

**Title: Assessing the extent of access and benefit sharing in the wildlife trade:
lessons from horticultural orchids in Southeast Asia**

Short title: Access and Benefit Sharing in the Orchid Trade

Authors: Amy Hinsley^{1,2*} and David L Roberts¹

¹Durrell Institute of Conservation and Ecology, School of Anthropology and
Conservation, Marlowe Building, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent, CT2 7NR

²Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1

* Corresponding author: amy.hinsley@zoo.ox.ac.uk

Word count (including references and legends): 5,991

Summary

The equitable sharing of benefits from natural resources is a key target of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Trade in its native species is one way in which a country can potentially benefit from its natural resources, and even small-scale traders can now access global markets online. However, little is known about the extent of benefit sharing for many products, and to what extent the appropriate processes and permits are being used. We surveyed online trade in a lucrative and widely-sold product in Southeast Asia (horticultural orchids), to assess the extent of access and benefit sharing. In total, 20.8% (n=1120) of orchid species from the region were being sold. Although 7/10 countries were trading, five had very little or no trade in their native species, and the majority of recently described endemic species being traded from non-range states had no reported CITES exports from their country of origin. We suggest that addressing access and benefit sharing gaps requires wider recognition of the problem, coupled with capacity building in the countries currently benefitting least: Laos, Myanmar and Cambodia. The priority should be to increase botanical capacity and enable these countries to better control the commercialization and trade of their native species.

INTRODUCTION

Commercial trade of its native plant and animal species is one way in which a country can gain economic benefits from its natural genetic resources. These benefits may include direct income to companies and individuals participating in trade, but also wider benefits such as increased income from taxes (Laird & Lisinge, 1998), greater in-country business spending (e.g. on rent or materials), and creation of jobs in supporting industries (Jepson et al., 2011). The sovereign right of a country to sustainably exploit its natural genetic resources, and benefit when these resources are used by others, is known as Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS), and is one of the three core objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (CBD, 1992; Nagoya Protocol, 2011). Exploitation of another country's natural resources usually involves collection of wild material to supply companies directly, or to enable artificial propagation or captive breeding *ex situ* (Laird & Lisinge, 1998; Trommetter, 2005). Where the use of these resources takes place formally, ABS principles require compensation, which may include up-front or ongoing payments, royalties from sales (Trommetter, 2005), or the transfer of knowledge, goods or technology to build capacity for trade within the country of origin (FAO, 2009). However, shifts in trade networks, product types, and methods of trade have taken place since the CBD came into force over two decades ago, some of which are likely to add further complexity to ABS implementation. A good example is the rapid increase in online wildlife trade, a development that has provided opportunities for small businesses to access international markets, but which has proved difficult to monitor and regulate (Lavorgna, 2014).

Identifying and addressing ABS inequities is important, not only because benefit sharing is an ethical issue (Schroeder, 2007) but also because in some cases it has the potential for tangible conservation benefits, for example by providing an incentive for the protection of exploited species and habitats (e.g. butterflies: Gordon & Ayiemba, 2003). However, despite its recognised importance, to date there have been few studies of how ABS has worked in real markets. These studies include ABS examples in the agricultural (Richerzhagen & Holm-Mueller, 2005), cosmetic (Lybbert et al., 2002), pharmaceutical and phytomedicine (Laird & Lisinge, 1998), and food-supplement sectors (Vermeulen, 2007). However, efforts to assess the extent and form of ABS in other markets that rely on the development of new products from wild genetic resources are limited. One such market is the international horticultural trade, which has a relatively limited awareness of ABS (Ten Kate & Laird, 2000; Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 2008), despite clear emphasis on the importance of benefit sharing by the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (CBD, 2002; CBD, 2012). The horticultural trade is extremely lucrative, with an estimated global export value of US\$9.1 billion live plants in 2013 (ITC, 2014). Although most traded plants are mass-produced hybrids, wild species are important in the development of new products, a trend that is predicted to increase as breeding technology improves (Volk & Richards, 2011). The only high profile horticultural ABS case was in 1999 between the South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) and the American company Ball, to jointly develop new products from South Africa's wild flora (Henne & Fakir, 1999).

Here we focus on ABS in the Southeast Asian orchid market, by studying the online market for orchid species. Orchids are one of the top horticultural plants in trade in

terms of sales volume, net profits and price consistency over time (FloraHolland, 2013; USDA, 2014) and comprise 70% of all species listed by the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES, 2013). However, even though all orchid species are listed by CITES, their trade receives little attention (Phelps & Webb, 2015). In addition, they are relatively easy to transport across international borders, as they are difficult to identify (McGough et al. 2006) and likely to be a low priority for busy customs officers. Orchids are also widely traded online, including some trade which does not comply with national and international trade regulations (Krigas et al. 2014; Hinsley et al. 2016b). Here we test the use of an online survey to assess ABS for traded products, with the aim of identifying which countries are not trading in their native and endemic species, and which countries are trading in the species of others. We hypothesize that the countries with the least capacity for trade (in terms of paucity of botanical and horticultural expertise, and limited access to propagation technology) will be the ones most likely to be losing out.

