

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

---



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

Strategic matters

Committee reports and recommendations

Plants Committee

REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Introduction

1. This report has been prepared by Ms Margarita África Clemente-Muñoz, Chair of the Plants Committee\*, with the kind assistance of the members of the Committee and the CITES Secretariat, and covers the period from 4 January 2007 to 14 October 2009. During this period, the Committee held two meetings: the 17th, in Geneva, Switzerland, from 15 to 19 April 2008 (PC17), and the 18th, in Buenos Aires, Argentina, from 17 to 21 March 2009 (PC18). The 17th meeting was attended by representatives of 38 countries, two United Nations bodies, three intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and 11 non-governmental organizations (NGOs), for a total of 107 participants. The 18th meeting was attended by representatives of 32 countries, one United Nations body, two intergovernmental organizations and 7 non-governmental organizations, for a total of 104 participants.
2. The Committee would like to express its gratitude to the authorities of the Argentine Republic, which hosted PC18, for organizing and supporting it so effectively.
3. The Committee also wishes to express its appreciation to the Secretariat for the organization and preparation of the documentation for both meetings, and for all its intersessional support.
4. Following PC17, a full day's joint meeting was held with the Animals Committee, at which the topics that had been assigned to both Committees at the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP14) were covered. During the 58th meeting of the Standing Committee (Geneva, July 2009), the Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committees and the Secretariat held a working session to deal jointly with the topics assigned to both Committees.
5. Listed below is the composition of the Plants Committee. On 15 June 2007, immediately after the closure of CoP14, the members and alternate members of the Plants Committee and the CITES Secretariat met unofficially in The Hague, Netherlands, and Ms Margarita África Clemente-Muñoz (Spain) was designated Chair elect, and Mr Greg Leach (Australia) Vice-Chair elect. Both were formally elected at the beginning of PC17.

---

\* *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.*

Region	Regional representative	Alternate
Africa	Mr David L.N. Hafashimana (Uganda) Ms Beatrice Khayota (Kenya)	Mr Koffi Akpagana (Togo) Mr Quentin Luke (Kenya)
Asia	Mr Tukirin Partomihardjo (Indonesia) Mr Wichar Thitiprasert (Thailand)	Mr Mohd Yunus Zakaria (Malaysia) Mr M. Sanjappa (India)
Central and South America and the Caribbean	Ms Mariana de Jesús Mites Cadena (Ecuador) Ms Dora Ingrid Rivera (Costa Rica)	Ms Adriana Rivera Brusatin (Colombia) Mr Milcíades Mejía (Dominican Republic)
Europe	Ms Margarita África Clemente-Muñoz (Spain) Chair Mr Maurizio Sajevo (Italy)	Ms Nika Debeljak Sabec (Slovenia) Mr Jonas Lüthy (Switzerland)
North America	Mr Robert R. Gabel (United States of America)	Ms Adrienne Sinclair (Canada)
Oceania	Mr Greg Leach (Australia) Vice-Chair	Mr Osia Gideon (Papua New Guinea)
<b>Nomenclature specialist</b>		
Mr Noel McGough (United Kingdom)		

All representatives attended both meetings, except for one of the representatives of the African region (Mr Hafashimana), who was unable to attend the 17th meeting and was replaced by his alternate (Mr Akpagana), and was also unable to attend the 18th meeting, owing to visa problems. The required regional reports were presented at the two meetings, listing in detail the activities undertaken in the various regions.

7. The Chair of the Plants Committee took part in the meetings listed below:
- a) 55th, 56th, 57th and 58th meetings of the Standing Committee (SC).
  - b) International workshop of experts on non-detriment findings on bigleaf mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*) held in Cancún, Mexico, from 10 to 13 April 2007.
  - c) First meeting of the chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions, held in Paris on 1 July 2007.
  - d) Workshop of the Central American subregion and the Dominican Republic on 'Implementation of CITES: improving international trade in bigleaf mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*)' held in Managua, Nicaragua, from 15 to 17 August 2007.
  - e) Second scientific conference on Andean orchids, from 15 to 17 November 2007. At this conference she gave a presentation on 'Orchid conservation and trade: are these concepts incompatible?'
  - f) Second meeting of the chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions, held in Bonn on 25 May 2008.
  - g) Meeting of the working group on *Prunus africana* in Naivasha, Kenya, from 8 to 11 September 2008.
  - h) *Ad hoc* intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, from 10 to 12 November 2008.
  - i) Seventh European regional CITES plants meeting, held in Lampedusa, Italy, from 7 to 9 October 2008.

- j) Fourth meeting of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group, held in Cancún, Mexico, from 13 to 15 November 2008. This meeting was organized in conjunction with the first Latin American workshop of the joint ITTO-CITES project.
- k) International expert workshop on non-detriment findings, held in Cancún, Mexico, from 17 to 22 November 2008.
- l) Expert meeting on development of post-2010 global biodiversity targets, held in Nairobi, Kenya, on 2 and 3 October 2009.
- m) Third meeting of the chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions, held in Nairobi, Kenya, on 4 October 2009.
- n) *Ad hoc* intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, held in Nairobi, Kenya, from 5 to 9 October 2009.

