

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



Twentieth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Samarkand (Uzbekistan), 24 November – 5 December 2025

NOMENCLATURE NOTES ON CITES COP20 PROPOSALS*

1. This document has been submitted by the Secretariat and prepared by the nomenclature specialists of the Plants and Animals Committees. It provides observations, considerations, and recommendations concerning the information presented in the Proposals for amendment of the CITES Appendices submitted for the 20th meeting of the Conference of the Parties. This document provides additional information to that contained in the [Addendum](#) to document CoP20 Doc.110 on Standard Nomenclature. All references that are not fully cited in this document are provided in full either in the Annex to CITES [Resolution Conf. 12.11 \(Rev. CoP19\)](#) on *Standard nomenclature*, in the Proposal under discussion, or in [CoP20 Doc. 110](#).
2. The annex to this document provides an analysis of the impact that adoption of the Flora proposals and the relevant standard nomenclature references proposed in these proposals and in CoP20 Doc. 110 Add. will have on the CITES Appendices.

Section 1: Comments on proposals

Fauna

3. **CoP20 Proposal 3: *Saiga tatarica*** – amend the annotation by adding the wording "except for specimens from the population *Saiga tatarica* of Kazakhstan"

The adopted standard nomenclature reference for CITES-listed mammals (Wilson & Reeder 2005 pages 688–689) recognizes two distinct species in the genus *Saiga*, namely *Saiga tatarica* and *Saiga borealis*. *Saiga borealis* is variously considered a separate species, or a subspecies of *Saiga tatarica* in the scientific community; for CITES purposes it should be treated as a separate full species. The proposal refers to *Saiga borealis* as a subspecies in section 1.5; this does not affect the substance of the Proposal.

4. **CoP20 Proposal 4: *Giraffa camelopardalis*** – delete the populations of Angola, Botswana, Eswatini, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, and Zimbabwe from Appendix II

The proposal states "these populations are now recognized by science as a different species (*Giraffa giraffa*; southern giraffe)". Based on the taxonomy and nomenclature adopted as part of the original proposal to include all giraffes in Appendix II ([CoP18 Prop. 5](#)) and citing the adopted nomenclature standard reference for Mammals (Wilson & Reeder 2005: page 672), only a single species of Giraffe is recognized for CITES purposes, being *Giraffa camelopardalis*, with six recognized subspecies (*camelopardalis*, *reticulata*, *rothschildi*, *thornicrofti*, *tippelskirchi*, and *giraffa*; the taxon *G. c. angolensis* was considered a synonym of subspecies *giraffa* by Wilson & Reeder 2005).

No updates to the taxonomy or nomenclature of the Giraffe species have been recommended by the Animals Committee for consideration by the Parties at CoP20, and while Proposal 5 refers to alternative taxonomies being proposed and supported by researchers within the scientific community, the Proposal does not explicitly recommend the adoption of an updated nomenclature standard reference for giraffes.

* 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.

For the purposes of CITES the Proposal must be understood to refer to the national populations of *Giraffa camelopardalis* of the listed Nations.

In this respect, the inclusion of Malawi and Zambia in the range and population estimates of southern giraffes (sections 1.4, 2, 3.1, 4.2, and 9.2) is noteworthy, as Winter *et al.* 2018 (Figure 2) assigned the giraffe populations of both Malawi and Zambia to *Giraffa tippelskirchi*, while Coimbra *et al.* 2021 (fig. 1) later considered the Zambian giraffe population as *tippelskirchi* and the Malawi population as *giraffa*; this contrasts with the Proposal, which includes the Malawi and Zambia populations as part of the *giraffa* (sub)species. A 2024 study by an independent team of researchers (Bertola *et al.* 2024) did not assign the Malawi or Zambia populations to species or subspecies.

In their deliberations regarding Proposal 4, the parties may wish to consider whether to add the genus *Giraffa* to the list of priority groups for nomenclature updates presented in paragraph 82 of Document [CoP20 Doc. 110](#) on Standard nomenclature.

5. **CoP20 Proposal 8: *Monachus tropicalis* – delete from Appendix I**

The proposal is to delete the extinct species *Monachus tropicalis* from Appendix I and include the following text in the Appendices “*Monachus* spp. (except ‘*Monachus tropicalis*’ which is extinct and was removed from the Appendices on [insert date])”.

As the Proposal notes, at its 33rd meeting the Animals Committee recommended that the taxonomic – nomenclatural split of the genus *Monachus* into *Monachus* spp. and *Neomonachus* spp. be recognized, and this is proposed for adoption by the Parties at their 20th Meeting in document [CoP20 Doc. 110](#), Annex 3, and the specific change is spelled out in Annex 5.