METHODS

The internet is increasingly being used to sell plants, animals and other products derived from wildlife (Lavorgna, 2014) including horticultural plants (e.g. Krigas et al. 2014). Trading online allows traders and buyers of illegal products to evade detection (Hinsley et al. 2016b) but online trade also provides a good opportunity for the study of large scale trade patterns. We focus our analysis on Southeast Asia, a hub of legal and illegal wildlife trade (Nijman, 2010), and a centre of diversity for the tropical epiphytic orchid species that are popular in trade, including two species (*Dendrobium cruentum* and *Renanthera imschootiana*) and one genus

108 (*Paphiopedilum*) listed in CITES Appendix I (CITES, 2013). Studies of orchid trade
109 via street markets in the region have already taken place (e.g. Phelps et al., 2014)
110 but little attention has been paid to the study of internet trade, which is becoming
111 increasingly important for horticultural plants (Sajeve et al., 2013; Shirey & Lamberti,
112 2011). We focus on 10 Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries:
113 Brunei Darussalam (hereafter Brunei), Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao Peoples'
114 Democratic Republic (hereafter Laos), Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines,
115 Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam (ASEAN, 2013).

116

117 Between April and June 2012 we searched the www.orchidmall.com and
118 www.orchidwire.com vendor directories and carried out Google searches for each
119 country name plus 'orchid nursery', 'orchid for sale' and 'orchid species' (after Shirey
120 & Lamberti, 2011). We then consulted in-country orchid experts to identify any
121 missed nurseries. Due to our focus on ABS, we restricted analysis to trade via official
122 nursery websites, as these are likely to represent formal, although not necessarily
123 legal, trade.

124

125 Each website was visited and all orchid species for sale were recorded, including
126 any recognized species listed as parent plants of hybrids. We recorded all species
127 whether wild or artificially propagated, but omitted complex hybrid plants, many of
128 which are mass-produced for non-specialist buyers (Hinsley et al. 2015), and often
129 too far-removed from wild genetic resources for these links to be made. In addition,
130 species are usually aimed at the smaller specialist market, which presents a greater
131 opportunity for small-scale producers. To look at variations in taxonomic accuracy
132 and listing language in each country, we coded each listed name as (1) an accepted

species name; (2) a recognized synonym; and (3) an unknown/trade name.

Presence/absence and type of descriptors were also recorded, for example whether the listing included a physical description (e.g. flower color/size), geographical (country/region) or other information (e.g. 'new species').

We used the World Checklist of Selected Plant Families (WCSP, 2014) to check taxonomy and species' distributions, and to compile national lists of native and endemic species. The coding system in this database for distributions matched political boundaries for most countries, with some exceptions. The code for New Guinea did not distinguish between species in Papua New Guinea and Indonesian New Guinea, so all species with this code were omitted unless further detail showed that they were present or endemic in Indonesia. In addition, the Borneo code did not separate Indonesian Borneo, Malaysian Borneo, or Brunei. As these countries were all part of the study this code was included and, where available, additional information in each species listing was used to assign species as present or endemic to one of these countries. For those that could not be assigned, we used a sensitivity analysis to investigate the effect of including these species in either Malaysia or Indonesia. Singapore was listed under the Malaysia code, so Singaporean species were identified using Chong et al. (2009). Finally, East Timor endemics (Silveira et al., 2008) were removed from the Indonesian total.

We produced descriptive statistics for the region and individual countries, and used a Pearson's Chi squared Goodness of Fit test to compare each country to the regional figure for the proportion of own native and endemic species that it sold. We then used simple weighted network analysis (Opsahl, 2010) to calculate eight network

measures for each country: the out-degree, in-degree, out-strength and in-strength, for both native and endemic species. For each country, the degree is defined as a count of the number of other countries which a) sell that country's native/endemic species (out-degree), and b) have native/endemic species sold by that country (in-degree). Similarly the strength is defined as a count of the number of species a) native/endemic to that country that are sold by other countries (out-strength), and b) sold in that country, which are native/endemic to another country (in-strength).

Finally, we carried out an analysis of all recently discovered endemic species found for sale outside the country of origin to investigate whether exports have taken place via formal channels, and how rapidly these species are commercialized for international trade by their country of origin. We calculated the time from date of description (WCSP, 2014) to first commercial export reported to CITES from the country of origin (UNEP-WCMC, 2017). Our search was for all exports (importer or exporter reported) of any product that could lead to the production of live plants for trade (live plants, cultures, seeds, roots and stems). We analysed only species described since CITES began in 1975, with a separate analysis of species described since 1996, as better data checks were introduced in late 1995 (UNEP-WCMC, 2013). Although Laos only became a party to CITES in 2004, non-Parties are required to have equivalent documents for the export of listed species (Resolution Conf. 9.5 (Rev. CoP16)).