#### Main topics covered

- 8. The Secretariat prepared document PC17 Doc. 12.1 which was submitted for consideration by the Committee at its first meeting after CoP14. Annexes 1 and 2 to this document present all the instructions directed to the Plants Committee or concerning which it might be necessary to consult or inform the Committee. These instructions are contained in the Resolutions and Decisions of the Conference of the Parties currently in effect.
- 9. Some of the topics that were covered at the Committee's joint meeting with the Animals Committee are listed only in this report, and the recommendations that emerged from the discussions are recorded in various documents prepared jointly by the Chairs of the two Committees (see documents CoP15 Doc. 16.2.2, CoP15 Doc. 29 and CoP15 Doc. 33).
- 10. Listed below are the Resolutions and Decisions directed to the Plants Committee and the results achieved. The documents cited are available on the CITES website. The specific measures recommended are listed individually in separate documents [see documents CoP15 Doc. 10.4 (Decision 14.15); CoP15 Doc. 16.3 (Decisions 14.135 and 14.143); CoP15 Doc. 26 (Decision 14.20); CoP15 Doc. 56 (Decision 14.131); CoP15 Doc. 57 (Decision 14.146); CoP15 Doc. 58 (Decision 14.145); CoP15 Doc. 59 (Decision 14.147); CoP15 Doc. 60 (Decision 14.142); CoP15 Doc. 64 (Decision 14.130); CoP15 Doc. 65 (Decisions 14.133 and 14.134) and CoP15 Doc. 66 (Decision 14.148)].

#### Instructions directed to the Plants Committee contained in Resolutions

##### **Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II [Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14)]**

- 11. With respect to the Periodic Review of Appendices I and II, the Standing Committee confirmed at its 55th meeting (The Hague, 2 June 2007) the list of plant taxa to be reviewed before the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Doha, 2010), except for those species deleted from the Appendices or transferred from one Appendix to another at CoP14, and this decision was transmitted by the Secretariat by way of Notification to the Parties No. 2008/004 of 28 January 2008.
- 12. At its 17th meeting, the Plants Committee adopted the following conclusions (see Summary record of PC17): (a) *Agave parviflora* should remain in Appendix I; (b) Argentina was understood to be considering the possibility of submitting a proposal to CoP15 to transfer *Podocarpus parlatoarei* from Appendix I to Appendix II, with an appropriate annotation for its parts and derivatives; (c) South Africa was understood to be preparing proposals to delete *Orothamnus zeyheri* and *Protea odorata* from Appendix II, which would be submitted for consideration at CoP15; (d) Namibia was understood to be preparing a report on the examination of *Welwitschia mirabilis*, which would be submitted for the consideration of PC18; (e) Mexico's examination of *Euphorbia antisiphilitica* was under way and the examination of *Agave victoriae-reginae* would probably start in the near future; (f) the Netherlands had offered to examine *Cycas beddomei*; and (g) a volunteer specialist had been identified to examine 10 *Euphorbia* spp. of Madagascar in Appendix I, and France would request his assistance.
- 13. At its 18th meeting, the Plants Committee adopted the following conclusions (see PC18 summary record): (a) the current listing of *Tillandsia harrisii* in Appendix II is correct; (b) the current listing of *Podocarpus parlatoarei* in Appendix I is correct; (c) for *Welwitschia mirabilis*, a proposal should be prepared for its

deletion from Appendix II and the Committee took note of the offer of Namibia to prepare such a proposal, which would be submitted directly by that country; (d) the current listing of *Euphorbia antisiphilitica* in Appendix II is correct; however, finished products should be excluded; (e) the Committee sent draft guidelines for improving the process of reviewing the Appendices to the 24th meeting of the Animals Committee, which, however, ultimately considered that it was not necessary to modify the current process.

14. The Committee kept the intersessional working group operational so that the work could continue on *Aloe* spp., *Euphorbia* spp. and Didiereaceae spp., and, in particular, so that it could consult with the authorities of Madagascar on how to complete the review of the taxa in that country.
15. The Plants Committee took note that the chair of the working group did not wish to handle that task intersessionally, and agreed to settle on a new person to lead the working group, by an exchange of correspondence.
16. The Plants Committee decided unanimously, through the exchange of correspondence, to elect Ms Patricia Dávila (Mexico) as the chair of the working group on the Review of the Appendices and thanked Mr Jonas Lüthy (Switzerland) for his efforts during the time that he chaired the working group. The Committee also expressed its gratitude to the Government of Switzerland for the contribution of USD 2,500 for the review of the species *Saussurea costus*.

**Establishment of committees [Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP14)]**

17. With respect to the requirements laid down in Annex 2 of the Resolution, the Plants Committee fulfilled the responsibilities and functions assigned by the Conference of the Parties.

**Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species [Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13)]**

18. At PC17, the Plants Committee classified the populations of the following species as 'of urgent concern': *Christensonia vietnamica*, population of Viet Nam; *Taxus wallichiana*, population of India; *Pterocarpus santalinus*, population of India; *Rauvolfia serpentina*, population of India. It further classified the populations of the following species as 'of possible concern': *Rauvolfia serpentina*, populations of Myanmar and Thailand; *Pachypodium bispinosum* and *Pachypodium succulentum*, population of South Africa; and *Myrmecophila tibicinis*, population of Belize.
19. In compliance with the provisions of paragraph a) of the section *Selection of species to be reviewed* of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), at PC17, the Plants Committee selected 92 species for review, drawing on the CITES database of annual report statistics and on information available. In compliance with the provisions of paragraph d) of the same section of the Resolution, within the 30 days following PC17, the Secretariat consulted with the range States concerned with regard to their implementation of paragraphs 2 a) and 3 of Article IV, covering trade in the selected species.
20. Pursuant to paragraph f) of that same section of the Resolution, the Committee studied the information available in order to determine whether it could be considered that paragraphs 2 a) and 3 of Article IV were being implemented appropriately, and reached the following conclusions:

Taxon	Country – Replied?	Exclude	Include in next round	NOTES For species from Madagascar the information below is based on their reply to the Secretariat of 18 July 2008
<i>Aloe acutissima</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe antandroi</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe betsileensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe bosseri</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe bulbillifera</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys

<b>Taxon</b>	<b>Country – Replied?</b>	<b>Exclude</b>	<b>Include in next round</b>	<b>NOTES</b> For species from Madagascar the information below is based on their reply to the Secretariat of 18 July 2008
<i>Aloe capitata</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Aloe conifera</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe deltoideodonta</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Aloe divaricata</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Aloe erythrophylla</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe guillaumetii</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe humbertii</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe ibitiensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Aloe imalotensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe isaloensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe itremensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Aloe macroclada</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe pratensis</i>	Lesotho Answer received		Yes	Field studies required
<i>Aloe pratensis</i>	South Africa No response		Yes	Responded in meeting. Field studies required
<i>Aloe poliphylla</i>	Lesotho Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place
<i>Aloe prostrate</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe suarezensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Aloe trachyticola</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Aloe vaombe</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Aloe vaotsanda</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Beccariophoenix madagascariensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Additional data required
<i>Calanthe alleizettei</i>	Viet Nam No response		Yes	No response
<i>Cistanche deserticola</i>	China Answer received		Yes	Additional data required
<i>Cistanche deserticola</i>	Mongolia No response		Yes	No response
<i>Cymbidium erythrostylum</i>	Viet Nam No response		Yes	No response
<i>Euphorbia alfredii</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response

<b>Taxon</b>	<b>Country – Replied?</b>	<b>Exclude</b>	<b>Include in next round</b>	<b>NOTES</b> For species from Madagascar the information below is based on their reply to the Secretariat of 18 July 2008
<i>Euphorbia ankarensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Euphorbia antso</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Euphorbia aureoviridiflora</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Euphorbia banae</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Euphorbia beharensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Euphorbia berorohae</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Euphorbia biaculeata</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Euphorbia bongolavensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Euphorbia bulbispina</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Euphorbia capmanambatoensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Euphorbia capuronii</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Euphorbia croizatii</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Euphorbia denisiana</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Euphorbia didiereoides</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Euphorbia duranii</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Euphorbia elliotii</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Euphorbia famatamboay</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Euphorbia fianarantsoae</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Widespread in habitat and not threatened by collection
<i>Euphorbia genoudiana</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Euphorbia geroldii</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Euphorbia gottlebei</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Euphorbia guillauminiana</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Euphorbia hedyotoides</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Widespread in habitat and not threatened by collection
<i>Euphorbia herman-schwartzii</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Euphorbia hofstaetteri</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Euphorbia horombensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Inconsistent data in report

<b>Taxon</b>	<b>Country – Replied?</b>	<b>Exclude</b>	<b>Include in next round</b>	<b>NOTES</b> For species from Madagascar the information below is based on their reply to the Secretariat of 18 July 2008
<i>Euphorbia iharanae</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Euphorbia itremensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Euphorbia kondoi</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Euphorbia labatii</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Euphorbia leucodendron</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Euphorbia leuconeura</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Euphorbia lophogona</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Species is easily artificially propagated
<i>Euphorbia mahabobokensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Euphorbia mangokyensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Euphorbia neobosseri</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Euphorbia neohumbertii</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Euphorbia pachypodioides</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Inconsistent data in report
<i>Euphorbia paulianii</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Euphorbia pedilanthoides</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Euphorbia perrieri</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Euphorbia primulifolia</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Widespread in habitat and not threatened by collection
<i>Euphorbia razafindratsirae</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Euphorbia robivelonae</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Await results of field surveys
<i>Euphorbia rossii</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	No data included in response
<i>Euphorbia sakarahaensis</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Euphorbia stenoclada</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Euphorbia suzannae-marnierae</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Euphorbia viguieri</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Large distribution
<i>Euphorbia waringiae</i>	Madagascar Answer received	Yes		Export ban in place. Only artificially propagated plants are exported
<i>Lemurophoenix halleuxii</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Additional data required

