt the proposed interim definition until the United States had had time to consider fully the comments in document PC13 Inf. 1.

Later in the meeting the United States made the following statement.

After conferring with the United States plant enforcement and Customs officials, the United States reported that, in response to document PC13 Inf. 1, they have the following comments:

- a) *regarding units of measure, m² should be used as a preferred unit of measure, not mandatory, when available;*
- b) *regarding modification of the United States proposed definition by limiting it to sheets with plies not exceeding 6 mm in thickness (document PC13 Inf. 1). This could cause confusion because it would create a new CITES definition for 'plywood' that does not match the first-level definition of 'plywood' provided in the Harmonized System of the Wood Customs Organization. Furthermore, without further analysis of the trade in this commodity, it would be difficult to know what the implications would be if plywood with plies greater than 6 mm thickness were excluded.*

The United States reminded the PC that this is just an interim suggested definition that Parties might use and will be referred to the Mahogany Working Group for consideration and further refinement, if needed.

The Committee adopted the proposed interim definition of *S. macrophylla* plywood as outlined in document PC13 Doc. 10.4. It advised that the square metre was the preferred unit of measure to report such shipments of *S. macrophylla*, but that the cubic metre was also acceptable.

11. Species proposals for the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

As agreed in the closed session, the Committee issued the following statement on listing proposals.

The Plants Committee expresses its concern over the approval at the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP12) of proposals to amend the Appendices that were not based on the best scientific information available and that were not presented in the format provided for in Resolution Conf. 9.24.

These problems were exacerbated by the fact that proposals were considered at CoP12 within a severely curtailed debate owing to time constraints.

Given the current efforts to review the Appendices and the criteria to ensure that CITES can be properly implemented, it is essential that proposals are based on the most reliable scientific data available and are presented in an agreed format.

The Committee strongly urges the provision of full information as required in Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 6. The Committee further encourages Parties to submit draft proposals to the technical committees (AC/PC) in a timely manner to allow for additional comments and refinement.

The Committee recommends, therefore, that proper planning and established procedures be followed to ensure that such situations are not repeated in the future.

The Committee also asked the Secretariat to suggest to the SC and the AC that plant proposals be considered before animal proposals at CoP13.

**11.1 Annotations for certain artificially propagated orchid hybrids (PC13 Doc. 11.1)**

The Chairman introduced this agenda item.

Mr Lüthy presented a proposed annotation to exclude certain artificially propagated orchid hybrids from CITES controls.

Mr Gabel stated that he was unable to decide whether to support the proposed annotation because the United States needed more time to consider its implications. He stated that the United States would give the document more attention if it were to be submitted as a proposal at CoP13.

Mr Benítez recommended to the Committee that it wait to see if the current annotation for *Phalaenopsis* was working before deciding on further annotations for Orchidaceae. Mr Lüthy stated that Switzerland was happy with the current *Phalaenopsis* annotation but added that it did not cover a large volume of imports of artificially propagated hybrids. Mr Gabel reported that the United States had completed preliminary investigations into how well the *Phalaenopsis* annotation was working. He added that the United States would query the major countries involved in the orchid trade over how well the annotation was working and enquire as to whether they support the proposal from Switzerland.

The Committee thanked Switzerland for its work on the preparation of annotations for artificially propagated orchid hybrids and urged it to continue working on this project.

Mr Kwan (observer from China) commented that he understood why some artificially propagated orchid hybrids should not be subject to the Convention, but he remained concerned that some Customs officers may not properly enforce an annotation excluding orchid hybrids from controls. The Chairman replied that the Parties should consider both the prevention of smuggling and the desire to exclude artificially propagated orchid hybrids from CITES controls when discussing this issue. Mrs Irawati asked Switzerland to clarify if its proposed annotation applied to specific hybrids or to all artificially propagated Orchidaceae hybrids. Mr Lüthy replied that the proposed annotation applied to all artificially propagated orchid hybrids but that Switzerland would consider amending the proposal.

