

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP

1. This document has been prepared by the Chair of the Working Group on the Periodic Review (Patricia Dávila), with the assistance of the Scientific Authority of Mexico .

Background

2. At the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP15; Doha, 2010), the Management Authority of Switzerland presented document [CoP15 Doc. 55](#) on the *Trade in epiphytic cacti (Cactaceae spp.)*. The document highlighted the efforts in streamlining the listing of Cactaceae to exclude taxa not threatened by trade, and showed—through a preliminary survey of conservation status and international trade—that trade is not a major threat to epiphytic cacti, given that there is no evidence of significant commercial trade in wild specimens; and furthermore, that epiphytic cacti are propagated on an industrial scale in many nurseries worldwide in a very easy, fast and cheap manner. Finally, the document included in Annex 1 a draft Decision directed to the Plants Committee to review the listing of epiphytic cacti in Appendix II, focusing especially on the genera *Disocactus*, *Epiphyllum*, *Hatiora*, *Lepismium*, *Pseudorhipsalis*, *Rhipsalis* and *Schlumbergera*.
3. As a result of considering the above mentioned document, the CoP15 adopted [Decision 15.89](#) directed to the Plants Committee, as follows:

The Plants Committee shall assess trade in epiphytic cacti, considering the information of document CoP15 Doc. 55 and focusing especially on the genera Disocactus, Epiphyllum, Hatiora, Lepismium, Pseudorhipsalis, Rhipsalis and Schlumbergera. The Plants Committee shall consult with range States and if appropriate, encourage and support range States to submit proposals to exempt certain taxa of epiphytic cacti from Appendix II for consideration of the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties. If there are many range States for a certain taxon, rendering it difficult to allocate responsibilities, or if range States do not take action, the Plants Committee shall prepare such proposals.

4. In order to comply with Decision 15.89, during the nineteenth meeting of the Plants Committee (PC19; Geneva, 2011) the Chair of the Working Group on the Periodic Review introduced document [PC19 Doc. 14.1](#) on the *Assessment of trade in epiphytic cacti and review of listing of Cactaceae spp. in Appendix II (Decision 15.89)*. The document gives background on the current listing of epiphytic cacti in the Appendices and, most importantly, it includes a trade analysis of the seven genera mentioned in Decision 15.89 from data provided by the UNEP-WCMC for the period 1998-2008. As a result of this study, two groups of epiphytic cacti were identified:

- a) taxa at low risk from trade: traded as artificially propagated specimens and representing 99% of registered trade (specified in Annex 1 of the document); and,
- b) taxa at potential risk from trade: traded as specimens from wild (W), confiscated or seized (I), or unknown sources (U) (specified in Annex 2 of the document).

Additionally, based on the results of the study, the document recommended the Plants Committee to: a) begin a process of consultation with the range States of the species of the seven genera involved, raising the possibility of deleting them from App. II, taking into account their conservation status and possible look-alike problems; b) prepare, in conjunction with the Secretariat, a draft Notification to the Parties to be used for that consultation; and, c) present the results of that consultation at the 20th meeting of the Plants Committee.

The geographical designations employed in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the CITES Secretariat or the United Nations Environment Programme concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The responsibility for the contents of the document rests exclusively with its author.

5. The PC19 decided to incorporate the recommendations of document PC19 Doc. 14.1 into the mandate of PC19's Working Group of periodic review of plant species included in the Appendices ([PC19 WG09](#)). In this regard, and based on the recommendations of PC19 WG09, the Plants Committee agreed on the following:
- To request the Secretariat to send a Notification to range States regarding the possibility of exempting artificially propagated specimens of Appendix II epiphytic cacti included in Annex 1 of document [PC19 Doc. 14.1](#), and to request information about the conservation status and possible look-alike concerns of the taxa.
 - To prepare a Notification in conjunction with the Secretariat.
 - That the intersessional working group on periodic review would provide an update of the consultation with range States at PC20.
 - To note that, given the number of range States, the number of taxa involved and the complexity of the task mandated in Dec. 15.89, it would be difficult to accomplish the work during the intersessional period [PC19-PC20]. And,
 - To give due consideration to the implications of exempting the involved taxa through an annotation, which most likely would result in implementation challenges (e.g. laundering of wild specimens).

Actions taken

6. On September 21st 2011, the Secretariat issued [Notification No. 2011/038](#) on the *Periodic review of species included in the CITES Appendices*. Through paragraph 8 of such Notification, the Plants Committee invited range States to provide (by December 31 2011) information about the conservation status and possible look-alike concerns of the following species of epiphytic cacti (i.e. species listed in Annex 1 of document PC19 Doc. 14.1):

1	<i>Epiphyllum anguliger</i>
2	<i>Epiphyllum cartagense</i>
3	<i>Epiphyllum crenatum</i>
4	<i>Epiphyllum grandilobum</i>
5	<i>Epiphyllum guatemalense</i>
6	<i>Epiphyllum hookeri</i>
7	<i>Epiphyllum oxypetalum</i>
8	<i>Epiphyllum phyllanthus</i>
9	<i>Epiphyllum pittieri</i>
10	<i>Epiphyllum</i> spp.
11	<i>Epiphyllum thomsonianum</i>
12	<i>Hatiora gaertneri</i>
13	<i>Hatiora herminiae</i>
14	<i>Hatiora rosea</i>
15	<i>Hatiora salicornioides</i>
16	<i>Hatiora</i> spp.
17	<i>Hatiora x graeseri</i>
18	<i>Lepismium aculeatum</i>
19	<i>Lepismium bolivianum</i>
20	<i>Lepismium cruciforme</i>
21	<i>Lepismium houlettianum</i>
22	<i>Lepismium ianthothele</i>
23	<i>Lepismium lumbricoides</i>
24	<i>Lepismium micranthum</i>