<b>Taxon</b>	<b>Country – Replied?</b>	<b>Exclude</b>	<b>Include in next round</b>	<b>NOTES</b> For species from Madagascar the information below is based on their reply to the Secretariat of 18 July 2008
<i>Marojejya darianii</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Additional data required
<i>Pericopsis elata</i>	Cameroon No response		Yes	No reply
<i>Pericopsis elata</i>	Central African Republic No response		Yes	No reply
<i>Pericopsis elata</i>	Congo No response		Yes	No reply
<i>Pericopsis elata</i>	Côte d'Ivoire No response		Yes	No reply
<i>Pericopsis elata</i>	Democratic Republic of the Congo No response		Yes	No reply
<i>Pericopsis elata</i>	Ghana Answer received		Yes	Additional information required
<i>Pericopsis elata</i>	Nigeria No response		Yes	No reply
<i>Renanthera annamensis</i>	Myanmar No response		Yes	No reply
<i>Renanthera annamensis</i>	Viet Nam No response		Yes	No reply
<i>Ravenea rivularis</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Additional data required
<i>Satranala devussilvae</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Additional data required
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Belize Answer received		Yes	Additional data required
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Bolivia No response		Yes	No reply
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Colombia Answer received		Yes	Additional data required
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Costa Rica No response	Yes		Responded in meeting. Export ban in place
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Dominica No response	Yes		No reply. No recorded CITES trade
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Dominican Republic Answer received	Yes		No export of native species recorded
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Ecuador Answer received		Yes	Additional data required
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	El Salvador No response	Yes		No reply. No recorded CITES trade
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Guyana No response	Yes		No reply. No recorded CITES trade
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Honduras Answer received		Yes	Additional data required

Taxon	Country – Replied?	Exclude	Include in next round	NOTES For species from Madagascar the information below is based on their reply to the Secretariat of 18 July 2008
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Nicaragua Answer received		Yes	Ten year ban in place. Additional measures need to be put in place prior to any reopening of trade. Concern with regard to partial transformation of timber prior to export which may still require CITES documentation. To be further discussed in plenary
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Panama No response	Yes		No reply. No recorded CITES trade
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Peru Answer received	Yes		Considerable progress on implementation of NDFs have been made by Peru
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines No response	Yes		No reply. No recorded CITES trade
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) No response		Yes	No reply
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>	Saint Lucia Answer received	Yes		No reported CITES trade
<i>Voanioala gerardii</i>	Madagascar Answer received		Yes	Additional data required

21. Following on from the discussions at its 18th meeting, the Committee asked the Secretariat to request the Management Authority of Indonesia to provide information, within a time-frame of three months, on whether non-detriment findings were made, and if so how they were made, with regard to the species in the genera *Aquilaria* and *Gyrinops*. The Secretariat should then transmit the information received to the Committee.
22. The Committee agreed that, on the basis of that information, and using the postal procedure laid down in its rules of procedure, it would consider the inclusion of the species of those Indonesian genera in the Review of Significant Trade, in line with paragraph c) of the first operative paragraph beginning "DIRECTS" of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13).
23. The information requested was supplied within the time-frame by Indonesia and the postal procedure was followed through. The Committee unanimously agreed: (a) not to include the Indonesian *Aquilaria* spp. and *Gyrinops* spp. in the Review of Significant Trade; and (b) to recommend to the Secretariat that, pursuant to paragraph 18 of Resolution Conf. 14.7, it should encourage Indonesia to maintain its 2008 voluntary export quota for 2009.

**Financing and the costed programme of work for the Secretariat for the triennium 2009-2011 (Resolution Conf. 14.1)**

24. In accordance with paragraph c) of Resolution Conf. 14.1 on *Financing and the costed programme of work for the Secretariat for the triennium 2009-2011*, the Chair was consulted by the Secretariat on the assignment of scientific consultants and the definition of terms of reference for 10 specific projects requiring scientific expertise.

### **CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013 (Resolution Conf. 14.2, Annex)**

25. The Plants Committee contributed to the CITES Strategic Vision by way of the work carried out as part of the Review of the Appendices (Objective 1.4) and supplied and analysed the best available scientific information to make non-detriment findings for numerous species included in the Review of Significant Trade (Objective 1.5) (see PC17 and PC18 summary records).
26. In addition, the Committee analysed the results of the international expert workshop on non-detriment findings and also contributed to those results, both by the direct participation of eight members of the Plants Committee in the workshop and by the preparation of the documents on this topic which are to be discussed at the present meeting (see documents CoP15 Doc. 16.2.2 and CoP15 Doc. 16.3).

### **CITES compliance procedures (Resolution Conf. 14.3, Annex)**

27. The Plants Committee, acting in conformity with the instructions received from the Conference of the Parties and the powers delegated by it, advised and assisted the Standing Committee and the Conference of the Parties on compliance matters, *inter alia* through carrying out the examinations, consultations, evaluations and presentations of requisite reports on the topics requested of it and on the specific task of dealing with questions relating to the Review of Significant Trade (see documents SC57 Doc. 29.1 (Rev. 2) and SC58 Doc. 21.1, and documents produced during CoP14).

