

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



Fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
The Hague (Netherlands), 3-15 June 2007

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENT OF APPENDICES I AND II

A. Proposal

1. Amendment of the annotation regarding the populations of *Loxodonta africana* of Botswana, Namibia and South Africa to:

a) include the following provision:

"No trade in raw or worked ivory shall be permitted for a period of 20 years except for:

1) raw ivory exported as hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes; and

2) ivory exported pursuant to the conditional sale of registered government-owned ivory stocks agreed at the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties."; and

b) remove the following provision:

"6) trade in individually marked and certified ekipas incorporated in finished jewellery for non-commercial purposes for Namibia".

2. Amendment of the annotation regarding the population of *Loxodonta africana* of Zimbabwe to read:

"For the exclusive purpose of allowing:

1) export of live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations;

2) export of hides; and

3) export of leather goods for non-commercial purposes.

All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly.

No trade in raw or worked ivory shall be permitted for a period of 20 years.

To ensure that where a) destinations for live animals are to be appropriate and acceptable and/or b) the purpose of the import is to be non-commercial, export permits and re-export certificates may be issued only after the issuing Management Authority has received, from the Management Authority of the State of import, a certification to the effect that: in case a), in analogy to Article III, paragraph 3 (b) of the Convention, the holding facility has been reviewed by the competent Scientific Authority, and the proposed recipient has been found to be suitably equipped to house and care for the animals; and/or in case b), in analogy to Article III, paragraph 3 (c), the Management Authority is satisfied that the specimens will not be used for primarily commercial purposes."

B. Proponents

Kenya and Mali

C. Supporting statement

1. Taxonomy

1.1 Class: Mammalia

1.2 Order: Proboscidae

1.3 Family: Elephantidae

1.4 Genus, species or subspecies, including author and year: *Loxodonta africana* (Blumenbach, 1797)

1.5 Scientific synonyms: None

1.6 Common names: English: African elephant

French: éléphant d'Afrique

Spanish: elefante africano

1.7 Code numbers: CITES A-115.001.002.001 ISIS 5301415001002001001

2. Overview

A significant number of large seizures of ivory illustrates that demand for ivory has increased substantially since the last meeting of the CITES Conference of the Parties (CoP13), which took place in Bangkok from 2-14 October 2004. Since then, a total of 38,130 kg and 352 tusks have been reported seized (i.e. an estimated 39,425 kg). Annex 2 Table A of the present proposal summarizes information available on these seizures at the time of writing. Clearly, many thousands of elephants are dying annually to supply the illegal ivory markets. Using an average tusk weight of 3.68 kg (Hunter et al 2004) and 1.88 tusks per elephant (Parker and Martin 1982), it is estimated that 39,425 kg represents over 5,500 elephants. Assuming (generously) that authorities seize 15% of illegal shipments of ivory, the figures indicate that approximately 19,000 elephants (or possibly more considering the need to supply the domestic markets) have been poached annually since CoP13.

There is ample evidence that legal trade in worked ivory products for domestic markets and for tourist souvenirs provides an opportunity for laundering large quantities of illegal ivory. The exemptions which allow Zimbabwe and Namibia to export ivory products for "non-commercial" purposes contribute to this illegal trade, as do uncontrolled domestic ivory markets in Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe.

It is of the utmost concern that ivory from the government owned stockpile of Zimbabwe, which was granted an exemption by CITES to trade legally in "ivory carvings", appears to have entered the illegal market in China. Regrettably, poaching, ivory trade and sport hunting all seem to be out of control in Zimbabwe. Worked ivory from Zimbabwe is finding its way into markets in neighbouring South Africa and to a lesser extent Botswana and Namibia.

It merits further concern that the strict registration and certification system promised by Namibia at CoP13 to control a trade limited to "individually marked and certified ekipas incorporated in finished jewellery" has not been implemented, and that in its absence an uncontrolled trade in all types of ekipas (mostly unmounted) from unknown and possibly illegal sources has arisen. Meanwhile, Botswana and South Africa, whose elephant populations are also listed on CITES Appendix II, have been shown to serve as important transit routes for illegal ivory shipments.

