

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

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties

Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

PROPOSALS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION ON RANCHING

Submitted Proposals

1. In accordance with the provisions of paragraph d) of Resolution Conf. 3.15, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Madagascar and the United Republic of Tanzania, Parties to the Convention, submitted proposals for amendment pursuant to the Resolution on "Ranching". These proposals are as follows:
  - Ethiopia: Maintenance of its population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II
  - Indonesia: Maintenance of its population of *Crocodylus porosus* in Appendix II
  - Kenya: Maintenance of its population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II
  - Madagascar: Maintenance of its population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II
  - United Rep. of Tanzania: Maintenance of its population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II

The proposals were accompanied by supporting statements. That from Ethiopia was however received late, as the first copy did not reach the Secretariat.

2. In accordance with Resolution Conf. 3.15, recommendation d), the Secretariat communicated the proposals to IUCN and WTMU (both have agreed to undertake a thorough review of amendment proposals) to obtain appropriate scientific and technical advice. Comments were received from both organizations, except on the proposal from Ethiopia, and were forwarded to the proponents. The FAO expert for the crocodile project in Madagascar sent an extensive reply, while very short replies were received from Indonesia and Kenya.
3. The amendment proposals were sent by the Secretariat to all the Parties, in accordance with the provisions of Article XV of the Convention, through the Notification to contracting or signatory States of 28 October 1991 (see document Doc. 8.46 (Rev.) Annex 1).
4. It is worthwhile to note that all the Parties which have submitted a proposal pursuant to Resolution Conf. 3.15 have had their populations of *Crocodylus niloticus* or *Crocodylus porosus* listed in Appendix II for several years, but subject to annual export quotas (see also document Doc. 8.21).
5. When the recommendations below from the Secretariat were drafted, the final reports from IUCN and WTMU had not yet been received and the Secretariat, therefore, was not in a position to use them.

Recommendations from the Secretariat

6. Firstly, the Secretariat would like to note that the following recommendations are provisional and may change at a later stage on the basis of information it is expecting from various sources, in particular the IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group and the IUCN/WTMU review (see item 2. above).

7. Before considering each proposal the Secretariat wishes to raise again, as it did at the Lausanne meeting, the question of the taking of wild specimens apart from eggs and hatchlings, in countries which have their populations of crocodiles listed in Appendix II pursuant to Resolution Conf. 3.15. This question was not dealt with properly in Lausanne, although it must be if controversies are to be avoided in the future. Document Doc. 8.25 deals with this issue.
8. Proposal from Ethiopia. The supporting statement provided by Ethiopia is very similar to that submitted at the seventh meeting of the Parties with the proposal requesting the transfer of the Ethiopian population of *Crocodylus niloticus* to Appendix II subject to annual export quotas. That proposal was accepted by the Conference of the Parties without objection. In its recommendation, the Secretariat indicated that the proposal was well prepared and provided information which would almost be sufficient for a ranching proposal. With the additional data provided, the Secretariat considers that the proposal is sufficient under Resolution Conf. 3.15 and, therefore, recommends that it be accepted.
9. Proposal from Indonesia. Serious criticisms have been made regarding Indonesia and the way crocodiles are exploited in that country. It appears from the proposal itself that the problems have not all been solved and, as the FAO project has not been renewed (?), the situation might become worse. On the other hand, Australia has increased its co-operation with Indonesia for the management of crocodiles. As an answer to the comments from WTMU, the Management Authority of Indonesia announced that a workshop on the management of crocodiles was planned for the end of October.

An important factor to achieve success in Indonesia would be the compliance of the crocodile industry with the rules, i.e. the law of Indonesia and CITES. To demonstrate the need for such compliance and to allow time for necessary measures and procedures to be adopted, a moratorium on the trade in crocodiles, if the situation has not dramatically changed within a short period of time, might be the best option. The crocodile industry should also be financially involved in the management of the resource.

The question of the continuous offtake of wild crocodiles should also be dealt with and solved, i.e. the decision of the Parties must be clearly stated in the Proceedings of the meeting.

In conclusion, if Indonesia agrees to strictly limit the export of *Crocodylus porosus* specimens to ranch products, the Secretariat would recommend that the proposal be approved. This takes into account the fact that a rejection of the proposal, thus the transfer of the Indonesian population back to Appendix I, might be worse for the conservation of the species, than the acceptance of the proposal.

10. Proposal from Kenya. Responding to the comments made by the WTMU and IUCN, the Kenyan Management Authority stated that all activities of the crocodile farms in the country are now carefully controlled and monitored. The Secretariat, therefore, is confident that the crocodile ranching would be beneficial to the conservation of the species in Kenya and recommends that the proposal be approved.
11. Proposal from Madagascar. Madagascar was faced with serious political and economic problems when this document was drafted. Therefore, only the head of the FAO project on crocodiles in Madagascar was able to reply to the comments from WTMU and to provide additional information to support the ranching proposal.

In 1990, a representative of the Secretariat visited Madagascar and was able to observe the motivation of certain entrepreneurs and their great efforts in the field of crocodile ranching. He was persuaded that the only way to ensure the conservation of the species in Madagascar would be through the support of the planned programme, on the condition, however, that the offtake of specimens be better controlled. Progress has already been achieved in this field, however.

In addition, the apparent ease with which the eggs necessary for the ranches were collected in late 1990 indicates that the status of the crocodile in Madagascar allows such exploitation.

The Secretariat, therefore, recommends that the Malagasy proposal be approved, considering also that this could prevent the crocodile from becoming again a "pest" species in Madagascar, as it was a few years ago.

12. Proposal from the United Republic of Tanzania. In spite of the fact that both WTMU and IUCN made serious criticisms of its proposal, the Tanzanian Management Authority did not provide any additional information. One of the most serious points concerns the fact that, although the proposal indicates that four farms are operating in the country, no information was provided on those farms.

The proposal asks also for an annual quota of 1900 crocodiles from the wild, apart from 100 hunting trophies. Such a quota was not granted by the Conference of the Parties at the Lausanne meeting, for 1992, considering that only ranched specimens should be internationally traded.

The Secretariat, recognizing that the Tanzanian population of crocodiles could provide eggs for ranching but that no management plan seems to have been established yet, would be prepared to recommend the acceptance of the proposal if an adequate management plan were to be presented during the meeting of the Parties. However, the export of specimens should be limited to those originating from the ranches (possibly excepting some hunting trophies).

13. Comments from the Parties. None was provided.