### **Cooperation between CITES and ITTO regarding trade in tropical timber (Resolution Conf. 14.4)**

28. The Secretariat kept the Plants Committee informed about the activities undertaken under the agreement made with ITTO. At PC17, the Secretariat presented a summary report on the regional workshop held in Cameroon from 2 to 4 April 2008, as part of a joint CITES-ITTO project on timber, which had given rise to an action plan for *Pericopsis elata*. The Committee welcomed the CITES-ITTO project, considering it an excellent model of cooperation, and one which should form the basis for improving the implementation of CITES with regard to timber species. At PC18, again, the Committee warmly welcomed the results of the project and took the view that there was scope for widening it to other countries and species, if funds were available.

### **Periodic Review of the Appendices (Resolution Conf. 14.8)**

29. With respect to the requirements laid down in the Resolution, the Plants Committee fulfilled the responsibilities and functions assigned by the Conference of the Parties.

### Resolutions with respect to which it might be necessary to consult or inform the Plants Committee

#### **Guidelines for the registration of nurseries exporting artificially propagated specimens of Appendix-I species [Resolution Conf. 9.19 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 3]**

30. No summary conclusions were presented to the Plants Committee. It is hoped that, pursuant to the Resolution (Annex 3, paragraph d) the Secretariat will keep the Committee informed.

#### **Inclusion of species in Appendix III [Resolution Conf. 9.25 (Rev. CoP14)]**

31. No request was received for a Committee opinion.

#### **Transport of live specimens [Resolution Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP14)]**

32. This topic was covered at the Committee's joint meeting with the Animals Committee, see document CoP15 Doc. 33.
33. Mr Michael Kiehn (Austria) was elected at PC17 to be responsible for plants topics within the Transport Working Group, and presented a report at PC18 (see document PC18 Doc. 21.2). The Committee took note of the report and requested the observer from Austria to continue representing the Plants Committee in the Transport Working Group and to inform the Chair of the Plants Committee on progress in that group, in particular in cases in which plants questions arose or it was necessary to take measures.

**Regulation of trade in plants [Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP14)]**

34. No request was received for a Committee opinion.

**Identification Manual (Resolution Conf. 11.19)**

35. The Secretariat submitted reports at PC17 and PC18 on the status of the Identification Manual.

**Procedure for approval of externally funded projects (Resolution Conf. 12.2, Annex 1)**

36. There were no consultations between the Secretariat and the Plants Committee, neither to approve projects to be carried out nor to prioritize them, as stipulated in paragraph 2 c) of Annex 1 to the Resolution.

Decisions directed to the Plants Committee

**Reporting on trade in artificially propagated plants (Decision 14.40)**

37. During PC18, the Secretariat made an oral presentation on the implementation of Decisions 14.39 to 14.41, concerning reporting on trade in artificially propagated plants.

38. In connection with Decision 14.40, the Committee agreed that reporting on trade in artificially propagated plants of taxa included in Appendix II was useful to its programme of work. Nevertheless, given the difficulties in analysing Parties' reporting practices for those specimens, it also agreed that it might be necessary to present draft revisions of Decisions 14.39 to 14.41 at CoP15 and to request for an appropriate budget to perform that analysis (see document CoP15 Doc. 22).

**Cactaceae and Orchidaceae: review of annotations (Decision 14.130)**

39. In order to implement Decision 14.130, the Committee agreed at PC17 to establish two working groups, chaired by Mexico, which would continue their work intersessionally and present their conclusions at PC18. Owing to the linkages between this Decision and Decision 14.148, it was decided that the working group set up by the Committee and chaired by the regional representative of North America to deal with Decision 14.148 would also be requested to undertake the overall coordination of the review of the annotations. It was further decided that the various groups should coordinate their work. The work carried out by the Plants Committee under these Decisions is covered in document CoP15 Doc. 64 and amendment proposal CoP15 Prop. 25.

**Euphorbia spp. (14.131)**

40. The Committee covered this topic at PC17 and PC18. The results are contained in document CoP15 Doc. 56.

**Orchids: annotation for species included in Appendix II (Decisions 14.133 and 14.134)**

41. The Committee covered this topic at PC17 and PC18. The results are contained in document CoP15 Doc. 65.

**Timber species and medicinal plants: non-detriment findings (Decision 14.135)**

42. The Committee covered this topic at PC17 and PC18. The results are contained in document CoP15 Doc. 16.3.

**Taxus cuspidata (Decision 14.147)**

43. The Committee covered this topic at PC17 and PC18. The results are contained in document CoP15 Doc. 59.

**Tree species: annotations for species included in Appendices II and III (Decision 14.148)**

44. The Committee covered this topic at PC17 and PC18. The results are contained in document CoP15 Doc. 66.

### ***Tree species (Decision 14.150)***

45. No new proposals to amend the Appendices were submitted to the Committee, whether on the basis of the document *Contribution to an evaluation of tree species*, or arising out of the results of regional workshops on the sustainable management of timber species in 2007 and 2008. Work will be pursued on this topic in the near future in order to have a better understanding of the subject.

