

Inclusion of Monkey-puzzle Tree *Araucaria araucana* in Appendix I, replacing *Araucaria araucana* +219 (populations of Argentina and Chile), and deletion of *Araucaria araucana** -114#1 in Appendix II. Proponent: Argentina.**

Summary: The Monkey-puzzle Tree *Araucaria araucana* is a long-lived conifer confined to the temperate forests of Chile and Argentina. The population in Chile has been included in Appendix I since 1975. In 2000 Argentina submitted a proposal to transfer its Appendix-II listed populations to Appendix I to “unify the protection status of this species, avoiding the double listing”. The proposal was adopted at CoP 11, and initially the Secretariat included all populations in Appendix I. They later revised the Appendices, including the populations of Argentina and Chile in Appendix I and listing all remaining populations in Appendix II. However, Argentina and the Plants Committee both questioned this interpretation, on the basis that any introduced populations, if they exist, should be maintained in the same Appendix as the wild population. The Standing Committee requested the Secretariat to bring the matter before CoP 12. Before this, Argentina requested a postal vote on a proposal to include all specimens of *A. araucana* in Appendix I. As fewer than half the Parties voted and the Philippines objected on the grounds that an Appendix-I listing would restrict its ability to trade in products from introduced populations, the proposal has been re-submitted. It now appears that the Philippines was mistaken in claiming to have introduced populations of the species. The current proposal seeks to rectify what the proponent sees as a misinterpretation of the proposal that it submitted to CoP 11 and which was accepted.

Analysis: As the CoP 11 proposal referred to Argentina’s population of the taxon, only the Argentinean population was eventually included in Appendix I, all other populations being retained in Appendix II. However, if any populations (rather than scattered introduced individuals) other than those of Chile and Argentina actually exist, for which there is currently no evidence, then they are introduced populations. Treatment of introduced populations is not referred to specifically in either the Convention text or Resolution Conf. 9.24, but the Parties may explore this issue further in relation to the work of the technical committees on *in-situ* and *ex-situ* production. In the meantime, some guidance is provided by Article VII paragraph 4. This paragraph states that any specimen of a species included in Appendix I that is artificially-propagated (Art. Prop.) for commercial purposes should be deemed to be a specimen of an Appendix-II species and traded under an Art. Prop. certificate. This suggests that the original drafters of the Convention expected that specimens of Appendix-I listed taxa would generally be retained in a single Appendix irrespective of their wild or non-wild provenance. However, the Secretariat has noted an alternative approach in two cases where domesticated or introduced specimens of Appendix-I and -III listed taxa are specifically excluded completely from the Appendices (the domesticated form of the Appendix-I listed *Chinchilla* spp. and specimens of Appendix-III listed Big-leafed Mahogany *Swietenia macrophylla* from outside the Americas). An Appendix-I listing for the whole *Araucaria araucana* taxon, with the ability to trade progeny of introduced specimens under artificial propagation certificates, could help to regulate the trade in seeds that is of concern to Argentina.

Supporting Statement (SS)	Additional information
<u>Discussion</u>	
<p>The proposal seeks to correct what the proponent sees as an error of interpretation of the intention of the Parties in dealing with the issue at CoP 11. Chile and Argentina are the only two range States for this species, and whilst individuals exist outside the range States, it is not clear that any introduced populations exist as such. A proposal to transfer Argentinean populations of <i>Araucaria araucana</i> from Appendix II to Appendix I to eliminate the split-listing was adopted at CoP11.</p> <p>After CoP11, the Secretariat published Notification to the Parties No. 2000/034 of 15 June 2000, which contained a revised version of Appendices I and II, deleting <i>A. araucana</i> from Appendix II and including the whole species in Appendix I.</p> <p>Notification to the Parties No. 2000/037 of 31 July</p>	<p><i>Argentina and Chile are the only two range States of this species, which extends from the Coastal Cordillera of Chile to the Andes in Argentina (IUCN/SSC and TRAFFIC, 2000). According to the Plants Committee at its 10th meeting (CITES Secretariat, 2001), “no other population of the species exists outside Chile and Argentina”.</i></p> <p><i>Individual trees are found in gardens and parks around the world (North America, Europe and New Zealand) (IUCN/SSC and TRAFFIC, 2000) and individuals regenerate spontaneously here and there, if only from root suckers (Farjoen, 2002).</i></p> <p><i>The species is not included in the revised list of Philippine trees (Rojo, 2001). The list of introduced species of Araucaria does not include Araucaria araucana according the Chairman of the IUCN SSC</i></p>

