

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

Twenty-third meeting of the Plants Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 22-27 July 2017

Species specific matters

Maintenance of the Appendices

Standard nomenclature

REPORT OF THE SPECIALIST ON BOTANICAL NOMENCLATURE

1. This document has been submitted by the nomenclature specialist of the Plants Committee*.
2. **Standard References adopted at CoP17:** The 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties adopted revised or new standard references for Cacti, Cycads, *Dalbergia* and *Diospyros* species of Madagascar and *Dypsis decipiens* and *Dypsis decaryi*. Parties are encouraged to feedback to the nomenclature specialist their experience and comments on using these revised lists in their day-to-day work as CITES authorities. It is important that there is feedback from those who use these checklists in Management Authorities, Scientific Authorities and enforcement agencies – whose role is increasingly important, especially in the case of the regulation of CITES listed timbers.
3. **Standard References requiring updates - Orchids:** The Orchid Checklists require updating, in particular Volume 1 published in 1995. This volume contains the highly traded Slipper Orchid genera. The most practical option here, and in the case of other traded orchid genera, is to produce downloads from on-line databases. This task has much in common with that outlined in Decisions 17.309-310, relating to time specific versions of on line databases for fauna nomenclature. The major institutions that hold such flora databases are likely to be willing to co-operate in the preparation and hosting of datasets, which would be tailored to CITES requirements. However, funding is required to cover the costs of the preparation of the “download” checklists by the institutions or organisations concerned. With relatively little funding, a programme of updates could be put in place for the major orchid taxa in trade.
4. **Standard References requiring updates – Generic Reference:** The Committee also needs to consider whether a replacement is required for the standard reference for the generic names of all plants listed in the Appendices, unless they are superseded by standard checklists adopted by the Conference of the Parties. Currently this is The Plant-Book, Second Edition [D.J. Mabberley, 1997 Cambridge University Press (reprinted with corrections 1998)]. This is now dated, and the Plants Committee should consider whether it be replaced by a new reference or whether it is in now more practical to consider any required generic update be carried out on a case by case basis, the latter option would give more flexibility in taking into account the views of range States in such decisions.
5. **Databases used by Parties:** As noted in the nomenclature report to the Conference of the Parties, countries are now making use of a range of on-line resources to assist them in their work, to garner information on species listed in the Appendices. These may be databases that, for example, hold information on a regional

* 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.

basis. Parties are encouraged to inform the nomenclature specialist of such databases and database and website managers are requested to provide information on data tools which may be of use to CITES Parties.

