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

Twenty-fourth meeting of the Plants Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 20, 21 and 23-26 July 2018

REVIEW OF CITES DISCUSSIONS REGARDING PLANT PRODUCTION SYSTEMS

1. This document has been submitted by Canada* at the request of the Co-Chair (Mr. Leach) of the intersessional working group on the definition of the term 'artificially propagated,' in relation to agenda item 16.

2. A draft of this document was circulated to the intersessional working group on the definition of the term 'artificially propagated' on December 13, 2017 as per paragraph 2 of the work plan developed for the working group by PC23 (described in PC24 DOC. 16.1 Paragraph 5 (2)). The purpose of this review was to provide a history of work done in CITES to assist the intersessional working group with their work.

3. This document provides a chronological summary of CITES discussions on plant production systems, including the definition of 'artificially propagated,' as found from the records available on the Secretariat's web site for the Conference of the Parties, Plants Committee, Animals Committee and Standing 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.*

REVIEW OF CITES DISCUSSIONS REGARDING PLANT PRODUCTION SYSTEMS

This document provides a summary of CITES discussions on plant production systems, including discussions of source codes, general discussions on artificially propagated production systems, and discussions of definitions of artificially propagated for plants, including those for timber and agarwood. It was prepared from the records available on the Secretariat's web site for the Conference of the Parties, Plants Committee, Animals Committee and Standing Committee. This document is presented in chronological order, by meeting, from CoP2 (March 1979) to PC23 (July 2017). Links to documents are provided when available. Summary comments are provided in regular text. Key text from the meeting documents are presented in *italics*.

Second meeting of the Conference of the Parties (San José (Costa Rica), 19-30 March 1979)

Meeting documents and summary records are not available for this meeting. At this meeting Resolution Conf. 2.12 (Specimens bred in captivity or artificially propagated) was adopted. This resolution provides the first definition of "Artificially propagated" and when to apply Article VII paragraph 4 and 5 for specimens listed in Appendix I:

> *a) that the provisions of Article VII, paragraph 4, of the Convention be applied separately from those of Article VII, paragraph 5. Specimens of … or plant species in Appendix I artificially propagated for commercial purposes shall be treated as if they were in Appendix II, and shall not be exempted from the provisions of Article IV by the granting of certificates to the effect that they were bred in captivity or artificially propagated*
>
> *c) that the term "artificially propagated" be interpreted to refer only to plants grown by man from seeds, cuttings, callus tissue, spores or other propagules under controlled conditions. The artificially propagated stock must be:*
>
> > *i) established and maintained in a manner not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild, and*
> >
> > *ii) managed in a manner designed to maintain the artificially propagated stock indefinitely. Controlled conditions for plants is under an environment that is intensively manipulated by man for the purpose of producing selected species. General characteristics of controlled conditions may include but are not limited to tillage, fertilization, weed control, irrigation, or nursery operations such as potting, bedding, or protection from weather; and*

Seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Lausanne (Switzerland), 09-20 October 1989)

From CoP 7 Doc. 7.15 Report of the Plants Committee:
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/07/doc/E07-15.pdf.

This is the first report of PC1 that was formed through Resolution Conf. 6.1 Annex 3. This document includes a paragraph on how artificial propagation was viewed within the original goals and priorities of Plants Committee.

> *Goal & Priority: 1. To improve the CITES mechanism and administration for plants so that the treaty is an effective, simple tool to conserve qualifying taxa in international trade, without encumbering trade in specimens that usually are not of conservation concern (such as artificially propagated specimens and scientific specimens). (A strategy usually effective and more so for plants than animals is to satisfy trade demand with a ready supply of truly artificially propagated specimens.)*

Eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Kyoto (Japan), 02-13 March 1992)

From CoP 8 Doc. 8.27 Improving implementation of the Convention for plants:
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/08/doc/E-27-29-31.pdf

> *2. Trade in Artificially Propagated Plants*
>
> *The CITES Plant Working Group and Plants Committee have always promoted the artificial propagation of any plant species listed in the appendices. It is evident that when artificially propagated specimens of a species are abundantly available for the commercial and specialist trade, the pressure on the wild populations will decrease or even disappear. Thus, the trade in artificially propagated specimens can form a valuable contribution to the survival of the wild specimens, in particular for those species listed in Appendix I. It has, therefore, been considered of importance to facilitate the trade in artificially propagated plants as much as possible (Resolutions Conf. 4.24 and 5.14).*
>
> *In addition to the fact that, under the current text of the Convention, the trade in artificially propagated plants can not be excluded completely from CITES control, there is also a proven risk that wild-collected plants can be mixed with artificially propagated ones, in*

order to smuggle the unnoticed. Excluding artificially propagated plants from control can therefore not be considered. However, trade-control-facilitating mechanisms should be sought.

2.a Definition of "Artificially Propagated"

Resolution Conf. 2.12 provides to the Parties definitions of "bred in captivity" and of "artificially propagated".

In general the definition of "artificial propagation" of plants is adequate, and does not provide problems for the specialist familiar with this subject. However, one sentence in the definition is not sufficiently clear in its intent. Furthermore, two forms of artificial propagation are not mentioned in this Resolution, and this has caused some misunderstandings.

i) The definition in Resolution Conf 2.12, recommendation c), refers to the stock needed for propagation as "the artificially propagated stock..."

The apparent intention of this recommendation was to indicate that, once a parental stock is established for the purpose of production of seeds, cuttings etc., the stock should be maintained (preferably) in the same quantity of individual plants, irrespective of whether these plants are from wild-collected or artificially propagated origin.

But the present text of the Resolution does not clearly say this. The original intention of recommendation c) would be better expressed if, instead of referring to "the artificially propagated stock" it referred to "...the parental stock used for artificial propagation" using a phrase equivalent to that used in recommendation b) for animals.

A similar amendment should then be made in paragraph c. ii) replacing the words "artificially propagated" by "parental" to read "managed in a manner designed to maintain the parental stock indefinitely". In this sentence, however, the use of the word 'indefinitely' may be superfluous with regard to Appendix-II species, for which trade in wild-taken specimens is still allowed. The parental stock can easily be replaced or supplemented by legally acquired wild- collected plants. Therefore it is suggested this part be amended as follows: "in the case of Appendix-I species, be managed in a manner designed to maintain the parental stock indefinitely".

ii) Grafts

In cactus cultivation, it is a common practice to use grafting techniques. There are species which are difficult to cultivate: they grow very slowly, and are often sensitive to excessive moisture in the soil, which frequently causes rot in the roots. These problem-plants are grafted onto sturdy, fast-growing root-stocks, which transfer their vigour to the grafted plant. This technique is also used to make seedlings grow much faster than they would have done on their own roots. Grafting is furthermore essential for mutations such as the interesting red or yellow forms of Gymnocalycium mihanovichii, which can not grow on their own. As root-stocks, rooted cuttings are taken from plants of species of various genera including Hylocereus, Myrtillocactus, Echinopsis (Trichocereus) and Harrisia (Eriocereus). These stocks are often specially selected clones, and virtually always of artificially propagated origin. This is not always the case with the 'head', the scion. Wild-collected plants, which are sometimes susceptible to bacterial infections in the roots, are often grafted onto these root-stocks to avoid these problems. Although this technique of cultivation is frequently used, grafted plants can only be regarded as artificially propagated if both root and scion are artificially propagated. Wild- collected cacti grafted onto artificially propagated root-stocks are to be regarded as WILD.

iii) Division

Although 'division' can be regarded as a form of cutting (cutting = taking a shoot or branch, to be rooted and grown as an individual plant; division = dividing the plant into several individuals) the absence of the term in the definition of "artificially propagated" has given cause to doubt the acceptability of this technique as a means of artificial propagation in the context of CITES. An amended definition of "artificially propagated" is presented in the Annex.

From Summary Records p. 18: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/08/E-Com-II.pdf

The delegation of the United Kingdom suggested some changes to paragraph a) under "DETERMINES" in the operative part of the draft resolution. They wished to add in paragraph a) ii) the word cultivated before "parental stock", and to replace the wording in paragraph a) ii) B) with managed in such a way that long-term maintenance of this cultivated parental stock is guaranteed; and. The delegation of Israel was worried that this rewording would eliminate the possibility of taking seeds for cultivation from wild plants, and the delegations of India and Peru wished to restrict the definition of "artificially propagated", as far as orchids were concerned, to plants grown from seeds or in flasks, because of the difficulties in controlling trade in cuttings taken from wild plants. However, their fears were allayed by the Secretariat and, with support from the delegations of Thailand and Australia, paragraph a) of the draft resolution was agreed as amended.
There were no comments on paragraph b) of the draft resolution, and this was also agreed.

From Resolution Conf. 8.17 (Kyoto, 1992) – Improving the Regulation of Trade in Plants

DETERMINES
a) that with regard to the definition of "artificially propagated":
i) the term "artificially propagated" shall be interpreted to refer only to plants grown from seeds, cuttings, divisions, callus tissues or other plant tissues, spores or other propagules under controlled conditions;

"under controlled conditions" means in a non-natural environment that is intensively manipulated by human intervention for the purpose of producing selected species or hybrids. General characteristics of controlled conditions may include but are not limited to tillage, fertilization, weed control, irrigation, or nursery operations such as potting, bedding, or protection from weather;

ii) the cultivated parental stock used for artificial propagation must be:
A) established and maintained in a manner not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild; and
B) managed in such a way that long-term maintenance of this cultivated stock is guaranteed; and

iii) grafted plants be recognized as artificially propagated only when both the root-stock and the graft have been artificially propagated;

Tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Harare (Zimbabwe), 09-20 June 1997)

CoP10 Doc. 10.52 Paragraphs 62-67; pages 4- 5: Implementation of the Convention for Timber Species: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/10/doc/E10-52to54.pdf

Definition of 'artificially propagated' in relation to timber production
Background
62. A background paper was prepared for the Group that introduced the concept of silvicultural practices and discussed, from a timber production viewpoint, the present timber species in the appendices of CITES. Silvicultural methods can be divided broadly into those involved with assisted natural regeneration and those involving artificial propagation of trees. The latter is further divided into the establishment of plantations on land without forest cover (afforestation), plantation establishment on areas where the forest cover has been removed by clear-cutting (reforestation), or planting in areas with existing forest cover (enrichment planting). The propagative material used can be of either wild-collected or cultivated origin.

63. It was noted that the level of silvicultural knowledge for timber species currently listed in the CITES appendices ranges from those well known in silviculture to those that are more or less unknown in silviculture. The background paper also discussed some other issues in relation to CITES timber listings from the point of view of silviculture and forest management in general.

64. In the CITES context, 'artificially propagated' is defined in Resolution Conf. 9.18. It appears that the definition there is not easily applicable to certain silvicultural techniques such as assisted natural regeneration and enrichment planting.
Discussions by the Timber Working Group

65. The TWG discussed the definition of 'artificially propagated' as given in Resolution Conf. 9.18, the interpretation of its elements and the implications of these definitions for timber species. This led to a more detailed discussion of various silvicultural practices and whether or not these could or should be considered to be artificial propagation. The Group examined issues such as: whether or not plantations require definition in the CITES context and, if so, what this definition should be; and how to deal with silvicultural practices which appeared particularly problematic in relation to the current CITES definition of artificially propagated (e.g. assisted natural regeneration and enrichment planting). The TWG felt that it might be desirable to first explore the possible utilization of other CITES concepts, such as ranching, for several of these silvicultural techniques, before it would consider a possible adaptation of the current definition of 'artificially propagated'.

66. The Group considered the discussion points and certain other issues raised in the background document. The TWG noted the desirability of initiating the periodic review of listed plant species, as called for in Resolution Conf. 9.1, for timber species currently included in the appendices. A number of concerns were expressed by members of the Group about some of the points made in the background paper, including: a perceived concentration of focus on tropical timber issues; the labelling of many currently CITES-listed Appendix-II timber species as "endangered", which is not only inaccurate but may help perpetuate the misconception that the Convention only deals with endangered species; and that the paper erroneously indicates that a number of currently listed timber species have not been subject to international trade.

Recommendations of the Timber Working Group
67. The TWG decided to request the Secretariat to investigate the potential for silvicultural techniques to be dealt with in the general context of resolutions on ranching and quotas, to determine whether their inherent concepts are useful bases for establishing trade regimes for timber species listed in the appendices. The Group also recommended that the Plants Committee review the list of all timber species currently included in the appendices [as it is charged to do in Resolution Conf. 9.1, Annex 3, paragraph vii)] and report the results of this review at the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Finally, in discussing the numerous issues that were raised in the background document for this item, the TWG felt it worthwhile to recommend that Parties which are range States for timber species pay particular attention to internationally traded timber species within their territories for which the knowledge of biological status and silvicultural requirements indicate concern. See Annex 5 (Regarding the definition of 'artificially propagated' for timber species of concern) and Annex 6 (draft decision directed to the Plants Committee; draft decision 1. directed to the Secretariat).

Doc. 10.52 Annex 5:
DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
Implementation of the Convention for Timber Species

Regarding the definition of 'artificially propagated'

g) timber taken from specimens grown in monospecific plantations be recognized as being artificially propagated;

Doc. 10.52 Annex 6
DRAFT DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
Implementation of the Convention for Timber Species

Directed to the Secretariat
Regarding the use of particular silvicultural techniques
1. The potential for silvicultural techniques (e.g. enrichment plantings, assisted natural regeneration) to be dealt with in the general context of resolutions on ranching and quotas shall be investigated to determine whether these concepts provide useful bases for establishing trade regimes for timber species listed in the appendices.

From Summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/10/E10-ComII.pdf

Document Doc. 10.52 was approved, with the amendment to paragraph 1 of draft decisions directed to the Standing Committee, and that to paragraph 9 of those directed to the Secretariat. In addition the Secretariat was requested to reword the paragraphs directed to the Standing Committee and the Plants Committee.

CoP10 Doc 10.53 Paragraphs 4-10; pages 15-16 Amendment to the definition of 'Artificially propagated': https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/10/doc/E10-52to54.pdf

4. The definition can be easily applied to live plants. No reference is made to parts and derivatives although it could be interpreted that the word 'plants' also refers to parts and derivatives.

5. For plant species included in Appendix II, all seeds are excluded from CITES controls, although several countries have national legislation prohibiting the export of wild-collected seeds.

6. In view of the illegal trade in wild-collected specimens of species included in Appendices I and II, in particular of Cactaceae, the Plants Committee felt that it was important to build in some safeguards to avoid illegally collected plants being used for the production of artificially propagated seeds. It therefore deemed it important to include a reference to the legal origin of the parental stock from which the seeds are taken, referred to in paragraph b) of the definition. Such a reference is also important in relation to the conditions under which seeds are produced, referred to in the second part of paragraph a) of the current definition.

7. It is therefore proposed to amend the current paragraph b) to include the requirement that the parental stock be acquired legally.

8. The Plants Committee concluded that, in order to make the definition of 'artificially propagated' easily applicable to seeds, it would be difficult to make a textual amendment to the first part of paragraph a) without weakening the current text. The current paragraph a) should refer to live plants, and a separate paragraph dealing with seeds should be added.

9. While preparing this document, the Secretariat concluded that it would be better to make the text agreed upon by the Plants Committee applicable to all parts and derivatives (including seeds) rather than to seeds alone.

10. A proposed revision of the definition of 'artificially propagated' is included in the Annex to this document.

Doc. 10.53 (Rev. 2) Annex
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION CONF. 9.18
Regulation of Trade in Plants
The definition of 'artificially propagated' contained in Resolution Conf. 9.18 should read as follows:
Regarding the definition of 'artificially propagated'
DETERMINES:
a) that the term 'artificially propagated' shall be interpreted to refer only to live plants grown from seeds, cuttings, divisions, callus tissues or other plant tissues, spores or other propagules under controlled conditions; and that 'under controlled conditions' means in a non-natural environment that is intensively manipulated by human intervention for the purpose of producing selected species or hybrids. General characteristics of controlled conditions may include but are not limited to tillage, fertilization, weed control, irrigation, or nursery operations such as potting, bedding, or protection from weather;

b) that the cultivated parental stock used for artificial propagation must be, to the satisfaction of the competent government authorities of the exporting country:
i) established ~~and maintained~~ in accordance with the provisions of CITES and relevant national laws and in a manner not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild; and
ii) managed in such a way that long-term maintenance of this cultivated stock is guaranteed;

c) that seeds shall be regarded as artificially propagated only if they are taken from specimens acquired in accordance with the provisions of paragraph b) above and grown under controlled conditions, or from parental stock artificially propagated in accordance with paragraph a) above;

d) that all other parts and derivatives shall be regarded as being artificially propagated only if they are taken from specimens that have been artificially propagated in accordance with the provisions of paragraph a) above; and

e) that grafted plants shall be recognized as artificially propagated only when both the root-stock and the graft have been artificially propagated.

From summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/10/E10-ComII.pdf

From Com.II 10.8 (Rev.):

b) Amendment to the Definition of "Artificially Propagated"

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. 10.53 (Rev.), noting that the addition of the wording in paragraph c) of the Annex was the main change to Resolution Conf. 9.18. The delegation of the Netherlands, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union, expressed concerns about the clarity of the wording of the document and also had technical queries to make, and, therefore, requested a working group be set up to address these problems. After a request for further explanation from the delegation of Switzerland, the delegation of the United Kingdom stated that it was unclear in their opinion how the requirements of paragraph c) of the Annex would be applied in practice. The Secretariat offered to resolve these problems in consultation with those concerned and report back later.

From Com.II 10.12:

b) Amendment to the Definition of "Artificially Propagated"
The Secretariat introduced document Doc. 10.53 (Rev.) Annex. It noted that in paragraph c), "2" should be replaced with a). It further indicated that in sub-paragraph b) i), "requirements" should be replaced with provisions, and "domestic" with relevant national, to make the wording identical to that used to define captive-breeding. With these changes the document was accepted by consensus.

Tenth meeting of the Plants Committee (Shepherdstown (United States of America), 11-15 December 2000)

PC10 Doc. 8.1 DEFINITION OF 'ARTIFICIALLY PROPAGATED' IN RELATION TO TIMBER:
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/10/PC10-8-1.pdf

3. The text contained in paragraphs 4 to 33 below has been taken from a document that was prepared for the second meeting of the Timber Working Group (October 1996). This document was prepared by one of the European representatives (Switzerland) in this working group. [For Paragraphs 4 to 33 please see document]

The definition of 'artificially propagated'
37. It has already been agreed that timber from monospecific plantations (plantations consisting of one species only) as described in paragraphs 23 to 26, is to be regarded as being artificially propagated (see also Resolution Conf. 10.13).

38. The silvicultural techniques described in paragraphs 17 to 23 all relate to natural conditions. Specimens taken from such forest stands can therefore not comply with the current definition of 'artificially propagated' because they do not meet the requirement of being produced in a 'non-natural environment'. At the moment the source code for such specimens is therefore 'W' (wild origin).

39. However, guided natural regeneration also forms an additional guarantee that the resource is exploited sustainably, that the species continues to maintain its role in the ecosystem and that areas are not replanted with alien species (see paragraph 28). For trees produced under this management system, the making of non-detriment findings is greatly facilitated and trade in their timber should be in the interest of the conservation of the species.

40. The Secretariat therefore intends to explore this subject further, and to consider the creation of a special source code. A document on this subject will be presented at the 11th meeting of the Plants Committee.

From Summary record, p. 31: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/10/E-Minutes_PC10.pdf

8.1 Definition of "artificially propagated" in relation to timber *Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) introduced the document and explained that Decision 10.127 had arisen as a result of recommendations made by the timber working group. Mr van Vliet referred to the two suggestions in the document: 1) to prepare a draft resolution with regard to 'ranching' in terms of forestry, or 2) to consider the creation of a special source code.*
The observer from the United States of America disagreed with many of the statements in the document. For example, he did not agree that guided natural regeneration necessarily guarantees sustainable exploitation, as stated in paragraph 39 of the document, and he felt that the purpose of creating an additional source code for timber was not clear. He added that the current definition of "artificially propagated" in Resolution Conf. 11.11 was sufficiently flexible to accommodate the usual practices with regard to timber species.

From an enforcement standpoint, the observer from the United States of America said that it was difficult to differentiate wild vs. artificially propagated trees or lumber at the time the wood is imported. In particular, he was concerned that enforcement is problematic for the importing country if the wood from artificially propagated specimens was from a range country.
Concern was expressed that, if an additional source code was created for 'guided natural regeneration of timber species,' other industries may rightly claim similar treatment. The observer from the United States of America, recommended against the development of an intermediate source code for the purpose outlined here.
The Plants Committee supported the continuation of the work by the Secretariat and the representative of North America (Mr von Arx) stated that his colleagues in the Forestry Services in Canada would be happy to cooperate. The representative of Oceania (Mr Leach) also pointed out that this would be a useful process as the concept of ranching was applicable to all plants and not only timber species.
Concerns were expressed by the observers from the European Union, Germany and the International Wildlife Coalition, all of whom considered that it would be inappropriate and unnecessary to have a new source code because it could have a knock-on effect on the making of a non-detriment statement. However, it was agreed that the Secretariat should present a document on its findings at the next Plants Committee meeting.

Eleventh meeting of the Plants Committee (Langkawi (Malaysia), 03-07 September 2001)

PC11 Doc. 9.1a) Harvesting techniques of Galanthus in Georgia Secretariat report: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/11/E-PC11-09-01a.pdf

3. The Secretariat believes that the source code 'R' for ranching should only be used for specimens harvested under the provisions of Resolution Conf. 11.16 on 'Ranching and trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II' or, in the case of Appendix-II species, that are derived from ranching programmes that meet the requirements of the said Resolution.

4. Consequently, several new source codes have been proposed for specimens harvested in a different manner than the one referred to under paragraph 3. above. These can be found in paragraphs 6. and 7. of PC11 Inf. 3.
https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/11/E-PC11-Inf._03Annex.pdf

5. Georgia has been using the source code 'R' for export of Galanthus woronowii since 1999. This was based on a statement in the report on the bulb trade in Georgia by Flora and Fauna International that the Plants Committee at its ninth meeting had agreed that there was merit in further developing the concept of 'ranching' for plants. This is, however, not recorded in the proceedings of the meeting concerned.

8. Bulbs are only harvested in south-western Georgia, namely in the Ajarian Autonomous Republic and partly in the Guria region. Bulbs are only collected from cultivated agricultural lands, mainly cornfields and citrus or tea plantations. It is most likely that these cultivated fields have been laid out in areas of natural distribution of Galanthus species. This also explains why, in the past, the plants of this species were removed as weeds. However, nowadays the local people are keen to grow them on the cultivated land as an additional source of income. Collecting bulbs from natural wild plant communities is strictly prohibited by Georgian federal law. However, clearing of forest for agricultural purposes is permitted, and such clearing can still affect natural stands of Galanthus.

9. In Georgia, after harvesting, the bulbs are transported to the bulb delivery station at Gonio. The Scientific Authority of Georgia informed the Secretariat that at Gonio the soil and very small bulbs are separated from the larger ones. The latter are further sorted and those too small for export are added to the soil mixture. These bulbs (and soil) are replanted in farm fields, and harvested later, on a rotational basis. The bulbs thus produced would be considered as artificially propagated were it not for the fact that there is still a proportion of smaller wild harvested bulbs that are transplanted in these cultivated fields.

10. The current stocks of Galanthus in the cultivated fields are of wild orgin. However, transplanted bulbs are apparently added to these stocks. Recognizing that the bulbs in these cultivated fields are a mixture of truly wild specimens and transplanted wild specimens from other sites, the Secretariat suggests that for these a new source code be used, 'Wt', wild-transplanted, indicating that although the bulbs are of wild origin, they are not taken from natural vegetations (source code 'W') but from cultivated fields. The same code could also be used for bulbs produced by some of the experimental propagation techniques in Turkey.

11. The source code 'Wt' should be used for all Galanthus exports from Georgia, until it has been determined that the bulbs produced following the method described in paragraph 9 are truly artificially propagated. The report of the Scientific Authority of Germany might provide more details on the procedures in Georgia.

PC11 Doc. 9.1b) Germany report: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/11/E-PC11-09-01b.pdf

This is a preliminary report of a fact finding mission of the CITES Scientific Authority of Germany to Georgia

From Summary record, pages 33-34: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/11/E-Minutes_PC11.pdf

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

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

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

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

It was also agreed that the authorities of Georgia would communicate directly with the Secretariat in order to establish which source code should be currently used on permits for the export of Galanthus woronowii. With regard to document PC11 Doc. 9.1b, the Plants Committee congratulated Germany and Georgia for their efforts with regard to the sustainable management and harvest of Galanthus woronowii and encouraged assistance from any other countries.

PC11 Doc. 9.2 Decision 11.155 (Formerly Decision 10.127) [note: originates from CoP10 Doc 52]: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/11/E-PC11-09-02.pdf

2. At its 10th meeting, the Plants Committee discussed document Doc. PC.10.8.1, prepared by the Secretariat in relation to Decision 11.155. The Plants Committee agreed that timber coming from managed natural forests should be regarded as 'wild', because the current definition of "artificially propagated" could not be applied, owing to the absence of 'controlled conditions'.

6. Various international organizations are more and more encouraging sustainable forestry management [e.g. United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), ITTO, FAO, Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)] and contributing to the development of criteria and indicators for such management.1

7. When issued in accordance with the provisions of Article IV, the CITES export permit is the best guarantee for sustainably produced timber. However, the work of the Scientific Authorities is greatly assisted by knowing that the specimens originate from operations that have independently been certified as having used sustainable management systems or sustainable silvicultural management.

8. It may therefore be useful to determine if any current certification or eco-labelling system is compatible with the provisions of Article IV, and if any such system should be recognized by CITES in one way or another.

9. The Secretariat believes that sustainable management of ecosystems is essential, not only for the timber species being utilized, but for all species of flora and fauna living in it. Therefore it intends to make an evaluation of the current certification or eco-labelling procedures or codes of conduct, and to enter into dialogue with the organizations concerned to ensure adequate synergies in the interest of the exploitation of sustainable resources.

From Summary record, pages 34-35: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/11/E-Minutes_PC11.pdf

The Secretariat introduced document PC11 Doc. 9.2 and explained that due to the complexities already discussed with regard to Galanthus, the issue of source codes had not been discussed. However, the Secretariat had begun to gather information on the different production systems and certification of sustainably managed forests and their compatibility with the scientific approach to making a non-detriment finding. Mr von Arx (representative of North America) added that he had discussed various certification schemes with forestry colleagues in Canada and he would provide the information to the Secretariat.

The observer from the United States of America advised caution that an eco-label was not a guarantee of sustainable harvest and should not be used in place of a nondetriment finding made by the relevant Scientific Authority. Mr van Vliet (Secretariat) clarified that the idea was merely that of an information gathering exercise and that there was no intention of replacing the requirement of CITES for a non-detriment finding.

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

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

Eighteenth meeting of the Animals Committee (San José (Costa Rica), 08-12 April 2002)

AC18 Doc. 10 Relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation (Decision 11.102):
https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/18/E18-10.pdf

10. Relationship between ex situ production and in situ conservation (Decision 11.102)
1. Decision 11.102 directs the Animals Committee, regarding operations that breed Appendix-I animal species for commercial purposes, to "examine the complex issues related to the origin of founder breeding stock and the relationship between ex situ breeding operations and in situ conservation of the species and, in collaboration with interested organizations, identify possible strategies and other mechanisms by which registered ex situ breeding operations may contribute to enhancing the recovery and/or conservation of the species within the countries of origin, and report its findings at the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties".

3. The Secretariat participated in a workshop organized by IUCN on the impact of commercial captive production and artificial propagation on wild species conservation in December 2001, White Oaks, Florida, United States of America, and the executive summary of this workshop is provided as Annex 2. Elements of this workshop are highly relevant to the task before the Animals Committee, and it may be useful to ask IUCN how it intends to followup on this workshop. One of the recommendations of the workshop refers to the assessment of the potential consequences of commercial captive-breeding operations on the conservation of wild populations, following an approach similar to the checklist developed by IUCN regarding the making of non-detriment findings for CITES-listed species (document Inf. 11.6). This approach may prove to be of value in the context of CITES as well.

The results of a workshop on "The impact of commercial captive production/ artificial propagation in relation to wild species conservation" included as annex 2 of this doc

The groups developed a risk assessment framework for investigating the impacts of captive breeding and artificial propagation on the conservation of species. Currently there are no agreed definitions or descriptions of production systems so it is difficult to categorise the systems and to determine which are most likely to be beneficial to both conservation and livelihoods.

Consequently, the plant group in particular felt that it will be necessary to look at the characteristics on which such systems can be grouped if generalisations about the costs and benefits of such systems are to be drawn out. For fauna, the working group demonstrated a preliminary classification methodology (based on work presented to the Animals Committee by Hank Jenkins) to characterise production systems on the basis of their dependence on the wild population coupled with the degree of management control that is exercised over captive breeding operations.

From summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/18/summary_record.pdf

10. Relationship between ex-situ production and in-situ conservation..... (AC18 Doc. 10)
The Secretariat introduced document AC18 Doc. 10 and requested that, in the absence of any replies to Notification to the Parties No. 2001/91 (except one from Mexico), the Committee recommend to the meeting of the Conference of the Parties, that work on this issue continue after CoP12.

The findings of a workshop organized by IUCN on the impact of commercial captive production/artificial propagation in relation to wild species conservation (Annex 2 of AC18 Doc. 10) were elaborated on by the observer from IUCN. IUCN explained that follow-up action would include a risk assessment approach, analyses of particular case studies and would involve the academic community.

The lack of responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2001/91 was put down by several Parties to a lack of clarity on the issue, and the emphasis on the possible negative effects of ex-situ breeding operations, whereas Decision 11.102 requires the AC to examine mechanisms whereby such operations may contribute to enhancing recovery and/or conservation of the species in the country of origin. The subject was discussed extensively.

The Secretariat stated that it would support actions taken by the AC to comply with Decision 11.102 and sought guidance in this regard. Following the deliberations of the contact group during the meeting, the Chairman presented a list of recommendations from the AC to the Secretariat (see Annex 6). After some discussion, it was agreed that more pointed recommendations would be provided and a Notification to the Parties could be sent out.

The AC agreed to continue evaluating the relationship between ex-situ production and in situ conservation beyond CoP12, taking into account the possible approaches discussed at this meeting.

Thirteenth meeting of the Plants Committee (Geneva (Switzerland), 12-15 August 2003)

PC12 Doc. 20.3 Relationship between in situ conservation and ex situ production of plants:
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/12/E-PC12-20-03.pdf

This is the AC18 Doc 10. Relationship between ex situ production and in situ conservation (Decision 11.102) doc being brought to the Plants Committee

From summary record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/12/E-Minutes_PC12.pdf

The Secretariat introduced document PC12 Doc. 20.3, explaining that there was increasing concern over the impact of ex situ production on wild populations. It informed participants that following Decision 11.102, a Notification had been sent out inviting all Parties and organizations to provide information on the relationship between ex situ production systems and in situ conservation programmes for any CITES-listed species. At the time of the meeting, no response to this Notification had been received. The Secretariat added that the Animals Committee had suggested that the Notification be re-issued and suggested that it should also cover plants. It asked the Plants Committee for comments on this suggestion and to provide specific examples involving plants.

…

The Chairman concluded that this issue would be included in the Plants Committee working plan as a priority and that the Plants Committee supported the Secretariat's decision to consolidate all the information and include the views and examples provided by the Plants Committee members in a report for CoP12.

PC12 Doc 23.1 CITES plant production systems [note: originates from PC11 Doc 9.1]:
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/12/E-PC12-23-01.pdf

Paragraphs 2 to 8 discuss the pros and cons of new source codes/certifications and note that source codes should not replace NDFs. Different possible production systems for plants are summarized in table form in Paragraph 10.

9. In short, it would need to identify if some management regimes and/or production systems are preferable for a sustainable use of a species and eventually if they could qualify as a form of artificially propagation.