On the assumption that both Proposal 8 and the nomenclatural recommendations in [CoP20 Doc. 110](#) are adopted, the listing in the Appendices would then become:

“ *Monachus* spp.

Neomonachus spp. (except *Neomonachus tropicalis*, which is extinct and was removed from the Appendices on [insert date]) ”

It should be noted that other exclusions of extinct species from the Appendices use a different phrasing; see e.g. *Pteropus* spp. for exclusion of the extinct *Pteropus brunneus*, STRIGIFORMES spp. excluding *Scleroglaux albifacies*, and *Rheobatrachus* spp. excluding *R. silus* and *R. vitellinus*.

6. **CoP20 Proposal 12: *Cercocebus chrysogaster* – transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I**

In section 1.4, the author name should not be in brackets; the correct combination and authorship designation is *Cercocebus chrysogaster* Lydekker, 1900. The authorships and dates provided for the synonyms in section 1.5 are for the species to which *chrysogaster* was subsequently attributed as a subspecies.

7. **CoP20 Proposals 13 and 14: *Loxodonta africana***

Please refer to document [CoP20 Doc. 113](#) for consideration of possible ways how the populations subject of these Proposals could be designated in Appendix II.

8. **CoP20 Proposal 15: *Ceratogymna* spp. and *Bycanistes* spp. – include in Appendix II**

The proposal to include the two genera in Appendix II generally reflects the taxonomy and nomenclature in the adopted CITES general nomenclature standard reference for birds (i.e., Dickinson (Ed.) 2003) in the taxonomy section (1.3 & 1.4) of the supporting statement; however, for order- and family-names of birds and their content the parties adopted Morony *et al.* 1975, which places family Bucerotidae in the order Coraciiformes (as reflected in the Appendices); order Bucerotiformes is a more recently recognized concept that has not been adopted by the CITES Parties yet. *Bycanistes brevis* Friedmann, 1929, *B. fistulator duboisi* Sclater 1922, and *B. subcylindricus subquadratus* Cabanis, 1880, should have no brackets around the authorship name and year.

By most accounts, this taxonomy is out of date, with more recent works recognizing *Bycanistes albotibialis* (AviList 2025, Del Hoyo & Collar 2014) and *B. sharpii* (with subspecies *duboisi*) (Del Hoyo & Collar 2014,

but not AvIList 2025) as separate species (as opposed to these taxa being treated as subspecies in Dickinson (Ed.) 2003).

As noted in the taxonomic note on page 2 of Proposal 15, the proposal text follows the more recent taxonomy of Del Hoyo & Collar (2014) and refers to nine species (2 in *Ceratogymna*, 7 in *Bycanistes*). As the Proposal does not explicitly propose to designate an updated standard nomenclature reference for the two genera *Bycanistes* and *Ceratogymna*, the adopted 'default' nomenclature standard, being Dickinson (Ed.) 2003, applies until an undated reference is adopted by the Parties. With the recent publication of the consensus AvIList Checklist of birds of the world (www.avilist.org), adoption of updated nomenclature for all birds, including African Hornbills, should be not too far in the future.

9. **CoP20 Proposal 16: *Gyps africanus* and *Gyps rueppelli* – transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I**

Following the adopted higher classification (orders and families) of birds as set out in Morony *et al.* (1975), the *Gyps* vultures are considered part of Family Accipitridae, which is placed in the Order FALCONIFORMES (as presented in the CITES Appendices). This anachronism will hopefully soon be updated as part of the overall update of bird nomenclature for CITES.

Of note is that the Proposal correctly spells '*rueppelli*' with one 'i' at the end, whereas the SpeciesPlus database erroneously spells the name with two 'i's.

10. **CoP20 Proposal 17: *Falco peregrinus* – transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II**

For Proposal 17 it is worth remembering that the Parties at CoP19 (Panama, 2022: [CoP19 Doc. 84.1](#)) adopted updated nomenclature that treats the former separate species *Falco pelegrinoides* as a subspecies of *Falco peregrinus*, and thus Northern African and Middle Eastern populations that were previously attributed to the taxon *pelegrinoides* are subject to this proposal.

11. **CoP20 Proposal 18: *Sporophila maximiliani* – include in Appendix I; *S. angolensis*, *S. atrostris*, *S. crassirostris*, *S. funerea*, and *S. nuttingi* – include in Appendix II**

As noted in the Proposal, these large-billed finch species are placed in the genus *Oryzoborus* in the adopted 'default' nomenclature standards for birds, and placed in the Family Emberizidae, in both Morony *et al.* (1975) (family placement) and Dickinson (ed.) 2003 (species listing). Recent works (Del Hoyo & Collar 2016, AvIList 2025) have placed these species in the genus *Sporophila*, and placed this genus in the family Thraupidae (based on molecular research, the *Oryzoborus* species phylogenetically nested within *Sporophila*, making the genus *Oryzoborus* a junior synonym under *Sporophila*).

