Illegal logging is one of the most destructive wildlife crimes, as it threatens not just a single species, but entire habitats. Much illegal logging involves cutting common or undifferentiated species for charcoal or pulp and paper, but where specific rare timber species are targeted, the object is often tropical hardwood furniture. This industry provides a prime example of the way that, outside the CITES regime, wildlife harvested or exported contrary to national laws in its source country can still be introduced into legitimate commercial streams in other countries.

The demand for the tropical hardwood is driven by the furniture industry and the world trade in tropical hardwood furniture is immense. Global production of all types of furniture was valued at over US$400 billion in 2012. Of this, tropical hardwood furniture production was valued at approximately US$65 billion, representing about 39% of wooden furniture production and 16% of total furniture production by value (Fig. 1). Some of the top producers of tropical hardwood furniture are also some of the top consumers, so only a fraction of production is traded internationally. Thus, the international trade in tropical hardwood furniture was only worth some US$19 billion in 2013, or about one-third of production.

The primary source of tropical hardwoods is Southeast Asia and the Pacific, although African and Latin America are also major producers. The top producers include countries such as Brazil, Cameroon, and Indonesia, while the top consumers include China, the United States, and the United Kingdom. The trade in tropical hardwood furniture is highly concentrated, with a few large traders controlling a significant share of the market.
American countries contribute about one-third of exports. Some of the poorer source countries have struggled to come to terms with the burgeoning trade in tropical hardwoods, as they lack the capacity to monitor forest loss and prevent excessive logging. Threatened with widespread deforestation, some source countries have imposed log export bans, protections for specific species, or even general logging bans. But with limited capacity to monitor and enforce these controls, exports may be vulnerable to the introduction of wood that is illegally sourced.

Log export bans and species-specific controls

National log export bans are generally designed to accomplish two objectives:

--- to retain a greater share of the value of the logs in the source country, as the timber must be processed before export;
--- to slow the rate of extraction to the pace of the local sawmills.

Log exports can continue despite the bans. This can be documented by the import statistics of other countries, which identify the source of the logs. While these discrepancies can indicate real criminality, they may also be due to definitional differences around what constitutes a “log”. Logs are often roughly squared, removing the sap wood and improving packing efficiency, and this can sometimes be mistaken for “worked timber”. The same shipment may be exported as timber and imported as logs, so it can be difficult to reconcile trade statistics.

Bans on the trade and export of specific species can affect both logs and sawn wood. As these controls are usually based on executive decisions, officials have the discretion to make exceptions. Exceptions are typically made for timber that:

--- was felled prior to the controls;
--- resulted from land clearance for development projects, timber thinning, or agricultural expansion (the “salvage” exception);
--- was seized by government authorities as contraband. This is commonly later sold to private buyers at auction.

In each case, the trees are felled and the damage to the environment is done. The state or private firms are saddled with large volumes of wood and have an interest in profiting off this valuable commodity. Illegally sourced timber can be introduced into legal markets when it is publicly auctioned by the seizing state.

Generalized logging bans can give officials a basis for action at logging sites, but they do not provide a basis for challenging exports. This is true because even when no new wild harvesting is allowed, it remains possible that wood to be exported comes from stockpiles of timber felled prior to the ban, or that it was imported from another country without a logging ban. All of this creates a situation of considerable ambiguity as to the legality of any given export.
The limitations of national control systems

To compound the confusion, all these national controls appear to have little power once the wood has actually been exported. Outside CITES, most destination countries lack a legal basis for refusing wood that was harvested or exported contrary to source country regulations. The US Lacey Act, the EU Timber Regulations, and the Australian Illegal Logging Prohibition Act are exceptional because they prohibit the import of any illegal timber, wherever the law was broken. For other destination markets, however, the local regulations of source countries are irrelevant, and the wood cannot be refused. In this way, illegally logged or exported timber can become part of legal tropical hardwood furniture in another national market.

The only basis for most countries to seize wood imports of questionable origin is the CITES agreement. There are currently over 600 tree species listed on CITES appendices, including 400 species that are commonly harvested for their timber. A small number of the tropical hardwoods used in fine furnishings are CITES listed, including mahogany (Swietenia species and Cedrela species), afrormosia (Pericopsis elata), and ramin (Gonystylus species). Several species commonly marketed as “rosewood” are also included.

