

## Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

TRADE IN SPECIMENS OF SPECIES TRANSFERRED TO APPENDIX II SUBJECT  
TO ANNUAL EXPORT QUOTASReport of the Secretariat1. Introduction

This report covers export quotas granted by the Conference of the Parties under the provisions of Resolution Conf. 7.14 on Special Criteria for the Transfer of Taxa from Appendix I to Appendix II, adopted at its seventh meeting (Lausanne, 1989), for crocodylians and *Scleropages formosus* (the Asian bonytongue). The report of the Secretariat submitted to the eighth meeting (Kyoto, 1992) reported on the use of the export quotas granted for 1991 for the period January to June only. Therefore, the present report covers the use of export quotas granted for 1991, 1992 and 1993. Information on the use of export quotas granted for 1994 is not included in the present report.

2. Changes made at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties

In 1991, Cameroon and the Congo had zero export quotas for their populations of *Crocodylus niloticus* (the Nile crocodile), and the Congo had a zero export quota for its population of *Osteolaemus tetraspis* (the dwarf crocodile). In the same year, the Congo had an export quota of 600 skins of *Crocodylus cataphractus* (the African slender-snouted crocodile). At the eighth meeting, the populations of these species in the two countries were transferred back to Appendix I.

Somalia did not submit a proposal to the eighth meeting to retain its population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II under the quota system or under Resolution Conf. 3.15 on Ranching. Nevertheless, the export quota of 500 skins for 1992 was maintained but zero quotas were decided for 1993 and 1994.

At the eighth meeting, the *Crocodylus niloticus* population of South Africa was transferred to Appendix II, with an annual export quota of 1000 specimens for 1993 to 1995, in order to allow that country to exploit the Lake Saint Lucia sub-population. South Africa has since submitted a proposal to retain its population in Appendix II under Resolution Conf. 3.15 (see document Doc. 9.46).

In addition, at the eighth meeting the *Crocodylus niloticus* population of Uganda was transferred to Appendix II, under an annual export quota of 2500 specimens for 1992 to 1994, in order to allow the export of skins from an existing crocodile ranching operation in that country. In August 1994, Uganda submitted a proposal to retain its population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II under the quota system, but the deadline for the submission of such a proposal had long passed. However, in that proposal, Uganda indicated that it would like its export quota increased to 2,600 skins for 1994, 1995 and 1996.

The *Crocodylus niloticus* populations of Ethiopia, Kenya and the United Republic of Tanzania were maintained in Appendix II under Resolution Conf. 3.15, on the basis of the proposals submitted by those countries at the eighth meeting.

Madagascar also submitted a proposal at that meeting for the maintenance of its population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II under the same Resolution, as did Indonesia for its population of *Crocodylus porosus*, but the proposals were rejected. Instead, Madagascar

and Indonesia were allowed to continue to trade the skins of these species (ranching and/or wild-taken) under the quota system for the years 1992, 1993 and 1994. Madagascar and Indonesia have since presented proposals to maintain their populations in Appendix II, under Resolution Conf. 3.15 (see document Doc. 9.46).

In addition, Madagascar and the United Republic of Tanzania were granted export quotas for wild-taken skins of *Crocodylus niloticus* resulting either from sport-hunted animals or from the control of problem animals. Soon after the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Tanzanian authorities sought to have their quota for wild-taken skins increased. The Secretariat advised that this would require the submission of a proposal, with adequate scientific and other justifications, for consideration at the ninth meeting (see document Doc. 9.47).

Furthermore, Indonesia and the Sudan were granted special export quotas to dispose of their stocks of skins of *Crocodylus porosus* and *Crocodylus niloticus*, respectively, from the previous years' export quotas. The skins had not been exported because of the slump in the international prices for crocodylian skins or, in the case of the Sudan, because of delays in moving the skins from the field to collecting centres.

The special export quota was granted to the Sudan on the condition that the skins should be exported between 11 June and 11 July 1992 (the date on which the inclusion of the *Crocodylus niloticus* population of the Sudan in Appendix I entered into force). It was agreed by the Conference of the Parties that the skins should be tagged, documented and exported under the supervision of an independent observer, and that USD 2 per skin resulting from the sale of the skins should be put into a fund for the conservation of the Sudanese population of *Crocodylus niloticus*. A supervisor was nominated at the eighth meeting, and he undertook a mission to the Sudan from 4 to 10 June 1992, taking with him tags for marking the skins. The costs of that mission and the tags were paid from the fund mentioned above. The supervisor took stock of all saleable skins, attached identification tags to them, and ensured the completion of export permits before he left the country. He submitted his report to the Secretariat soon after.