The proposal explicitly designates Del Hoyo & Collar (2016) as the nomenclature standard reference for the species in this proposal; if the Parties adopt Proposal 18, this reference must be added to the Annex to Resolution Conf 12.11 (Rev. CoP20) as applying specifically to the *Sporophila* species:

DEL HOYO, J., & COLLAR, N.J. (2016): *HBW and Birdlife International Illustrated Checklist of the Birds of the World. Volume 2: Passerines*. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona. ISBN 978-84-96553-98-9.

For consistency with adopted higher classification of birds for CITES purposes (i.e., Morony *et al.* 1975), if Proposal 18 is adopted, the species should be listed in the Appendices under PASSERIFORMES, Emberizidae, and the same placement should be used to place the Del Hoyo & Collar 2016 reference in the Annex to Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP20).

Making progress towards an updated bird nomenclature will be a priority for the Animals Committee following CoP20 ([CoP20 Doc.110](#) paragraphs 70–74).

12. **CoP20 Proposal 19: *Caribicus warreni* – include in Appendix I**

No standard nomenclature reference has been adopted by the CITES Parties to date concerning the genus or species name, and consideration by the Animals Committee of a suitable standard reference is desirable. *Caribicus* is part of the alligator lizards that are currently considered to form their own family, Diploglossidae, which was treated as a subfamily of Anguidae in the adopted standard nomenclature reference for delimitation of lizard families (Pough *et al.* 1998); thus, if adopted, *Caribicus warreni* should be listed in the Appendices under Anguidae, alongside *Abronia*.

13. **CoP20 Proposals 20 & 21: *Phyllurus amnicola* & *Phyllurus caudiannulatus* – include in Appendix II**

Both proposals note these species to be part of the family Carphodactylidae, which is where recent gecko systematics studies have placed them, the Carphodactylidae being one of several subfamilies having been elevated out from the family Gekkonidae. Nevertheless, the adopted CITES nomenclature standard reference for delimitation of lizard families (Pough *et al.* 1998) treats these species as placed in subfamily Carphodactylinae under the family Gekkonidae – which is where the *Phyllurus* species are placed in Appendix III at present.

14. **CoP20 Proposal 22: *Amblyrhynchus* spp. – transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I**

The Proposal's nomenclature is in agreement with the updated nomenclature standard reference proposed for Iguanid lizards in document [CoP20 Doc.110](#) paragraph 79 b).

15. **CoP20 Proposal 23: *Conolophus* spp. – transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I**

The Proposal's nomenclature is in agreement with the updated nomenclature standard reference proposed for Iguanid lizards in document [CoP20 Doc.110](#) paragraph 79 b).

The synonyms presented in section 1.5 of the Proposal pertain to the Marine Iguana, *Amblyrhynchus cristatus*, which is the subject of Proposal 22.

16. **CoP20 Proposal 24: *Bitis harensa* & *Bitis parviocula* – include in Appendix I**

Bitis parviocula is included in the adopted standard reference for non-Colubrid snakes (McDiarmid *et al.* 1999), while *Bitis harensa* was only recognized as distinct from *B. parviocula* in 2016, and is thus not included in the adopted nomenclature standard references of CITES.

While the proposal makes no recommendations in this regard, the [Addendum to document CoP20 Doc. 110](#) notes that if the Parties adopt Proposal 24, the Parties may wish to consider adopting a nomenclature standard reference for the two species; the following recommendation not only taxonomically and nomenclaturally defines both species, but also provides a functional key to identify and differentiate the species:

GOWER, D.J., WADE, E.O.Z., SPAWLS, S., BÖHME, W., BUECHLEY, E.R., SYKES, D., & COLSTON, T.J. (2016): A new large species of *Bitis* Gray, 1842 (Serpentes: Viperidae) from the Bale Mountains of Ethiopia. *Zootaxa* 4093 (1): 041–063. <http://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4093.1.3>

17. **CoP20 Proposal 25: *Crotalus* spp. & *Sistrurus* spp. – include in Appendix II**

The adopted standard reference for rattlesnakes and dwarf rattlesnakes of the genera *Crotalus* and *Sistrurus* is McDiarmid *et al.* (1999), but as the Proposal notes, this standard reference is significantly out of date, including placing *ravus* in *Sistrurus*, rather than its current placement in *Crotalus* (this transfer indicates how closely related the two genera are).

As noted in the proposal, the Proponents recommend the adoption of an extract from *The Reptile Database*, as of 27 June 2025, as updated nomenclatural standard reference for the genera *Crotalus* and *Sistrurus*. This Checklist was prepared by the nomenclature specialist of the Animals Committee and is available as [Annex 5 to document CoP20 Doc. 110 Addendum](#).