RESULTS

We found 87 websites, 49% (n=43) of which were excluded from the analysis because: they only sold complex hybrids or cut flowers (n = 24), were for a related

business (e.g. selling pots or fertiliser) ($n = 7$), were not working for the whole study period ($n = 6$) or listed no products for sale online ($n = 6$) (Table 1).

There were 5387 species reported to be native to at least one country in the region, ranging from 23 in Brunei to 3082 in Indonesia (including all Borneo species) (Fig. 1).



Figure 1: Total number of native orchid species in each country in Southeast Asia (all species listed under the Borneo code with no further information are included in both the Indonesian and Malaysian totals) (data from World Checklist of Selected Plant Families: WCSP, 2013).

Of this regional total, 20.8% ($n = 1120$) were found for sale. When Borneo was included in Indonesia, 9.9% of species endemic to at least one country in the region

were in trade; when Borneo was included in Malaysia this figure was 9.6%. The observed proportions of native species sold by country of origin differed significantly from the expected value (Borneo = Indonesia: $\chi^2 = 979.0$, 6 d.f., $P < 0.001$; Borneo = Malaysia: $\chi^2 = 868.1$, 6 d.f., $P < 0.001$). Similarly, sales by each country of their own endemic species differed significantly from the expected, both when the figure used was 9.9% (Borneo = Indonesia: $\chi^2 = 274.5$, 6 d.f., $P < 0.001$; Borneo = Malaysia: $\chi^2 = 275.8$, 6 d.f., $P < 0.001$) and 9.6% (Borneo = Indonesia: $\chi^2 = 195.0$, 6 d.f., $P < 0.001$; Borneo = Malaysia: $\chi^2 = 195.9$, 6 d.f., $P < 0.001$).

Native species from Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Indonesia (including Borneo), the Philippines and Malaysia were on sale in every country where trade was occurring ($n = 6$). Endemic species from Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines were on sale in the most countries (5/6 trading countries). Nurseries in Singapore and Malaysia sold native species from every country in the region, whilst Thailand and Singapore sold endemic species from the most other countries (6/9) (Table 2).

We found 137 endemic orchid species for sale in at least one non-range state, of which 21 were described between 1975 and 1995, and 29 between 1996 and 2012. Of the 50 endemic species described since 1975, 32 (64%) had no CITES record of export from their country of origin. For those described after 1996, 21 (72%) had no reported exports from their country of origin (Fig. 2), including 4 CITES Appendix I *Paphiopedilum* species. Most of these 21 species were from Indonesia and Viet Nam. In addition, two species (*Bulbophyllum coweniorum* and *Holcoglossum calicicola*) were from Laos, which had no facilities to produce artificially propagated orchids at this time.




Figure 2: Number of endemic species described 1996-2012 for sale from non-range states, showing a breakdown of the number of years from discovery to first reported CITES export from country of origin (data from CITES Trade Database: UNEP-WCMC, 2017)

DISCUSSION

Our study of the online horticultural orchid trade in Southeast Asia suggests that the international movement and commercialization of species is widespread, with more than 1 in 5 of the region's species found for sale from online platforms. However, much of this trade appears to have taken place without formal ABS implementation and some without CITES permits. This supports earlier concerns of limited awareness of ABS in the horticultural sector (Ten Kate & Laird, 2000; Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 2008), and findings of CITES non-compliance in the orchid trade, especially by professional growers (Hinsley et al. 2016b).

236

237 Despite the growth of online trade in wildlife products (Lavorgna, 2014), there has
238 been little work to understand how this trade is linked to broader trade patterns. We
239 show that large numbers of species are being sold online and that these numbers
240 are comparable to recorded data on offline trade. For example, Phelps & Webb
241 (2015) found 13% of Thailand's orchid flora for sale during surveys over one year in
242 four large flower markets, compared to our finding of 25.2% of the country's orchid
243 species sold by Thai nurseries online, and 41% sold by nurseries in the whole
244 region. Further, broad patterns observed in online trade can closely match offline
245 data, suggesting that these markets can be a good proxy for understanding broad
246 trade trends in related products. For example, the countries in our study with the
247 most (Thailand, Malaysia and Singapore) and least trade (Myanmar, Cambodia, Lao
248 and Brunei) match customs data for the countries with the highest and lowest value
249 exports of both general horticultural products and cut orchid flowers (ITC, 2014).
250 Despite their utility, we acknowledge that online surveys will not capture the local
251 trends and patterns of trade that can be observed in offline shops and markets (e.g.
252 Phelps et al., 2014). In addition, surveys of online formal online trade may omit
253 important informal platforms where orchid trade takes place, such as social media
254 websites (Hinsley et al, 2016a). However, online sales are playing an increasingly
255 prominent part in horticultural and other wildlife trades (Lavorgna, 2014), and
256 surveying them provides an easily accessible method for the study of these markets
257 (Shirey & Lamberti, 2011; Sajeve et al., 2013; 2013; Krigas et al. 2014). Further work
258 to assess the linkages between online and offline markets for horticultural and other
259 wildlife products is needed to better understand these interaction between.