Mrs Sprotte (observer for Germany) stated that the burden of implementing the Appendices lay with enforcement agencies. She added that this made it essential for Parties to ensure that there were sufficient identification materials to assist Customs officers in implementing new annotations.

11.2 Specimens in international trade under exemption (PC13 Doc. 11.2)

Mr Lüthy introduced this agenda item and presented a draft proposal to clarify the interpretation of the Appendices in order to avoid complications with the re-export of specimens that legally entered international trade under exemptions from the provisions of the Convention. The Secretariat added that, under this proposal, Box 5 on CITES permit applications would be used for indicating that specimens originally entered international trade under exemption.

Mr Schürmann asked how frequently the case of originally exempt plants re-entering trade as non-exempt plants arose. He added that exporters are only required to indicate on the permit application form that their plants had originally been legally imported under CITES exemption. The Chairman commented that this was a frequent problem, especially in the orchid trade. She said that Thailand and Sri Lanka, for example, had well developed plant propagation industries that exported large quantities of flaked seedlings which were exempt from CITES controls. She added that these plants needed CITES permits as soon as their containers were opened and it was unclear how to indicate this on the CITES permit.

Mr McGough reported that the exemption of flaked seedlings from CITES controls had been a source of detrimental trade for some orchid taxa. He said that this was because some



authorities had not applied the correct definition of artificial propagation when granting CITES permits. He said he supported the technical change proposed by Switzerland but asked that the Secretariat remind the Parties to apply the definition of 'artificial propagation' properly.

Mr Benítez commented that the scenario outlined in paragraph 2 (d) of document PC13 Doc. 11.2 should never happen because specimens exchanged for scientific purposes should never enter commercial trade. He requested that Switzerland specify exactly what exemption their proposed annotation was intended to address.

In response to Mr Benítez's former comment, Mr Jorge Alvarez replied that specimens originally exchanged under the scientific institution exemption could eventually enter trade. He advised that Mexico had received requests from scientific institutions that wanted the right to have access to the genetic resources of specimens held in their collections.

Mr Gabel stated that 'country of origin' was already defined in Resolution Conf. 12.3 and recommended to Switzerland that it revise its draft proposal to recommend a revision of the definition of 'country of origin' in that Resolution. He proposed the addition of new text to the end of the proposed amendment to the interpretation of the Appendices, such as:

, except in the case of plant specimens that no longer qualify for an exemption from the provisions of CITES owing to an annotation or Article VII, paragraph 6. In such instances, the country of origin is the first country to export the plant specimens that no longer qualify for an exemption.

Mr Gabel recommended to Switzerland that the draft proposal be revised to add similar language to Section I of Resolution Conf. 12.3 because having 'country of origin' defined in the body of the Resolution would ensure better implementation of this provision on specimens that no longer qualified for an exemption. He commented that the second option given in paragraph 3 of the proposal would not work on the current standard CITES form as there was not enough space for the explanation "Legally imported under an exemption from the prescriptions of the Convention" in the ISO country code block. However, he noted that such an explanation could be included in block 5 of the standard CITES form. Finally he added that the proposal could be revised to recommend that Resolution Conf. 11.11 be amended to emphasize that the trade in plants that no longer met the conditions of the exemption is regulated.

Mr Kiehn commented that "enter commercial trade" in paragraph 2 d) of the document was misleading and suggested replacing the phrase with "entered trade".

Mr Ó'Críodáin recommended that Parties obtain advice from Customs agencies on the draft proposal before deciding whether to support its adoption.

The Secretariat commented that the proposal from Switzerland was an effective solution to a specific problem. It stated that the example of detrimental trade cited by the United Kingdom warranted further investigation but should not affect the development of the proposal by Switzerland. He added that the situation referred to in paragraph 2 d) of the proposal had happened in the past and may happen again.

The Committee asked Switzerland to take into account the points raised in the discussion when preparing a further revision of its proposal for consideration at PC14.