18. **CoP20 Proposal 27: *Pelophylax epeiroticus*, *P. ridibundus*, *P. shqipericus*, *P. lessonae* – include in Appendix II with delayed entry into effect**

As noted in Proposal 27 to include four species of Eurasian frogs in Appendix II, the phylogeny, taxonomy and nomenclature of these frogs are exceedingly complicated, due to extensive hybridization between taxa and extensive geographic and individual variability in morphology. Annex 1 to the proposal is a Checklist extracted from the *Amphibians of the World* database, from which extracts for other amphibian groups have already been adopted as CITES standard references for amphibian nomenclature. The proposal explicitly notes that this Annex be adopted as the standard nomenclature reference for these taxa if the Proposal is adopted; it would then be included in the Annex to Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP20).

19. **CoP20 Proposal 29: *Galeorhinus galeus*, *Mustelus* spp.** – include in Appendix II

The Proposal notes that in addition to the three focal species *Galeorhinus galeus*, *Mustelus mustelus*, and *M. schmitti*, another 26 species of *Mustelus* are included in the Proposal. No checklist concerning these species has been adopted or proposed for CITES, and if the proposal is adopted, such a checklist would need preparation at the earliest reasonable opportunity, ideally for consideration at the 34th meeting of the Animals Committee. As of 30 July 2025, *Eschmeyer's Catalog of Fishes* as well as FishBase list 27 valid species of *Mustelus* (*Mustelus walkeri* White & Last 2006, synonymized with *M. antarcticus* by White *et al.* 2021, being the discrepancy with Table 9), indicating the need for evaluation and review.

20. **CoP20 Proposal 30: *Mobulidae* spp.** – transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I

The Proposal is consistent with the [Taxonomic Checklist of selected fish taxa...](#) proposed for adoption at CoP20, including its recognition of *Mobulidae* as a separate family, and the recognition of nine species in the single genus *Mobula*.

The description of *Mobula yarae* (a split-out from *M. birostris*) was published by [Bucair et al. \(2025\)](#) after the submission deadline, and this case may be taken up by the Animals Committee at its next meeting.

21. **CoP20 Proposal 32: *Glaucostegus* spp.** – add annotation for a zero annual export quota for wild-taken specimens for commercial purposes

Proposal 32 lists 7 species as being validly recognized in the genus *Glaucostegus*; this contrasts with the [currently-adopted CITES nomenclature](#) recognizing 9 species.

Glaucostegus microphthalmus is at present considered a synonym of *G. typus*; *Glaucostegus petiti* is a synonym of *G. cemiculus*; *Glaucostegus spinosus* is based on a single specimen from 1870, most likely a juvenile of a previously-described species, and is best considered invalid for the time being; and the recently-described *Glaucostegus younholeei* is included in the Proposal but not yet recognized by CITES.

In all these updates, the Proposal concurs with the recommendations from the Animals Committee for updated nomenclature of CITES-listed fishes, and is fully consistent with the [Taxonomic Checklist of selected fish taxa...](#) proposed for adoption at CoP20.

22. **CoP20 Proposal 33: *Rhinidae* spp.** – add annotation for a zero annual export quota for wild-taken specimens for commercial purposes

The Proposal, while at the family level in its scope, enumerates the species currently contained in the family in section 1.4 and elsewhere in the proposal. Compared to the list of species recognized by CITES to date ([CITES Checklist](#)), *Rhynchobatus mononoke* is added; this species was described after the family was included in the CITES Appendices, it was [recommended](#) for CITES recognition by the Animals Committee, and is therefore included as a valid species in the proposed updated [Taxonomic Checklist of selected fish taxa...](#)

23. **CoP20 Proposal 34: *Centrophoridae* spp.** – include in Appendix II

Gulper shark taxonomy and nomenclature have been challenging, and in the preparation of the proposal its proponents worked with the nomenclature specialist of the Animals Committee to evaluate taxonomic – nomenclatural options and prepare a database extract that can serve as a nomenclature standard reference for the gulper sharks for CITES purposes. An extract from *Eschmeyer's Catalog of Fishes* was included with the Proposal as Annex 3, and in case of adoption of Proposal 34 this should be adopted as a standard nomenclature reference for the family and added to the Annex to Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP20) on *Standard Nomenclature*.