260

261 Our findings suggest that two decades on from the introduction of the CBD, the
262 countries of Southeast Asia are not benefitting equally from trade in their native
263 species. We acknowledge that our focus on formal trade does not recognize the
264 benefits that may be transferred from illegal orchid trade, which may be essential
265 supplementary income for some households (Hinsley, 2011). However, the collection
266 of orchids for trade can quickly become a significant conservation issue without
267 careful management, leading to rapid decline or extinction (Averyanov et al., 2003).
268 These informal agreements may bring short term benefits to some people, but the
269 potential benefits from the commercialization of valuable species will exist over a
270 much longer period, meaning that overall the country is losing out (Laird & Lisinge,
271 1998). We therefore identify several countries that would benefit from action to
272 address ABS inequities in formal trade, primarily Laos, Cambodia and Myanmar.
273 These findings are likely to be linked to economic development, as Cambodia and
274 Laos have the lowest Gross National Income per capita in the region (no data
275 available for Myanmar) (World Bank, 2014). Identifying the form that ABS activities
276 could take is not straightforward. The Nagoya protocol recommends that equitable
277 sharing of benefits should be achieved by “appropriate transfer of relevant
278 technologies ... and by appropriate funding” (Nagoya Protocol, 2011, p4). Other
279 examples for ABS have shown that this often takes the form of direct payments for
280 the bioprospecting of new products (e.g. Richerzhagen & Holm-Mueller, 2005).
281 However, applying the principles of ABS to the orchid trade will require a different
282 approach. For example, direct payments for initial access to, or on-going use of, a
283 country’s genetic resources is an approach taken in the pharmaceutical industry
284 (Trommetter, 2005) but has had limited application in the horticultural trade. The
285 landmark agreement between the horticultural company Ball and South Africa’s

286 National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) eventually resulted in direct benefits being
287 shared, but demonstrated that careful management was essential (Secretariat of the
288 Convention on Biological Diversity, 2008). The company in this case was large and
289 had the resources to make a long-term commitment to fund SANBI. Whilst this may
290 be a useful model for the mass-market horticultural industry, it is unlikely to work for
291 the orchid species market, which is supplied by small businesses selling a large
292 range of species in small numbers. Additionally, direct payments would only be
293 successful for newly commercialized species, as sharing benefits is particularly
294 difficult if captive breeding or propagation has already been taking place for some
295 time in different countries (Roe et al., 2002; Richerzhagen & Holm-Mueller, 2005).
296

297 If direct payments are unsuitable, another approach suggested in other ABS cases is
298 capacity building to allow countries to develop their own trade (FAO, 2009). In
299 theory, this approach may address some of the potential causes of the gaps found in
300 our study. For example, we found that the countries with little or no trade in their own
301 taxa contributed a large proportion of their species to the trade of other countries,
302 including over half of Laos' native species and three of its 12 endemic species. This
303 suggests that the gaps in trade are not due to a lack of market for these species but
304 to a lack of interest or capacity for trade. The former is unlikely, as several countries
305 in the region have declared an interest in developing orchid trade (Viet Nam News,
306 2010; Hajramurni, 2011; The Brunei Times, 2012; Malanes, 2014; Phyu, 2014).
307 Producing plants for the international market requires laboratories and greenhouses,
308 a well-developed infrastructure, and expertise in breeding, growing and marketing
309 plants for export. In our study, reliable internet access and the expertise to develop
310 websites and online commerce also likely played a role. This capacity is well

developed in those countries with existing horticultural industries (ITC, 2014) but limited in those such as Laos, where most plants in trade are wild-sourced (Vernon, pers. comm 2014) and only one company was in the early stages of producing orchids legally for trade in 2009 (Lamxay, 2009). Similarly, in 2014 Cambodia had only one well-established nursery, which grew hybrids to supply local cut-flower markets (Jancloes, pers. comm. 2014).

Although, in theory, building capacity for countries to trade in their own orchids may be a good solution to tackling ABS inequities, this may have negative conservation outcomes. Whilst there are examples of the development of legal trade successfully reducing wild collection (Entwistle et al., 2002), there are others showing that demand for wild-sourced products remains stable (Drury, 2009; Dutton et al., 2011), including for the Southeast Asian orchid *Rhynchostylis gigantea* (Phelps et al., 2014). Further, cultivation can also increase wild collection (Williams et al., 2014), and legitimizing trade may facilitate laundering of wild products (Lyons & Natusch, 2011), a problem already occurring in the orchid trade as a method to bypass CITES rules (Hinsley et al., 2016b). In addition to these conservation concerns, the CBD recognizes ABS at a state level, giving no guarantee that direct payments or capacity building efforts would reach places where they would benefit development or conservation (Richerzhagen, 2011). People in rural communities may rely on the income from collecting wild animals or plants for trade (Broad et al., 2001), and the development of formal trade may shift profits from these people to a few wealthy business owners (Lybbert et al., 2002; Roe et al., 2002). Where a community approach is taken, as was the case of the appetite suppressant *Hoodia*, it is essential that participants in capacity building projects are not given unrealistic

expectations that trade will be an easy, risk-free source of income (Vermeeylen, 2007).