“Rosewood” is an imprecise trade term associated with a wide range of richly hued, and often fragrant, tropical hardwoods. The term is most commonly equated with Dalbergia and Pterocarpus species, many of which are CITES-listed, and many of which are not. These species are primarily found in South and Southeast Asia, West and East Africa, and Latin America.

CITES-protected species

Supply of rosewood

The CITES-listed species make up only a small share of the species traded as “rosewood”, and currently comprise a fraction of the rosewood timber market. As a result, both the trade data (based on CITES permits) and World WISE seizure data (which focus on CITES listed species) capture only a portion of the legal and illegal markets respectively. Only one rosewood species is on Appendix I and cannot be commercially traded: *Dalbergia nigra*, known as “Brazilian rosewood”. Brazilian rosewood grows only in a relatively small area of Brazil, recent legal trade in this species has been extremely limited, and World WISE captures only a dozen seizures. A number of species are listed on Appendix II and can be traded with the proper permits, but most of these were only added in 2013. The exception is *Pterocarpus santalinus* from India, a precious wood known as “red sanders”, which has been listed on CITES Appendix II since 2007, and, as a result, comprises most of the seizures historically. Among the 2013 listings are all 48 *Dalbergia* species of Madagascar, which have held a zero export quota since 2013. Huge seizures have been made of Malagasy rosewood, particularly *Dalbergia louvelii*, suggesting Madagascar is where much of the trade in CITES-listed rosewoods is sourced. One of the highest value rosewoods is from Southeast Asia, *Dalbergia cochinchinensis* (Siamese rosewood). The remainder come from Central America, including 2013 listed Appendix II species *Dalbergia grunadillo* (granadillo), *Dalbergia retusa* (cocobolo), and *Dalbergia stevensonii* (Honduran rosewood).

National populations from Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Panama have been included in Appendix III. In 2016, an African species, *Pterocarpus erinaceus* was added to Appendix III by Senegal. Export permits are required for species coming from the specified source countries, and other countries are required to issue certificates of origin when exporting these species.

Illegal trade

With regard to seizures of CITES-listed species, most have involved red sanders, Siamese rosewood, Malagasy rosewood, and Honduran rosewood.

The governments of China, India, Malaysia, and Singapore have seized multi-ton shipments of red sanders over the years. Detected shipments are mainly destined for China (particularly via Hong Kong, China), or the United Arab Emirates (mainly via Mumbai seaport).

Siamese rosewood has been seized by the Malay, Thai, and Vietnamese authorities. There are only three multi-ton seizures of Siamese rosewood captured in World WISE, all made in 2013:

- 30 tons seized in Bac Ninh province of Viet Nam on its way to China;
- 5.5 tons seized in Bukit Kayu Hitam, Malaysia on its way from Thailand;
- 9 tons in Phu Quoc Island, Kien Giang province of Viet Nam, coming from Cambodia.

The largest seizure of rosewood ever made, and possibly the largest seizure of wildlife ever made, was carried out by the Singapore authorities in 2014: some 3,000 tons of Malagasy rosewood. On 8 October 2015, acting on intelligence, Chinese Customs in Hong Kong intercepted a vessel from...
Tanzania and found 1,100 metric tons of Malagasy rosewood.10 Other remarkable recent seizures of Malagasy rosewood include:11

--- In 2013 and 2014, the Malagasy government seized 14,894 logs in two seizures.

--- Between February and May 2014, Mozambican authorities seized 1,087 logs and 90 metric tons of rosewood in two separate incidents.

--- In February 2014, Tanzanian customs officers seized 781 logs of rosewood in six containers in Zanzibar.

--- On 26 May 2014, the Kenya Wildlife Service seized 4,400 logs in 34 containers in Mombasa, which had been loaded in Zanzibar.

--- On 2 April 2014, Sri Lankan authorities seized 3,669 logs from 28 containers, weighing 420 metric tons, which had also been loaded in Zanzibar.