11.3 Proposal to include *Caesalpinia echinata* in the Appendices (no document)

Mr Schippmann reported to the Committee on studies by the German Scientific Authority about the need to propose *Caesalpinia echinata* for inclusion in the Appendices.

Mr Ciambelli (observer from COMURNAT) reported on the International Pernambuco Conservation Initiative (IPCI), as outlined in document PC13 Inf. 4. He noted that the IPCI members would be concerned about a proposal to include *C. echinata* in Appendix II. He



explained that such an action would affect the professional bow makers' enthusiasm and involvement in a programme that could serve as an important example of community and industry involvement in species conservation. Consequently, he requested the Committee to consider all factors potentially affecting the conservation of *C. echinata* before deciding whether to recommend the submission of such a proposal.

Ms Oldfield added that FFI was supporting research by Rio de Janeiro Botanic Gardens in to *C. echinata* and was also working with a Brazilian NGO and the music industry of Brazil to raise awareness of this problem. She said that FFI would be willing to work of COMURNAT on this issue.

Mr Althaus doubted that the Swiss Government would support a proposal to include *C. echinata* in the Appendices because the major threats to its survival appeared to be local or national. He explained that an Appendix-II listing would be unlikely to address these problems.

Mr Martínez asked Mr Forero and Mrs Mereles whether they knew the opinion of Brazil on this matter. Mr Forero replied that he did not know it and added that regional representatives were often not informed when proposals were submitted. He suggested that regional representatives should be notified when a submitted proposal would affect one of the Parties in a region.

The Committee welcomed the Pernambuco Initiative as a possible model example of how to implement Decision 12.11, paragraph k). It recommended that Mr Forero and Mrs Mereles consult the Brazilian Management and Scientific Authorities about the possible listing of *C. echinata*. It also recommended that Germany wait for the response from Brazil before deciding on whether to present a draft proposal to list *C. echinata* for discussion at PC14. Mr Schippmann notified the Committee that Germany had already written to the Brazilian Management Authority asking if such a proposal would be supported. Mr Berney welcomed Germany's cautious approach. He emphasized that including *C. echinata* in the Appendices may not help protect it even if the criteria for its listing were met.

Mr Martínez added that the funding for the conservation of *C. echinata* came from exporters that were acting in the best interests of the species, and that it was the alternative uses of *C. echinata* habitat that threatened its survival. He asked Mr Forero and Mrs Mereles to keep Chile informed of future discussions on this matter.

The Chairman commented that this was another good example of involving industry to assist in species conservation. She added that this could also be used as an example to help explain the role of Appendix II because an Appendix-II listing would allow sustainable trade in this species and provide a framework for this to be enforced.

Mr Gabel commented that any proposal that may be developed for CoP13 to include *C. echinata* in the Appendices should include information on the quantity of the species in international trade in comparison to the quantity used domestically. He also requested that the proponents consider whether finished products should be included in the listing, noting potential implications for implementation of such a listing.

Malaysia made the following statement:

Malaysia is not a range State of this species but Malaysia would like to propose that more time be given to the range States, especially Brazil, to look into this proposal. On this matter, Malaysia would also like to stress its concern regarding the weakness of CITES in allowing every Party and also NGOs that do not have any interest in this particular species to put forward a proposal for its inclusion in the CITES Appendices without consulting the range States.



12. Significant trade in plants

The Committee noted the presentation by the Secretariat on *Plants Committee and the Resolutions and commended* its clarity. The Committee noted that this presentation would be useful as a tool to explain the Review of Significant Trade and recommended that it be made available for downloading from the CITES website.

Mr Kathe commented that the UNEP-WCMC trade data gave a wide range of relevant information for conducting a Review of Significant Trade. Mr McGough noted that these data did not cover illegal trade and would have inconsistencies due to the mis-declaration of shipments and unrecorded data. He recommended that the Committee consider the apparent lack of data for the trade in certain taxa.