Considering these limitations of traditional ABS approaches for the horticultural market, we suggest a different approach to capacity building, one that focusses on strengthening the ability of countries to better control the commercialization of their species. The primary way of doing this is through CITES, which maintained a neutral position on ABS in the past (Roe et al. 2002), but which has developed closer links with the CBD in recent years, including joint meetings in 2016 (Secretariat of CITES and the CBD, 2016). We show that most of the recently described endemic species in trade outside their country of origin have crossed international borders without reported CITES exports, including four CITES Appendix I species. All international movement of orchid species must have CITES paperwork, with some exemptions for trade in seeds, and seedlings in sterile flasks (CITES, 2013). It is possible that some species with no reported CITES exports may have been legally exported as these exempt products, although trade in orchid seed is rare, and the production of seedlings in sterile flasks requires expertise and equipment for propagation. In some cases, this seems unlikely; *Bulbophyllum coweniorum*, a Laotian endemic species with no reported CITES exports, has been popular in trade since at least 2007 (Cockel, 2013) but was not being propagated in Laos at this time (Lamxay, 2009). In addition, some endemic species may have been exported with CITES permits that were not reported to CITES by Parties, or low botanical capacity could mean that some endemics are, in fact, naturally present in the neighboring countries where they are being sold. However, this is unlikely to be the case for all the species we identified, and several are likely to have left their country of origin without the correct

CITES permits. This is supported by recorded examples of this occurring, most recently in the case of *Paphiopedilum rungsuriyanum*, a Laotian endemic that was first described from a plant that had been wild-collected and transported to a Thai nursery (Gruss et al., 2014). Our findings therefore support those of recent studies showing that the current CITES rules for orchids are not always followed (Phelps & Webb, 2015; Hinsley et al. 2016b).

To address these problems we suggest capacity building in two key areas. Firstly, to enhance in-country expertise and knowledge of native species by building botanical capacity, which for Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar are amongst the lowest in the region (Seidenfaden, 1992; Schuiteman & de Vogel, 2000). Species often enter trade very quickly after discovery, due to consumer preferences for novelty in these specialist markets (Courchamp et al., 2006; Hinsley et al. 2015). This is especially true in the horticultural trade, where market saturation for commonly traded species has increased the importance of the rapid development of products from new wild species or varieties (Volk & Richards, 2011). Therefore, improving botanical capacity may increase the chances that species are discovered before they have already entered trade and become threatened by over-collection, both of which are common occurrences (Vermeulen & Lamb, 2011; Vermeulen et al., 2014). This may allow conservation measures to be put in place before over-collection occurs, where there is the will and capacity to do so. Secondly, building the capacity of these countries to monitor and control the wild collection and export of their species is also important. This includes strengthening protection of wild plants from over-exploitation and improving the ability of customs officers to detect and identify plants leaving the country. Encouraging CITES Parties to report exports of their orchid species would

allow emerging trade trends to be better monitored, for example via the CITES Review of Significant Trade process. This could be facilitated by efforts to raise the profile of orchid trade in CITES discussions, and increase awareness amongst countries of the value of their native orchid species.

Acknowledgements

T. Lee for advice on network analysis. E.J. Milner-Gulland and Z. Davies for their comments on a draft of this manuscript. The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the Oxford Martin Programme on the Illegal Wildlife Trade

Financial support

AH was funded by the Natural Environmental Research Council. Grant number: NE/J500458/1

Conflict of interest

None.

REFERENCES

- ASEAN (2013). The Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Available from <http://www.asean.org/asean/asean-member-states>(accessed April 2012).
- Averyanov, L., Cribb, P., Phan Ke L. and Nguyen T.H. (2003) Slipper Orchids of Vietnam. Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, U.K.
- Broad, S., Mulliken, T. and Roe, D. (2001). The nature and extent of legal and illegal

411 trade in wildlife. Pages 3-22). In S. Oldfield, editor. The trade in wildlife: regulation for
412 conservation. Routledge. London.

413

414 The Brunei Times (2012) 'Pioneering orchid business blooms' The Brunei Times.
415 21st December 2012. Available from [http://www.bt.com.bn/2012/12/21/pioneering-](http://www.bt.com.bn/2012/12/21/pioneering-orchid-business-blooms)
416 [orchid-business-blooms](http://www.bt.com.bn/2012/12/21/pioneering-orchid-business-blooms) (accessed May 2014).