After the Proposal submission deadline, it was realized that an oversight had occurred in Eschmeyer's database (and this apparently perpetuated into other databases consulted): In a 2017 article, White, Ebert & Naylor (<https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4344.1.3>) had demonstrated that the type specimen of *Centrophorus lusitanicus* was actually a specimen of *C. granulatus*, and thus a junior synonym. The long-finned slender gulper sharks that had up to then been attributed to *C. lusitanicus* therefore needed a new name, and *C. longipinnis* (eastern Atlantic) and *C. lesliei* (Indo-Western Pacific) were named and described accordingly. These new names are in the databases and Proposal, but *lusitanicus* was not

deleted. If Proposal 34 is adopted, it is recommended that this matter be addressed at the 34th meeting of the Animals Committee.

24. **CoP20 Proposal 35: *Anguilla* spp.** – include in Appendix II with delayed entry into effect

Section 1.4 of the proposal notes that the adoption of the Proposal would include the adoption of its Annex 1 as nomenclature standard reference for the genus *Anguilla*. Annex 1 of Proposal 35 is an updated version of the draft fish checklist reviewed by the Animals Committee at its 33rd meeting ([Annex 1 of document AC33 Doc.48](#)). Three updated taxonomic placements were made following a review of available taxonomic literature and databases and consultation with anguillid eel specialists to elucidate the most appropriate taxonomic status for three poorly-known taxa: the taxa *labiata*, *nebulosa*, and *pacifica*.

The species status of *Anguilla labiata* (Peters, 1852) from the western Indian Ocean remains questionable; the most recent molecular phylogeny available (Teng, Lin & Tzeng 2009, Zoological Studies 48(6): 808–822) treated *labiata* as a subspecies of *Anguilla bengalensis* (Gray, 1831), which ranges throughout the Indian Ocean basin. Similarly, Teng *et al.* (2009) treated the poorly-known taxon *Anguilla pacifica* Schmidt, 1928 from northern Australia as a subspecies of *Anguilla bicolor* McClelland, 1844, which ranges throughout the Indian Ocean and western Pacific Ocean basins. The status of *Anguilla nebulosa* McClelland, 1844, from the Bay of Bengal, versus *Anguilla bengalensis* remains unsettled, with outright synonymy of the two taxa, subspecies status for *nebulosa* under *bengalensis*, and separate species status all having been proposed in recent literature; pending further information, it appears prudent to follow the status used by both *Eschmeyer's Catalog of Fishes* and *Fishbase*, and treat the two taxa as separate valid species.

Should Proposal 35 be adopted, it would be appropriate to integrate this updated Anguillid eel taxonomy and nomenclature in the proposed updated [Taxonomic Checklist of selected fish taxa...](#) by replacing the Anguillid eel section in the proposed Checklist with Annex 1 of Proposal 35, and for the Animals Committee to look further into the status of *Anguilla labiata*, *A. nebulosa*, and *A. pacifica*.

25. **CoP20 Proposal 36: Six species of *Actinopyga*** – include in Appendix II

The Proposal concerns six named species of *Actinopyga* sea cucumbers; Annex 1 provides a Checklist of sea cucumbers of the genus *Actinopyga*. Should Proposal 36 including its Annex 1 be adopted at CoP20, the proposed [Taxonomic Checklist of selected Sea Cucumber taxa relevant for CITES following CoP19](#) can be expanded by the inclusion of Annex 1 of the proposal in an updated version.

26. **CoP20 Proposal 37: *Holothuria lessoni*** – include in Appendix II

Similar to Proposal 36, Proposal 37 includes a taxonomic and nomenclatural definition of *Holothuria lessoni* as its Annex 1, and if the proposal is adopted by the Parties its Annex 1 can be incorporated in an updated version of the proposed [Taxonomic Checklist of selected Sea Cucumber taxa relevant for CITES following CoP19](#).

27. **CoP20 Proposal 38: 15 species of Tarantulas in the genera *Grammostola*, *Acanthoscurria*, *Avicularia*, *Catumiri*, *Cyriocosmus*, *Hapalotremus*, *Holothele*, *Pamphobeteus*, and *Umbyquyra*** – inclusion in Appendix II

No nomenclature standard reference has been adopted by the CITES Parties for species in these genera, and no standard reference is recommended in the Proposal for adoption. Each of the genera contains additional species beyond those proposed for inclusion in Appendix II. Consideration of a possible standard reference for the Theraphosid tarantulas appears to be a task for the Animals Committee following CoP20 if Proposal 38 is adopted.

28. **CoP20 Proposal 39: *Haliotis midae*** – include the population of South Africa in Appendix II with the annotation "dried specimens only"

To date, no nomenclature standard reference has been adopted by CITES that pertains to *Haliotis* spp.; if Proposal 39 is adopted, this would be a matter for the Animals Committee to consider.