The Secretariat reminded the Committee that Resolution Conf. 12.8 accommodated for the consideration of information that was additional to the UNEP-WCMC trade data when conducting a Review of Significant Trade. He added that in situations where Parties were concerned about the trade levels of certain taxa they should select these taxa irrespective of the UNEP-WCMC trade data.

12.1 Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade (PC13 Doc. 12.1)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and invited comments from the Committee.

The Chairman reiterated that the Committee was to draft terms of reference for an evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade and, additionally, had to carry out a Review of Significant Trade for selected taxa. She recommended that the Committee review the draft terms of reference and submit their comments to the Secretariat and AC.

Mrs Dávila pointed out a concern of the North American region related to the draft terms of reference, as it appeared that the Secretariat was in charge of coordinating the whole process and defining many aspects, while the mandate from the Conference of the Parties was directed to the Animals and Plants Committees. The Secretariat replied that this was a misunderstanding and clarified that it had only provided document PC12 Doc. 12.1 to support the two Committees.

The Committee established a working group (working group 4) to review the draft terms of reference in the Annex to document PC13 Doc. 12.1. The working group comprised a PC regional representative of Africa, Asia, North America and Oceania as well as observers from China, Malaysia, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the United States (Chairman), the European Commission, IUCN, TRAFFIC and UNEP-WCMC, the Chairman of the Animals Committee and the Secretariat.

Mr Gabel said that he did not fully agree with the second sentence in paragraph 4 of document PC13 Doc. 12.1 because there had been several cases of species being transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II at recent CoPs. He added that paragraph 5 of the same document was extremely negative about the significant trade process yet without quoting any examples where this was the case. The Secretariat reiterated that part of the purpose of the review would be to assess whether the negative perceptions outlined in paragraph 5 of document PC13 Doc. 12.1 were well founded.

Mr Leach commented that it was unclear whether paragraph 5 of document PC13 Doc. 12.1 referred to CITES-listed species or all species. He recommended that paragraph 1 b) of the draft terms of reference be changed to include specifically CITES-listed and non-CITES-listed species. The Chairman commented that there would be a lack of data for non-CITES-listed species, although if reliable data were available for such a species then it could be included in the Review of Significant Trade. Mr Schürmann reminded the Committee that action point 2.1.4 (see document PC13 Doc. 8.1) justified the inclusion of non-CITES species in the Review of Significant Trade. The Chairman agreed but emphasized that the data used must be from a reliable source and that the process should not place extra burden on those carrying out the review. The Secretariat added that any Review of Significant Trade for non-CITES species would depend on the availability of funding.



Mr Schürmann expressed concern over the short time-frame available to carry out the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade. The Secretariat agreed that more time to evaluate the Review of Significant Trade would be preferable but reminded the Committee that this was not what was decided at CoP12.

Later in the meeting the Committee noted the report by the Chairman of working group 4 (see document PC13 WG4 Doc. 1) and adopted the group's recommendations. It asked the United Kingdom to act as the link between the PC and the AC in order to finalize the Terms of Reference for the review.

12.2 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.8

12.2.1 Trade in plants from Madagascar (PC13 Doc. 12.2.1)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. Mr McGough summarized the progress of the United Kingdom in the Review of Significant Trade for plants from Madagascar, as outlined in document PC13 Inf. 8.

The Committee congratulated Madagascar, the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, and the Secretariat for their work on this project and noted that the study was a good model for future reviews.

Mr Gabel requested that the Secretariat i) make available the proceedings of the Review of Significant Trade Workshop in Madagascar to those attending the present meeting; ii) clarify whether the procedure for the Review of Significant Trade would have to be approved before the Review of Significant Trade for plants from Madagascar proceeded any further; and iii) clarify the situation with regard to the suspension of the issuance of CITES export permits by Madagascar.

The Secretariat replied that it would distribute the proceedings of that workshop and that the Review of Significant Trade process would have to be approved before it continue in Madagascar. It added that it would try to find out the current situation with regard to the issuance of CITES export permits by Madagascar.