Some plant production systems
Plant specimens taken from the wild
*• Plant specimens collected from the **wild in the natural** range of the species*
*• Plant specimens collected from the **wild outside of the natural range** of the species (i.e., from a naturalized population)*
*• Plant specimens obtained from wild-collected seeds or spores, bulbs, roots, tubers, corms, rhizomes, vegetative cuttings, or divisions and planted and **grown in the natural habitat** of the species*
*• Plant specimens obtained from wild-collected seeds or spores, bulbs, bulblets, roots, tubers, corms, rhizomes, grafts, vegetative cuttings, divisions, or other forms of vegetative propagules, and planted and **grown in cultivation in a controlled environment***
*• Seeds or spores, bulbs, bulblets, roots, tubers, corms, rhizomes, grafts, vegetative cuttings, or divisions **from cultivated parental stock, planted and grown in natural habitat***
*• Plant specimens **grown in cultivation from tissue culture of wild parental plants***

Plant specimens artificially propagated in accordance with Resolution Conf. 11.11, paragraph a)
*• Plant specimens grown in cultivation from seeds or spores, bulbs, bulblets, roots, tubers, corms, rhizomes, grafts, vegetative cuttings, divisions, or other forms of vegetative propagules of **cultivated parental plants***
*• Plant specimens grown in cultivation from **tissue culture of cultivated parental plants***
*• **Timber** harvested from **plantation grown trees***

From Summary records: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/12/E-Minutes_PC12.pdf

Mr von Arx (representative on North America) introduced document PC12 Doc. 23.1. He reminded participants that at the previous Plants Committee meeting it had been decided that a review of production systems would be undertaken and information on the codes used should be compiled. Following this decision, countries had been consulted and it had become obvious that a full range of production systems were being used. The United States Management Authority provided a list of broad categories that could be defined more concisely if a complete list needed to be created. However, it was felt that a new list of codes would not necessarily be helpful for the implementation of CITES. He concluded by stating that it might be helpful just to create new codes for specific categories.

The Secretariat thanked the representative from North America for his report and stated that this had become quite a complicated but very important issue that was linked with the making of non-detriment findings. It added that the precise origin of specimens in trade was seldom known and therefore the conservation impact was unknown. This was clearly something that needed to be addressed. The Secretariat informed participants that there was an emerging consensus that supported the use of extra source codes, especially for specific cases such as bulbs from Georgia. It concluded that the situation and the need for new codes would be considered at CoP12.

Mr Shaari (representative of Asia) highlighted the example of the need for new codes with respect to the situation with tropical timber. In many cases, seeds collected for plantations have a low viability. However, it is much more successful to allow to fall and germinate in their natural environment. The ground underneath the mother trees can be manipulated and the germinated seeds collected and replanted. In this case the origin of the specimen is known and the growing area has been manipulated. He stated

that there was really no difference between this and plantations and suggested it be considered under Resolution Conf. 11.11, Regulation of trade in plants.

The observer from IWMC-CH stated that the problems arose when trying to determine whether the export of a specimen was detrimental to wild populations. He added that using multiple codes would not necessarily help and could confuse the issue further.

The observer from the United States of America supported the view of the observer from IWMC-CH and was also concerned about the implication of using the source code 'W' on permits. He stated that this was often viewed negatively. He concluded that the exercise of reviewing the production systems could be beneficial to the Parties if linked with the identification of the likely risks and pitfalls.

The Secretariat thanked the Plants Committee for all the comments and congratulated members for remaining objective. It recommended that the issue be discussed again at the following Plants Committee meeting with a view to preparing a report on the subject for CoP13.

Twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Santiago (Chile), 03-15 November 2002)

CoP12 Doc. 53 Trade regimes for timber species https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/12/doc/E12-53.pdf

Decision 11.155, formerly Decision 10.127 reads as follows:

The potential for silvicultural techniques (e.g. enrichment plantings, assisted natural regeneration) to be dealt with in the general context of Resolutions on ranching and quotas, as well as in accordance with the definition of 'artificially propagated' contained in Resolution Conf. 11.11, shall be investigated to determine whether these concepts provide useful bases for establishing trade regimes for timber species listed in the Appendices.

3. At its 10th meeting (Shepherdstown, 11-15 December 2000), the Plants Committee discussed a document on this subject (document Doc. PC. 10.8.1), prepared by the Secretariat.

4. The Secretariat presented the following conclusions therein:
– ranching, as defined by CITES, (i.e. the introduction of specimens taken from the wild into controlled environments) is currently not used for tree plantations;
– only a few Parties use export quotas for timber species; and
– there are a number of silvicultural techniques (e.g. enrichment planting, guided natural generation, replanting of wildlings collected in other forest areas) that might benefit from the use of special source codes.

5. The Plants Committee agreed that further exploring the possible use of special source codes would be useful, in particular since the Animals Committee is currently considering similar options for animal production systems (cf. documents AC17 Doc. 14 (Rev. 1) and PC12 Doc. 23.1). This discussion will be continued at the next meetings of the Animals and Plants Committee 6. The Secretariat is of the opinion that it has complied with Decision 11.115 and recommends that it be repealed.

From Summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/12/rep/ComII_12.PDF

53. Trade regimes for timber species
The Secretariat introduced document CoP12 Doc. 53. It was clarified that in paragraph 6 of the document, the Decision referred to should have been Decision 11.155, not Decision 11.115. The repeal of Decision 11.155 was agreed by consensus.

Thirteenth meeting of the Plants Committee (Geneva (Switzerland), 12-15 August 2003)

PC13 Doc. 19 in situ conservation and ex situ production of plants:
https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/13/E-PC13-19.pdf

A notification on the relationship between ex situ production and in situ conservation was sent to collect information for AC/PC to have information to carry out Decision 11.102. Parties were invited to provide information. There were no responses from Parties. The Secretariat proposed a new notification and also noted that this work and Doc 25.1 on plant production systems were closely related and could be considered by the same working group.
https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/notif/2001/091.shtml

PC13 Inf. 6 Production systems and impact on wild populations:
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/common/com/pc/13/X-PC13-06-inf.pdf

Paragraphs 6 to 19 discuss the relationship between in situ conservation and ex situ production of plants

11. It is often argued that ex situ production is beneficial to species conservation by reducing incentives to collect specimens from the wild populations, so for example the large trade in "bulbs" produced through artificial propagation is considered to reduce pressure on wild stocks, particularly for Appendix-I listed species. But it has also been argued that ex situ production can stimulate increased demand for wild products, when such products are deemed more efficacious than ex situ produced specimens or when they are produced more cheaply or simply mislabelled. For example, there has been concern that the large trade in certain species of orchid produced through artificial propagation might mask trade in rare species collected from the wild. The balance point of these opposite forces will depend on the level of demand for the product, the availability/ conservation status of the product and the resources available to regulate trade.

12. By competing for market share with products from wild sources it has also been argued that ex situ production may reduce the opportunities for trade in wild products to provide economic incentives to encourage in situ conservation. In addition, competition for market share can also drive down prices for wild collected specimens (particularly where there is no premium on wild collected specimens), again reducing possible economic incentives for in situ conservation.

13. However, when trade from the wild is prohibited, as is the case for many Appendix-I taxa, there are few opportunities for wild collection for international trade to contribute economic incentives for conservation, as trade is allowed only in exceptional circumstances. In this case, the conservation impacts of the ex situ production on in situ conservation will depend on whether or not the trade in artificially propagated specimens stimulates or reduces pressures for illegal trade. For Appendix-I plant species, there will be little danger of ex situ production competing with in situ production for market share (as there should be no in situ production of Appendix-I specimens) and thus reducing the opportunities for wild harvest to provide economic incentives to encourage conservation. [In the case of animal species, trophy hunts of wild Appendix-I listed species can provide considerable economic benefits for in situ conservation, which could arguably in future be jeopardised by ex situ captive breeding for so called "canned" trophy hunts]. The situation for Appendix-II listed species is likely to be less clear-cut.

From Summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/13/E-Minutes-PC13.pdf

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.

PC13 Doc. 25.1 CITES plant production systems: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/13/E-PC13-25-01.pdf

2. The Plants Committee has noted concern that CITES definitions of production systems are not being used appropriately (see document PC11 Doc. 9.1a, Harvesting techniques of Galanthus in Georgia, which discusses how to define the production system for Galanthus bulbs). Further discussion on this topic was tabled at the 12th meeting of the Plants Committee (Leiden, May 2002) when document PC12 Doc. 23.1 on CITES plant production systems was discussed. Documents PC11 Doc. 9.2 on Decision 11.155, discussing how to characterize sylviculture production systems and PC12 Doc. 20.3 on Relationship between in situ conservation and ex situ production of plants also address this issue.

3. In document PC12 Doc. 23.1 it was noted that there is a wide range of production systems in use, but that creating many new source codes would not necessarily be helpful. Rather, it was argued that definitions of plant production systems should be used to clarify existing codes given in Resolution Conf. 12.3 on Permits and certificates, and that additional codes should be kept to a minimum. It was also noted that source codes should not replace non-detriment findings, but could complement them. One Party suggested developing a checklist of production systems and evaluating the conservation benefits of the various systems.

4. The Secretariat contracted the IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme to work further on this issue. It is expected that a summary of its main findings and recommendations will be made available by the time of the meeting. In that case, the Secretariat would propose that the Plants Committee considers establishing a small technical working group to review the information presented in this summary document, and to progress with classifying different production methods for CITES-listed plant species in trade. This group should be tasked with preparing a document for consideration at the 14th meeting of the Plants Committee.

PC13 Inf. 6 Production systems and impact on wild populations:
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/common/com/pc/13/X-PC13-06-inf.pdf

Paragraphs 22 to 23 discuss the variety and grouping of production systems for plants and Paragraphs 24 to 26 discuss concerns regarding current definitions of production systems

20. In reality, there are numerous other means of producing "wild" specimens as demonstrated in documents Doc. AC.16.15 and Doc. PC 11.9.1a, Doc. PC11.19.2 and Doc. PC 12.32. Many specimens produced for trade may not be collected directly from a pristine wild habitat, but may be produced through a variety of methods of managing the wild habitat such as sylviculture, enrichment planting and artificial seeding in natural ecosystems and ex situ rearing of wild collected bulbs. Production in natural ecosystems can also be enhanced through fertilization and or weeding/thinning or competitor control. Such management is designed to enhance individual survival or productivity above unmanaged natural levels. In reality, production systems form a continuum ranging from the collection of wild individuals from wild habitats through production of semi-wild/semi-domesticated individuals to multi-generation closed cycle systems that produce virtually "domesticated" individuals. Differentiating between these overlapping systems can be extremely difficult. Production operations may even "evolve" through the different 'categories' as they become more established.

21. Some would argue that the current CITES source code provisions, which simply recognise, specimens taken from the wild (W); and two forms of artificially propagated specimens (A,D); do not adequately recognise the potential of other production systems to enhance productivity and to provide economic incentives to encourage in situ conservation. Others argue that by manipulating the wild habitat to increase production of a target species, non-target species may be detrimentally affected, and the Scientific Authority should judge the relative impacts in making its non-detriment findings. This raises the question: Should CITES Parties develop guidance for Scientific Authorities on distinguishing between production from a pristine wild habitat and production from a managed wild habitat, and can differences in the conservation benefits between the systems be accurately described?

24. Provisions regarding artificial propagation of plants and captive production for animals:
- *differ in the level of restriction between plants and animals, requiring demonstration of F2 production for Appendix I, II and II animals, but not for plants;*
- *involve three different forms of trade regulation (Article VII para 4 and para 5; and Article IV provisions for commercially produced Appendix-I specimens; and*

the definition of controlled environment does not apparently recognise the possibility of production in extensive semi-natural surroundings.

From Summary Record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/13/E-Minutes-PC13.pdf

25.1 Plant production systems ..... PC13 Doc. 25.1
This Agenda item was discussed together with item 19.

Fourteenth meeting of the Plants Committee (Windhoek (Namibia), 16-20 February 2004)

PC14 Doc. 7.4 Review of Resolutions on plants and plant trade (Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11) and definition of 'Artificially Propagated' [Decision 12.11 e)]:
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/14/E-PC14-07-04.pdf
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/common/com/pc/14/X-PC14-07-04Add.pdf

6. Artificially propagated specimens: Previous discussions in meetings of the Plants Committee had focussed largely on the definition of 'artificially propagated', which is somewhat convoluted and unclear. The working group attempted to clarify the definition while retaining its basic elements. Based on a recommendation of both the Management Authority of Chile and the Secretariat, the working group proposes to amend the definition of "artificially propagated" to allow, in exceptional circumstances, for some Appendix-I plants grown from wild-collected seed to be treated as artificially propagated specimens if they meet certain conditions.

7. Grafted plants: The treatment of grafted plants has been separated into its own section, with additional draft language to cover the case of a grafted plant consisting of a graft and rootstock of species listed in different Appendices.

8. Higher-taxon listings: The section on higher-taxon listings has been substantially reduced and may be removed altogether, because some working group members believed that this section does not belong in a Resolution on plant trade, but instead should be considered for inclusion in the Resolution on listing criteria [currently Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP12), also under revision].

Draft Revision of Resolution Conf. 11.11 – Regulation of trade in plants
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/common/com/pc/14/wg/E-PC14_WG_4_Doc-1.pdf

From Summary record pages 30-31: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/14/E-Minutes-PC14.pdf

7.4 Review of Resolutions on plants and plant trade (Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11) and definition of 'Artificially Propagated' [Decision 12.11 e)] ..... (PC14 Doc. 7.4 and PC14 Doc. 7.4 Addendum)

Mr Gabel (observer from the United States) introduced this agenda item. The Secretariat introduced the Addendum to document PC14 Doc. 7.4.

Mr Gabel disagreed with the Secretariat's proposed definition of 'artificially propagated', as outlined in the Addendum to document PC14 Doc. 7.4 because the term introduced an exemption within an exemption. He added that the Secretariat's proposed definition did not exempt the wild-collected seeds of Appendix-I plants. Mr Gabel said that he preferred the Secretariat's definition of 'ranching'. Mr Donaldson commented that he disagreed strongly with the Secretariat on its position with regard to not exempting the seeds of Appendix-I plants from CITES controls. He cited the example of Appendix-I Cycads in which collectors would not collect the plants if they could collect their seeds as an alternative. The Chairman agreed with the comments by Mr Gabel and Mr Donaldson and remarked that the definition may also have to accommodate for a situation in the future where seeds were harvested from a short-lived plant species. Mr Benítez Díaz (observer from Mexico) suggested that the definition of 'artificially propagated' include a definition of 'non-natural environment' alongside the definition of 'under controlled conditions' and that the term 'grown from cuttings or divisions' be deleted. Regarding the recommended changes to Resolution Conf 11.11, outlined in Annex 3 of document PC14 Doc. 7.4, Mr Benítez Díaz recommended changing 'competent government authorities' to 'CITES authorities', further simplifying the recommendation for deeming wild collected seeds as artificially propagated, and that the advice regarding flasked seedlings of Appendix-I orchids be re-written to apply to all flasked seedlings. Ms Irawati added that many nurseries in developing countries would not fit the definition of 'controlled conditions' since they grew plants in private forest gardens. Mr Gabel commented that the United States would not be opposed to adding a section to Resolution Conf. 11.11 stating that plants grown from wild-collected seeds of Appendix-I species would only be exempted from control for the range States. He continued that further definitions in Resolution Conf. 11.11 may be required. Mr Berney (observer from IWMC-World Conservation Trust) argued that the definitions of captive breeding had influenced the definitions of 'artificial propagation' for plants and that 'cultivated parental stock' was not possible for plant species such as annual species, monocarpic species and some palms. He argued that Resolution Conf. 11.11 should be written to be generally applicable and that exceptions be made through species annotations.

The Committee congratulated the working group on plant Resolutions for their work and requested it to prepare a further review of Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11, in consideration of the recommendations made to document PC14 Doc. 7.4 and in document PC14 Doc. 22, and by the meeting participants, for consideration by the Committee later in the meeting. The Committee decided that the working group (Working Group 4) would comprise the original members [the observers from Chile, France, Mexico, the United States (Chairman) and the Secretariat], the regional representative of Africa and the observers from the European Commission and IWMC.

Later in the meeting Mr Gabel introduced document PC14 WG4 Doc. 1, outlining the recommended changes to Resolution Conf. 11.11. Recommendations were made by the participants regarding minor changes to the wording used in document PC14 WG4 Doc. 1. The Committee agreed that the working group had to continue its work, making further amendments to the document following recommendations by the meeting participants and through working with the Secretariat, with the intention of preparing proposed amendments to Resolutions Conf. 11.11 and Conf. 9.19 for consideration at CoP13.

PC14 Doc. 15 Relationship between *in situ* conservation and *ex situ* production of plants [Decision 12.11 l)]: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/14/E-PC14-15.pdf

6. The IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme has been contracted by the Secretariat to prepare a paper to assist the Plants Committee in its discussions on Decision 12.11, paragraph l). A summary of this work was presented at PC13 as document PC13 Inf. 6, Production systems involving CITES-listed species and their impact on wild populations. It was agreed at PC13 that the full IUCN/SSC report should be circulated to PC members and form the basis for discussion at PC14. This report is provided as an Annex to this document.