Flora

29. **CoP20 Proposal 40: *Panax quinquefolius*** – amendment annotation #3 to exempt finished products packaged and ready for retail trade of thin-sliced roots derived from artificially propagated plants

- a) The synonymy of *Panax quinquefolius* L. as given in CoP20 Prop. 40 (p. 2) is similar to what appears on Species+ and in the CITES Checklist of Species. However, a few small nomenclatural corrections are required for accuracy.

Aralia quinquefolia (L.) Decne. & Planch. and *Ginseng quinquefolium* (L.) Alph.Wood are correctly given as homotypic synonyms of *Panax quinquefolius* L. However, the basionym author (see underlined text in the previous sentence) should be added for accuracy, and the abbreviation of the publishing author of *Ginseng quinquefolium* should be corrected in the CITES Checklist of Species and Species+ [i.e., it should be Alph.Wood instead of Wood]. *Panax americanus* (Raf.) Raf. is correctly given as a heterotypic synonym. However, the author citation should be updated in the CITES Checklist of Species and Species+ to also include the basionym author as given in the proposal [i.e., it should be (Raf.) Raf. instead of Raf.].

Names that are missing from the synonymy in both the proposal and the CITES Checklist of Species and Species+ according to POWO (<https://powo.science.kew.org/taxon/urn:lsid:ipni.org:names:300467-2>), are *Panax cuneatus* Raf. and infraspecific names under *P. quinquefolia* and *P. americanus*.

The proposal, as well as the CITES Checklist of Species and Species+ databases, include “*Aralia canadensis* Tourn.” and “*Aureliana canadensis* Lafit.” in the synonymy of *Panax quinquefolius* L. Neither of these designations were validly published and their application remain uncertain. From what is mentioned in the ‘protologue’ of “*Aureliana canadensis* Lafiteau ex Catesby” [note correct author citation, i.e., is should be Lafiteau ex Catesby instead of Latif.] this designation could be associated with *Panax quinquefolius* (see <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/page/40680445#page/356/mode/1up>). However, “*Aralia canadensis* Tourn.” is generally associated with *Aralia racemosa* L., another North American species (see Taxon 41(1): 72. 1992; under the treatment of *Aralia racemosa* L.; <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1222491>).

- b) The proposal states that *Panax quinquefolius* L. occurs in the U.S.A. and Canada, which is correct. The inaccurate listing of China as a range state for this species on the CITES Checklist of Species and Species+ is highlighted (CoP20 Prop. 40, p. 3). Correction of the distribution information will be requested.

Panax quinquefolius is currently listed on Species+ as occurring in China as an introduced plant, which is accurate, but no such residence status is indicated for the distribution in China on the CITES Checklist of Species. UNEP-WCMC should advise on how this information can best be displayed on the CITES Checklist of Species and Species+.

- c) No standard nomenclature reference is suggested in the proposal. If a standard reference is proposed for this species, it would be sensible to also include the Appendix II-listed *Panax ginseng* C.A.Mey. in the same reference. The possibility of producing a time-stamped extract for these two species from POWO was investigated by the flora nomenclature specialist. However, there would be several changes required to the synonymy of both species as currently reflected in the CITES Checklist of Species and Species+, should such an extract be accepted as the standard nomenclature reference. Some of these might constitute substantial changes to the concept of the species as initially listed.

Examples of such changes include the mention above of “*Aralia canadensis* Tourn.” that should rather be included in the synonymy of the non-listed *Aralia racemosa* L. than under the synonymy of *Panax quinquefolius* L. Regarding *Panax ginseng* C.A.Mey., *Panax pseudoginseng* Wallich is listed as a synonym in the CITES Checklist of Species and Species+, but is regarded as a separate species in Flora of China (2007) and POWO.

It might therefore be necessary to add the production of a standard nomenclature reference for the two CITES-listed *Panax* species to the nomenclature workplan of the Plants Committee for the next intersession. This will allow time for investigating the impact of classification changes on the listing of these species and provide Parties with the opportunity to analyse and comment on these changes, before suggesting a way forward regarding the adoption of a standard nomenclature reference.

30. CoP20 Proposal 41: *Jubaea chilensis* – include in Appendix I

No standard nomenclature reference is suggested in the proposal. A time-stamped extract from POWO prepared by the flora nomenclature specialist is proposed for adoption as a standard nomenclature reference (see [CoP20 Doc. 110 Add., Annex 1](#)):

POWO. (2025). *Jubaea*. World Checklist of Vascular Plants. Facilitated by the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Published on the Internet; <https://powo.science.kew.org/> Retrieved 28 July 2025.

31. **CoP20 Proposal 42: *Beaucarnea hookeri* and *Beaucarnea glassiana*** – include in Appendix II, as part of the listing of the genus *Beaucarnea* spp.

The background to this listing proposal was covered in [CoP20 Doc. 110](#) (paragraphs 47 & 48), which includes a proposed standard nomenclature reference for the Appendix II *Beaucarnea* spp. listing.