25	<i>Lepismium monacanthum</i>
26	<i>Lepismium paranganiense</i>
27	<i>Lepismium</i> spp.
28	<i>Lepismium warmingianum</i>
29	<i>Pseudorhipsalis ramulosa</i>
30	<i>Pseudorhipsalis</i> spp.
31	<i>Rhipsalis baccifera</i>
32	<i>Rhipsalis baccifera</i> ssp. <i>horrida</i>
33	<i>Rhipsalis burchellii</i>
34	<i>Rhipsalis campos-portoana</i>
35	<i>Rhipsalis cereoides</i>
36	<i>Rhipsalis cereuscula</i>
37	<i>Rhipsalis clavata</i>
38	<i>Rhipsalis crispate</i>
39	<i>Rhipsalis dissimilis</i>
40	<i>Rhipsalis elliptica</i>
41	<i>Rhipsalis ewaldiana</i>
42	<i>Rhipsalis floccosa</i>
43	<i>Rhipsalis goebeliana</i>
44	<i>Rhipsalis grandiflora</i>
45	<i>Rhipsalis hoelleri</i>
46	<i>Rhipsalis lindbergiana</i>
47	<i>Rhipsalis mesembryanthemoides</i>
48	<i>Rhipsalis micrantha</i>

49	<i>Rhipsalis neves-armondii</i>
50	<i>Rhipsalis pachyptera</i>
51	<i>Rhipsalis paradoxa</i>
52	<i>Rhipsalis pentaptera</i>
53	<i>Rhipsalis pilocarpa</i>
54	<i>Rhipsalis puniceodiscus</i>
55	<i>Rhipsalis russellii</i>
56	<i>Rhipsalis</i> spp.
57	<i>Rhipsalis sulcata</i>

58	<i>Rhipsalis teres</i>
59	<i>Rhipsalis trigona</i>
60	<i>Schlumbergera kautskyi</i>
61	<i>Schlumbergera opuntioides</i>
62	<i>Schlumbergera orssichiana</i>
63	<i>Schlumbergera russelliana</i>
64	<i>Schlumbergera</i> spp.
65	<i>Schlumbergera truncata</i>
66	<i>Schlumbergera</i> x <i>buckleyi</i>

Progress achieved

7. No responses were received regarding paragraph 8 of [Notification No. 2011/038](#).
8. The Secretariat contracted a consultant (Mr. James E. Grogan) to develop the study “Assessment of trade in epiphytic cacti and review of listing of Cactaceae spp. in Appendix II (Decision 15.89)”, which is included as an Annex to this document.

In summary, the study consists of:

- a) A review and analysis of the conservation status of the seven genera of epiphytic cacti concerned.
 - b) An analysis of the UNEP-WCMC trade record for the seven genera under consideration during the period 1976-2010, detailing the methods followed based on a precautionary approach.
 - c) Conclusions and recommendations derived from the conservation and trade analysis. And finally,
 - d) A review of the listing of Cactaceae spp. in Appendix II.
9. The study’s main conclusions and recommendations on epiphytic cacti related to Decision 15.89 are as follows (the complete conclusions can be consulted in the Annex of this document):
 - a) Many epiphytic cacti species face significant threats to survival, especially in Brazil’s Atlantic Forest where habitat loss continues. But no species considered in this report appears threatened by wild collection for international trade. Unlike many epiphytic orchids, for example, market demand for wild-collected epiphytic cacti appears to be low, perhaps because floral characters of most species are relatively nondescript compared to the highly diverse Orchidaceae.
 - b) The trade analysis indicates that the epiphytic cacti do not meet the criteria of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) for inclusion of species in Appendix II, and should be considered for deletion. They are not frequently traded internationally except as artificially propagated specimens, and identification issues appear surmountable given the relatively small number of species involved and morphological categories represented.
 - c) If it is determined that the epiphytic cacti do not meet the criteria for inclusion on Appendix II, then Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15), Annex 2b, which states that species may be included in Appendix II if “... specimens of the species in the form in which they are traded resemble specimens of a species included in Appendix II”, does not apply to this group.

Recommendations to the Plants Committee

10. The Plants Committee is invited to:

- a) Take note of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the above mentioned study (Annex of this document); and
- b) Consider the pertinence of drafting and submitting an amendment proposal to de-list from Appendix II the seven genera of epiphytic cacti here discussed (i.e. *Disocactus*, *Epiphyllum*, *Hatiora*, *Lepismium*, *Pseudorhipsalis*, *Rhipsalis* and *Schlumbergera*), for consideration of the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP16), including identification materials to distinguish such genera from other non-epiphytic cacti.

Acknowledgments

11. The Chair of the Working Group on the Periodic Review and the Mexican Scientific Authority thank and congratulate Mr. Grogan for developing the study "Assessment of trade in epiphytic cacti and review of listing of Cactaceae spp. in Appendix II (Decision 15.89)", which has resulted in fundamental progress towards complying with Dec. 15.89.