Mr Luke commented that it was unfortunate that the regional representatives of Africa had not been invited to the workshop in Madagascar.

The Committee asked the Secretariat to support the attendance of regional representatives at workshops on significant trade or other CITES-related topics in their regions, in compliance with Decision 12.13.

Mr Kiehn commented on the collaborative project between Austria and Madagascar on the assessment of population data on Malagasy orchids and offered to share the information available with the consultants and the Malagasy CITES Authorities.

12.2.2 Cycads (PC13 Doc. 12.2.2)

Mr Donaldson introduced this agenda item and added that all the UNEP-WCMC trade data for Cycads had been analysed and that he had sent letters to all the range States requesting information on how they were implementing Article IV of the Convention. He recommended that similar information to that included in document PC13 Inf. 8 be produced for Cycads. He also informed the Committee that the final report on the *CITES Significant Trade Review of Cycads* would be completed by the end of September 2003.

Mr Donaldson clarified that the totals outlined in the Annex to document 12.2.2 were initial estimates of the levels of trade in Cycads and that the species numbers related to the species recognized by the Cycads specialist group.



Mr Leach added that Vanuatu should be added to the list if the intention was to include all range States. He added that he would contact Papua New Guinea and ask that they respond to the request for information from their regional representative.

Mr Jorge Alvarez stated that out of 114,000 specimens from a total of 14 species exported from Mexico between 1998 and 2002, only 96 of them had been of wild origin. TRAFFIC responded that it would amend its report to reflect that specimens of only 14 species had been exported from Mexico and not 45 as wrongly stated.

Mr Berney said that he was surprised by the comment in the Annex of document PC13 Doc. 12.2.2 on the surprisingly low numbers of Cycad seed recorded in international trade. He explained that the only Cycad seeds controlled by CITES were of the Appendix-I taxa. He said that since the Review of Significant Trade only covered Appendix-II taxa then that would explain why there were so few records. The Secretariat responded that in this particular case it had agreed that a consultant should also look at the data for Appendix-I species given the potential problem of Appendix-I taxa being traded as Appendix-II taxa.

12.2.3 Taxa for review

12.2.3.1 *Prunus Africana* (PC13 Doc. 12.2.3.1)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and thanked the Committee for its advice on suitable consultants to conduct a review of significant trade in *Prunus africana*.

12.2.3.2 *Aquilaria malaccensis* (PC13 Doc. 12.2.3.2)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. Mr Kathe informed the Committee that the final report of the review of significant trade in *Aquilaria malaccensis* would be completed by the end of September 2003.

12.2.3.3 *Pericopsis elata* (PC13 Doc. 12.2.3.3)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. Ms Oldfield informed the Committee that the final report of the review of significant trade in *Pericopsis elata* would be completed by the end of September 2003.

12.2.3.4 *Aloe* species from East Africa used as extracts (PC13 Doc. 12.2.3.4)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. Ms Oldfield informed the Committee that the final report of the review of significant trade in *Aloe* species from East Africa used as extracts would be completed by the end of September 2003.

13. Review of the Appendices

13.1 Timber species (PC13 Doc. 13.1)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and added that the Committee might wish to wait until the review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) had been completed before reviewing the timber species listed on the Appendices.

The Committee offered its assistance to any Party wishing to propose a change to the listing of any timber species on the Appendices.

Mr Leach expressed concern that species may be excluded from the review of the criteria because they had already been selected for the Review of Significant Trade. The Secretariat commented that this decision was made to avoid confusing the two reviews, and the Parties conducting those reviews.



The Committee agreed that the United States should proceed to find out how certain timber annotations are working and report these results at PC14.

13.2 Artificially propagated plants traded in great quantities (PC13 Doc. 13.2)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and added that the Committee might wish to wait until the review of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12) had been completed before reviewing the artificially propagated plants traded in great quantities listed on the Appendices. The Committee agreed to postpone further discussion on this issue until PC14.