8. The Plants Committee is requested to review the Annex to this document and to prepare recommendations to be presented at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Plants Committee may also wish to consider whether its work on this topic is now complete taking into account related Agenda item 21.1 on plant production systems and source codes.

Terms of Reference for IUCN report:
IUCN/SSC shall, in close cooperation with the CITES Secretariat, carry out the following activities:
a) Critically review the current definitions and descriptions of production systems for Appendix-listed animal and plant species used in CITES, taking account of work already undertaken by the Animals Committee at its 16th and 17th meetings.
b) Conduct a literature review and/or consult with appropriate experts to determine which other forms of production systems are being used, or could be expected to be used for CITES-listed species. Consult with the AC and PC working groups on this issue to ensure that production systems in mariculture, aquaculture and sylviculture are fully incorporated.
c) Prepare, in tabulated format along with descriptive text, proposed definitions and categories of production systems for Appendix-listed species for circulation by the Secretariat to Parties for testing and comment against existing systems, proposed production systems.

d) Receive and coordinate comments and other inputs from Parties, consulting where necessary with respondents and collaborators.
e) On the basis of comments received, prepare a revised classification of production systems for Appendix-II species on the basis of their relationship with, and relative impact that such systems may have on wild populations, for consideration by the Animals and Plants Committees. Provide recommendations, where necessary, to amend existing conference resolutions.
f) Identify key parameters that Management Authorities can use to identify, monitor and regulate production systems and their likely impact on wild populations, thus facilitate the making of nondetriment findings or not, based on consultation with relevant experts, the Secretariat and Management Authorities.
g) Make recommendations on incorporating production system categorisation in NDF guidelines when they are next revised.

From Summary Record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/14/E-Minutes-PC14.pdf

15. Relationship between in situ conservation and ex situ production plants [Decision 12.11 l)] ..... (PC14 Doc. 15)

The Committee dealt with agenda items 15 and 21 together. The Secretariat introduced these agenda items. Mr Gabel (observer from the United States) introduced document PC14 Inf. 17, commenting that the document was submitted because the report of the IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme, outlined in document PC14 Doc. 15 had become confused on two issues. Firstly, the report suggested that particular plant production systems may be non-detrimental to the survival of species in the wild. He argued that any plant production system could be detrimental and that the report should have just defined different production systems and their source codes. Secondly, he reported that there were several errors in the report that required correcting. Mr Berney (observer from IWMC-World Conservation Trust) agreed, adding that Management Authorities had enough problems with the current source codes and that the report should not have suggested extra ones. Mr Leach added that there was concern that the increased awareness of the wide spectrum of different plant production systems could lead to an explosion in source codes and recommended that there be fewer rather than more of the current source codes. Mr Gabel responded that several changes to the report had not been made following the comments of the Animals Committee at its last meeting, such as the inclusion of additional source codes and the proposed definition of 'bred in captivity'. Mr Berney recommended that the report be re-drafted to deal with animal and plant issues separately. The Secretariat reminded the Plants Committee that Decision 12.11 l) was directed to them, and that the report by IUCN had been brought to its attention for information only. The Plants Committee could develop its own views on this matter.

The Committee agreed that it would not make recommendations based on the Review of Production Systems report by the IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme, as outlined in the Annex to document PC14 Doc. 15. The Committee agreed that the Chairman would inform the IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme of these recommendations. The Committee agreed that it would report to CoP13 that it could not make a decision on these two agenda items and would propose to deal with them again at PC15.

PC14 Doc. 21 Production systems involving CITES-listed species and their impact on wild populations; designation of source codes: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/14/E-PC14-21.pdf

This document presents a table of the current source codes and notes that the Plants Committee might wish to consider forming a working group to consider whether additional source codes for plants are required taking into account the information in the IUCN report

Plant production systems and CITES source codes: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/common/com/pc/14/X-PC14-17-Inf.pdf

From Summary record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/14/E-Minutes-PC14.pdf

21. Production systems involving CITES-listed species and their impact on wild populations; designation of source code ..... (PC14 Doc. 21)
This agenda item was discussed together with agenda item 15.

Thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Bangkok (Thailand), 02-14 October 2004)

CoP13 Doc. 49 Production systems for specimens of CITES listed species: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/13/doc/E13-49.pdf

2. The Animals and Plants Committees have both expressed their concerns that CITES definitions of production systems are not fully understood and are not being used appropriately or consistently by all Parties. For the past several years, the issue of clearly identifying and defining production systems of CITES-listed species and determining under which CITES permit source code each system fits has been discussed extensively by both committees. However, the main goal of clearly identifying and defining production systems of CITES-listed species and determining under which permit source code each system fits remains unfulfilled.

3. A summary of the history of the issue of production systems in both the Animals and Plants Committees is provided in Annex 2 of this document …

5. Leading into AC19 and PC13 (both held in Geneva in August 2003), the production systems discussions in both Committees appeared to be heading toward the same objectives. The Secretariat contracted the IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme to prepare a report on the issue. However, the Animals and Plants Committees concluded that the IUCN/SSC report on production systems presented at PC14 (Windhoek, February 2004, document PC14 Doc. 15, Annex) and AC20 (Johannesburg, March-April 2004, document AC20 Inf. 15) did not clearly define production systems or clearly indicate the appropriate permit source codes for them. Rather, the report confused the issue by linking it with other separate issues, such as the relationship between in situ conservation and ex situ production, economic incentives to encourage conservation and how to make non-detriment findings.

Conclusions
7. Due to ongoing confusion on this issue, it is important now for the Parties to re-focus their efforts on clearly identifying and defining the different production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species of animals and plants. The United States agrees with the recommendations made by the Animals Committee and believes that this issue should be addressed by a joint working group established at CoP13. However, the Parties should be aware that a number of existing CITES Resolutions could potentially need to be revised based on the outcome of the working group's discussions (a list of these Resolutions is provided in Annex 3 of this document). Therefore, to assist in moving forward, the United States offers the following recommendations.

From summary records: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/13/rep/E13-ComIIRep12.pdf

49. Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species

The delegation of the United States introduced document CoP13 Doc. 49, Annex 1 of which contained a draft decision, directed jointly to the Animals and Plants Committees, regarding the establishment of a working group on production systems for CITES-listed species, and setting out terms of reference. The Chairman also drew the attention of the participants to a related recommendation of the Animals Committee, recommendation 2 in the Annex to document CoP13 Doc. 9.1.1, that the Animals and Plants Committees should be jointly involved in examining the definitions of the different production systems for animals and plants and determine the appropriate source codes for each. The establishment of a working group was supported by the delegations of Israel and the Netherlands, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, and by the observer from TRAFFIC who emphasized the importance of accurate reporting of sources. The delegation of the Netherlands, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, proposed that the working group's terms of reference also take into account work on economic incentives and include specific reference to defining ranching. After some discussion, it was agreed to add to paragraph b) of the draft decision an additional subparagraph reading consider the definition of 'ranching' within the context of previous CITES Resolutions. With this amendment, the draft decision in Annex 1 to document CoP13 Doc. 49 was agreed.

CoP13 Doc. 51 Review of Resolutions on plants and plant trade and the definition of 'artificially propagated': https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/13/doc/E13-51.pdf

8. Artificially propagated specimens: Previous discussions in meetings of the Plants Committee had focused largely on the definition of 'artificially propagated', which is somewhat convoluted and unclear. The working group attempted to clarify the definition while retaining its basic elements. Based on a recommendation of the Management Authority of Chile, the working group examined whether to amend the definition of 'artificially propagated' to allow, in exceptional circumstances, for some Appendix-I plants grown from wild-collected seed to be treated as artificially propagated specimens if they meet certain conditions. The basis for Chile's recommendation is the practical limitations that might be experienced in an attempt to meet the requirements of the Convention for long-lived, late-maturing species, such as certain trees (e.g. Araucaria araucana). This alternative treatment is reflected in the paragraph beginning with "RECOMMENDS", presented in bold and brackets under "Regarding the definition of 'artificially propagated'". However, the working group could not reach consensus on this alternative interpretation of the term 'artificially propagated'. Both the United States and the Secretariat oppose the inclusion of such provisions for applying the exemption for artificially propagated plant specimens for several reasons, including:

a) such an interpretation allows regular, repeated commercial trade in specimens that actually originate in the wild, which is a violation of the terms of the Convention, particularly with respect to Appendix-I species;
b) a more appropriate approach would be to apply the ranching provisions of Resolution Conf. 11.16, which includes many of the provisions advocated by Chile;[We note, however, that this Resolution contains numerous references to animals and their various life stages, which caused the working group some difficulty in considering the application of this Resolution to plants.]
c) unlike the provisions for ranching or trade in Appendix-I animal species bred for commercial purposes, the proposed alternative does not include an opportunity for review by the Conference of the Parties; and d) such provisions would add to the complexity and inconsistency of how Appendix-I species are treated, and particularly because some countries in the past have mistakenly designated plants grown from wild-collected seeds, when germinated under controlled conditions, as artificially propagated.

We should also note, however, that the recommendation from Chile was endorsed by the African regional representative to the Plants Committee (Mr Donaldson), who is also Chairman of the IUCN Cycad Specialist Group. He indicated that such an approach might reduce collection pressure on wild populations by providing a source of legitimate specimens for the horticultural market.

9. Grafted plants: The treatment of grafted plants has been separated into its own section, with additional draft language to cover the case of a grafted plant consisting of a graft and rootstock of species listed in different Appendices.

Draft decisions regarding artificially propagated plants: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/13/com/E13-ComI-09.pdf

Draft revision of Resolution Conf. 11.11: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/13/com/E13-ComI-10.pdf

From Summary Records: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/13/rep/E13-ComIRep5.pdf

> ***51. Review of Resolutions on plants and plant trade and the definition of 'artificially propagated'*** *The delegation of the United States introduced document CoP13 Doc. 51, explaining that the working group of the Plants Committee on Resolutions pertaining to plants had reached consensus on all issues of its mandate except for the definition of 'artificially propagated' contained in Resolution Conf. 11.11. What was needed was a discussion of the paragraph under the first 'RECOMMENDS' of Annex 2 of document CoP13 Doc. 51. The delegation of the United States was in agreement with the Secretariat in opposing the proposed definition, as it would allow treatment of Appendix-I listed species that would contravene the text of the Convention. The delegation of Canada agreed with the Secretariat's suggestion of adapting Resolution Conf. 11.16, on Ranching and trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II, to make it equally applicable to plants and animals. That view was also supported by the Netherlands, on behalf of the 25 Member States of the European Community, but with the proviso that a more creative wording might be sought that would be acceptable to range States.*
>
> *The delegation of South Africa welcomed the definition of 'artificially propagated' contained in document CoP13 Doc. 51, believing that it removed confusion. They had taken note of the concerns of the Secretariat with regard to wild-collected seeds, but observed that harvesting of wild seeds could be an important conservation method as it reduced demand for mature or juvenile plants. They were also concerned that these issues would remain unaddressed for too long if a decision were to be delayed so that a new resolution on ranching could be adopted and implemented. In response, the Chairman clarified that it would be possible to present a new draft resolution at the present meeting.*
>
> *The delegation of Chile, supported by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Malaysia and Switzerland, fully supported the revision of Resolution Conf. 11.11 contained in the Annex to document CoP13 Doc. 51, believing that the working group's proposal reflected a practical and desirable solution to the problems faced by range States, and was in line with the underlying spirit of the Convention. They believed that adapting Resolution Conf. 11.16 would lead to unnecessary complexity. They also noted that subparagraph d) in the Spanish version of the text should refer to 'Scientific Authority'. The delegations of Bolivia and Mexico also supported the revision proposed in the Annex to document CoP13 Doc. 51. The former proposed changing 'within a range State' in subparagraph b) under the first RECOMMENDS to within the country of origin. The latter proposed further amendments so that the paragraph should make explicit the following: that only a certain percentage of seeds should be taken from the wild, so as not to endanger wild propagation; that part of the extracted material should be used in plantations or nurseries as future parental stock; and that a certain quantity of the plants propagated in nurseries should be used for restocking areas where the seeds had been collected. The delegations of Guatemala, Kenya, Lesotho and Paraguay supported the revised resolution with these changes. The delegation of the United States suggested that if the proposal were accepted with the changes suggested by the delegations of Bolivia and Mexico, an additional decision should be drafted, directing the Plants Committee to monitor the effects of this alternative definition of "artificially propagated".*
>
> *The Chairman then established a drafting group comprising the original working group established by the Plants Committee and the representative of Africa to the Plants Committee to address this issue. The group was tasked with incorporating the comments from the delegations of Bolivia and Mexico into the draft revision of Resolution Conf. 11.11, in particular into the first paragraph beginning RECOMMENDS. It was also asked to prepare a draft decision to instruct the Plants Committee to monitor the proposed changes. Whilst recognizing the will of the Committee, the Secretariat stressed that in its view, under the terms of the Convention, specimens of plants taken from the wild could never be described as artificially propagated and that a way was needed to accommodate the valid concerns of Chile and South Africa without contradicting the text of the Convention. The Chairman asked the drafting group to report by Friday 8 October.*

From Summary Records: *https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/13/rep/E13-ComIRep8.pdf*

> *In agenda item 51, the delegation of Malaysia noted that they had not supported the Secretariat's suggestion of adapting Resolution Conf. 11.16 and should, instead, be listed in the first line of the third paragraph. The delegation of the United States wished to amend the penultimate sentence of the second paragraph to read <u>They were also concerned that these issues would remain unaddressed for too long if a decision were to be delayed so that a new resolution on ranching could be adopted and implemented</u>. They also wanted to replace the phrase "for future paternal" in the penultimate sentence in the third paragraph with <u>as future parental</u>, and to replace 'thereof' at the end of the fourth paragraph with <u>of this alternative definition of "artificially propagated"</u>. Their final request was to reword the first sentence of the final paragraph of agenda item 51, which would read <u>The Chairman then established a drafting group comprising the original working group established by the Plants Committee and the representative of Africa to the Plants Committee to address the issue.</u>*

CoP13 Doc. 56.3.1 Relationship between *ex situ* breeding and *in situ* conservation Report of the Animal Committee: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/13/doc/E13-56-3-1.pdf

10. The Animals Committee therefore recommends referring issues regarding the relationship between ex situ breeding operations and in situ conservation of CITES-listed species to the Standing Committee which, acting as a clearing house, should direct them to the appropriate CITES bodies. The Animals Committee would have to receive new and very precise instructions if the Standing Committee concludes that the Animals Committee should continue to deal with these issues or relevant aspects thereof. It might also be worth considering this matter in the context of the joint work programme on the relationships between CITES and CBD or the "economic incentives" agenda of the Standing Committee, or to take a "time out" and wait for the findings of additional research on this matter, such as the results of a review by the IUCN Crocodile Specialist Group of the impacts of crocodile ranching operations and ex situ production on in situ conservation of crocodilians.

From Summary Record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/13/rep/E13-ComIIRep5.pdf

The Chairman of the Animals Committee introduced document CoP13 Doc. 56.3.1, noting that, despite several years work, it had not been possible to reach concrete conclusions. He highlighted the recommendation in paragraph 10 to refer issues regarding the relationship between ex situ breeding operations and in situ conservation of CITES-listed species to the Standing Committee which, acting as a clearing house, could direct them to the appropriate CITES bodies. The Secretariat clarified that the clearing-house function of the Standing Committee was a new initiative and suggested adoption of a new decision directed to the Standing Committee, for which the Secretariat would provide the text, to decide the appropriate way to continue.

Pointing out some of the inherent problems with the subject, the delegations of the Bahamas and India supported the recommendation. The delegation of the Netherlands, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, and the observer from TRAFFIC noted that the outcome of discussions should be in conformity with decisions of the CBD and suggested that the issue could be referred to the working group on economic incentives. The delegation of Japan regarded it as premature to adopt the recommendation but considered that it could be included in a joint work plan of CITES and CBD.

The delegation of the United States, supported by the delegation of Israel, did not consider the issue strictly relevant to CITES and could not support the recommendation.