Supporting Statement (SS)	Additional information
<p>2000 then amended the Appendices (without consulting range States or the Plants Committee) to maintain populations of the species, other than in Chile and Argentina, in Appendix II.</p> <p>Argentina questioned this decision and the Plants Committee concluded that there is no good evidence of naturalised populations of <i>Araucaria araucana</i> outside of Argentina and Chile, despite horticultural cultivation of the species outside Argentina and Chile.</p> <p>However, the Standing Committee accepted the Secretariat report (SC45 Doc. 14), which maintained that a change of the current listing would require a Party to submit an amendment proposal for postal ballot or at a Meeting of the Conference of the Parties.</p> <p>Argentina requested confirmation of the decision adopted by CoP 11 by submitting a new proposal to be considered by the Parties, through postal procedure. Less than half of parties voted and Philippines objected that <i>Araucaria araucana</i> is an introduced species there and that its trade has no negative impacts on natural populations of Argentina and Chile.</p> <p>Argentina's proposal was supported by Chile, Ecuador, the Plants Committee, several members of the Standing Committee as well as by FAO, IUCN, TRAFFIC and three other Parties. However because a quorum was not attained, the proposal has been brought before CoP 12.</p> <p>As information pertaining to the criteria for inclusion in Appendix I was considered at CoP 11; the proponent is not presenting the data again.</p>	<p><i>Philippine Plants Specialist Group (Madulid, 2002). Text from Menghi (2002) quotes two unnamed experts refuting the existence of introduced populations of the species in the Philippines.</i></p> <p><i>Neither the Convention nor Resolution Conf. 9.24 make specific reference to introduced populations. The only possible guidance is provide by Article VII paragraph 4, which notes that Appendix-1 specimens artificially propagated for commercial purposes shall be deemed to be specimens of Appendix II species. The recommendation in Resolution Conf. 9.24 Annex 3 to avoid split-listing of a species (unless on the basis of a national population) may also be pertinent.</i></p> <p><i>In Notification No.2001/080, the Secretariat noted that the domesticated form of the Chinchilla (Chinchilla spp.) has been excluded from provisions of the Appendices, and similarly, that Big-leafed Mahogany (Swietenia macrophylla) populations outside their natural range have also been excluded from an Appendix III-listing. In contrast, the populations of Przewalski's Horse Equus przewalskii, originally extinct in the wild and included in Appendix I were in fact captive populations from outside the natural range. In the absence of formal guidance, in the past Parties appear to have made pragmatic decisions weighing the perceived conservation importance of the taxon and the enforcement burden.</i></p> <p><i>The species is included in nursery catalogues in Europe and North America (IUCN/SSC and TRAFFIC, 2000). According to Farjoen (2002), the species is still popular in the horticultural trade in many countries, although perhaps a little less than previously. However, as the proponent notes, an Appendix-I listing would not prevent international trade in artificially propagated specimens.</i></p> <p><i>Gardiner (2002) notes that, to his knowledge, the species does not occur widely in plantations and it does not produce good quality timber. He supports the intent of the proposal.</i></p>

Reviewers: A. Farjoen, M. Gardiner, O. Menghi, TRAFFIC South America.

References:

- CITES Secretariat. 2001. *Proceedings of the Tenth Meeting of the CITES Plants Committee*. Sheperdstown, USA, 11-15 December, 2000.
- Farjoen, A., 2002. *in litt.* to IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme, Cambridge, UK.
- Gardiner, M., 2002. *in litt.* to IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme, Cambridge, UK.
- IUCN/SSC and TRAFFIC, 2000. *IUCN Analyses of Proposals to amend the CITES Appendices*. Prepared by IUCN Species Survival Commission and the TRAFFIC network for the Eleventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES. IUCN-The World Conservation Union. Gland, Switzerland.
- Madulid, D., Chair of the IUCN/SSC Philippine Plant Specialist Group, 2002. *in litt.* to Management Authority of Argentina - in TRAFFIC South America, 2002. *in litt.* to TRAFFIC International, Cambridge, UK.
- Menghi, O., 2002. *in litt.* to IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme, Cambridge, UK.
- Notification to the Parties No. 2000/037.
- Notification to Parties No. 2000/034.
- Notification to the Parties No. 2001/080, Annex 2: Comments and recommendation of the Secretariat regarding the proposal of Argentina to amend Appendices I and II to include *Araucaria araucana* in Appendix I in place of

*Araucaria araucana***+219 (populations of Argentina and Chile and to delete *Araucaria araucana**-114#1 from Appendix II.

Royo, J.P., 2001. *Revised Lexicon of Philippine Trees*. In TRAFFIC South America, 2002. *in litt.* to TRAFFIC International, Cambridge, UK.