World WISE data on seizures from Latin America are more limited, although a number of incidents involving between 10 and 30 metric tons were reported by Mexico. In addition, media reports contain several notable seizures:

--- In April 2014, 13 containers (200 cubic metres) of cocobolo (Dalbergia retusa) were seized in Panama disguised as scrap on their way to Hong Kong, China.12

--- Some 92 tons of Honduran rosewood (Dalbergia stevensonii) in four forty-foot shipping containers declared as rubber waste were seized in Hong Kong, China in December 2014.15

According to World WISE, the vast majority of CITES-listed rosewood seized was destined for China.

Species under national control, but not currently CITES-listed

But while trade in CITES-listed rosewoods is relatively small, the rosewood furniture market is immense, often involving closely-related species of Dalbergia and Pterocarpus that are not yet CITES-listed. Three species in particular appear to have become prominent in the trade:

--- Burmese rosewood (Dalbergia oliveri), or “tamalan”, a mid-class wood from Southeast Asia;

--- Burmese padauk (Pterocarpus macarocarpus), a slightly cheaper wood from Southeast Asia; and,

--- African rosewood (Pterocarpus erinaceus), or “kosso”, a low-end wood from West Africa.14

While not CITES-listed, the harvesting of these woods is either illegal or highly regulated in the source countries, out of keeping with large exports.

Most Southeast Asian countries have recognised the threat of deforestation and have taken measures to restrict or prevent logging of endangered woods. All logging of wild species has been banned in Thailand since 1989.15 In Myanmar, both tamalan and padauk are protected species, and harvest is illegal without permission of the Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry.16 In both Cambodia and Lao People’s Democratic Republic, both tamalan and padauk are protected species.17

Kosso has been placed on CITES Appendix III by Senegal, effective 9 May 2016. It is also protected under national law in most West African source countries (Table 1). Its legal status is ambiguous in two countries in particular: Togo and Nigeria. At present, while Togo has a Forest Code (2008), it has not yet issued a list of protected species. As of 21 May 2015, however, the transport of kosso is prohibited by Ministerial Declaration.18 In Nigeria, there appears to be a standing log export ban (1976), but log exports are recorded.19

The export data are complicated to interpret because in both Southeast Asia and West Africa, the exporting country is not necessarily the source country. For example, based on fieldwork in the region, most of the rosewood exported from Gambia was seized in Hong Kong, China in Panama disguised as scrap on their way to Hong Kong, China.20 Similarly, about half of the rosewood exported from Benin appears to come from Nigeria.21

In addition to logging bans, most of the source countries for these woods have log export bans in place (Table 2). These bans were implemented due to concerns about the extremely rapid rate at which the species was being stripped from these countries. In response, timber brokers have repeatedly relocated their operations to neighboring states where bans were not yet in place. The logging of Pterocarpus erinaceus is particularly worrying because it is a fire-resistant and nitrogen-fixing species that grows in arid areas, without which desertification becomes a risk. In addition, in both Southeast Asia and West Africa, rosewood is sourced from areas where insurgents are active, and so may be seen as a source of conflict finance.

Southeast Asia

Southeast Asian countries have long been afflicted by illegal logging,
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much of its range and it has become increasingly rare, however. The harvesting of Burmese rosewood (Dalbergia oliveri) and Burmese padauk (Pterocarpus macrocarpus), which are not CITES-listed, seems to have filled the void. As noted above, these species are recognized as endangered, and so are protected under national law in all range states, but not under CITES. Illegal logging affects each country differently. In Cambodia, for example, rosewood may be harvested when