13.3 Periodic review of animal and plant taxa in the Appendices (PC13 Do. 13.3)

Mr Javier Alvarez introduced this agenda item and requested the Committee to decide on: i) the proposed approach for the implementation of document SC49 Doc. 20.1; ii) the species to be reviewed; and iii) a time-frame over which the review should be conducted. The Chairman added that the PC and the AC should establish common guidelines for conducting the review.

Mr Donaldson recommended that the Committees review animal and plant taxa on the Appendices after reviewing the criteria for including species in the CITES Appendices. He therefore recommended that the Committees worked on establishing a common mechanism for reviewing the Appendices until the review of the listing criteria was completed.

Mr Luke commented that there was sometimes insufficient communication between Management and Scientific Authorities and advised that the Committee contact all those who would be concerned by the review. Mr Althaus emphasized that the review process should involve the range States of CITES taxa.

The Committee adopted the approach presented in document PC13 Doc. 13.3. It decided on the members who would join the Contact Group on the Review of the Appendices of the Animals Committee to review that document and to present a revised proposal at PC14. The contact group would therefore consist of the representatives of Africa (John Donaldson and Quentin Luke) and Oceania (Greg Leach), the observer from the United States (Javier Alvarez, Chairman) and UNEP-WCMC (Gerardo Fragoso), the observer from Spain at the Animals Committee (Carlos Ibero) and the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees.

14. Review of heavily traded non-CITES species

14.1 Review of heavily traded non-CITES species (PC13 Doc. 14.1)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item. The Committee noted this document and agreed to consider any draft proposals from Parties concerning heavily traded non-CITES species at PC14.

14.2 Evaluation of tree species [PC13 Doc. 14.2 (Rev.1)]

Mr Schürmann introduced this agenda item. The Committee congratulated the Netherlands on its work on this subject and asked that it reports on any progress at PC14.

Mr Leach reported on the regional capacity-building workshop held in Fiji in 2002. A questionnaire was developed at the workshop for participants to assess the extent of their knowledge of heavily traded species. With regard to tree species, both agarwood and santalum were identified. Mr Leach suggested that the questionnaire template and the information provided on tree species may be useful to the Netherlands for the proposed workshops and he offered to make this information available.

Mr Gabel reported that the United States would assist the Netherlands in organizing a workshop in North America and would work with the Netherlands to find funding for this.

**14.3 Project report on *Dalbergia melanoxylon* (no document)**

Ms Oldfield (observer from FFI) introduced this agenda item. She reported on the latest survey by FFI on the International Trade in *Dalbergia melanoxylon* and added that the full report was available from FFI. The Committee congratulated FFI on its work. Mr Luke added that it was worrying that there were no figures on the numbers of *D. melanoxylon* in the wild and the comparative levels being used in the music and carving industry.

15. Checklists and nomenclature**15.1 Progress report (PC13 Doc. 15.1)**

Mr McGough (botanist of the Nomenclature Committee) introduced this agenda item and also reported on the outcomes of the recent Nomenclature Committee meeting. The Chairman reminded the PC that Mr McGough was seeking help to find experts in particular taxa, especially experts that were from the range States of those taxa.

Mrs Gillett (observer from UNEP-WCMC) reported that the taxon-based checklists were needed to produce the UNEP-WCMC checklists. She requested feedback from the Committee on the 2003 edition of the UNEP-WCMC checklist.

Mr Benítez commented that he was not in full agreement with some changes in the standard nomenclature for certain bird taxa. He requested a clear explanation of how the Nomenclature Committee proceeded and operated. The Secretariat directed Mr Benítez to Annex 3 of Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP12) which outlined the Terms of Reference of the NC. Mr Benítez commented that Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP12) did not include a time-frame for sending documents and requested that this be stated formally. He added that it would be useful to Parties if the NC had more precise rules of procedure and would outline the full implications of adopting a standard reference. Mr Lüthy concurred with this statement adding that it was important when new standard nomenclature was proposed, that the proposal make it clear exactly what the effect would be.