CoP13 Doc. 56.3.2 Relationship between *ex situ* breeding and *in situ* conservation of Appendix-I species [Mexico]: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/13/doc/E13-56-3-2.pdf

6. In recent years, this important issue has become more complex by its relationship to access and benefit-sharing under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). However, we urge Parties not to allow the ongoing CBD debate to obscure the fact that this is also a trade issue, and as such certainly deserves to be considered in the CITES context. Captive-breeding operations for CITES Appendix-I species are often established in non-range States in response to an Appendix-I listing, and supply specimens for a domestic trade as well as for the international trade. While these operations may serve to relieve harvesting pressure on wild populations, they may also remove the economic incentive for range States to conserve those populations. In order to contribute to conservation, these non-range States could make direct and indirect contributions by paying conservation levies, making donations to support in situ conservation projects, donating specimens or genetic material to support recovery projects, transferring technology and providing training to in situ breeding facilities, among others. We realize that the incentive for undertaking such efforts is small, and therefore urge Parties to enter into voluntary cooperative agreements to support in situ conservation of these Appendix-I species. Mexico therefore recommends the adoption of the draft resolution annexed to this document.

From Summary Record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/13/rep/E13-ComIIRep5.pdf

The Chairman then invited the delegation of Mexico to introduce document CoP13 Doc. 56.3.2, noting that it was closely related to the document under discussion and offered another approach. The draft resolution annexed to document Doc. 56.3.2 was generally supported by the delegations of the Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, India and Malaysia, and the observer from WWF.

The delegation of Switzerland, supported by the delegation of China, questioned whether it was appropriate to direct recommendations to ex situ breeding operations, which were often private organizations, as was done in paragraph b) of the draft resolution. He suggested that the paragraph should instead be directed to Parties to take actions in relation to those breeding operations. The delegations of Bolivia and Brazil suggested that additional preambular text be included referring to the CBD. The delegation of the Netherlands, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, were not convinced by the approach suggested by Mexico and favoured further examination in the context of the joint working programme of CITES and CBD.

The Chairman suggested that Mexico, with assistance from other interested Parties, particularly Bolivia, Brazil and Switzerland, revise the draft resolution, on the basis of comments made, for consideration at a future session of the Committee.

Fifteenth meeting of the Plants Committee (Geneva (Switzerland), 17-21 May 2005)

PC15 Doc. 12 Production systems for specimens of CITES listed species:
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/15/E-PC15-12.pdf

Decision 13.68 directs the Animals and Plants Committees to establish an intersessional working group to jointly address issues relating to production systems. The terms of reference of this working group are outlines in Paragraph 4.

In session working group report: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/common/com/ac-pc/X-PC15-AC21-WG4.pdf

The Chairman noted that, in the United States of America, tissue cultures were being viewed as a form of captive breeding for the purpose of issuing CITES documents.

The observer from Canada noted that some production systems are not compatible with existing permit codes. For example, Panax quinquefolius is grown in systems that are neither wild nor do they meet the strict definition of 'artificially propagated'. The observer from Mexico agreed that there is a need to examine production systems that are not captured by existing codes.

The observer from IWMC-World Conservation Trust advised that there should be two purposes to this exercise: an effort to devise more precise codes for trade and the improvement of non-detriment findings for different production systems. He noted that under the strict terms of the Convention, there are only two basic sources of specimens: wild and bred in captivity (animals) or artificially propagated (plants). The Parties have added ranching as a special case of wild. He expressed support for the development of an inventory of all productions systems, with animals and plants treated separately. He advised against the use of additional codes because this would contribute to more confusion, but that more information is needed so that importing countries have a better understanding of production systems in exporting countries.

The observer from the United Kingdom stated that additional codes would not be confusing if they were clearly defined and understandable. She expressed the view that the current system is too ambiguous. The observer from Canada noted that the definition of production systems is distinct from appropriate application of permit codes.

The observer from Canada noted that much work has already been done to inventory different production systems and that we need to determine if the production systems we have identified can be categorized broadly relative to source codes. She noted mariculture and farming as systems to consider.

The Secretariat (De Meulenaer) suggested that the Working Group should focus on common systems first, then consider uncommon systems for a latter phase of work. He noted that some production systems are detrimental.

The observer from the United States of America suggested that production systems that have consistent characteristics in common should be lumped together.

The observer from IWMC-World Conservation Trust advised that the IUCN documents referenced in Decision 13.68 are a good basis from which to begin work, but again advised to keep animals and plants separated.

Regarding the special case of ranching, a general discussion revealed that there seemed to be support for the definition of ranching contained in AC20 WG6 Doc. 1, although there was some feeling that it is a bit wordy. However, Working Group members could not reach consensus on whether the R code should be restricted in use to only those cases of downlistings from Appendix I to Appendix II as per Resolution Conf. 11.16. Although there was agreement that the concept of ranching could be applied to Appendix-II species, it was noted by some observers that allowing the use of the R code for trade in specimens of Appendix-II species did not involve the same scrutiny of management by the Parties as in the case of Resolution Conf. 11.16. On the other hand, it was also the opinion of some Working Group members that use of R for such specimens would be more informative as to the actual level of management applied to the species. Some observers still expressed reservations about whether the use of the R code really conveys any more information than W, and that the use of the R code may convey a sense of conservation value that does not really exist. The observer from Germany in particular expressed the view that exporting countries applying the R code should first have management plans in place that have been reviewed by the Conference of the Parties.

The observer from Species Management Specialists asked whether production systems could be categorized as high, medium or low conservation risk. The observer from the United States of America cautioned against assigning a level of conservation risk to codes, since benefits and risks could be associated with any production system.

From Summary record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/15/E-PC15-SummaryRecord.pdf

12. Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species

This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC15/AC21 meeting. The PC representative of North America introduced documents PC15 Doc. 12 and AC21 Doc. 12, pointing to a mistake in paragraph 5. d) which should have read "… 16th meeting of the Plants Committee and 22nd meeting of the Animals Committee …", instead of "17th" and "23rd" respectively. It was confirmed that NGOs could join a working group on this topic, and delegates from Parties in Asia, Africa and Central and South America and the Caribbean as well as plant experts were also urged to participate. The Committees established a working group (PC15/AC21 WG4) to look at this issue [see document PC15/AC21 WG4 Doc. 1 (Rev. 1) for membership]. Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the Working Group, the PC representative of North America (Mr Gabel), introduced document PC15/AC21 WG4 Doc. 1, stressing the divergence in views in the Working Group, for example on the scope of application of ranching and the use of code 'R'. This meant that ultimately the different viewpoints may have to be presented to the Conference of the Parties, asking it to

make a decision. The Committees adopted the report of PC15/AC21 WG4, acknowledging that the Working Group would need to carry on working intersessionally. It was also noted that PC15/AC21 WG4 would retain the membership indicated in the report, with the addition of the observer from Humane Society International.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the observers from Germany, Israel, Mexico, the Netherlands and Humane Society International, and the Secretariat.

Sixteenth meeting of the Plants Committee (Lima (Peru), 03-08 July 2006)

PC16 Doc. 12.2 Review of production systems: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/16/E-PC16-12-01.pdf

5. The working group deliberations have resulted in multiple, often directly competing, recommendations for some source codes, which in some cases would result in a significant departure from current practice. There is disagreement within the working group on the application of ranching and the use of its associated source code 'R', and working group members also failed to reach consensus on source codes applying to plant specimens that are artificially propagated and animals that are bred in captivity.

Report of the working group is in the Annex: Based on historical information, including the Convention and CITES resolutions, the purpose of source codes on CITES permits are threefold. First, they provide information on how the specimen in trade was produced (e.g. harvested from the wild, bred in captivity, artificially propagated). Second, they indicate whether a CITES document was issued under Article III, IV or V, or whether it was issued under one of the exemptions provided in Article VII. Third, as noted in Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP13) on Permits and Certificates, "the data carried on permits and certificates must supply maximum information, as much for export as for import, to allow verification of the conformity between the specimens and the document."

As evident from the history on this subject, the Parties, through the Plants and Animals Committees, have been attempting to relate production systems to a corresponding source code for some time. The Parties have acknowledged that CITES definitions of source codes are not fully understood and are not being used appropriately or consistently by all Parties.

Through the significant discussions carried out to date, it appears that the Parties have agreed on three basic principles:
a) although there is a wide range of production systems in use, creating a number of new source codes for such systems would be confusing and not necessarily helpful;
b) if new source codes were necessary, the additions should be kept to an absolute minimum; and
c) source codes themselves do not indicate non-detriment findings, but reflect information that should be used in making non-detriment findings.

The document then proposes options for each source code.

In session working group report: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/common/com/ac-pc/PC16-AC22-WG03-Doc01.pdf

From Summary Record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/16/E-PC16_summary_record.pdf

12.1 Review of production systems
This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC16/AC22 session.
The PC representative of North America introduced documents AC22 Doc. 12.1 and PC16 Doc. 12.1. The main areas of disagreement within the joint PC/AC working group on production system, established at the previous joint meeting of the AC and PC in 2005, were codes and definitions for artificially propagated plants, captive-bred animals and ranching, and the use of source code 'F'.

The Committees established a working group (PC16/AC22 WG3) on the review of production systems, of with the membership is shown in Annex 1.
The working group was instructed to undertake the following:
1. Finalize the report in the Annex to documents AC22/PC16 Doc. 12.1;
2. In particular try to reach consensus on the use of source code 'R' and on source codes applicable to artificially propagated plants and animals that are bred in captivity;
3. Consider a revision of Resolution Conf. 11.16 on Ranching and trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II in the light of the discussion on the use of source code 'R' and ranching production systems; and
4. Prepare a report for the Animals and Plants Committee to submit to CoP14.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of PC16/AC22 WG3, the PC representative of North America, presented document PC16/AC22 WG3 Doc. 1, pertaining to items 12.1 and 12.2. He explained that the discussion in the working group on the proposed use of source code R (for 'ranching') had not been concluded, and that no consensus had been reached on the use of

source codes A, C and D (for 'artificially propagated' and 'captive bred') and F for animals born in captivity that do not fulfil the definition of 'bred in captivity' in Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.), as well as parts and derivatives thereof. The Working Group had also been unable to agree on a possible revision of Resolution Conf. 11.16. However, in view of the progress that had been made, he believed that all these issues could be resolved and a document prepared for CoP14. Broad agreement had for instance been reached on ranching and the use of source code 'R'. The observer from the Netherlands noted that the discussions in the Working Group had mostly involved importing countries and NGOs, and that it would be important to engage exporting countries.

The Committees took note of document PC16/AC22 WG3 Doc. 1, and agreed that their joint Working Group on Production Systems for Specimens of CITES-Listed Species continue intersessionally to attempt to fulfil its mandate as agreed at the present meeting. Parties, IGOs and NOGs interested in joining the existing Working Group should contact the Chairman of PC16/AC22 WG3. The Working Group was encouraged to seek the opinion of exporting Parties on the use of source codes.

PC16 Doc. 18 Effects of implementing the revised definition of 'artificially propagated': https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/16/E-PC16-18.pdf

2. In Decision 13.72 the Conference of the Parties directs the Plants Committee to: monitor the effects of implementing the revised definition of 'artificially propagated' contained in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP13), pertaining to the production of specimens of Appendix-I species grown from wild-collected seeds and spores, and report their findings at the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties. This report shall particularly note any adverse effects on the conservation of Appendix-I species that have been subject to this revised definition.

3. At its 15th meeting (Geneva, May 2005), the Plants Committee instructed the Secretariat to issue a Notification to the Parties requesting them to provide information on the implementation of the revised definition of 'artificially propagated' contained in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP13), practical case studies or examples, and information on any adverse effect on the conservation of Appendix-I species that may have been noted.

4. Consequently, the Secretariat issued Notification to the Parties No. 2005/045 on 11 August 2005. By the deadline of 31 December 2005, it had received replied from: Canada, Chile, Mexico, New Zealand, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. These are copied in the Annex to this document in the language in which they were received, for analysis by the Committee, with a view to using them in its report for the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

5. According to Decision 13.72, the Committee is therefore requested to analyse these responses and prepare its report for presentation at the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, noting particularly any adverse effects of the revised definition of 'Artificially propagated' on the conservation of Appendix-I species that have been subject to it.

From Summary Record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/16/E-PC16_summary_record.pdf

18. Effects of implementing the revised definition of 'artificially propagated'
The Secretariat introduced document PC16 Doc. 18. At the request of the PC representative of North America, the observer from Chile elaborated on the country's response to Notification to the Parties No. 2005/045 on this matter, explaining that in the case of the production of Araucaria araucana from wild-collected seeds, the revised definition of 'artificially propagated' had not caused negative effects on the conservation of the species The Plants Committee noted document PC16 Doc. 18. In the context of the implementation of Decision 13.72, the Committee concluded that for the time being, the revised definition of 'Artificially propagated' had not adversely effected the conservation of Appendix-I species that had been subject to it. During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the PC representative of North America and the observer from Chile.

Fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (The Hague (Netherlands), 03-15 June 2007)

CoP14 Doc. 8.3 Report of the Plants Committee: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/14/doc/E14-08-3.pdf

The report of the Plants Committee to CoP14 proposes to amend the current Resolution 10.13 definition of "artificially propagated" for timber species as well as proposing a suite of decisions to implement recommendations from a 2006 workshop on agarwood.

89. Decision 13.65, paragraph d) required input from the Plants Committee so the Secretariat could present information on the identification of Agarwood products in trade at a capacity-building workshop, as well as information that would assist in determining sustainable harvest levels and in making non-detriment findings. The regional representatives for Asia (Ms Irawati), Oceania (Mr Greg Leach) and the alternate for Asia (Mr Zul Mukshar bin Md. Shaari) participated in the workshop held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, from 14 to 17 November.

90. The full report and recommendations from the workshop will be distributed by TRAFFIC Southeast Asia. However, in the final plenary session of the workshop, participants agreed to a number of actions that would be best progressed through a number of

new decisions. The workshop participants requested that these draft decisions be submitted to the Conference of the Parties for approval through the Plants Committee Chairman's report.

91. There has been a substantial increase in the extent of agarwood plantations in a number of countries with a predicted significant increase in plantation-sourced agarwood entering trade in coming years. The agarwood workshop identified a number of definitional issues relating to artificial propagation, plantations, and non-timber forest products that needed further clarity.

From Summary Records:

Report of the Plants Committee: *https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/14/rep/E14-Plen-2.pdf*

The Secretariat suggested that all of the draft decisions in the document be referred to Committee I, and that the budget matters be referred to Committee II. This was agreed and the report was noted.

Report of Committee I: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/14/rep/E14-Com-I-Rep-04.pdf

Draft decisions related to agarwood were adopted, but there is no discussion of the proposed changes to Resolution 10.13

Report of Committee I: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/14/rep/E14-Com-I-Rep-14.pdf

The Chairman corrected an omission in Summary Record CoP14 Com. I. Rep. 4, in so far as it had not reflected two amendments agreed in session to Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP13). Firstly the United States had suggested replacing the word "taken" with "derived" in the definition of 'artificially propagated' [paragraph g)], and this had been reflected in document Com. I. 9 (Rev. 1). Secondly Suriname had suggested replacing the word "fixed" with "annual" in the new paragraph added under Regarding the establishment of export quotas for timber species, and this correction needed to be made to the text in document Com. I. 9 (Rev. 1).

AMENDMENT PROPOSAL OF RESOLUTION CONF. 10.13 (COP13) ON TIMBER SPECIES CoP14 Com I.9 R1: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/14/com/E14-Com-I-09.pdf

To amend the current definition of 'artificially propagated' for timber species as stated in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (CoP13) so as to read: timber and non-timber products derived from trees grown in monospecific plantations be considered as being artificially propagated in accordance with the definition contained in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP13)

Report of Plenary: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/14/rep/E14-Plen-6.pdf

The Chairman of Committee I reported that the 14 draft decisions on a variety of subjects and a draft amendment to Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP13) on Implementation of the Convention for timber species, contained in the Annex to document CoP14 Doc. 8.3 (Rev. 1), had been agreed by consensus, subject to some minor amendments. The resulting texts were to be found in document CoP14 Com. I. 9 (Rev. 1), with the words "annual national export quotas" replacing "fixed national export quotas" in the draft amendment to Resolution Conf. 10.13 (CoP13). This correction had been omitted in Summary Record CoP14 Com. I. Rep. 14 but would be recorded
in the revised version of the Summary Record. The draft decisions and draft amendment to Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP13), with the correction described above, in document CoP14 Com. I. 9 (Rev. 1) were adopted.