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Logging protections for kosso in some West African countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE COUNTRY</td>
<td>PROTECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>Kosso protected under Schedule 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Felling and export ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>Logging moratorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Felling prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Determined by state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Kosso “partially protected”: quota; for domestic use only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Transport of kosso prohibited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Log export bans in top rosewood source countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>YEAR OF LOG EXPORT BAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1992, 200622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People’s Democratic Republic</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which is why some log export bans extend back to the early 1990s. Based on the seizure data, it appears that Thailand and Viet Nam continue to be targeted for their high value species. In terms of volume, however, the primary source countries today appear to be the poorest in the region: Cambodia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Myanmar. While Lao People’s Democratic Republic remains widely forested, forest cover has declined dramatically in Cambodia and Myanmar in the last 25 years (Fig. 6). The situation in Myanmar is complicated by the fact that large swaths of the forested area of the country are host to non-state armed groups. In recent years, attention has focused on the high-value, CITES-listed Siamese rosewood (Dalbergia cochinchinensis), which is found in Cambodia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Thailand and Viet Nam. Harvesting of this species is prohibited under national law throughout much of its range and it has become increasingly rare, however. The harvesting of Burmese rosewood (Dalbergia oliveri) and Burmese padauk (Pterocarpus macrocarpus), which are not CITES-listed, seems to have filled the void. As noted above, these species are recognized as endangered, and so are protected under national law in all range states, but not under CITES. Illegal logging affects each country differently. In Cambodia, for example, rosewood may be harvested when
previous history of commercial forestry and no commercial forests left within its borders, began exporting large volumes of logs. The source of the wood appears to have been the Casamance region of Senegal, and since Senegal has a longstanding export ban, this timber was illegally exported to Gambia.36 Exports fell back after a log export ban was imposed, and a series of West African countries stepped up to fill the void, most recently, Nigeria. As in Southeast Asia, it appears salvage permits are used to launder illegally felled rosewood.37

Since illegal timber trade on this scale is new to many countries in the region, some are only now mounting enforcement efforts. INTERPOL’s Operation Log saw the seizure of over US$200 million in illegally harvested kosso and other woods in 2015.

Analysis

Estimating the size of the flow of illegal rosewood requires clarity on how illegality is defined. Looking strictly at CITES listed species, World WISE documents the seizure of almost 10,000 metric tons of protected rosewoods between 2005 and 2015.38 Based on media reports, it appears that many seizures have taken place account of it.

This windfall has not accrued to a single nation. It would appear that traders are moving from one West African country to another, adjusting their procurement as local supplies run out or once the relevant government increases regulation. Due to free movement within the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS),35 the source country and the exporter may differ. Between 2011 and the middle of 2013, Gambia, a country with little land is cleared under Economic Land Concessions or other development projects. Several of these concessions were recently cancelled, in part due to illegal logging.39 Legitimate salvage from development projects may be used to “launder” wood illegally harvested elsewhere.30 There also appear to be issues around the auctioning of seized rosewood, a practice that has been banned in Thailand since 2007.31 Illegal cross-border harvesting and the sourcing of timber from protected areas have been reported.32 Trafficking of tamalan and padauk contrary to national laws appears to have increased dramatically in recent years. For example, seizures of both species in Myanmar spiked in the financial year 2013-2014.34 Crackdowns in the region appear to have resulted in a decline in exports around April 2014, based on import statistics of destination countries.

West Africa

The situation in West Africa is equally problematic. Demand for “kosso”, Pterocarpus erinaceus, has taken the region by storm. Exports of logs from certain countries in West Africa went from nothing in 2010 to hundreds of millions of dollars by 2015.34 The rapidity of this development has caught the region off guard, and many countries are still struggling to take
in Asia and possibly Latin America that are not recorded in World WISE, possibly because not all countries class timber as “wildlife”. Based on media reports, it appears that many seizures have taken place in Asia and possibly Latin America that are not recorded in World WISE. Timber seizures are often recorded by a separate authority than other wildlife seizures, and so may be omitted in regular reporting.

Looking more broadly at illegally harvested or exported logs would produce a different result. Discrepancies in the trade data indicate that many countries are exporting rosewood logs of species not listed in the CITES appendices, contrary to their own national laws. The volumes involved could be much greater than the flow in CITES listed species.

Rosewood illustrates the limitations of a species-specific approach to wildlife protection. Timber traders evade CITES controls by finding substitute species, and the buying rush on these unprotected woods can devastate populations before controls can be put in place. Furthermore, it is very difficult for front line inspectors to distinguish different species of wood in the many forms it might appear, and misdeclaration of species has been detected.93 At present, there is generally no legal basis for most importing countries to respect the laws of exporters, and thus large volumes of illegally sourced wood may be entering legal markets.
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