

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

Seventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties

Lausanne (Switzerland), 9 to 20 October 1989

Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

Review of Resolution Conf. 5.21 on Special Criteria
for the Transfer of Taxa from Appendix I to Appendix II

SECRETARIAT REPORT ON CROCODYLIAN QUOTAS

1. Resolution Conf. 5.21, adopted at the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Buenos Aires, 1985) (see document Doc. 7.37 Annex 1), requests that the Secretariat compile data on trade in specimens of species subject to quotas and report to each meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Resolution recommends that range states assigned a quota under the terms of the Resolution meet their reporting requirements under Article VIII, paragraph 7, of the Convention in a timely fashion.
2. At the sixth meeting (Ottawa, 1987), the Conference of the Parties adopted amendment proposals to transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II or to retain in Appendix II, subject to specified annual export quotas, the populations of Crocodylus niloticus, Crocodylus cataphractus, Crocodylus porosus and Osteolaemus tetraspis of the following states:

Crocodylus niloticus

	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>
Botswana	2,000	2,000	2,000
Cameroon	100	100	100
Congo	150	150	150
Kenya	5,000	5,000	5,000
Madagascar	1,000	1,000	1,000
		3,784*	
Malawi	900	1,000	1,300
		1,700*	2,300*
Mozambique	1,000	1,000	4,000
Sudan	5,000	5,000	5,000
United Republic of Tanzania	2,000	2,000	2,000
Zambia	3,350	5,600	8,200

* Quota increased through the postal procedures.

Crocodylus cataphractus

	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>
Congo	600	600	600

Crocodylus porosus

	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>
Indonesia	2,000	4,000	4,000

Osteolaemus tetraspis

	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>
Congo	500	500	500

3. Recognizing the importance of marking of specimens in the control of trade and in the absence of specific recommendations from the Technical Committee, the Secretariat had proposed that all skins to be exported be marked with self-locking plastic tags bearing a unique serial number. The system was continued in 1987, 1988 and 1989. Tags were ordered from a manufacturer through the Secretariat.
4. The following information is based on special reports for 1987 and 1988, quota/ranching proposals and 1987 trade statistics compiled from Annual Reports.

a) Crocodylus niloticus

Botswana - The Secretariat received the 1987 Annual Report from Botswana on 17 August 1989. It appears from the report that Botswana exported 484 live crocodiles, 5 hunting trophies, 10 tanned skins and 1 hand bag in 1987. Botswana returned 200 tags for 1987, which were not used, to the Secretariat.

Cameroon - The Cameroon Annual Report for 1987 shows 19 specimens exported.

Congo - The Secretariat has received both 1987 and 1988 Annual Reports from the Congo. In 1987, until the decision of the Conference of the Parties in Ottawa, the quota for the Congo was of 1000 specimens. This explains why the Congo exported 534 specimens that year.

In 1988, 150 specimens were exported, as confirmed by the proposal submitted for consideration at the seventh meeting.

It must be noted also that the Congo always send copies of its export permits to the Secretariat, allowing a monitoring of the trade in quota species.

Kenya - The 1987 Annual Report showed that 150 skins were exported that year.

Madagascar - In its proposal, Madagascar reported that it exported 3651 skins in 1987 and 1000 in 1988. The 1987 Annual Report of Madagascar refers to the export of 3606 skins, mainly to France. In

addition, 406 items in crocodile leather have been exported under export permits. Even if Madagascar had a registered farm in 1987, it seems that the quota has been exceeded to a large extent.

Malawi - The proposal mentioned that Malawi exported 200 skins in 1987. However, it appears from the 1987 Annual Report that 101 skins were exported. No report is available for 1988.

Mozambique - In its proposal, Mozambique reported 1000 skins exported for 1987. No annual reports for 1987 and 1988 have been submitted to the Secretariat. However, since the beginning of 1988, Mozambique has been sending copies of its export permits to the Secretariat. In 1988, 1 skin, 2 live specimens and 1 skull appeared on the copies received. In addition, 477 skins bearing 1988 tags were exported in 1989 only.

Sudan - The Secretariat has not received annual reports from the Sudan since 1986. It appears, however, from copies of export permits received from the Sudan, that in early 1987 1150 skins were exported with 1986 tags, and that in 1989 1279 skins were exported with 1988 tags [No 1001 to 2279 (does that mean that tags 0001 to 1000 were also used? the Secretariat does not know)], and 50 skins with 1989 tags (No. 00001 to 0050).

United Republic of Tanzania - The proposal of the United Republic of Tanzania states that 2000 skins were exported in 1987 and 1849 skins in 1988 (until 4 November). The 1987 Annual Report indicates that only 1382 skins were exported that year.

Zambia - The proposal stated that Zambia exported 3500 skins in 1987 and 5600 skins in 1988. No annual report was received for either 1987 or 1988. Zambia returned 197 unused tags for 1987 to the Secretariat.

b) Crocodylus cataphractus

Congo - The proposal states that the Congo exported 60 skins in 1988. The 1987 Annual Report does not mention any exports in 1987. However, 594 of the 599 skins reported as exported in 1988 were bearing 1987 tags. See also the remark under C. niloticus regarding copies of export permits.

c) Crocodylus porosus

Indonesia - In its proposal for new quotas, Indonesia reports that 1389 skins were exported in 1987, 3104 in 1988 and 648 in 1989 (until July). Indonesia has not submitted annual reports for 1987 and 1988.

d) Osteolaemus tetraspis

Congo - In the proposal submitted to the Secretariat, the Congo states that only 10 specimens were exported in 1988. However, the 1987 Annual Report mentioned the export of 22 specimens, mainly personal effects or souvenirs, and the 1988 Annual Report mentioned the export of 19 specimens. See also the remark under C. niloticus regarding copies of export permits.

PROBLEMS

5. The Secretariat requested a special report of exports for 1987 and 1988. Some states did not submit the information and, as a result, the Secretariat report is not complete.
6. The Secretariat arranged for tag orders, but some of the shipments were lost on the way to each Management Authority or the delivery was delayed significantly.

The supply of tags in 1985 and 1986 was funded by the Commission of the European Communities. Since then, however, the cost of the tags must be borne by the quota states. Those states which have not reimbursed the cost to the Secretariat are requested to do so as soon as possible.

CONCLUSION

7. The Secretariat has received no information on serious abuse of the system (with the possible exception of Madagascar) and feels that the system had positive effects on the conservation of the species. However, the Secretariat urges the interested Parties to better comply with the reporting requirements.

Documents Doc. 7.40 and Doc. 7.42 contain additional information that is relevant to this document.