32. **CoP20 Proposal 43: *Commiphora wightii*** – include in Appendix II

a) As discussed in the proposal, the correct distribution of this species is uncertain. It has been shown to occur in India, Pakistan, and Oman, but there are also unsubstantiated reports of its presence in Bangladesh and Nepal in the literature, but there are no concrete proof of this (e.g., no herbarium records). The possible occurrence of the species in these countries need to be further investigated. Until evidence is found to extend the distribution range of *Commiphora wightii*, it should be regarded as occurring in only India, Pakistan, and Oman.

b) No standard nomenclature reference is suggested in the proposal. The taxonomy and synonymy cited follows POWO. The proposal mentions that WFO considers *Commiphora mukul* (Hook. ex Stock) Engl. as an accepted name, while POWO treats it as a synonym of *C. wightii*. However, in the June 2025 release of The WFO Plant List, *C. mukul* is similarly included in the synonymy of *C. wightii*. Therefore the taxonomy in the proposal represents the consensus classification for this species. A time-stamped extract from POWO prepared by the flora nomenclature specialist is proposed for adoption as a standard nomenclature reference (see [CoP20 Doc. 110 Add., Annex 2](#)):

POWO. (2025). *Commiphora wightii*. World Checklist of Vascular Plants. Facilitated by the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Published on the Internet; <https://powo.science.kew.org/> Retrieved 29 July 2025.

33. **CoP20 Proposal 45: *Afzelia bipindensis*** – delete the populations from Central Africa: Cameroon, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, and Republic of the Congo from Appendix II

a) African populations of *Afzelia* spp. were added to Appendix II following acceptance of a listing proposal at the 19th Conference of the Parties (Panama, 2022: [CoP19 Prop. 46](#)). A reference [Donkpegan, A.S.L., Doucet, J.L., Hardy, O.J., Heuertz, M. and Piñeiro, R. 2020. Miocene diversification in the savannahs precedes tetraploid rainforest radiation in the African tree genus *Afzelia* (Detarioideae, Fabaceae). *Frontiers in Plant Science* 11(June): 1–14.] was suggested as standard nomenclature reference in CoP19 Prop. 46. However, this reference is not ideal as a CITES standard nomenclature reference and was not adopted. *Afzelia* spp. is amongst the group of taxa indicated as priorities for production of standard nomenclature references (see [CoP20 Doc. 110](#), paragraph 82). In this light, a time-stamped extract from POWO prepared by the flora nomenclature specialist is proposed for adoption as a standard nomenclature reference (see [CoP20 Doc. 110 Add., Annex 3](#)):

POWO. (2025). African populations of *Afzelia* spp. World Checklist of Vascular Plants. Facilitated by the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Published on the Internet; <https://powo.science.kew.org/> Retrieved 7 August 2025.

b) Populations from Angola, Ivory Coast, Nigeria, and Uganda are not included in this proposal, which only requests exclusion of populations from Central Africa (i.e., Cameroon, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, and Republic of the Congo). Equatorial Guinea was not listed as a range state in the CoP19 proposal (CoP19 Prop. 46), but the *Flora de Guinea Ecuatorial*, Volume 5, confirms that this species (as well as *A. africana*, *A. bella*, and *A. pachyloba*) is present in Equatorial Guinea. The flora nomenclature specialist has liaised with the POWO editors to amend the distribution of these species accordingly to ensure that the proposed standard nomenclature reference is accurate.

34. **CoP20 Proposal 47: *Pterocarpus soyauxii*** – delete the populations from Angola, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, and Gabon from Appendix II

- a) African populations of *Pterocarpus* spp. were added to Appendix II following acceptance of a listing proposal at the 19th Conference of the Parties (Panama, 2022: [CoP19 Prop. 50](#)). The CoP19 listing proposal followed taxonomy as then reflected in the African Plants Database, where *Pterocarpus casteelsii* was regarded as a synonym of *P. soyauxii* at the time. The current proposal (CoP20 Prop. 47) follows the same taxonomy and nomenclature. However, the standard nomenclature reference included in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP19) on *Standard Nomenclature* for *Pterocarpus* spp. is a time-stamped extract from POWO, where *Pterocarpus casteelsii* is regarded as a separate species endemic to DRC. This latter taxonomy is also now followed in the Legume Data Portal and World Flora Online, although Tropicos still regards the two taxa as conspecific; while the African Plants Database now includes *P. casteelsii* var. *ealaensis* in the synonym of *P. soyauxii*, but regards *P. casteelsii* as an insufficiently known taxon of unresolved application.