Mr Schippmann asked what the status of the taxon-based checklists was now that the UNEP-WCMC checklist was the only standard reference adopted by the Parties. The Secretariat replied that the UNEP-WCMC checklist was the accepted reference. It commented that the main advantage of this system was that all names were contained in one volume and the same Resolution did not have to be amended at every CoP. Mr Gabel agreed on the usefulness of a single nomenclature reference but argued that this resulted in a long time period between the adoption of a new checklist and Parties actually receiving them. He said that he favoured the return to the old system of taxon-based checklists.

Mr Kiehn agreed that those working with CITES plants were suffering from a situation that was specific to the AC. He commented that plant checklists were useful tools to assist in the enforcement of the Convention. He added that the data in the taxon-based checklists was needed to produce the UNEP-WCMC checklists, and that the taxon-based checklists were more likely to be funded by external agencies.

The Committee agreed to assist the Nomenclature Committee in finding experts to review a number of draft checklists of CITES-listed plant taxa that were in preparation. The Committee asked Mr McGough to work with Mexico and Switzerland to resolve the issue regarding the clarification of the Terms of Reference for the Nomenclature Committee. The Committee agreed that taxon-based checklists were as valuable as the UNEP-WCMC *Checklist of CITES Species* and that the Resolution on Standard nomenclature should reflect this. It invited the Nomenclature Committee to consider proposing an amendment to Resolution Conf. 12.11 to this effect.

**15.2 Checklist of Succulent *Euphorbia*, new edition (no document)**

Mr Schippmann introduced this agenda item and informed the Committee of the imminent publication of a new edition of the *Checklist of Succulent Euphorbia*.

15.3 Checklist of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants, new edition (no document)

Mr Schippmann introduced this agenda item and informed the Committee of the imminent publication of a new edition of the *Checklist of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants*.

15.4 Preparation of CITES checklist for *Bulbophyllum* (Orchidaceae) (no document)

Mr Kiehn introduced this agenda item and requested comments from the Committee on the draft CITES checklist for *Bulbophyllum* (Orchidaceae).

The Committee commented on the preparation of the draft and recommended that Mr Kiehn work with the botanist of the Nomenclature Committee to produce the checklist.

16. Strategic Planning (PC): Action Plan of the Plants Committee

This item was discussed under Agenda item 8.1.

17. ID Manual: progress report (PC13 Doc. 17)

The Committee noted the progress report on the ID manual, presented by the Secretariat, and congratulated Switzerland on the production of useful identification material for taxa of the genera *Aloe*, *Pachypodium* and *Euphorbia* (succulent taxa only).

The Chairman reminded the Committee that when Parties proposed to include taxa in the Appendices they were obliged to produce identification materials for those taxa if the proposal is accepted.

Mr Lüthy added that the United Kingdom could add the information on the Malagasy species to their Review of Significant Trade for Malagasy plants.

18. Guidelines for transport of live plants (no document)

Mr von Arx (observer from Canada) introduced this agenda item. The Committee welcomed the update of the *IATA Perishable Handbook*. It decided that Canada and Mrs Dávila would be the Committee's contact point with IATA to assist in the production of future updates of the handbook.

Mr Gabel informed the Committee that the United States would support the development of a standard form for notifying the country of export/re-export of incidents when clearance was delayed because of lack of compliance with the guidelines. He added that this form would be separate from any notification concerning the seizure of plants shipments because of non-compliance with CITES. He stated that the United States would be willing to assist in the development of a standardized form.

19. Relationship between *in situ* conservation and *ex situ* production in plants (PC13 Doc. 19)

The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and agenda item 25.1 on Plant production systems (document PC13 Doc. 25.1). Mrs Haywood (observer from IUCN) then presented document PC13 Inf. 6.

Mr Gabel commented that it was not clear how the issues in documents PC13 Doc. 19 and PC13 Doc. 25.1 related to international trade in endangered species. He added that document PC13 Doc. 19 made no reference to the work of the AC on these issues and recommended the establishment of a working group, comprising members of both the PC and the AC, to address both documents and present a joint report to the Committee.