### Decisions directed to the Parties and involving the Plants Committee

#### ***Bigleaf mahogany (Decision 14.145)***

46. The Committee covered this topic at PC17 and PC18. The results are contained in document CoP15 Doc. 58.

#### ***Cedrela odorata, Dalbergia retusa, Dalbergia granadillo and Dalbergia stevensonii (Decision 14.146)***

47. The Committee covered this topic at PC17 and PC18. The results are contained in document CoP15 Doc. 57.

### Decisions directed to the Animals and Plants Committees

#### ***Review of the scientific committees (Decisions 14.7 and 14.8)***

48. Decision 14.7 was discussed at the joint meeting of the two Committees, which agreed that there was no need at the moment to revise their terms of reference. With respect to Decision 14.8, the Plants Committee drew up at PC17 a plan of the work to be carried out, in which this Decision was included, with the expectation that this would be implemented jointly with the Animals Committee. Since the Committees have not, since then, had an opportunity to meet together again, it has not been possible to agree on and coordinate the implementation of this Decision. Consequently, the Committee would wish to be informed by the Conference, as appropriate, whether it wishes this Decision to remain in effect.

#### ***International expert workshop on non-detriment findings (Decision 14.50)***

49. This topic was covered by both the Plants Committee and the Animals Committee (see document CoP15 Doc. 16.2.2 prepared jointly by the Chairs of the two Committees).

#### ***Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species (Decision 14.52)***

50. This topic was covered by both the Plants Committee and the Animals Committee. At PC18, the Plants Committee agreed to recommend at CoP15 that the Parties not use source code R for plants (see document CoP15 Doc. 29 prepared jointly by the Chairs of the two Committees).

#### ***Review of Significant Trade [Decision 13.67 (Rev. CoP14) and Annex 1 to the CoP14 Decisions]***

51. At the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Santiago, 2002), the Animals and Plants Committees were tasked with drawing up the terms of reference for an evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade process. These terms of reference were adopted at CoP13 (Bangkok, 2004) and may be found in Annex 1 to the Decisions of the Conference of the Parties in effect after CoP14.
52. The terms of reference assign the responsibility for overseeing the evaluation to the Animals and Plants Committees, with assistance from an advisory group composed of members of the Committees, Parties, the Secretariat and invited experts. The Secretariat is responsible for administering the evaluation and for reporting regularly on progress to the Committees. Although it had been decided that the evaluation would start after CoP14, a date has not yet been set by when it should be concluded.
53. The Animals and Plants Committees examined this matter at their joint session on 19 April 2008 and drew up suggestions for the Secretariat as to the composition of the advisory group. The start of the evaluation is dependent upon availability of sufficient funds to ensure that it can be fully executed. In October 2008, the European Commission provided USD 40,000 for this exercise to be carried out.

54. In line with the suggestions from the Committees, the Secretariat proposed that the advisory group comprise the following members:
- a) Animals Committee: 1 member selected by the Committee;
  - b) Plants Committee: 1 member selected by the Committee;
  - c) Parties: Africa (4): Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea, Madagascar, United Republic of Tanzania; Asia (3): China, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran; Central and South America and the Caribbean (3): Guyana, Jamaica, Peru; Europe (3): Iceland, Russian Federation, one Party from the European Union; North America (1): United States; Oceania (1): Fiji; and
  - d) Invited experts: IUCN, TRAFFIC, UNEP-WCMC and the European Community.
55. The Parties proposed for each region were selected in consideration of the criteria proposed by the Committees at their last joint session. The number of members for each region is based on the balance applied for the membership of the Standing Committee.
56. As for the actual performance of the evaluation, the Secretariat suggested a *modus operandi* for each element of the terms of reference (see Annex 2 of document PC18 Doc. 8.2).
57. The Committee was requested: to invite the nominated Parties and experts to join the advisory group; to nominate a representative of the Committee to take part in the group; to identify the case studies referred to in paragraph 7 b) of the terms of reference; to set priorities; and to endorse the *modus operandi* drawn up for conducting the evaluation (see Annex 2 of document PC18 Doc. 8.2).
58. At PC18, the Plants Committee agreed: (a) on the composition of the advisory group, subject to the addition of the Scientific Authority of Canada to subparagraph d); (b) to ask the Secretariat to send a letter to the Parties concerned, transmitting the Committee's invitation to those Parties to join the group; (c) to propose the following case studies, listed in order of priority: 1. *Prunus africana*; 2. *Pericopsis elata*; 3. Madagascar, country-based review; (d) to endorse the *modus operandi* proposed by the Secretariat and to recommend that it be considered as constituting general guidelines and that restrictions should not be imposed on the advisory group, thereby enabling it to propose further modifications.
59. In addition, the Committee agreed that allowance should be made for the following: (a) in selecting consultants the Secretariat should take account of the experience of the advisory group and of the Animals and Plants Committees, so as to identify consultants with the appropriate technical expertise to carry out the evaluation; (b) with respect to the case studies, the Parties would be encouraged to participate in the evaluation by carrying out case studies in collaboration with the advisory group and under its direction; (c) in examining compliance-related matters, consideration should be given to the cases of *Prunus africana* and of the seven Asian species of medicinal plants [see document PC18 Doc. 8.5 (Rev. 1)].
60. The Committee also agreed to appoint the specialist on botanical nomenclature (Mr McGough) as the Plants Committee's representative on the advisory group, stating that he should share the chairmanship of the group with the Animals Committee representative.