CoP14 Doc. 38 Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species:
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/14/doc/E14-38.pdf

4. At the 22nd and 16th meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees (AC22 and PC16; Lima, 2006), the discussion in the joint working group on the proposed use of source code R (for 'ranching') could not be concluded. No consensus had been reached on the use of source codes A, C and D (for 'artificially propagated' and 'captive bred') and F (for animals born in captivity that do not fulfil the definition of 'bred in captivity' in Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.), as well as parts and derivatives thereof). There was also no consensus on extending the application of source code F to plants. Further, there was no agreement on a possible revision of Resolution Conf. 11.16. Nevertheless, in view of the progress that had been made within the joint working group, the Committees concluded that in regard to the codes, the deliberations should be continued and that, what concerns the concept of ranching, there was interest in trying to develop a common understanding for the purpose of improving the definition of ranching used for CITES purposes, and thus better define the applicability of source code R for the issuance of CITES documents.

5. The joint working group continued to work intersessionaly after AC22 and PC16, but failed to reach consensus on the items mentioned in paragraph 4. Therefore, the instructions in Decision 13.68 could not be implemented.

From Summary Record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/14/rep/E14-Com-I-Rep-01.pdf

38. Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species

The Chairman of the Animals Committee outlined the tasks set out by Decision 13.68 regarding, inter alia, production systems, CITES permit source codes, and the definition of ranching. He noted that consensus could not be reached on the use of source codes A, C, D or R, or on extending the application of source code F to plants. Australia highlighted the need to look at production systems not normally considered as ranching, such as aquaculture systems. The draft decision included in document CoP14 Doc. 38 to continue work on this issue was supported by Indonesia, Senegal and the United States of America. Senegal stressed the need for work to consider ranching in a broad sense.

Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, suggested addressing this item along with agenda item 21 regarding the revision of Resolution Conf. 11.16, which was under consideration by Committee II. Israel and the United States pointed out that logistical and substantive problems would arise from this approach, and it was agreed to keep the draft decision separate although the Chairman said he would still discuss the issue with his Committee II counterpart.

Seventeenth meeting of the Plants Committee (Geneva (Switzerland), 15-19 April 2008)

PC17 Doc. 9 Review of the use of source code 'R': https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/17/E-PC17-09.pdf

9. The Committees are invited to review countries which are using the source code 'R' and identify those doing so on a regular basis for species other than crocodilians transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II subject to ranching. The Secretariat will then seek information from these countries about the management programmes for such species. The Committees are also invited to decide how they will review the literature on wildlife management for current information on management systems that would resemble ranching (i.e. primarily focused on the harvest of specimens representing early life stages for rearing in captivity) and identify common elements in these programmes, so that at their next meetings they can agree a definition of ranching and the use of source code 'R' for CITES purposes which can be reported at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties in compliance with Decision 14.52.

From Summary record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/17/E-PC17_summary_record.pdf

*9**. Review of the use of source code 'R'***
This agenda item was discussed during the joint PC17/AC23 session. The Secretariat introduced documents PC17 Doc. 9 (Rev. 2) and AC23 Doc. 9 (Rev. 2) which addressed implementation of Decision 14.152. It drew attention to a correction of the tables in Annex 2 of the documents: all exports from Peru in 1994 had been misclassified in the CITES database of annual report statistics; these should have been reported under source code 'A' and not 'R' and should therefore not have been included in the table.

In order to further implementation of Decision 14.152, a working group (PC17/AC23 WG3) was established. The membership of the group is included in Annex 1 to the present document.

Later, the Committees adopted the report of PC17/AC23 WG3 presented orally by the Netherlands as co-chairman of the group, as follows:
a) Based on the trade data provided in document AC23 Doc. 9 (Rev. 2) a small drafting group will select relevant Parties and species during AC23 from which the working group will seek information on use of code 'R' through a questionnaire. The small group will also draft questions, and will look into how to proceed with the literature review, assisted by NGOs and IUCN.
b) The co-chairmen of the working group, in consultation with the working group and the relevant regional representatives of the Committees will send a questionnaire to the selected Parties and request a response within 2 months, that is before 1 July 2008.
c) The co-chairmen of the working group, in consultation with the working group, will review and analyse the information received and decide how to proceed in order to prepare a document for the next AC and PC.
d) If feasible, a draft document will be sent to the Parties for consultation in September 2008.
e) A redrafted document will be submitted by the working group to the Animals Committee and Plants Committee in December 2008.
f) It may be necessary to revise the proposed time-schedule during the process.
g) Animals and plants will not be merged, but will follow the same process.

Eighteenth meeting of the Plants Committee (Buenos Aires (Argentina), 17-21 March 2009)

PC18 Doc. 9 Review of the use of source code 'R': https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/18/E-PC18-09.pdf

Results are provided of a survey for source code R. Only example of Source code R used for plants is Georgia (snowdrops).

10. … Georgia used source code R for Galanthus woronowii in 1999-2001, which was agreed by the CITES Secretariat. Since the 11th meeting of the Plants Committee in 2001 it was decided that bulbs harvested from farm fields are to be regarded as being of wild origin. Since 2002 Georgia uses source code W for Galanthus woronowii.

From Summary record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/18/E-PC18-sum.pdf

9. Review of the use of source code 'R'
The Netherlands introduced document PC18 Doc. 9. The Committee agreed to recommend at CoP15 that Parties not use source code 'R' for plants. Participants believed that the concept of ranching was not appropriate for plants and were concerned that continued use of the source code 'R' could permit laundering of wild plants.

PC18 Doc.15 Definition of non-timber forest products:
https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/18/E-PC18-15.pdf

4 At the Experts Group Meeting on Agarwood: Capacity building Workshop for improving implementation and enforcement of the listing of Aquilaria malaccensis and other Agarwood–producing species, held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia in November 2006, the issue of dealing with the regulation and permitting of increasing amounts of plantation-grown Agarwood was a major topic of discussion.

5 A possible solution for exempting the plantation material from CITES controls was to include plantation grown Agarwood in the definition of 'artificially propagated' in Resolution Conf 10.13 (Implementation of the Convention for timber species). Such a solution raised the subsequent issue that Agarwood was not really a timber species and workshop participants found it peculiar that a resolution relating to timber species should be utilised for Agarwood. The discussion considered the question of what was 'Agarwood' as a product, and it was in this context that the issue of a definition of non-timber products was raised with reference to the implementation of the Convention. The workshop did not consider the subtlety in the difference between a definition of non-timber products compared with non-timber forest products or minor forest products.

6 Agarwood can be traded in many forms from large lumps of wood to woodchips, wood powder or sawdust, leaves for tea, distilled oil and manufactured products such as incense and perfumes. It is not a high-value timber species, but commands high prices for its non-timber products. It was noted that CITES has the capacity to almost infinitely define products that are either controlled or exempted from control.

7 The original problem for Agarwood that initiated this discussion was solved at CoP14 by an amendment to Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP14) with the inclusion of non-timber products from trees in the definition of artificially propagated specimens. Plantation-grown Agarwood from monospecific plantations in any of its traded forms can now be treated as artificially propagated.

8. There is potential confusion in that the title of the relevant Resolution [Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. Cop14)] is "Implementation of the Convention for timber species" but the definition of 'artificially propagated' in the Resolution now allows non-timber products from trees to be considered under this Resolution.

10. It was observed that there is confusion in the use of two separate terms, "non-timber products from trees" and "non-timber forest products." These are not the same, but were being used interchangeably at the last PC meeting. In one instance, the artificial propagation definition would apply as for timber from plantations, but for the other it would not. For example, agarwood harvested from trees in a plantation would qualify as artificially propagated (as a non-timber product from trees), but specimens from some sort of understory plants growing under the trees in a plantation (a non-timber forest product) would only qualify if the understory plants were themselves artificially propagated in accordance with the definition contained in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP14).

16 b) Although the language of Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP14) is sufficiently precise and clear as to its intent, should further clarification be required, the WG suggests the Resolution could be amended using existing CITES terminology as follows:

Regarding the definition of 'artificially propagated'
g) Timber ~~and non-timber products~~ or other parts or derivatives of ~~derived from~~ trees grown in monospecific plantations be considered as being artificially propagated in accordance with the definition contained in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP14);

From Summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/18/E-PC18-sum.pdf

15. Definition of non-timber forest products
The representative of Oceania (Mr Leach) introduced document PC18 Doc. 15. The Committee adopted the recommendations in paragraph 16 of the document, that a definition of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) was no longer needed and that Decision 14.142 had been implemented.

Although some participants felt that, because agarwood is grown in mixed plantations, including rubber plantations, the word "monospecific" could be deleted from paragraph g) in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP14) on Implementation of the Convention for timber species, others were concerned that this could have unintended consequences for other species and that more study of the matter was needed.

The Committee agreed to a suggestion by the representative of Oceania that it should propose two draft decisions on this issue to CoP15 which would read:
Directed to the Plants Committee
The Plants Committee shall consider current definitions of artificially propagated plants and how they apply to trees in mixed species plantations, and report at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Directed to the Secretariat
The Secretariat will obtain funding and will liaise with agarwood range States to organize a workshop to discuss management of wild and plantation-sourced agarwood.

Fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Doha (Qatar), 13-25 March 2010)

CoP15 Doc. 29 Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/15/doc/E15-29.pdf

Plants Committee
14. The response to the questionnaire did not provide an example for ranching of plants. The intersessional working group of the joint AC/PC suggested not to use source code R for plants (PC18 Doc. 9). The Plants Committee (PC18) in March 2009 advised that the concept of ranching was not appropriate for plants and was concerned that continued use of source code R could permit laundering of wild plants. The Plants Committee (PC18) in March 2009 agreed to recommend at CoP15 that Parties not use source code R for plants.

From Summary records: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/15/sum/E15-Com-I-Rec02.pdf

…
Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, supported the change to the definition of ranching as amended by the Secretariat which provided further clarity to the term. However, they felt there would still be confusion on how to apply codes for production systems similar to ranching, and opposed the restriction of source code R only to populations of species that had been transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II as ranching is not specific to an Appendix. This would also limit the availability of trade data with source R that could be available from the CITES Trade Database for the Review of Significant Trade process. They further noted that ranching is a more benign form of harvest than wild harvest, and that non-detriment findings were still required for ranched specimens as well as those of wild origin.
…
Mexico stated that Resolution Conf 11.16 made reference only to ranched populations that had been transferred from Appendix I to II. Israel suggested formation of a drafting group to provide two sets of wording for a definition of ranching to incorporate and highlight the opposing views. This could be brought back to Committee I for discussion and a vote. The Chair agreed on this as way forward and the working group was formed with the following members: Australia, China, Israel, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States (Chair), Species Management Specialists and Species Survival Network.

From Summary Records: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/15/sum/E15-Com-I-Rec12.pdf

The United States introduced document CoP15 Com. I. 17, containing two draft decisions, the second of which included two operative options. The Secretariat asked for clarification of the amount of external funds that were likely to be required in paragraph 2 a). Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, supported by Australia, indicated that they would prefer Option 2 in paragraph 3. The document was accepted, with Option 2 as the selected option.

https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/15/ins/E15-Com-I-17.pdf
2. The following draft decisions should be accepted:
Directed to the Secretariat
15.XX The Secretariat shall:
a) contingent on the availability of external funds, contract an appropriate expert to prepare a guide to advise the Parties on the appropriate use of source codes;
b) provide a draft of this guide to the Animals and Plants Committees for review and comment; and
c) prepare and distribute the final product, incorporating the feedback of the Animals and Plants Committees, to inform the Parties on the appropriate use of source codes.
Directed to the Animals and Plants Committees
15.XX The Animals and Plants Committees shall review and provide feedback to the Secretariat on the draft guide to advise the Parties on the appropriate use of source codes.

CoP15 Doc. 60 Agarwood producing taxa Annex: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/15/doc/E15-60.pdf

To amend:

Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP14): Implementation of the Convention for timber species

Regarding the definition of 'artificially propagated'

g) timber ~~and non-timber products~~ or other parts or derivatives of ~~derived from~~ trees grown in monospecific plantations be considered as being artificially propagated in accordance with the definition contained in Res. Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP14);

DRAFT DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

15.XX (15.94)

Directed to the Plants Committee:

The Plants Committee shall consider current definitions of artificially propagated plants and how they apply to trees in mixed species plantations and report back to the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

From Summary record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/15/sum/E15-Com-I-Rec03.pdf

The Chair of the Plants Committee introduced document CoP15 Doc. 60 and noted that the Plants Committee had accepted the amendments proposed by the Secretariat to the draft decision directed to the Secretariat. The representative of TRAFFIC completed an introduction to the document, explaining some of the problems associated with this issue.

The inclusion of the word 'monospecific' in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP14) had been debated at length but no conclusion had been reached. Thailand and Viet Nam recommended that the word should be deleted, on the basis that many agarwood-producing trees were in mixed species plantations. The United States recommended that discussion of this issue should continue at the next meeting of the Plants Committee, as was suggested in document CoP15 Doc. 60, in a draft decision directed to the Plants Committee.

Indonesia noted that they were organizing a workshop to discuss this subject, which would take place in 2011.

Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, supported the adoption of the current wording in the document, including the revisions made by the Secretariat. This position was also held by Cambodia, Kuwait and Malaysia, with the last of these also expressing support for developing a workshop on these issues.

The All Assam Agar Traders and Agaroil Manufacturers supported the need to clarify the definition of terms used in the document. They were concerned that no export permits had yet been issued for agarwood from cultivated sources in India.

The proposals in the Annex to the document were accepted by consensus, with the replacement of the text of the draft decision directed to the Secretariat replaced by the revised version in paragraph A of the Comments from the Secretariat and the associated budget in paragraph 22 of the document was noted.

From Summary Record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/15/sum/E15-Plen-05.pdf

The Chair of Committee I reported that two draft decisions Regarding agarwood-producing taxa and an amendment to Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP14) on Implementation of the Convention for timber had been accepted by consensus and could be found in document CoP15 Com. I. 4. These were adopted.

From Com-I-04: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/15/ins/E15-Com-I-04.pdf

Nineteenth meeting of the Plants Committee (Geneva (Switzerland), 18-21 April 2011)

PC19 Doc.16.3 Agarwood producing taxa (Decision 15.94):
https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/19/e19-16-03.pdf

2. Decision 15.94 is directed to the Plants Committee: The Plants Committee shall consider current definitions of artificially propagated plants and how they apply to trees in mixed species plantations and report at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

3. The Decision seeks to examine whether there are any deficiencies in the definitions of artificially propagated as they apply to mixed species plantations. Although the wording of the Decision is very broad and applies to all mixed tree species plantations, the primary concern remains that of Agarwood.

5. There are two possible approaches to this Decision in considering the definitions of artificially propagated as they apply to trees in mixed species plantations. One is through Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) Implementation of the Convention for timber species. The other is through Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15) Regulation of trade in plants.

Paragraphs 6 to 20 discuss the different approaches

21. The Plants Committee is requested to consider the approaches outlined above as a means to implementing Decision 15.94. In particular:

a) Should a revised wording for Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) be crafted that restricts the consideration of plantation material only to those specimens that have been deliberately cultivated and explicitly exclude any adventive material that occurs in a plantation? Would such a wording alleviate concerns and allow consideration of deletion of the restriction to monospecific plantations?

b) Parties producing plantation grown Agarwood are requested to provide background on the source of origin of the plantation material i.e., is the material sourced from within or outside the range state, whether seed or vegetative propagation is used and whether there is ongoing collection of wild propagating material.

c) Does the application and interpretation of Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15) satisfy all Parties that are producing mixed species plantation grown Agarwood that this material can qualify as artificially propagated?

d) Are there other non-Agarwood CITES listed tree species that should be considered in this discussion of mixed species plantations?

From Summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/19/Sum/E19_SumRec.pdf

Later in the meeting, the Chair of WG11 presented the recommendations of the group as follows.

Working group report: Agar producing taxa (Agenda item 16.3) - https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/19/wg/E19-WG11.pdf

1. The Working Group noted the ongoing concerns expressed by the United States and other Parties about the possible ramifications of the deletion of the word 'monospecific' in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15). The concern is a broader issue than the application of 'artificially propagated' to other non-plantation species. It was considered unlikely that any new wording would alleviate these concerns. Nevertheless, the working group agreed to leave this issue for consideration in the proposed agarwood workshops in conjunction with the consideration of the application of Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15).

2. Agarwood range States participating in the agarwood workshop to be held in Kuwait in October 2011 will be requested to provide information on the origin of their plantation material.

3. The Kuwait workshop will include an agenda item for agarwood range States to assess the application of artificially propagated in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15) to their plantations.

4. The information derived from recommendations 2 and 3 above will be fed into the second workshop being held in Indonesia in late 2011.

5. The working group did not elicit any particular CITES-listed tree species that may be of concern with mixed-species plantations, but recommended that the outcomes of the agarwood workshops be a useful model for any future considerations of other CITES-listed tree species grown in mixed plantations.