Mr Benítez commented that the documents were helpful because there was a need to clarify the definitions of production systems. Mr Kiehn explained that including extra information when describing production systems would be especially useful for Parties making non-detriment statements. He added that another incentive for adopting this system would be to give information on the impacts of *ex situ* propagation on *in situ* conservation.

The Committee asked the Secretariat to send the final IUCN report to the members when it would become available. The Committee agreed to take the forthcoming IUCN report into account before deciding on how to implement Decision 12.11, paragraph l), at PC14. The Committee recommended the Secretariat to wait until after PC14 before deciding on sending the Notification to the Parties contained in the Annex to document PC13 Doc. 19.

20. Links with industry and traders to promote projects on sustainable use (no document)

The Committee agreed that the activities related to the conservation of and trade in *Harpagophytum* spp. (see agenda item 9.1) and *Caesalpinia echinata* (see agenda item 11.3) met the requirements of Decision 12.11, paragraph k). The Committee decided to re-consider this issue at PC14 in order to present examples of best practice at CoP13.

21. Role of Appendix II (no document)

The Committee agreed that the process that had led to the inclusion of *Guaiacum* spp. in Appendix II (see agenda item 9.2) was a good example of how Decision 12.11, paragraph m), could be implemented. The Committee decided to re-consider this issue at PC14 in order to present examples of best practice at CoP13.

22. Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (CBD): Analysis and links with CBD (no document)

IUCN introduced document PC13 Inf. 11. The Committee established a working group (working group 5) to look at ways for the PC to assist in the implementation of the CBD Global Strategy for Plant Conservation. This working group comprised the regional representative of Oceania and observers from Austria, Mexico, FFI (Chairman), IUCN and UNEP-WCMC.

Later in the meeting the Committee noted the report by the Chairman of working group 5 (see document PC13 WG5 Doc. 1) and adopted the group's recommendations. It instructed the group to report on its progress with this issue at PC14.

23. Other issues resulting from PC12 (no document)

There were no other issues resulting from PC12 that needed to be addressed.

24. Training initiatives

24.1 Standard slide package: progress report (PC13 Doc. 24.1)

Mr McGough introduced this agenda item and reported that slides had now been replaced by PowerPoint presentations which were less costly and more flexible to produce. The Committee congratulated the United Kingdom on the production of the PowerPoint presentations. The Committee established a contact group (contact group 2) to develop a directory of capacity-building materials. The contact group comprises observers from Germany, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States, and the Secretariat. The contact group is to decide at a later stage on its chairman.

24.2 Master's Course in Baeza, Spain, 2003 (no document)

The Committee noted the oral report of the Chairman.



25. Production systems involving CITES-listed species and their impact on wild populations – source code designations

25.1 Plant production systems PC13 Doc. 25.1

This Agenda item was discussed together with item 19.

26. Time and venue of the 14th Plants Committee meeting (no document)

The Committee accepted with gratitude the offer from Namibia to host the 14th meeting of the Plants Committee in February 2004. It also decided to consider the feasibility of holding PC15 in a country other than Switzerland.

27. Any other business

27.1 Annotations of parts and derivatives (no document)

This agenda item was covered in the discussion of Agenda item 10.1.

27.2 Artificially propagated *Tillandsia xerographica* from Guatemala and the Philippines (no document)

Mr Schürmann introduced this agenda item, as outlined in document PC13 Inf. 5. The Committee agreed with the recommendation to contact the Management Authorities of Guatemala and the Philippines and instructed Mr Forero, Mrs Irawati, Mrs Mereles, Mr Singh and Mr Schürmann to do this.

28. Closing remarks

The Chairman thanked the Plants Committee and the observers for their constructive spirit and their cooperation in arriving at the decisions that had been taken. She also thanked the Secretariat for organizing the meeting the interpreters for their support throughout the meeting and Mr Mustard for his excellent job as rapporteur.