6. **Issues outstanding from the Periodic Review:** Following the revision of the Appendix I listing of *Sclerocactus* and adoption of the new edition of the Cactus Checklist a number of issues may still require some clarification. This includes some taxa within the genus *Glandulicactus*, and clarity with regard to their current status. The Nomenclature Specialist will liaise with relevant experts/range States to resolve any issues and report at PC24. With regard to the status of *Pachypodium enigmaticum* from Madagascar, it is recommended that this should be treated as an accepted species but it should be fully reviewed when the *Pachypodium* checklist is updated.
7. **New listings at CoP17 and priorities for future checklists (including Decisions 167-169):** Tree species dominated the new listings at CoP17. Within the tree listings, Rosewoods dominate, and in particular the full genus listing of *Dalbergia*. CoP17 adopted a preliminary list for the names of *Dalbergia* species (populations of Madagascar). With the *Dalbergia* CoP7 listing a review is required to look at options with regard to the provision of a “stable” list of names for the full genus. The issue of standard references for tree species is covered in Decision 17.167 and will be dealt with by an additional working group at PC23. However the Nomenclature Working Group should initially review checklist priorities for all taxa at PC23.
8. **Decisions adopted or updated at CoP17:** Decision 17.167 refers to nomenclature issues with regard to the prioritisation of standard references for tree species and the research and resource needs for same. This issue will be covered in detail in a working group dedicated to Decisions 17.166 – 17.169 at PC23. Decision 17.206 paragraph b) tasks the Plants Committee to continue supporting the preparation of a standard checklist for species of the genera *Diospyros* and *Dalbergia* occurring in Madagascar. Preliminary CITES checklists for these groups were adopted by CoP17, but revisions will be required based on on-going research. Decisions 17.314-317 relates to the use of the CITES Cactaceae Checklist (3rd edition) and asks Parties to report to the Secretariat on any issues that may arise on its use; the Secretariat to liaise with UNEP-WCMC on the utility of the Checklist and report to the PC the feedback it receives from Parties and UNEP-WCMC. PC23 should review any feedback available at this time. The working group on the cactus checklist at CoP17 also requested that a legend be inserted at regular intervals throughout the list to assist users with regard to the various symbols and abbreviations used. Due to pagination issues the editor could not do this throughout the list, however, post CoP17, a footnote was included on every page of the checklist referring to the legend included in the introduction to the list. Funding is now being sought to allow hard copy publication of the list in order that hard copies be available to the CITES community.
9. ***Caesalpinia echinata* (Pau-brasil):** Brazil has informed the Nomenclature Specialist of its concern with regard to potential illegal trade in Pau-brasil if Parties are not fully aware of recent name changes. *Caesalpinia echinata* Lam. has been revised to *Paubrasilia echinata* (Lam.) E. Gagnon, H.C. Lima & G.P. Lewis (published by Gagnon, E., Bruneau, A., Hughes, C.E., Queiroz, L.P. & G.P. Lewis, *PhytoKeys*, 71: 1–160., 2016). This is now the accepted name. As it is an endemic tree species from Brazil, the Brazilian CITES Management and Scientific authorities requested that the name be updated as quickly as possible to avoid potential confusion or mis-declarations in trade. *Caesalpinia echinata* is the name currently used in CITES, and to formally change it requires approval by a meeting of the Conference of the Parties. However as the next CoP is some time away, some actions are warranted to ensure Parties are aware of the new name of this iconic tree species. Potential actions include; including the new name in Species+ and issuing a Notification on the issue to inform Parties. Parties in the European Union may also consider including the information in the EU – TWIX system to inform the enforcement community of the new name.
10. **Nomenclature representation post CoP18:** The term for the Nomenclature Specialist on the Plants Committee expires at CoP18 and the current specialist will not seek re-election, having covered these issues for CITES plants since CoP8 in 1992. The position is currently not financially supported and the Committee may wish to consider whether such a situation will be viable post CoP18. The pool of potential specialists is relatively small and is further restricted when travel and subsistence costs are not covered. These restrictions effectively exclude specialists from developing countries being able to carry out the position. The workload is also likely to continue to increase with major tree genera being listed, which bring challenges in taxonomy and nomenclature. Botanical institutions, which are under financial stress globally, are also unlikely to release experts to work on these issues unless they receive some financial return, at least in terms of travel costs. The Plants Committee may therefore wish to consider various options by which the situation may be addressed.

11. **The Plants Committee is therefore asked to convene a Nomenclature working Group to:**

- a) Consider the need for Parties to provide feedback on the use of newly adopted checklists and on databases that they find useful as resources to assist them in their work;
- b) Make recommendations with regard to options to provide financial support for preparation of on-line updates of the CITES orchid checklists;
- c) Review options with regard to the update the standard reference for the generic names of all plants listed in the Appendices – and not covered by specific standard references;
- d) Support the Nomenclature Specialist in working with experts/range States in any outstanding issues from the Periodic Review;
- e) Note that *Pachypodium enigmaticum* be treated as an accepted species name but should be fully reviewed when the *Pachypodium* checklist is updated;
- f) Prioritise species (including tree species) for the preparation and production of new standard checklists and consider possible sources of funding – taking into account all relevant decisions of the CoP;
- g) Review any feedback on the application and use of the CITES Cactaceae Checklist (3rd edition)
- h) Recommend actions that can be taken to ensure that that the revision of the name of *Caesalpinia echinata* to *Paubrasilia echinata* is widely promulgated within the CITES and enforcement community;
- i) Consider options by which the role of Nomenclature Specialist be given some financial support post CoP17; and,
- j) Consider any other relevant issues raised at PC23 and where possible make recommendations on these to the Committee.