The Committee noted the recommendations and welcomed the assurances from Kuwait and Indonesia that they would work closely together on the subjects to be covered in agarwood workshops planned for Kuwait (first week of October 2011) and Sumatra, Indonesia (fourth week of November 2011).

PC19 Doc. 17 Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species: No Document

From Summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/19/Sum/E19_SumRec.pdf

17. Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species

The Secretariat reported that they had located funding through the European Commission and would soon be engaging a consultant to produce the report called for in Decision 15.52 for PC20. This was noted. There were no interventions during discussion of this item.

Twentieth meeting of the Plants Committee (Dublin (Ireland), 22-30 March 2012)

PC20 Doc. 17.2.1 Agarwood-producing taxa (Decision 15.94):
https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/20/E20-17-02-01.pdf

PC20 Inf. 1: Workshop on Implementation of CITES for Agarwood-Producing Species (3-6 October 2011, Kuwait) https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/common/com/pc/20/inf_docs/E20-01i.pdf

PC20 Inf. 7: Asia Regional Workshop on Agarwood: Management of Wild and Plantation-Grown Agarwood Trees – Report of the Workshop (Bangka Tengah, Province of Bangka Belitung Islands, Indonesia, 22-24 November 2011) https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/common/com/pc/20/inf_docs/E20-07i.pdf

From Summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/20/sum/E-PC20-SumRec.pdf

> *Kuwait then introduced document PC20 Doc. 17.2.1, explaining that it had been prepared jointly with Indonesia and that it conveyed the results of workshops on agarwood-producing species held in these two countries in October and November 2011. More detailed information about these workshops could be found in information documents PC20 Inf. 1 and PC20 Inf. 7. Guidance was sought on how to submit these proposals at CoP16 and in particular what status the glossary in Annex 3 of document PC20 Doc. 17.2.1 could have.*
>
> *The Committee established a working group (PC20 WG6), to be co-chaired by the regional representatives of Asia (Ms Zhou) and Oceania (Mr Leach), and by Kuwait, with the mandate to consider the recommendations in documents PC20 Doc. 15.1 and PC20 Doc. 17.2.1.*
>
> *Later in the meeting, Mr Leach introduced document PC20 WG6 Doc. 1, noting that the regional representative of Africa (Mr Hafashimana) and India had participated in the working group. Indonesia introduced document PC20 Com. 1, welcoming comments. With respect to the definitions of artificially propagated plants and how they applied to trees in mixed species plantations, it was recognized that there was some overlap between the proposals of the range States and the obligation of the Committee arising from Decision 15.94. Some speakers expressed concern that defining specimens of artificially propagated agarwood-producing species too broadly would mean that controls would be reduced on many specimens exported and that, if the amended definition were applied to other plant species, there may be unforeseen consequences. It was not possible to reconcile the diverging views on this point. Regarding the Committee's comments on other aspects of documents PC20 Doc. 15.1, the suggestions in document PC20 WG6 were welcomed by Kuwait, which confirmed that they would act on them when making their proposal for CoP16. There was less discussion on the working group's recommendations related to PC20 Doc. 17.2.1 and to document PC20 Com. 1.*
> *The Committee agreed the following amendments to document PC20 WG6 Doc. 1: (see doc for detailed amendments)*
>
> *With these changes, the Committee adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 1 to 14 of document PC20 WG6 Doc. 1.9*
> *With respect to paragraphs 15 to 18 of document PC20 WG6 Doc. 1 and to document PC20 Com. 1, the Committee noted that Parties would consider submitting these proposals at CoP16.10*
>
> *https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/common/com/pc/20/E20-Com-01.pdf*
> *https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/20/wg/E20-WG06.pdf*

62nd meeting of the Standing Committee (Geneva (Switzerland), 23-27 July 2012)

SC62 Doc. 26 Implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens:
https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/62/E62-26.pdf

> ***Recommendations:***
> *Paragraph 8 a) The implementation of Decisions 15.52 and 15.53 regarding development and review of a guide on the use of source codes is considered a high priority that would help to address several important issues. This project, subject to external funds, has not been funded and no progress has been made on implementing these decisions. The Standing Committee should consider possible sources of funding for this work and, if these decisions are not implemented prior to CoP16, should recommend that these decisions be retained following CoP16.*

From Summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/62/E-SC62-SumRec.pdf

> *There was general support for the recommendations of the working group, with the suggestion of the Secretariat. Support was also expressed for the development of guidelines for monitoring captive-breeding operations. The reference to captive breeding in the recommendations from the Working Group on Snakes was mentioned, as was the need to coordinate approaches.*

Sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Bangkok (Thailand), 03-14 March 2013)

CoP16 Doc. 48 Implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens:
https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/16/doc/E-CoP16-48.pdf

Recommendation: agree that Decisions 15.52 and 15.53, regarding development and review of a guide on the use of source codes, should remain in effect following CoP16;

From summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/common/cop/16/sum/E-CoP16-Com-II-Rec-08.pdf

The draft decisions in the Annex to the document, with the amendment suggested by the Secretariat were accepted. The Committee agreed to retain Decisions 15.52 and 15.53.

CoP16 Doc. 67.1 Agarwood-producing taxa: Report of the Plants Committee: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/16/doc/E-CoP16-67-01.pdf

From Summary Record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/common/cop/16/sum/E-CoP16-Com-I-Rec-03.pdf

The Chair of the Plants Committee introduced document CoP16 Doc. 67.1 (Rev. 2) referring to Decision 15.94 on agarwood-producing taxa. She described the recommendations of the working group formed at PC19 (Geneva, 2011), highlighting the possible ramifications of the deletion of the word 'monospecific' in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15). She introduced the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) and the two draft decisions in the annex to the document. …

Indonesia provided further details on document CoP16 Doc. 67.2 (Rev. 1), expressing the view that the unique nature of the agarwood trade merited a specific resolution. They expressed their concern that the current definitions of "artificially propagated" and "under controlled conditions" in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15) and Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) were not readily applicable to plantations in the tropics. Ireland, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, and supported by the United States, were opposed to certain aspects of document CoP16 Doc. 67.1 (Rev. 2) but supported the draft decisions contained in it.

Ireland, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, and supported by the United States, were opposed to certain aspects of document CoP16 Doc. 67.1 (Rev. 2) but supported the draft decisions contained in it. Australia, Canada, China, the Kingdom of Bahrain, Ireland, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, the United Arab Emirates and the United States all broadly supported the draft resolution in the annex to document CoP16 Doc. 67.2 (Rev. 1). They proposed the formation of drafting group to revise it. Indonesia did not support the proposal to form a drafting group, as the resolution had been drafted on the basis of several working groups with representation from key stakeholders. Kuwait added that they would like to hear the views of range States before coming to a decision. Qatar expressed its support for both documents.

From Summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/common/cop/16/sum/E-CoP16-Com-I-Rec-04.pdf

Thailand, as one of the co-proponents of document CoP16 Doc. 67.2 (Rev. 1) introduced the draft resolution regarding Implementation of the Convention for agarwood-producing taxa. Malaysia, Viet Nam and the Assam Agarwood Association supported the draft resolution. Ireland, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, requested clarification on how the resolution would apply with respect to "gardens, homes and community gardens". Indonesia clarified that agarwood grown in home gardens could not be described as being of wild origin.

The United States of America supported the draft resolution in principle, but expressed concern over the definition of "artificially propagated", noting that the proposed definition could allow regular, repeated wild-collection of specimens and their subsequent export as artificially propagated. The United States proposed the adoption of a decision to monitor implementation of the draft resolution to assess possible impacts as follows:
Decision 16.XX The Plants Committee shall monitor the implementation of Resolution Conf. 16.XX Implementation of the Convention for agarwood-producing taxa to assess any potential conservation impacts to the long-term survival of agarwood-producing species and possible problems arising from the implementation, and shall report on these issues at the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Australia, Canada, Ireland, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, supported the adoption of the draft resolution with the draft decision proposed by the United States. China, Indonesia, Kuwait and Thailand agreed to the draft decision proposed by the United States. This and the draft resolution in the Annex to document CoP16 Doc. 67.2 (Rev. 1) were accepted.

From Conf. 16.10 Implementation of the Convention for agarwood-producing taxa: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/document/E-Res-16-10.pdf

1. AGREES that:

a) the current definition of 'artificially propagated' in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17) does not meet the circumstances of agarwood-producing taxa, due to the definition of the term 'under controlled conditions', and that the source of parental stock is not suitable and fully complied with in the plantation activities of agarwood-producing taxa; and
b) the source of seeds or propagules for cultivation of agarwood-producing species may be obtained from the wild according to the definition of 'cultivated parental stock' in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17);

2. ADOPTS the following definition for terms used in this Resolution:

For agarwood-producing taxa, 'under controlled conditions' means in a tree plantation, including other non-natural environment, that is manipulated by human intervention for the purpose of producing plants or plant parts and derivatives;

3. DETERMINES that the term 'artificially propagated' shall be interpreted to refer to plant specimens of agarwood as follows:
a) grown under controlled conditions; and
b) grown from seeds, seedlings, saplings, cuttings, grafting, marcoting/air-layering, divisions, plant tissues or other propagules that have been derived from wild or cultivated parental stocks, according to the definition of 'cultivated parental stock' in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17);

4. AGREES that trees of agarwood-producing taxa grown in cultivation such as:
a) gardens (home and/or community garden); and
b) state, private or community production plantation, either monospecific or mixed species;
shall be considered as artificially propagated in accordance with the definition above;

Twenty-seventh meeting of the Animals Committee (Veracruz (Mexico), 28 April-03 May 2014)

AC27 Doc.17 Implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens (Decision 16.65): https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/27/E-AC27-17.pdf

7. The Secretariat notes that other decisions adopted at CoP16 are also likely to provide results of significant importance with respect to the implementation of Convention provisions relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens. In particular:
Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species
Directed to the Secretariat
15.52 The Secretariat shall:
a) contingent on the availability of external funds, contract an appropriate expert to prepare a guide to advise the Parties on the appropriate use of source codes;
b) provide a draft of this guide to the Animals and Plants Committees for review and comment; and
c) prepare and distribute the final product, incorporating the feedback of the Animals and Plants Committees, to inform the Parties on the appropriate use of source codes.
Directed to the Animals and Plants Committees
15.53 The Animals and Plants Committees shall review and provide feedback to the Secretariat on the draft guide to advise the Parties on the appropriate use of source codes.

From Summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/27/sum/E-AC27-ExSum-Cons.pdf

The Committee adopted the recommendations in document AC27 WG2 Doc. 1 with the following amendments: …

https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/27/wg/E-AC27-WG-02.pdf
a) Incorrect application of source codes
The working group recommends that the Animals Committee:
i. agrees that, with respect to Decision 15.52, there is no need to seek to modify the number or definitions of the source codes currently available;
ii. emphasise, therefore, that implementation of Decision 15.52 remains a high priority to help Parties to determine the correct source code to apply to specimens derived from captive production systems.
iii. advise the Secretariat, when commissioning the report required under Decision 15.52, that it should ensure that the guide commissioned under this Decision should provide examples of the full range of different captive production systems and advise on the correct source code which should be applied to each;
iv. note that the implementation of other Decisions related to captive breeding and other production systems (such as Decisions 16.63 a) vii) and Decision 16.102 f) i) would also assist Parties in interpreting and applying source codes for such systems.

Twenty-first meeting of the Plants Committee (Veracruz (Mexico), 02-08 May 2014)

PC21 Doc. 17 Galanthus woronowii in trade from the wild and the development of artificial propagation in Georgia: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/21/E-PC21-17.pdf

1. This report outlines the current situation with artificial propagation of Galanthus waronowii in Georgia

2. Georgia has implemented a process to allow application of the CITES definition of Artificial Propagation outlined in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15) to conditions in cultivation fields managed by local stakeholders in the countryside in Georgia

3. The aim of this process is to ensure that the bulbs are "CITES compliant" and that added income is available to support and improve local livelihoods

4. To review the process and to review "CITES compliance" artificial propagation field surveys will be carried out as part of a new GIZ funded international project. Based on the results of these surveys quotas will be set for harvest and export of wild and artificially propagated bulbs for the 2014 season

5. In addition expert workshops will be held in Autumn 2014 including sessions with local stakeholders and traders
6. The initial results of the surveys should be available in May 2014.

From Summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/21/sum/E-PC21-ExSum-Cons.pdf

The Committee noted document PC21 Doc. 17

PC21 Doc. 18.5 Agarwood-producing taxa (Aquilaria spp. and Gyrinops spp.) [Resolution Conf. 16.10; Decisions 16.156, 16.157 and 15.95 (Rev. CoP16)]:
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/21/E-PC21-18-05.pdf

Directed to the Plants Committee
16.156 The Plants Committee shall consider the current production systems of tree species, including mixed and monospecific plantations, and assess the applicability of the current definitions of artificial propagation in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) and Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15) respectively, and report back at the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Implementation of Decision 16.156
4. Although Decision 16.156 has been formulated in the context of agarwood-producing species, it targets all tree species included in the CITES Appendices. The Committee could consider establishing a working group at the present meeting to undertake the work described in this Decision.

From Summary record: https://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/21/sum/E-PC21-ExSum-Cons.pdf

18. Trees
The Committee established an intersessional working group on plantations and artificial propagation of trees with the following mandate:
a) Consider the current production systems of tree species, including mixed and mono-specific plantations, and assess the applicability of the current definitions of artificial propagation in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) and Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15) respectively.
b) Consider how the Committee could report on these matters at the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

18.5 Agarwood-producing taxa (Aquilaria spp. and Gyrinops spp.) [Resolution Conf. 16.10; Decisions 16.156, 16.157 and 15.95 (Rev. CoP16)] ..... (PC21 Doc. 18.5)
The Secretariat introduced document PC21 Doc. 18.5.
The Committee noted document PC21 Doc. 18.5.

Twenty-eighth meeting of the Animals Committee, Tel Aviv, Israel (Tel Aviv (Israel), 30 August-03 September 2015)

AC28 Doc. 12 Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species (Decision 15.53):
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/28/E-AC28-12%28Rev%29.pdf

8. The Animals and Plants Committees are invited to review and provide feedback to the Secretariat on the draft guide to advise the Parties on the appropriate use of source codes.

From Summary record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/28/E-AC28-SumRec.pdf

The Secretariat introduced document AC28 Doc. 12. IUCN then presented the guidance on CITES source codes, contained in Annexes 1, 2 and 3 of that document.
In the following discussion, speakers pointed out a need to further work on the guidance.
To this end, the Committee established a working group on agenda item 12 with the following mandate:
Taking account of the presentations and discussions in plenary, the working group shall:
1. Review the draft guides in the Annexes to document AC28 Doc. 12 and provide feedback to the Secretariat towards improving the proposed guide on the appropriate use of source codes.
2. Provide suggestions for incorporating examples of different production and cultivation systems into the guidance without overcomplicating the guide.
Later in the meeting, Ms. Caceres introduced document AC28 Com. 7.13
The Committee adopted the recommendations in document AC28 Com. 7.
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/ac/28/Com/E-AC28-Com-07.pdf

Twenty-second meeting of the Plants Committee (Tbilisi (Georgia), 19-23 October 2015)

PC22 Doc. 16 Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species (Decision 15.53):
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/22/E-PC22-16.pdf

8. The Animals and Plants Committees are invited to review and provide feedback to the Secretariat on the draft guide to advise the Parties on the appropriate use of source codes
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/22/E-PC22-16-A01.pdf
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/22/E-PC22-16-A02.pdf

Note: PC22 was provided with AC28 Com. 7

From Summary record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/22/ExSum/E-PC22-SR.pdf

The Secretariat introduced document PC22 Doc. 16. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) then presented the guidance on CITES source codes, contained in Annexes 1, 2 and 3 of that document. It highlighted inconsistent or conflicting directions between existing Resolutions about source codes. The Chair of the Animals Committee drew the attention of the Plants Committee to document AC28 Com 7 where the Animals Committee recommended that a new version of this guide be commissioned, considering that the scientific committees were not the proper venue to resolve these contradictions and that it would also encroach on the issue under the purview of the Standing Committee. The Animals Committee had noted, inter alia, this document should not provide guidance towards making a non-detriment finding or an export decision. As such, language regarding the appropriateness of an export should be removed.

Speakers supported the approach adopted by the Animals Committee and argued that there was no need to seek a change in the number of source codes or to modify the definition of source codes. They supported the idea of a guidance manual on the interpretation of source codes, but noted that Parties needed to provide additional comments.