The single species concept likely stems from a publication by Rojo (1972) [Rojo, J.P., 1972. *Pterocarpus* (Leguminosae-Papilionaceae) revised for the world. Phanerogamarum Monographiae. Volume 5. J. Cramer, Lehre, Germany.] and is followed in several recent papers on the genus (the most recent being Albrecht *et al.* in *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 204: a108277. 2025). The *Flore du Congo Belge et du Ruanda-Urundi, Spermatophytes*, vol. VI (1954) treated *P. casteelsii* as a separate species, but noted that it is doubtfully distinct from *P. soyauxii*. Nonetheless, Lock (1989 in *Legumes of Africa: a checklist*) continued to accept *P. casteelsii* as a distinct species and most followers of the two-species concept likely base their classification on this publication.

Because of the difference in classification followed in the proposal and the adopted standard nomenclature reference, the matter is not without complications. The proposal effectively requests both *P. soyauxii* (apart from Nigerian populations) and *P. casteelsii* to be excluded from the genus listing, if the classification in the proposal is translated to that in the standard nomenclature reference included in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP19) on *Standard Nomenclature*. The populations listed for exclusion comprises the entire distribution range of *P. casteelsii* and almost the entire distribution range of *P. soyauxii* (only excluding Nigerian populations, see below).

- b) The current proposal (CoP20 Prop. 47) does not mention Nigerian populations of this species to be excluded, even though Nigeria is specifically listed as part of the distribution range of the species (see CoP20 Prop. 47 paragraph 3.1 op p. 2). Furthermore, the original listing proposal (CoP19 Prop. 50) did indicate Nigeria as a range state for *P. soyauxii*. This distribution is also reflected in the standard nomenclature reference in Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP19) on *Standard Nomenclature* for *Pterocarpus* spp., on POWO, the African Plants Database, the Legume Data Portal, and GBIF. The species therefore definitely also occur in Nigeria based on available records.

35. **CoP20 Proposal 48: *Aloe bergeriana*, *Aloe jeppeae*, *Aloe subspicata*, and *Aloe welwitschia* – amend the listing of *Aloe* spp. in Appendix II to also include the four species previously treated in the non-listed genus *Chortolirion*, but now included in *Aloe* section *Chortolirion***

The background to this listing proposal was covered in [CoP20 Doc. 110](#) (paragraphs 8–11), which includes a proposed standard nomenclature reference for the Appendix II *Aloe* spp. listing and aloe species individually listed on Appendix I.

36. **CoP20 Proposal 49: *Podocarpus parlatoresi* – transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II**

Peru is indicated as a range state of this species on several online resources. However, it has been confirmed that this is a mistake stemming from a wrong citation in an influential publication that was used in the past (see CoP20 Prop. 49, paragraph 10). The flora nomenclature specialist has liaised with the POWO editors to make the required correction. In this light, a time-stamped extract from POWO prepared by the flora nomenclature specialist is proposed for adoption as a standard nomenclature reference (see [CoP20 Doc. 110 Add., Annex 4](#)):

POWO. (2025). *Podocarpus parlatoresi*. World Checklist of Vascular Plants. Facilitated by the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Published on the Internet; <https://powo.science.kew.org/> Retrieved 30 July 2025.

37. **CoP20 Proposal 50: *Avonia quinaria* – transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I (without an annotation)**

The genus *Avonia* (E.Mey. ex Fenzl) G.D.Rowley is now regarded as a synonym of *Anacampseros* L. Therefore, *Avonia quinaria* (E.Mey. ex Fenzl) G.D.Rowley, should be treated as *Anacampseros quinaria*

E.Mey. ex Fenzl, as briefly mentioned under the section '3.4 Morphological characteristics' in the proposal (CoP20 Prop. 50, p. 4). The name is also included as such in the proposed standard nomenclature reference that was prepared for *Anacampteros* (including *Avonia* spp. and *Xenia* spp., but excluding *Talinaria* spp.) (see further information in [CoP20 Doc. 110](#), paragraphs 51–54).

Section 2: Proposals that are consistent with adopted CITES nomenclature

38. Fauna

Proposal 1: *Damaliscus pygargus pygargus*

Proposal 2: *Gazella dorcas*

Proposal 5: *Okapia johnstoni*

Proposal 6: *Hyaena hyaena*

Proposal 7: *Arctocephalus townsendi*

Proposal 9: *Ceratotherium simum simum*

Proposal 10: *Diceros bicornis bicornis*

Proposal 11: *Choloepus didactylus*, *C. hoffmanni*

Proposals 13 & 14: *Loxodonta africana*

Proposal 26: *Kinixys homeana*

Proposal 28: *Carcharias longimanus*

Proposal 31: *Rhincodon typus*

39. Flora

Proposal 44: *Euphorbia bupleurifolia*

Proposal 46: *Paubrasilia echinata*