

AMENDMENTS TO APPENDICES I AND II OF THE CONVENTION

Ten Year Review Proposals

A. PROPOSAL

Deletion of Phoenix hanceana var. philippinensis from Appendix II.

B. PROPONENT

The United States of America.

C. SUPPORTING STATEMENT

1. Taxonomy

11. Class: Liliopsida (Monocotyledonae)
12. Order: Arecales
13. Family: Palmae (= Arecaceae)
131. Subfamily: Phoenicoideae
14. Species: Phoenix hanceana Naud. var. philippinensis Becc.
15. Synonymy: This species has been placed as a synonym of P. loureirii Kunth, a widespread species from the foothills of the Himalayas to Hong Kong (cf. Moore, 1976). However, the variety may be distinct (Doc. 3.19 Annex 1). According to Dr. J. Dransfield [Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, pers. comm. to IUCN Threatened Plants Unit (TPU), 1980], it is a very polymorphic species that is impossible to identify in the herbarium.
16. Common Names: English: voyavoy, Philippine phoenix
French:
Spanish:
17. Hybrids: Species in cultivation are known to hybridize freely (Moore, 1976; Uhl and Dransfield, 1987).
18. Code Numbers:

2. Biological Data

21. Distribution: Philippines: Batan Islands (Sabtang Island) (Merrill, 1925).
22. Population: Very few wild palms of this taxon are left; it is one of the most threatened palms in the Philippines (D.A. Madulid in litt. to D.V. Johnson, 12/03/86). It is cultivated on many islands locally (see section 31. National Utilization below).

23. Habitat: In pastures on the plateau of Itbayat Island, Batanes (Delegation of the Philippines, 1973).

3. Trade Data

31. National Utilization: According to Brown and Merrill (1919), the leaves of *P. hanceana* var. *philippinensis* are extensively used in the Batan Islands to make thatched raincoats; it is also used occasionally for roof thatching (Madulid in litt. to Johnson, 12/03/86). It is these activities that are causing the species to decline, not international trade. It is cultivated (sic "domesticated") on many islands in the province of Batanes (Quisumbing, 1967; Delegation of the Philippines, 1973). J.B. Alvarez, Jr. (Philippine Bureau of Forest Development) stated that "only cultural specimens" are found in trade [in litt. to U.S. Scientific Authority (R. McManus), 25/07/77]. However, there are no records of seeds being traded or plants sold locally (Madulid in litt. to Johnson, 12/03/86).

32. Legal International Trade: No evidence. Dr. Madulid recommended to the Deputy Chairman of the IUCN SSC Palm Specialist Group (in litt. to Johnson, 12/03/86) that the taxon should be removed from CITES because there are no records of international sales or trade in seeds or plants. Dr. Madulid is a member of the Palm Specialist Group. (Resolution Conf. 4.26 encourages completion of the 10 year review.)

33. Illegal Trade: Unknown.

34. Potential Trade Threats:

341. Live Specimens: D. Hull (pers. comm. to TPU, 1980) has never seen seeds or plants of this taxon in trade. It does not appear to be of international trade interest.
342. Parts and Derivatives: According to Dr. J. Dransfield (pers. comm. to TPU, 1980), there are vast numbers of palm seeds of all species leaving the Philippines.

4. Protection Status

41. National: Unknown. The Philippines has several laws that might protect this taxon (Davis et al., 1986), but whether it is specifically included in Act No. 3983 or Presidential Decrees No. 1152 and No. 1586 is unknown, nor is it known how those laws are enforced. Myers (1988) addresses environmental pressures in the country.

42. International: Unknown.

43. Additional Protection Needs: Unknown.

5. Information on Similar Species

The genus is briefly summarized by Uhl and Dransfield (1987); cf. Moore (1973). According to Brown and Merrill (1919), this is the only native representative of the genus in the Philippines, which has introduced and cultivated specimens of *P. canariensis* Hort. ex Chaubard, *P. dactylifera* L., and *P. rupicola* T. Anders. Species of

Phoenix L. are notably hard to identify, especially in cultivation (Moore, 1976). Phoenix roebelenii O'Brien is commercially important as a nursery-pot plant.

6. Comments from Countries of Origin

None; to be sought.

7. Additional Remarks

Resolution Conf. 2.19 is for species in Appendix I; however, its intent does not seem of use here because of the lack of international trade pressure on the taxon.

8. References

Brown, W.H. and E.D. Merrill, 1919. Philippine Palms and Palm Products. Dept. Agric. Natural Res., Bureau Forestry Bull. No. 18.

Davis, S.D. et al., 1986. Plants in danger: What do we know? Threatened Plants Unit, IUCN Conservation Monitoring Centre. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, England, U.K. 461 pp.

Delegation of the Philippines, 1973. Proposed amendment to Appendices I and II for Committee II (Plants) consideration. Plenipotentiary Conference to conclude an international Convention on trade in certain species of wildlife. Doc. 7 (Add. 3). 3 pp.

Madulid, D.A., 1982. Plants in peril. Filipinas J. 3: 8-16 [n.v.].
Merrill, E.D. 1925. An Enumeration of Philippine Flowering Plants Vol. 1. Bureau of Printing, Manila, Philippines.

Moore, H.E., Jr., 1973. Palms in tropical forest ecosystems of Africa and Latin America, pp. 63-88 in B.J. Meggers et al., Tropical Forest Ecosystems in Africa and South America: A Comparative Review. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

(Moore, H.E., Jr.), 1976. Phoenix L., pp. 862-863 in L.H. Bailey Hortorium Staff. Hortus Third. Macmillan Publ. Co., New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

Myers, N., 1988. Environmental degradation and some economic consequences in the Philippines. Environm. Conserv. 15(3): 205-214.

Quisumbing, E., 1967. Philippine species of plants facing extinction. Araneta J. Agric. 14(3): 135-162.

Uhl, N. and J. Dransfield, 1987. Genera Palmarum. L.H. Bailey Hortorium of Cornell University and The International Palm Society. Allen Press, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A. 610 pp.