Decisions directed to the Secretariat and involving collaboration by the Plants Committee

**Capacity-building programme for science-based establishment and implementation of voluntary national export quotas for Appendix-II species (Decision 12.91)**

61. The Plants Committee did not receive any requests for consultation relating to these topics.

**Global Strategy for Plant Conservation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Decision 14.15)**

62. The Committee covered this topic at PC17 and PC18. The results are contained in document CoP15 Doc. 10.4.

### **Harmonization of nomenclature and taxonomy with other Multilateral Environmental Agreements (Decision 14.18)**

63. With respect to the harmonization of nomenclature and taxonomy within the MEAs, the Plants Committee pointed out that account had to be taken of the fact that each had differing objectives. While Objective 1 of the Convention on Biological Diversity's Global Strategy for Plant Conservation has as a goal the gathering of data, the lists of CITES species or the standard references are operational tools to facilitate the work of the Convention.
64. Consequently, the Plants Committee recommends that any effort towards harmonization of nomenclature and taxonomy in the MEAs should make allowance for the fact that the lists of CITES species or the standard references are operational tools to facilitate the work of the Convention, and that CITES should retain the ability to adopt such independent standard references as are appropriate to the needs of the Parties.

### **Physical inspection of timber shipments (Decision 14.60)**

65. In consultation with the Plants Committee and the relevant intergovernmental organizations, the Secretariat established the electronic working group.

### **Agarwood-producing taxa (Decisions 14.142 and 14.143)**

66. The Committee covered this topic at PC17 and PC18. The results are contained in documents CoP15 Doc. 60 and CoP15 Doc. 16.3.

### Other Decisions to which the Plants Committee contributed

### **Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II plant species (*Cistanche deserticola*, *Dioscorea deltoidea*, *Nardostachys grandiflora*, *Picrorhiza kurrooa*, *Pterocarpus santalinus*, *Rauvolfia serpentina* and *Taxus wallichiana*) (Decision 14.20)**

67. The Committee covered this topic at PC17 and PC18. The results are contained in document CoP15 Doc. 26.

### Other topics considered

### **Cooperation with advisory bodies of other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements**

68. This topic was examined at the joint PC17/AC23 session and at PC18.
69. The Secretariat presented documents PC17 Doc. 7 and AC23 Doc. 7. Support was expressed for cooperation between CITES and other multilateral environmental agreements, although it was pointed out that the mandate of CITES was different from that of the other agreements.
70. An update was given on progress in developing the International Mechanism of Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity (IMoSEB). At the same time it was observed that not all Parties were in favour of developing such a mechanism.
71. Reference was made to the cooperation in place between CITES and the Convention on Biological Diversity through the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation.
72. The Animals and Plants Committees took note of the documents.

### **Cooperation with other multilateral instruments**

73. In the *Strategic Vision through 2005* and its Action Plan, as well as in the *CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013*, particular emphasis is placed on ensuring that CITES cooperates with other multilateral instruments and processes. With this in mind, the Secretariat and the Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committees have undertaken various activities related to those instruments and processes.

#### Meeting of the Chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions

74. Pursuant to the suggestion of the CITES Secretariat at the fourth meeting of the Biodiversity Liaison Group (BLG) (Bonn, October 2005), the BLG agreed to organize a meeting of the Chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions (CSAB). The intention was that the chairs of those bodies, together with the representatives of the secretariats, should promote cooperation, share information on the activities and processes of their conventions, and support collectively progress towards achievement of the 2010 biodiversity target.
75. The first meeting of the CSAB was held on 1 July 2007 in Paris. It was arranged by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) with the support of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). CITES was represented by the Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committees and a representative of the Secretariat. For more information, see document PC17 Doc. 7.
76. The second meeting of the CSAB was held on 25 May 2008 in Bonn, with CITES being represented by the Chair of the Plants Committee and a representative of the Secretariat. The meeting dealt with the processes and approaches of the scientific bodies of the conventions with regard to the provision of advice. The programmes of work of the Animals and Plants Committees were distributed for information. Summary information was provided to the participants on the steps taken in connection with the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).
77. The third meeting of the CSAB was held on 4 October 2009 in Nairobi. CITES was represented by the Chair of the Plants Committee, the Vice-Chair of the Animals Committee and a representative of the Secretariat. The meeting covered areas of common interest with a view to developing joint activities so as to avoid duplications in the programmes of work. Participants learned about progress in drawing up goals with a view to establishing a strategy beyond 2010, about the events planned to celebrate the year 2010 as the International Year of Biodiversity, and about the planned course of the second meeting on the IPBES.

#### 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership

78. Document PC17 Doc. 7 provides general information on this initiative to simplify biodiversity indicators in order to meet the 2010 biodiversity target.

#### Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)

79. As reported in document PC17 Doc. 7, between 2005 and 2007 an International Mechanism of Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity held consultations on the need to have an objective source of information on biodiversity change and its impacts on ecosystem services and human well-being. As a result of those consultations, those involved requested the Executive Director of UNEP to convene an intergovernmental meeting to examine the idea of establishing an international interface between science and policy to address those objectives.
80. That meeting, entitled *Intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services*, was held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, from 10 to 12 November 2008, and was attended by the Chair of the Plants Committee and the Secretary-General.
81. The platform proposed would provide scientific support to the multilateral environmental agreements, to national governments and to others with responsibility for adopting policies on the consequences of biodiversity loss and ecosystem change.
82. The results of the meeting were presented to the Executive Director of UNEP at the 25th meeting of the UNEP Governing Council (16 to 20 February 2009), when the Executive Director was requested to convene a second intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting, with the aim of strengthening and improving the interface between science and policy in the interests of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and in furtherance of human well-being, including giving consideration to a new science-policy platform. As the first meeting had made frequent references to the functioning and needs of the multilateral environmental agreements such as CITES, and to the relationships among them, it is consequently important for the Convention to participate in future discussions.
83. The Plants Committee took note of the report.

84. As a result of the meeting in Putrajaya, Malaysia, a gap analysis was carried out and submitted to the Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committees to enable them to gather comments. The Chair of the Plants Committee prepared some draft comments which were circulated to the members of the Animals and Plants Committees and to the Secretariat. Once all of their comments had been received, they were submitted in the names of the two Committee Chairs, within the time-frame allowed for consultations.
85. The second meeting on the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services was held from 5 to 9 October in Nairobi, and was attended by the Chair of the Plants Committee, the Vice-Chair of the Animals Committee and a representative of the Secretariat. The results of that meeting may be found at <http://ipbes.net> (see document CoP15 Doc. 10.1).

#### Budget of the Plants Committee

86. At a minimum, the Plants Committee will require for the triennium 2012-2014 the same support as in the preceding three years. The Committee calls on the Parties to give consideration to approving a supplementary budget, estimated by the CITES Secretariat, to support the Chair of the Committee in the event that the chairmanship is held by a national of a developing country.

#### Acknowledgements

87. Finally, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to the members of the Plants Committee for their commitment, enthusiastic collaboration and the excellent work they performed. I should also like to thank the Chairs and members of the Animals and Standing Committees, and the Chairs and members of the working groups, for their support, cooperation and interest in the activities of the Plants Committee. I should like to extend my gratitude to the observers from the Parties, to the intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and to the CITES Secretariat, with special thanks to David Morgan, Milena Sosa Schmidt, Victoria Zentilli and Maritza Campos for their extremely valuable contributions to the Plants Committee. And last of all, I wish to express my deepest thanks to the Scientific and Management Authorities of my country, Spain, and to the University of Cordoba, for the enormous amount of help and support that they provided to enable me to fulfil my functions as Chair of the Plants Committee.

## COMMENTS FROM THE SECRETARIAT

- A. This time the report of the Chair of the Plants Committee does not include recommendations or draft decisions, since specific PC activities or joint AC/PC issues are the subject of separate agenda items. The Secretariat therefore provides its comments to these issues under the corresponding agenda items.
- B. After consideration of the reports of the Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committees, the Secretariat would like to reiterate the comment it made at CoP14 in document CoP14 Doc. 8.4 (*Joint report of the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees*). In that document, the Secretariat suggested that, because members of the technical committees were individuals, rather than representatives of Parties as in the Standing Committee, rules needed to be developed for preventing and dealing with potential conflicts of interest relating to the activities of the Animals and Plants Committees, similar to those in certain other Multilateral Environmental Agreements. When this matter was discussed in Committee II at CoP14, Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, as well as Mexico and the United States of America supported the recommendation made by the Secretariat. The Chair of the Animals Committee said that such minor amendments to the Rules could be addressed bilaterally between the Secretariat and the scientific committees, and that the final Rules could be adopted at the following meetings of those Committees. [see summary record CoP14 Com. II Rep. 4 (Rev. 1)].
- C. However, when the Secretariat proposed the adoption of the following text in the Rules of Procedure to address this issue at the joint session of AC23 and PC17 the Animals and Plants Committees rejected the proposal:
- In cases where a member or alternate member of the Animals and Plants Committee has a financial or personal interest that could call into question his or her impartiality, objectivity or independence regarding a subject to be discussed by the Committee, he or she must disclose the interest to the Committee in advance of the discussions. Following any such disclosure and where appropriate after consultations with the Secretariat, the member or alternate member may participate in the discussion but not in the making of any decision with regard to the subject.*
- D. The Secretariat believes that the insertion of the draft rule in paragraph C above is a basic requirement for the conduct of an impartial, objective and independent advisory body, and understood that Parties shared this view at CoP14. The Secretariat therefore suggests a draft decision to bring this into effect:

## DRAFT DECISION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

### **Directed to the Animals and Plants Committees**

- 15.xx** The Animals and Plants Committees shall amend their Rules of Procedure to include the following rule before conducting any further meetings:

In cases where a member or alternate member of the Animals and Plants Committee has a financial or personal interest that could call into question his or her impartiality, objectivity or independence regarding a subject to be discussed by the Committee, he or she must disclose the interest to the Committee in advance of the discussions. Following any such disclosure and after consultations with the Secretariat where appropriate, the member or alternate member may participate in the discussion but not in the making of any decision with regard to the subject.