417

418 CITES (2013). Numbers of species listed in the CITES Appendices as of October
419 2013. CITES. Available from <http://www.cites.org/eng/disc/species.php> (accessed
420 May 2016).

421

422 CBD (1992) Convention on Biological Diversity. Adopted 5 June 1992, Rio de
423 Janeiro, Brazil. Available from <http://www.cbd.int/convention/text/> (accessed
424 November 2016).

425

426 CBD (2002). Decision VI/9, Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, 2002–2010.
427 Sixth Ordinary Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on
428 Biological Diversity (COP 6). The Hague, The Netherlands. Available from
429 <http://www.cbd.int/decision/cop/?id=7183>, (accessed November 2016).

430

431 CBD (2012). Decision X/17, Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, 2011–2020.
432 Tenth Ordinary Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on
433 Biological Diversity (COP 10). Nagoya, Japan. Available from
434 <http://www.cbd.int/gspc/strategy.shtml>, (accessed November 2016).

435

436 Courchamp, F., Angulo E., Rivalan P., Hall R., Signoret L., Bull L., and Meinard, Y.
 437 (2006). Rarity value and species extinction: the anthropogenic allee effect. PLOS
 438 biology, **4** (12), e415. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0040415
 439
 440 Chong, K. Y., Tan, H. T. W. and Corlett, R. T. (2009). A Checklist of the Total
 441 Vascular Plant Flora of Singapore. Native, Naturalised and Cultivated Species.
 442 Raffles Museum of Biodiversity Research. National University of Singapore.
 443
 444 Cockel, C. (2013). *Bulbophyllum coweniorum*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened
 445 Species. Version 2014.3. Available at www.iucnredlist.org accessed January 2015.
 446
 447 Drury, R. (2009). Reducing urban demand for wild animals in Vietnam: examining
 448 the potential of wildlife farming as a conservation tool. Conservation Letters, **2**:263–
 449 270.
 450
 451 Dutton, A. J., Hepburn, C. and Macdonald, D. W. (2011). A stated preference
 452 investigation into the Chinese demand for farmed vs. wild bear bile. PloS one, 6(7):
 453 e21243. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0021243
 454
 455 Entwistle, A., Atay, S., Byfield, A. and Oldfield, S. (2002). Alternatives for the bulb
 456 trade from Turkey: a case study of indigenous bulb propagation. Oryx, **36**:333–341.
 457
 458 FAO (2009). International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and
 459 Agriculture of the Food and Agricultural Organization. Available from:
 460 <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/011/i0510e/i0510e.pdf> (accessed May, 2014).

461
 462 FloraHolland (2013). Facts and Figures 2013. FloraHolland. Available from
 463 <http://www.floraholland.com/media/2460310/Kengetallen-EN-2013.pdf> (accessed
 464 November 2014)
 465
 466 Gordon, I., and Ayiemba, W. (2003). Harnessing butterfly biodiversity for improving
 467 livelihoods and forest conservation: the Kipepeo Project. *The Journal of Environment*
 468 *& Development*, 12 (1), 82-98.
 469
 470 Gruss, O., Rungruang N., Yongyouth Y. and Dionisio I. (2014). A new and very
 471 distinct species of the genus *Paphiopedilum* from north-Lao is described as
 472 *Paphiopedilum rungsuriyanum*. *Orchideen Journal*. 2, 1, 1–11. Available from
 473 [http://orchideen-](http://orchideen-journal.de/permalink/GRUSS_RUNGRUANG_YONYOUTH_CHAISURIYAKUL_DIONISIO_Paphiopedilum.pdf)
 474 [journal.de/permalink/GRUSS_RUNGRUANG_YONYOUTH_CHAISURIYAKUL_DIO](http://orchideen-journal.de/permalink/GRUSS_RUNGRUANG_YONYOUTH_CHAISURIYAKUL_DIONISIO_Paphiopedilum.pdf)
 475 [NISIO_Paphiopedilum.pdf](http://orchideen-journal.de/permalink/GRUSS_RUNGRUANG_YONYOUTH_CHAISURIYAKUL_DIONISIO_Paphiopedilum.pdf) (accessed May 2014).
 476
 477 Hajramurni, A. (2011). ‘Indonesia encouraged to grow orchids’ *The Jakarta Post*.
 478 25th October 2011. Available from
 479 [http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2011/10/25/indonesia-encouraged-grow-](http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2011/10/25/indonesia-encouraged-grow-orchids.html)
 480 [orchids.html](http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2011/10/25/indonesia-encouraged-grow-orchids.html) (accessed May 2014).
 481
 482 Henne, G. and Fakir, S. (1999). NBI-Ball Agreement: A new phase in bioprospecting.
 483 *Biotechnology and Development Monitor*, **39**:18–21.
 484
 485 Hinsley, A. (2011). Notes on the trade of orchids in the Cardamom Mountains,
 486 Pursat and Koh Kong Provinces. *Cambodian Journal of Natural History*, 2011:11–13

487

488 Hinsley, A., Verissimo, D. and Roberts, D.L., 2015. Heterogeneity in consumer
489 preferences for orchids in international trade and the potential for the use of market
490 research methods to study demand for wildlife. *Biological Conservation*, 190, pp.80-
491 86.

