

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



Twenty-first meeting of the Plants Committee
Veracruz (Mexico), 2-8 May 2014

Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

Species trade and conservation

Standard nomenclature [Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP16)]

REPORT OF THE SPECIALIST ON BOTANICAL NOMENCLATURE

1. This document has been prepared by the nomenclature specialist of the Plants Committee*.

Update on CITES Checklists

2. **The CITES Orchid Checklists:** A revision of Volume 1 (published 1995) of the Checklist which includes the widely traded genera *Paphiopedilum* and *Phragmipedium* cannot be completed at this time due to lack of resources. Work will recommence when resources are secured.
3. **The CITES Cactus Checklist:** Funding has finally been secured to allow the preparation of the third edition to go ahead. This update is the revision of CITES plant checklists most requested by CITES Parties and the Cactaceae are the group for which the nomenclature specialist receives most queries. It is clear that the revision is a priority. The editor of the checklist has now signed a contract to prepare the third edition based on *The New Cactus Lexicon* (DH Books, 2006). Based on recommendations made at previous meetings of the Plants Committee, the revision will include an account of *Opuntia* subgenus *Opuntia* and this will be one of the first products to be prepared by the editor. Sample texts of the checklist will be produced by the editor for review by the Plants Committee. The Plants Committee has previously discussed the format of the checklist in the Nomenclature Working Group. The format agreed at that time is included in Annex A to this document. Currently this is the format that the editor is working to and if any revisions are recommended a decision will be required as soon as possible. It is hoped that the revised checklist will be completed for approval by CoP17, with formal publication following that meeting. To facilitate approval, by the meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Plants Committee is asked to recommend experts in the range States for the editor to liaise with during the preparation of the checklist. Funding to support publication of the list, following CoP17, is currently being sought.
4. **The World List of Cycads:** The CITES standard reference is "The *World List of Cycads* (D.W. Stevenson, R. Osborne and K.D. Hill, 1995; In: P. Vorster (Ed.), Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Cycad Biology, pp. 55-64, Cycad Society of South Africa, Stellenbosch) and its updates accepted by the Plants Committee, as a guideline when making reference to names of species of Cycadaceae, Stangeriaceae and Zamiaceae."

* 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. As this version is now out of date the nomenclature specialist has worked with the editors of the latest version of *The World List of Cycads* to reformat it in a manner to make it more suitable for CITES use and to make it available for review by the Parties. To facilitate this process *The World List of Cycads* (Roy Osborne, Michael A. Calonje, Ken D. Hill, Leonie Stanberg and Dennis Wm. Stevenson. 2012. *In: Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Cycad Biology (CYCAD 2008)*, January 2008, Panama, City, Panama, *Memoirs of the New York Botanical Garden* 106: 480-510.) has been amended and reformatted as *CITES and Cycads: Checklist 2013* (Roy Osborne, Michael A. Calonje, Ken D. Hill, Leonie Stanberg and Dennis Wm. Stevenson) and included, as an annex, in the publication *CITES and Cycads a user's guide* (Rutherford, C. *et. al.*, 2013, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. UK). In this form the list is now available for comment and review by the Parties. Following review it will be put to the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties for approval.
6. **Dalbergia and Diospyros – Madagascar Checklist:** Decision 16.152 includes “that the Plants Committee shall recommend and facilitate the preparation of a standard reference for the names of *Diospyros* spp. (populations of Madagascar) and *Dalbergia* spp. (populations of Madagascar) to be adopted, if appropriate, at the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties”. The most suitable source for such a checklist is the *Catalogue of the Vascular Plants of Madagascar* and the nomenclature specialist will work with the authors and national experts to identify the most appropriate means of fulfilling this decision.

Other Issues

7. **Aloe species:** Experts on this genus have communicated to the nomenclature specialist recent changes in the taxonomy which may impact on the CITES listing. These changes have been outlined in a separate document submitted to the Plants Committee by South Africa. It is recommended that these issues be considered by a Nomenclature Working Group at this meeting.
8. **Cyathea species:** UNEP-WCMC has identified an area of confusion with the current listing of *Cyathea* spp. in the CITES Appendices which is giving rise to queries from the Parties. The text for the listing of *Cyathea* no longer includes the bracketed insert (Including *Alsophila*, *Nephelea*, *Sphaeropteris*, *Trichipteris*). Some Parties are now interpreting the listing to exclude these taxa from control and this is causing some confusion and queries to UNEP-WCMC and to the nomenclature specialist. There is no standard reference for Tree Ferns, in that case we revert to Mabberley (*The Plant-Book*, 1997, Second edition with corrections 1998) as a reference and Mabberley treats all of these genera as = *Cyathea*. To avoid future confusion it is recommended that the bracketed text be re-inserted to accompany the listing in the Appendices. The Plants Committee may also wish to consider whether a standard reference is required. When last discussed in a Nomenclature Working Group no agreement could be found with regard to an appropriate reference.

Summary

9. The Plants Committee is asked to convene a Nomenclature Working Group to:
 - a) Review the proposed format of the cactus checklist and recommend experts/ propose a mechanism by which the editor obtains names of appropriate experts/ in the cactus range States to liaise with during preparation of the list
 - b) Recommend a mechanism by which *CITES and Cycads: Checklist 2013* can be made most widely available to the Parties for review
 - c) Consider the mechanism by which the nomenclature elements of Decision 16.152 can be implemented by CoP17
 - d) Review changes in the taxonomy of *Aloe* species and consider what changes may be required in relation to the CITES listing or standard references
 - e) Consider the whether the text defining the listing of *Cyathea* spp. in the CITES Appendices should be re-inserted and also review the need for a standard reference for this group.

The CITES Cactus Checklist Format:

Page size: **Decision: A5.**

Content: Previous editions were in 3 part format. Part I - alphabetic list of names in current usage, Part II - list of accepted taxa with distributions and synonymy and Part III - Country Checklists. **Decision: Agreed.**

Reference data: For the second edition of the Cactus Checklist (CC2) the then Nomenclature Committee, based on a user survey, requested the inclusion of botanical authorities in the list of taxa. For CC3 the editor feels that this is of limited value as, for those consulting the list as a pointer for more information, the date and place of publication of each name listed would be of more assistance. Inserting this information in CC3, in full, would expand the list and possibly cause confusion to non-experts. An alternative would be to include all this data in a highly abbreviated form in order that it is restricted to one line of text. The data would then be available to those who require it. **Decision: Abbreviated list.**

Cross-Reference to the Cactus Lexicon: The editor and the nomenclature specialist recommend that the species entries be cross referenced to illustrations in *The New Cactus Lexicon*. A number of Parties have confirmed that they would find this useful. A similar cross referencing could also deal with the issues of botanical authorities and date and place of publication. **Decision: Agreed.**

Index numbers: It is proposed that CC3 be available as a web version in addition to a hardcopy publication. In the online version each name will have a unique database record number. It may be advantageous to include these numbers in the published version to allow ease of cross reference to the online version and the proposed online version of *The New Cactus Lexicon*. **Decision: No**

Page Column Format:

Single column format with botanical authorities as in Cactus Checklist 2, only amendment is cross reference to illustrations in the Atlas volume of *The New Cactus Lexicon* indicated by the symbol @. **Decision: No**

Single column format with database record number and abbreviated literature references as in *The New Cactus Lexicon* (an index of the abbreviations would be provided) plus cross reference to illustrations in the Atlas volume of *The New Cactus Lexicon* indicated by the symbol @. **Decision: Yes – without database record number.**

Two column format, with no authorities, references or database record numbers. **Decision: No**