In 1991, Indonesia was granted an export quota for wild-taken specimens of *Scleropages formosus*. At the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties that quota was set at zero, but Indonesia was granted a quota to export captive-bred specimens from one operation. Indonesia has since proposed the transfer of its population of this species to Appendix I (see document Doc. 9.46).

3. Marking requirements

The first paragraph e) of Resolution Conf. 7.14 recommends that 'the products of the quota are adequately marked - in accordance with Resolution Conf. 5.16, adopted at the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Buenos Aires, 1985) and subsequent Resolutions on marking - and documented to ensure they can be readily distinguished from products of Appendix-I populations'. This condition is met for crocodiles by attaching to each crocodile skin exported under the quota a self-locking identification tag,

on which is indicated the ISO two-letter code of the State of export, a serial number and the year to which the quota applies.

There is at present no marking system approved by the Animals Committee for live specimens of *Scleropages formosus*. In 1990, Indonesia decided to use special labels to be affixed to an aquarium by the final buyer of the specimen. It also decided to maintain records of these labels in a studbook that could be inspected by the Secretariat (Notification to the Parties No. 592 of 31.07.90). However, in their proposals to register captive-breeding operations for *Scleropages formosus*, Malaysia and Singapore have proposed to use Passive Integrated Transponders (PIT) to mark specimens produced in captive-breeding operations (Notification to the Parties No. 825 of 25.08.94). Therefore, Indonesia should also consider using the same method to mark specimens of *Scleropages formosus* to be exported from that country.

As in previous years, and with the exception of a very few of the countries concerned, the Secretariat assisted in procuring tags for the Parties to which crocodylian export quotas were granted, on the condition that they reimburse the Secretariat for the cost incurred. Parties that have benefited from this assistance have reimbursed the Secretariat without undue delay.

#### 4. Reporting requirements

The second paragraph f) of Resolution Conf. 7.14 recommends that countries granted annual export quotas under that Resolution include in their reports to the Secretariat information on the total annual wild harvests and its forms, the number and type of wild-collected specimens that have been exported, the number and type of specimens reared in captivity from wild-taken eggs or hatchlings that have been exported, and the number and type of captive-born specimens that have been exported. Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, South Africa and Uganda have submitted their reports as required.

The Secretariat has not been able to communicate with the Management Authority of Somalia since the outbreak of civil war in that country in 1991.

Finally, with a very few exceptions, the countries concerned send to the Secretariat on a regular basis, copies of export permits that they issue.

#### 5. Reported exports

To facilitate comparison between the years in question, the reported exports are presented in the table in the last pages of this report.

This information was either provided in special reports by the Management Authorities of the countries concerned, or obtained from copies of export permits and annual reports submitted by them. In addition, the table includes data from the CITES database maintained by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre, in Cambridge, United Kingdom. Many of the annual reports for 1993 had not been submitted at the time of completing this report and, therefore, the data for that year are not included in the table.

#### 6. Specific comments

Reference should be made to the accompanying table regarding the specific comments on the countries mentioned below.

Cameroon and Congo: In 1991, the export quotas for Cameroon and the Congo for *Crocodylus niloticus* and that for Congo for *Osteolaemus tetraspis* were zero. In 1992, the populations of these species in the two countries were included in Appendix I. As no exports for

commercial purposes were reported from the two countries in 1991 for the two species, these countries are not included in the table regarding the trade in specimens of these species.

Indonesia: Indonesia did not submit special reports on the use of its annual quotas for 1991, 1992 and 1993, for *Crocodylus porosus* and *Scleropages formosus*, nor has Indonesia submitted its annual report for 1992.

In its annual report for 1991, Indonesia reported that it had allowed the export of 402 specimens of *Scleropages formosus*, without indicating whether the specimens were captive-bred, ranched or wild-taken. The data from the CITES database indicate that one country imported 1000 captive-bred specimens from Indonesia in 1991. The same source indicates that in 1992 another country imported two specimens from Indonesia. At the end of 1992, 1000 captive-bred specimens were exported to Japan but were stopped in Singapore because the transit conditions were not respected. The surviving fish were returned to Indonesia. In 1993, Indonesia imposed a ban on the export of specimens of this species.