Uncontrolled markets for ivory exist in many consumer countries, including China, the largest market. Ivory prices have increased by threefold in two years in China, while in Sudan and Egypt there has been a

twofold to fourfold increase in recent years (see section 6.4). Further rises in ivory prices will continue to increase the incentive for those involved in poaching and the illegal trade in ivory. The potential importing countries for future stockpile sales, China and Japan, are both destinations for major illegal ivory shipments and their domestic controls are insufficient to prevent the laundering of illegal ivory through legal trade.

The continued existence of large volumes of “legal” ivory on the international market through further stockpile sales of raw ivory and exemptions for trade in ivory products from Namibia and Zimbabwe renders effective enforcement impossible and fuels the laundering of ivory from poached elephants through the market.

Enforcement and control measures in most range States are inadequate to prevent poaching and illegal trade. Enforcement needs already exceed capacity in most range States; the relevant law enforcement authorities will be unable to meet the increased demands on enforcement resources that will result from further trade in ivory and other elephant products.

No emergency mechanism now exists to respond to an escalation in illegal hunting as a result of legal trade as was envisaged when the elephant populations of Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe were downlisted to Appendix II in 1997 (Decision 10.1, paragraph g; Doc. SC.41.6.4 (Rev. 2)). The annotation for the Appendix II listings of the populations of Botswana, Namibia and South Africa provides for halting the pending one-off sale agreed at CoP12 “in the case of proven detrimental impacts of the trade on other elephant populations”. It has been acknowledged, however, that it is not possible to establish with certainty the causes for increased poaching or illegal trade. Moreover, in its present form, MIKE (the programme for Monitoring Illegal Killing of Elephants) cannot serve as a system to provide early warning of escalating poaching.

Continued debate among CITES Parties about re-opening trade serves to fuel further demand, which brings with it increased enforcement challenges, particularly for range States which are already faced with other management challenges such as human-elephant conflict mitigation. To allow time to bring the alarming illegal trade under control and to develop a new methodology for meeting the considerable enforcement challenges facing African and Asian elephant range States, the introduction of a 20 year moratorium on all ivory trade is proposed and amendments to the annotations for those elephant populations listed in Appendix II of CITES (Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe) are suggested accordingly. Such a moratorium will provide the time needed - free from effects of any further CITES decisions on ivory trade - to bring illegal trade under control and to determine the effects of the one-off stockpile sale agreed to conditionally at CoP12. Furthermore, it will provide an opportunity to determine and address the factors that are driving the expanding illegal market, which are currently unknown, and provide time to refine MIKE so that it can become an instrument more capable of detecting problems with poaching at an early stage.

In general, a more “holistic” approach to decision-making on ivory trade is required, taking into account potential effects on all elephant populations. The African Elephant Status Report prepared by the IUCN African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG) points out that: “Policies concerned with elephant management and trade, in particular, transcend political boundaries drawn on a map. Trading by one country, for instance, could affect poaching or smuggling in another. Any management actions which, directly or indirectly, lead to fluctuations in the price of ivory, are all factors that can ultimately affect the future of the continent’s elephant population” (Blanc et al 2003). It is, therefore, vital that CITES decisions concerning elephants should not be confined by political boundaries and that they reflect the will of the Parties to the Convention to take responsibility for the conservation of the continental and global elephant population.

3. Species characteristics

3.1 Distribution

Elephants are distributed over 37 sub-Saharan African countries, covering a range of some 5 million km² (4,929,874 km²), approximately 22% of the African continent (see data for individual range States in Annex 1 of the present proposal). Protected areas account for only 16% of their range (Blanc et al 2003); thus 84% is outside protected areas. Elephant range in Africa is fragmented and discontinuous (AfESG 2006).