492

493 Hinsley, A., Lee, T. E., Harrison, J. R. and Roberts, D. L. (2016a), Estimating the
494 extent and structure of trade in horticultural orchids via social media. *Conservation*
495 *Biology*, 30: 1038–1047. doi:10.1111/cobi.12721

496

497 Hinsley, A., Nuno, A., Ridout, M., St. John, F. A.V. and Roberts, D. L. (2016b).
498 Estimating the extent of CITES non-compliance amongst traders and end-
499 consumers; lessons from the global orchid trade. *Conservation Letters*.
500 doi:10.1111/conl.12316

501

502 ITC (2014) Trade Map, International Trade Centre, Geneva. Available from
503 www.intracen.org/marketanalysis (accessed January 2015)

504

505 Jepson, P., Ladle, R. J. and Sujatnika (2011). Assessing market-based conservation
506 governance approaches: a socio-economic profile of Indonesian markets for wild
507 birds. *Oryx*, **45**(4): 482-491.

508

509 Krigas, N., Menteli, V. & Vokou, D. (2014). The Electronic Trade in Greek Endemic
510 Plants: Biodiversity, Commercial and Legal Aspects. *Economic Botany*. 68: 85.

511

512 Laird, S & Lisinge, E. (1998). Benefit-Sharing Case Studies: *Aristocladus korupensis*
 513 and *Prunus Africana*. Submission by the United Nations Environment Programme
 514 Item 16.3. Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.
 515 Fourth meeting, Bratislava, Slovakia 4 to 15 May 1998
 516

517 Lamxay, V. (2009). Case study on orchid exports from the Lao PDR:
 518 Recommendations for using the Convention on International Trade in Endangered
 519 Species of Wild Fauna and Flora to increase sustainable orchid trade. TRAFFIC.
 520 Cambridge.
 521

522 Lavorgna A. (2014). Wildlife trafficking in the Internet age. *Crime Science* 3:5–17.
 523

524 Lybbert, T., Barrett, C., and Narjisse, H. (2002). Market-based conservation and
 525 local benefits: the case of argan oil in Morocco. *Ecological Economics*, **41**:125–144.
 526

527 Lyons J., and Natusch D. (2011). Wildlife laundering through breeding farms: illegal
 528 harvest, population declines and a means of regulating the trade of green pythons
 529 (*Morelia viridis*) from Indonesia. *Biological Conservation* **144**:3073–3081.
 530

531 Malanes, M. (2014). Orchid collecting grows into big business' *Inquirer North Luzon*.
 532 28th May 2014. Available from [http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/606069/orchid-collecting-](http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/606069/orchid-collecting-grows-into-big-busines)
 533 [grows-into-big-busines](http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/606069/orchid-collecting-grows-into-big-busines) accessed May 2014
 534

535 McGough, N., Roberts, D., Brodie, C. and Kowalczyk, J. (2006). CITES and Slipper
 536 Orchids. Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, UK.

537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561

Nagoya Protocol (2011). The Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization (ABS) to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Adopted 29 October 2010 in Nagoya, Japan. Available from <http://www.cbd.int/abs/doc/protocol/nagoya-protocol-en.pdf> accessed May 2014

Nijman, V. (2010). An overview of international wildlife trade from Southeast Asia. *Biodiversity and conservation*, **19**:1101–1114.

Opsahl, T., Agneessens, F. and Skvoretz, J. (2010). Node centrality in weighted networks: Generalizing degree and shortest paths. *Social Networks*, **32**:245–251.

Phelps, J., Carrasco, L. R. and Webb, E.L. (2014) A Framework for Assessing Supply-Side Wildlife Conservation. *Conservation Biology*, **28**:244–257.

Phelps, J., and Webb, E. L. (2015). “Invisible” wildlife trades: Southeast Asia’s undocumented illegal trade in wild ornamental plants. *Biological Conservation*, **186**, 296-305.

Phyu, A.S. (2014) ‘Orchid smuggling putting rare species at risk, warn experts’ Myanmar Times. 10th March 2014. Available from <http://www.mmtimes.com/index.php/national-news/9796-orchid-smuggling-putting-rare-species-at-risk-warn-experts.htm> accessed May 2014

562 Roe, D., Milledge, S., Mulliken, T., Mremi, J., Mosha, S., and Grieg-Gran, A. (2002).
 563 Making a killing or making a living. Wildlife trade, trade controls and rural livelihoods.
 564 IIED, London and TRAFFIC, Cambridge
 565

566 Richerzhagen, C. and Holm-Mueller, K. (2005). The effectiveness of access and
 567 benefit sharing in Costa Rica: Implications for national and international regimes.
 568 Ecological Economics, **53**:445–460.
 569