Regarding *Crocodylus porosus*, the source of the 1691 skins reported in Indonesia's annual report for 1991 is not indicated. The data from the annual reports of importing countries, in the CITES database, indicate that 707 skins from captive-bred animals and 1303 skins from wild-taken animals were imported from Indonesia in 1991. For 1992, the same source indicates that 841 skins were imported from Indonesia, of which 177 skins were wild-taken.

In the proposal that Indonesia has submitted to the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to retain its population of *Crocodylus porosus* in Appendix II under Resolution Conf. 3.15, Indonesia has indicated that in 1991 it allowed the export of 1908 skins and that about 1730 of these were taken from wild animals. In the same proposal, Indonesia has also indicated that it allowed the export of 1352 skins in 1992, of which about 189 were wild-taken, and that 803 skins (source unspecified) were exported between January and June 1993.

Although Indonesia did not exceed its annual export quotas either for ranched or wild-taken specimens of *Crocodylus porosus* for the years in question, the observed differences between the reported exports and imports from that country raise questions about how many skins of that species, or of captive-bred or wild-taken specimens of live *Scleropages formosus* were actually exported.

Madagascar: In its special report to the Secretariat, Madagascar reported that 696 skins of *Crocodylus niloticus* were exported in 1991 and, in 1992, 1305 skins from captive-bred and ranched animals with tags indicating 1993 production year. The export permits were also issued in 1993. In 1992 Madagascar also exported 50 skins from wild-taken animals, bearing tags for its quota for that year, but the export permit was issued in 1993.

In its annual reports, Madagascar reported that in 1991 it authorized the export of 419 skins (source unspecified) and, in 1992, 1294 skins of which 50 were from wild-taken animals.

The data from the CITES database for 1991 indicate that 989 skins, of which 200 were from wild-taken animals, were reported as imports from Madagascar by importing countries. For 1992, reported imports included 1359 skins, of which 446 were from wild-taken animals. Madagascar had no quota for wild-taken skins in 1991, but at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties it was granted an annual quota of 100 wild-taken skins for 1992 and 1993.

Therefore, if there were no errors in the export permits or in the annual reports of importing countries, it has to be assumed that in 1991 Madagascar allowed the export of a higher number of skins than that reported in its annual report for that year and, in 1991 and 1992, a higher number of wild-taken skins than its annual export quotas for each of the two years. If one is to rely on the information provided by Madagascar in its special report and its proposal for retaining its population in Appendix II under Resolution Conf. 3.15, the only plausible explanation is that some of the skins reported in its annual report as wild-taken include ranched specimens and/or include skins that were tagged in the previous year. See comments on the Sudan below.

Somalia: In the CITES database, one importing country is reported to have imported 76 skins of *Crocodylus niloticus* from Somalia in 1991.

South Africa: In its special report for 1992 and 1993, South Africa did not report any export of wild-taken skins or live specimens from its quota for wild *Crocodylus niloticus*. Instead, eggs were collected and incubated, and the resulting hatchlings were sold to South African crocodile farmers.

Sudan: The Sudan's export quota for *Crocodylus niloticus* for 1991 was zero, and in its annual report for 1991 it did not report any exports. However, the data from the annual reports indicate that 700 skins were imported by one country. In response to an enquiry by the Secretariat, the country of import provided evidence that the skins were actually from the Sudan's 1990 export quota.

The Management Authority of the Sudan, by letter of 14 July 1992, transmitted to the Secretariat copies of four permits that it had issued under its special export quota of 8000 skins to two Egyptian firms, thus meeting the condition set by the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting. However, the annual report of Egypt indicates that only 7900 skins were imported into Egypt in 1992.

Authorities in Egypt and the Sudan hoped that the skins could be re-exported, but the Secretariat informed them that, in accordance with paragraph h) of Resolution Conf. 5.11, this was not possible after 11 July 1992 (see Section 2 above). Therefore, most of the skins are still stored in depots in Egypt, because the local market for crocodile skin products in Egypt is small, as stated by the representative of Egypt at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

United Republic of Tanzania: The special report submitted by the United Republic of Tanzania included

only wild-taken skins of *Crocodylus niloticus*, although for 1991 it should have also included information on exports of ranched specimens from its export quota for that year. According to that report, 27 of the 821 skins exported in 1991, 31 of the 459 skins exported in 1992, and 28 of the 148 skins exported in 1993 were hunting trophies.