The Committee adopted the recommendations in document AC28 Com. 7 (Rev. by Secretariat) with the following additional feedback specific to plants:
– With respect to guidance on source codes for plant trade, the Plants Committee noted in particular that the decision path for Source Code D needs revision to take into consideration Resolution Conf. 9.19 (Rev. CoP15), which recognizes that nurseries that are not registered may still continue exporting artificially propagated specimens of Appendix-I species grown for commercial purpose, with appropriate CITES export permits.
– It was also noted that the guidance did not address the definitions for "artificially propagated" agarwood (Resolution Conf. 16.10), grafts [Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15)] or trees grown in monospecific plantations [Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15)].
– Where references are made to 'cultivated parental stock,' this should be in accordance with the definition in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15), Regarding the definition of 'artificially propagated', paragraph b).
– There may be a nuance missing regarding exempt materials as described in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15) (i.e., seeds, cuttings, divisions, callus tissue or other plant tissues, spores or other propagules as noted under the heading, "DETERMINES that the term 'artificially propagated' shall be interpreted to refer to plant specimens"), including the coding of specimens to be exported that were grown from exempt callus tissue or other plant tissues. Some questions might be confusing, such as "Was the cutting or division taken from a wild plant that is NOT considered cultivated parental stock?".
– It would be useful to have the opportunity for CITES Authorities to ground test this guidance more fully. The Plants Committee commended this undertaking to provide discrete guidance for determining source codes and recognized that there is inconsistent advice within the relevant resolutions associated with source codes, which merits further attention by the Standing Committee and Parties. For example, ambiguity on the application of source code A and source code D.

The Plants Committee recommended that the Secretariat seek further feedback from the Standing Committee and Parties, and prepare a new version of this guidance taking into account the feedback received.

PC22 Doc. 17.5.2 Agarwood-producing taxa: Report of the working group on production systems of tree species, plantations and definitions of artificial propagation (Decision 16.156):
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/22/E-PC22-17-05-02.pdf

3. The Plants Committee at its 21st meeting (Veracruz, 5-8 May 2014), established an intersessional working group on plantations and artificial propagation of tree species with the following mandate:
a) Consider the current production systems of tree species, including mixed and monospecific plantations, and assess the applicability of the current definitions of artificial propagation in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) and Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15) respectively.
b) Consider how the Committee could report on these matters at the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

5. The intersessional working group has prepared a questionnaire (see annex) to gather information regarding productions systems for CITES-listed tree species, including monospecific and mixed plantations.
6. The cochairs asked the Secretariat to send a Notification to the Parties with the questionnaire to receive information with a deadline of 30 September 2015. The information received will be presented orally during the PC meeting.

From Summary record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/22/ExSum/E-PC22-SR.pdf

Guatemala, as co-chair of the working group, introduced document PC22 Doc. 17.5.2, noting that only a limited number of Parties had responded to the questionnaire to gather information regarding productions systems for CITES-listed tree species, including monospecific and mixed plantations. Speakers agreed that the mandate of the working group should be renewed and called for Parties to submit responses to the questionnaire.

The Committee noted document PC22 Doc. 17.5.2 and the oral update of co-chair of the working group on production systems of tree species, plantations and definitions of artificial propagation.

The Committee agreed to submit the following decision to the Conference of the Parties at its 17th meeting in order to renew the mandate of the working group on production systems of tree species, plantations and definitions of artificial propagation:
***Directed to the Plants Committee** 16.156(Rev. CoP17)*
The Plants Committee shall consider the current production systems of tree species, including mixed and monospecific plantations, and assess the applicability of the current definitions of artificial propagation in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) and Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15) respectively, and report back at the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

The Committee asked the Secretariat to publish an updated version of Notification to the Parties No. 2015/046 of 11 August 2015 at the request of the working group.

66th meeting of the Standing Committee (Geneva (Switzerland), 11-15 January 2016)

SC66 Doc. 41.1 Implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens - Report of the Secretariat: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/66/E-SC66-41-01x.pdf

8. Concerning the guide to advise the Parties on the appropriate use of source codes referred to in paragraph a) of Decision 15.52, the Secretariat commissioned the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) to prepare a draft guide. They prepared two different types of dichotomous key to correctly determine the appropriate source code which are attached as Annex 4 to the present document.

From Summary Record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/66/ExSum/E-SC66-Sum-02.pdf

The Standing Committee established an in-session working group with the following mandate:
–In light of the comments made in documents SC66 Doc. 32.3 and 32.4 and of the comments made during the plenary discussion, to revise the text of the draft decisions in document SC66 Doc. 41.1 and to revise the text of the draft resolution on Review of trade in specimens reported as produced in captivity in the annex to document SC66 Doc. 41.2.
–To propose wording for a specific reference to Resolution Conf. 4.25 (Rev. CoP14) in the revision to Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) on Review of significant trade in specimens of Appendix-II species.

From Summary Record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/66/ExSum/E-SC66-Sum-10.pdf

The Standing Committee adopted document SC66 Com. 10 with the following amendments:…
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/66/Com/E-SC66-Com-10%28RevbySec%29.pdf

Seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Johannesburg (South Africa), 24 September-04 October 2016)

CoP17 Doc. 32 Implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/WorkingDocs/E-CoP17-32.pdf

7. The Committee also examined two capacity-building tools commissioned by the Secretariat:
-one on the appropriate use of source codes, produced in compliance with Decision 15.52; and -the other on inspection of captive-breeding and ranching facilities and review of permit applications for captive-bred and ranched specimens under Decision 16.63 a) vii).

8. Speakers during the Standing Committee discussion of these documents broadly welcomed the resulting Guidance for inspection of captive-breeding and ranching facilities and Guidance for use of CITES source codes and agreed to provide written comments on drafts of these documents in order for the Secretariat to take them into account in the finalizing the documents.
Note that there was no mention of the Source code guidance in the SC66 Summary records. There was no notification to solicit written comments and the only country to provide comments was Canada.

Summary Record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/Com_II/SR/E-CoP17-Com-II-Rec-11.pdf

32. Implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens
The European Union presented document CoP17. Com. II. 18 containing a draft resolution and draft decisions which were agreed, as was deletion of Decisions 15.52, 15.53 and 16.63 to 16.66.
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/Com_II/E-CoP17-Com-II-18.pdf
Source code guide: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/prog/captive_breeding/E-Souce%20codes%20booklet%20-%20April%2017.pdf

CoP17 Doc. 43 Review of the definition of 'artificially propagated' for plants:
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/WorkingDocs/E-CoP17-43.pdf

Review of the definition of 'artificially propagated' for plants
3. The core elements of the definition concerning "artificial propagated" and "controlled conditions" date back to the genesis of the Convention and are found in Resolution Conf. 2.12 covering specimens bred in captivity or artificially propagated. Since that time there has been no comprehensive review of the definition, no analysis of its effectiveness or utility, or compilation of case studies on how it is applied to the different plant life forms by the CITES Parties. Parties have applied the definition using a range of strategies with perhaps the most widespread being the use of registration schemes combined with an inspection process. However, over this period the mechanisms of plant cultivation and propagation have evolved and the range of plants listed on CITES has expanded, including for example parasitic plants and plants producing high value resins and extracts. CITES Parties have also sought to encourage cultivation of CITES species by local communities in local conditions and some Parties have found it a challenge to apply the current definition in such conditions.

5. It seems likely that the current definition of 'artificially propagated' included in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15) is not best fitted to current practice in artificial propagation of relevant CITES listed plants and may in some cases discourage community based cultivation of CITES listed plant taxa.

7. Modern techniques and new methods, such as tissue culture, seedling hardening and artificial infection of parasitic plants have been broadly adopted in propagation of threatened species especially in the case of medicinal and ornamental plants. Treated or screened individuals of plants can grow exuberantly in a semi-natural even a full-natural environment without intensive manipulation by humans. For example, many species of Orchidaceae are widely propagated through tissue culture technique, then moved to semi-natural or natural environment before being harvested for commercial trade. Sometimes, the seedling is bound to trees in nature. Spores of Cistanche are artificially inoculated on host plants (i.e. Tamarix ramosissima or Haloxylon ammodendron) which are artificially planted in the wild. Except for irrigating once or twice per year, these specimens are totally under natural conditions before being harvested. Small holders cultivate species of Cyclamen and Galanthus with minimum intervention, however to fully meet the current definition of artificial propagation an intense management programme is required stretching the resources of local communities and discouraging such local initiatives. CITES Parties also struggle with the practical application of the definition to the use of mother stock plants and seeds in the new high technology propagation, high volume production of orchids, cacti and succulents.

8. Artificial propagating of threatened species in a semi-natural or a full-natural environment is relatively cost-effective and benefits local community livelihood –giving a value to the local resource. In the context of sustainable development, planting cloned and hardened seedlings in the desert or on rocks helps diminish deforestation and stony desertification; and benefits achieved through inoculation of host desert plants and their subsequent management encourages local people to implement desertification controls and afforestation. These activities concur with the goal of CITES, which aims at conserving wild population and eliminating pressure on them, as well as improving the livelihood of local communities. Similarly local cultivation of geophytes such as Galanthus and Cyclamen compliments sustainable wild collection allowing wild collected undersized tubers and bulbs to be utilized and allowing local communities to develop a more integrated harvest programme that can link to traditional farming practices such as growing maize where bulbs can be grown as an undercrop. Some Parties allow some manipulation of the wild habitat and treat the resultant plants as sustainably produced from the wild with a positive Non-Detriment Finding. This is a limited option and does not address the range of cultivation and propagation systems currently extant in CITES Parties.

9. Due to time limitation, comments on this document are collected from a small scope of parties and experts. We received general positive responses. Besides the applicability of the current definition of artificial propagation, some other concerns are expressed:
1) There is a lack of guidance in implementing well the definition of artificial propagation, especially with regard to motherstocks;
2) It might be difficult to distinguish between artificial propagated and wild harvested specimens (especially when they are

harvested in natural or semi-natural systems); 3) Possible conservation concerns exist when re-introducing and later harvesting from such populations.

From Summary Record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/Com_II/SR/E-CoP17-Com-II-Rec-10-R1.pdf

China, on behalf of Georgia, Indonesia and Kuwait, introduced document CoP17 Doc. 43, the annex to which contained two draft decisions directed to the Plants Committee. In the document, the Secretariat had suggested amendments to these.
Indonesia and Zimbabwe supported the draft decisions and the Secretariat's proposed amendments.
The European Union and its member States emphasized the difficulties in implementation raised by problems in interpreting the definition. Supported by the Republic of Korea and Switzerland, they proposed amending draft decision 17.XX2 in paragraph B of the Secretariat's comments by replacing "for consideration and adoption at the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties" with for consideration at the 70th meeting of the Standing Committee. They further proposed an additional draft decision to read:

The Standing Committee should consider the recommendations of the Plants Committee in accordance with Decision 17.XX1 and 17.XX2, and make recommendations, as appropriate, for consideration at the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
The Committee agreed to the draft decisions set out in paragraph B of the Secretariat's comments in document CoP17 Doc. 43, as amended by the European Union.

Decision 17.175
The Plants Committee shall review current production systems for artificial propagation and cultivation of non-tree-plant taxa listed in the Appendices and assess the applicability and utility of the current definitions of 'artificial propagation' and 'under controlled conditions' in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17).
Decision 17.176
The Plants Committee, following the review under Decision 17.175, shall consider if Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17) and other relevant Resolutions need to be revised, and as appropriate, propose such amendments for consideration to the 70th meeting of the Standing Committee.

CoP17 Doc. 53.1 Implementation of the Convention for agarwood-producing taxa: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/WorkingDocs/E-CoP17-53-01.pdf

5. In accordance with Decision 16.156, the Plants Committee at its 21st meeting established an intersessional working group on plantations and artificial propagation of tree species. The working group prepared and circulated a questionnaire (Notification 2015/046) to gather information regarding productions systems for CITES-listed tree species, including monospecific and mixed plantations. The working group presented the results orally at the 22nd meeting of the Committee.

6. The Committee noted the progress made by the working group, asked the Secretariat to publish an updated version of Notification 2015/046 at the request of the working group, and agreed to submit the following decision to CoP17 to renew the mandate of the working group. The working group decided to postpone publication of an updated version of the Notification until after CoP17, pending agreement by the CoP to renew the mandate.
Directed to the Plants Committee
16.156 (Rev. CoP17) The Plants Committee shall consider the current production systems of tree species, including mixed and monospecific plantations, and assess the applicability of the current definitions of artificial propagation in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) and Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP15) respectively, and report back at the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

From Summary records: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/Com_I/SR/E-CoP17-Com-I-Rec-03-R1.pdf

The revisions of Decisions 16.156 and 16.157 proposed in paragraphs 6 and 7 of document CoP17 Doc. 53.1 were agreed. The draft decision, with the amendment proposed by the United States, was accepted. The deletion of Decisions 16.155 and 16.158 was agreed.

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

PC23 Doc. 19.1 Definition of the term 'artificially propagated' Report of the Secretariat [Decision 16.156 (Rev. CoP17), 17.175 and 17.17]: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/23/E-PC23-19-01.pdf

This report summarizes the applicable decisions and invites the Plants Committee to commence implementation of these decisions.

2. The 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP17, Johannesburg, 2016) agreed on three Decisions directed to the Plants Committee related to the definition of the term 'artificially propagated' found in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17) on Regulation of trade in plants and in paragraph 1 g) of Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) on Implementation of the Convention for timber species, as follows:

Decision 16.156 (Rev. CoP17)

The Plants Committee shall consider the current production systems of tree species, including mixed and monospecific plantations, and assess the applicability of the current definitions of artificial propagation in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) on Implementation of the Convention for timber species and Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17) on Regulation of trade in plants respectively, and report back at the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Decision 17.175
The Plants Committee shall review current production systems for artificial propagation and cultivation of non-tree-plant taxa listed in the Appendices and assess the applicability and utility of the current definitions of 'artificial propagation' and 'under controlled conditions' in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17).

Decision 17.176
The Plants Committee, following the review under Decision 17.175, shall consider if Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17) and other relevant Resolutions need to be revised, and as appropriate, propose such amendments for consideration to the 70th meeting of the Standing Committee.

PC23 Doc. 19.2 Definition of the term 'artificially propagated' Report on production systems for tree species, plantations and definition of the term 'artificially propagated' [Decision 16.156 (Rev. CoP17)]: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/23/E-PC23-19-02.pdf

7. At its 17th meeting (CoP17; Johannesburg, 2016), the Conference of the Parties adopted Decision 16.156 (Rev. CoP17) addressed to the Plants Committee: "The Plants Committee shall consider the current production systems of tree species, including mixed and monospecific plantations, and assess the applicability of the current definitions of artificial propagation in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) on Implementation of the Convention for timber species and Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17) on Regulation of trade in plants respectively, and report back at the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties."

From Summary Record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/23/Exsum/E-PC23-ExSum-02-R1.pdf

The Committee established an intersessional working group on the definition of the term 'artificially propagated' (agenda item 19) with the following mandate:
Develop and implement a realistic workplan that will: a) give an overview of the evolution of Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17) and perspective on the original intent of the Resolution guiding the definition of artificial propagation in order to inform debate regarding possible amendment of Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17);
b) provide an overview of the relevant work completed and conclusions thus far in the Plants Committee and the Conference of Parties regarding production systems;
c) enable consideration of the current production systems of tree species, including mixed and monospecific plantations; and assess the applicability of the definition of 'artificial propagation' in Resolution Conf. 10.13 (Rev. CoP15) and Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17);
d) review current production systems for artificial propagation and cultivation of non-tree plant taxa listed in the Appendices and assess the applicability and utility of the definitions of 'artificial propagation' and 'under controlled conditions' in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP17); and
e) report back to the 24th meeting of the Plants Committee, including recommendations as appropriate.

From Summary Record: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/23/Exsum/E-PC23-ExSum-04-R1.pdf

The Committee adopted the recommendations in document PC23 Com. 6 with the following amendments:
– include the representative of Africa (Mr. Mahamane) as member of the intersessional working group;
– include "Resolution Conf. 16.10" at the end of paragraph c) of the mandate;
– include a new subparagraph e) in the mandate: "explore a definition of plantation", with paragraph e) becoming paragraph f); and
– include in paragraph 6, after "a possible new source code": ", keeping in mind non-detriment findings and legal acquisition requirements".
https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/pc/23/Com/E-PC23-Com-06-R.pdf