570 Richerzhagen, C. (2011). Effective governance of access and benefit-sharing under
 571 the Convention on Biological Diversity. Biodiversity and Conservation, **20**:2243–
 572 2261.
 573

574 Sajeve, M., Augugliaro, C., Smith, M. J., and Oddo, E. (2013). Regulating internet
 575 trade in CITES species. Conservation Biology, **27**(2), 429-430.
 576

577 Schroeder, D. (2007). Benefit sharing: it's time for a definition. Journal of medical
 578 ethics, 33(4), 205-209.
 579

580 Schuiteman, A., and De Vogel, E. (2000). Orchid genera of Thailand, Laos,
 581 Cambodia, and Vietnam. Leiden: Nationaal Herbarium Nederland.
 582

583 Secretariat of the CBD (2008). Access and Benefit-Sharing in Practice: Trends in
 584 Partnerships Across Sectors. Montreal, Technical Series No. 38.
 585

586 Secretariats of CITES and the CBD (2016) Notification to the Parties 2016/044.

587 Regional joint preparatory meetings of CITES and CBD representatives prior to the
588 upcoming meetings of the respective Conference of the Parties. Available at
589 <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/notif/E-Notif-2016-044.pdf> Accessed May 2017.

590

591 Seidenfaden, G. 1992. The Orchids of Indochina. *Opera Botanical*. **114**:1-502.

592

593 Shirey, P. D. and Lamberti, G. A. (2011). Regulate trade in rare plants. *Nature*,
594 **469**:465–467.

595

596 Silveira, P., Schuiteman, A., Vermeulen J., Sousa, A., Silva., H., Paiva, J., and De
597 Vogel, E. (2008). The orchids of Timor: checklist and conservation status. *Botanical*
598 *journal of the Linnean Society*, **157**:197–215.

599

600
601 Ten Kate, K. and Laird, S. (2000). Biodiversity and business: coming to terms with
602 the ‘grand bargain’. *International Affairs*, **76**:241–264.

603

604 Trommetter, M. (2005). Biodiversity and international stakes: A question of access.
605 *Ecological Economics*, **53**:573–583.

606

607 UNEP-WCMC (2013). A guide to using the CITES trade database. Version 8.
608 October 2013. UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre Available from
609 http://trade.cites.org/cites_trade_guidelines/en-CITES_Trade_Database_Guide.pdf
610 accessed May 2017

611

612 UNEP-WCMC (2017). CITES Trade Database, UNEP World Conservation

613 Monitoring Centre, UK. Available at: <https://trade.cites.org> accessed May 2017.

614

615 USDA (2014) Floriculture Crops. 2013 Summary. United States Department of

616 Agriculture National Agricultural Statistics Service. June 2014. Available from

617 <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/usda/current/FlorCrop/FlorCrop-06-19-2014.pdf>

618 accessed November 2014

619

620 Vermeulen, J. J. and Lamb, A. (2011). Endangered even before formally described:

621 *Bulbophyllum kubahense* n. sp., a beautiful and assumedly narrowly endemic orchid

622 from Borneo. *Plant Systematics and Evolution*, **292**:51–53.

623

624 Vermeulen, J. J., Phelps, J., and Thavipoke, P. (2014). Notes on *Bulbophyllum*

625 (*Dendrobiinae*; *Epidendroideae*; *Orchidaceae*): two new species and the dilemmas of

626 species discovery via illegal trade. *Phytotaxa*, (184), 012-022.

627

628 Vermeylen, S. (2007). Contextualizing ‘fair’ and ‘equitable’: the San's reflections on

629 the *Hoodia* benefit-sharing agreement. *Local Environment*, **12**:423–436.

630

631 Viet Nam News (2010). ‘Biotechnology needed for orchid industry’ Viet Nam News.

632 2nd October 2010. Available from

633 [http://vietnamnews.vn/agriculture/204286/biotechnology-needed-for-orchid-industry-](http://vietnamnews.vn/agriculture/204286/biotechnology-needed-for-orchid-industry-.html)

634 [.html](http://vietnamnews.vn/agriculture/204286/biotechnology-needed-for-orchid-industry-.html) (accessed May 2014).

635

636 Volk, G. and Richards, C. (2011). Horticultural value of wild genetic resources—

637 Introduction to the workshop. *HortScience*, 46(11), 1436-1437.

638

639 WCSP (2013). 'World Checklist of Selected Plant Families. Facilitated by the Royal

640 Botanic Gardens, Kew. Available from: <http://apps.kew.org/wcsp/> accessed

641 September 2013

642

643 Williams, S. J., Jones, J. P. G., Annewandter, R., and Gibbons, J. M. (2014).

644 Cultivation can increase harvesting pressure on overexploited plant populations.

645 Ecological Applications. 24(8), 2050-2062.

646

647 World Bank (2014) World Development indicators: 2012 GNI per capita, Atlas

648 method. Available from <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GNP.PCAP.CD>

649 accessed May 2014.