According to the 1991 and 1992 annual reports of the United Republic of Tanzania, 28 of the 279 skins exported in 1991 and 22 of the 134 skins exported in 1992 were hunting trophies. All except two of the skins exported in 1992 bore tags indicating 1991 as the year of production. The other two skins, exported as hunting trophies, bore tags indicating 1992 as the year of production.

Uganda: With the agreement of the Secretariat, the skins from ranched animals that were slaughtered in 1992 were exported in 1993, with a tag for the 1992 quota (the year of production) attached to each skin.

## 7. Observations

The data in the special reports submitted by some of the countries often differ from those in their annual reports, and from those in the annual reports of importing countries. There are two principal explanations for this. First, some of the annual reports are compiled on the basis of export permits issued, and do not necessarily reflect the actual exports effected. Second, some of the skins are exported after the year to which the quota applies, or at the very end of that year, but the importing countries record only the year in which they are imported.

Other than Ethiopia, the Secretariat has had to remind countries to which export quotas were granted to provide the information on the use of their quotas, and also to submit other reports required under Resolution Conf. 7.14. The second paragraph f) of this Resolution does not set any deadline for the submission of the required reports so that the Secretariat can meet its reporting obligations to the Conference of the Parties at its regular meetings. Therefore, the Secretariat proposes to the Parties to consider setting 31 March as the deadline for the submission of reports by countries granted quotas under the quota system, by amending the second paragraph f) of Resolution Conf. 7.14 read:

"f) the Management Authority shall submit, by 31 March of each year, a report to the Secretariat providing detailed information on: ...."

If Resolution Conf. 7.14 is repealed and replaced at the ninth meeting, then a similar recommendation should be incorporated in the new Resolution.

Utilization of annual export quotas for *Crocodylus* spp. and *Scleropages formosus*

Country	1991					1992				1993	
	Quota	Special reports (exports)	CITES Database		Quota	Special reports (exports)	CITES Database		Quota	Special reports x (exports)	
			Ex-ports <sup>1</sup>	Im-ports <sup>2</sup>			Ex-ports <sup>1</sup>	Im-ports <sup>2</sup>			
<b><i>Crocodylus niloticus</i></b>											
Ethiopia	R W	6000 50	0 7	0 7	0 4	population in Appendix II under Resolution Conf. 3.15					
Kenya	R	6000	650	650	650	population in Appendix II under Resolution Conf. 3.15					
Madagascar	R W	2000 0	696 0	R/W419	789 200	3000 100	1305 50	1294 50	913 446	4000 100	– –
Somalia	W	500	–	–	76	500	no communication with the M.A. since late 1991				
South Africa	W	not subject to export quota system			1000	no exports of wild-taken skins and live specimens in 1992 and 1993					
Sudan (special quota)	W	0	0	0	701	8000	8000	3	7900	0	0
Tanzania,	R	4000		R/W	R/W	rancher specimens not subject to quota; population under Resolution Conf. 3.15					
United Republic	W	1100	821	279	1015	500	459	R/W 134	R/W 186	300	148
Uganda	R	not subject to an export quota			2500	(2495) <sup>3</sup>	–	–	2500	1524	

Utilization of annual export quotas for *Crocodylus* spp. and *Scleropages formosus*

Country	1991					1992				1993	
	Quota	Special reports (exports)	CITES Database		Quota	Special reports (exports)	CITES Database		Quota	Special reports (exports)x	
			Ex-ports <sup>1</sup>	Im-ports <sup>2</sup>			Ex-ports <sup>1</sup>	Im-ports <sup>2</sup>			
<b><i>Crocodylus cataphractus</i></b>											
Congo	W	600	non soumis	459	459	population transferred to Appendix I in 1992					
<b><i>Crocodylus porosus</i></b>											
Indonesia	R W stock	3000 3000 0	non soumis	R/W 1691	707 1303	7000 1500 1200	not submitted	– – –	664 177 –	7000 1500 0	not submitted
<b><i>Scleropages formosus</i></b>											
Indonesia	R/C W	0 1500	non soumis	– 402	1002 0	0 0	not submitted	– –	2 –	3000 0	not submitted

<sup>1</sup> means those reported in the annual reports submitted by exporting countries

<sup>2</sup> means those reported in the annual reports submitted by importing countries;

<sup>3</sup> the skins from the 1992 quota were exported together with those for the 1993 export quota.

– means information not available or that the country concerned has not submitted an annual report

C means skins from captive-bred animals

R means skins from ranched animals

W means skins from wild-taken animals