Elephant ranges are poorly documented. Across the continent, up to 50% of potential elephant range has not been surveyed and only 15% is covered by systematic surveys (van Aarde and Jackson 2007 quoting Blanc et al 2003). Van Aarde and Jackson (2007) conclude that: “Clearly, we have a very poor

understanding of elephant ranges". They point out that presently, elephants do not occupy all potential range in southern Africa, and argue that, given the opportunity, additional range could be colonised by elephants since human densities are low and much of the land is relatively untransformed.

In Botswana most of the elephant range is situated in the north, spanning about 80 000km² in the wet season and concentrated along the perennial water sources of the Kwando-Linyanti-Chobe river systems on the Botswana/Namibia boundary in the dry season. The only other area where elephants occur is the Northern Tuli Block (927 km²) in eastern Botswana, bordering Zimbabwe and South Africa (Blanc et al 2003, CoP12 Doc. 12.6). In Namibia, elephants are restricted to the north of the country, where they occur in the Namib desert, the *mopane* woodlands, the semi arid Kalahari woodlands and the Okavango wetlands. 18% of the country's total area is elephant range. Populations are found in four main areas: Etosha, Kunene ("desert elephants"), Kaudom/Tsumkwe and Caprivi. It is believed that the Etosha and Kunene populations are closely related, with some interchange of elephants between them. In South Africa, the elephant range is only 2% of the country's total area and elephants are confined to protected areas and private reserves, largely in the north and east of the country, with the majority living in Kruger National Park. The Zimbabwean government reported in 2002 that elephants ranged over 29% of the total area. According to Blanc et al (2003), they are divided into four populations, largely around protected areas along the borders. Earlier surveys suggested that they should be treated as four separate populations existing in north-west Matabeleland, Sebungwe, Zambezi Valley, and Gonarezhou (Price Waterhouse 1996).

3.2 Habitat

Elephants cover a wide range of habitat. Most forest elephants live in central and western Africa's rain forests, while the savannah elephant is found throughout the grassy plains, woodlands, swamps and bush lands from sea level to high mountains. In north-western Namibia and in Mali, elephant populations even exist in desert areas.

3.3 Biological characteristics

African elephants are the largest living terrestrial mammals (shoulder height up to 330cm; weight up to 7,500 kg). Female elephants between 14 and 45 years may give birth to calves approximately every four years. Inter-birth intervals of up to 13 years may occur depending upon habitat conditions and population densities (AfESG 2006). The gestation period is 22 months on average. Under favourable conditions, elephant populations increase at an annual rate of 4-5 %. Although males reach sexual maturity at about 10 years, they reportedly cannot successfully compete for mating until the age of 20. Life expectancy is about 50-70 years. Individual home ranges vary from 15 to 3,700 square kilometres, depending on population and habitat (AfESG 2006). If food and water are available, elephants may not venture far; if not, they may make seasonal migrations of several hundred kilometres (Nowak 1991).

3.4 Morphological characteristics

Currently, two subspecies of the African elephant are recognized, the forest elephant (*Loxodonta africana cyclotis*) and the savannah elephant (*Loxodonta africana africana*). Recent genetic evidence indicates that African elephants may actually comprise three different species, the savannah elephant, the forest elephant and the west African elephant, but the issue is still being debated. The African forest elephant can be distinguished from the savannah elephant by its smaller body size, smaller ears and straighter, downward-projecting tusks (Roca et al 2001).

3.5 Role of the species in its ecosystem

Elephants play a key role in the ecology of their habitats. For example, their feeding habits open up thick bush and forest for grazing species; they also maintain waterholes and keep open forest pathways used by wildlife and humans (Carroll 1988). Elephants are also important dispersal agents for a number of tree species (Alexandre 1978).

4. Status and trends

4.1 Habitat trends

Forest elephants in central Africa are suffering serious habitat loss due to logging, along with concomitant road development and human population expansion (Blake and Hedges 2004). The MIKE survey submitted to CoP13 in 2004 (CoP13 Doc. 29.3) confirmed that forest elephant range in central Africa is

shrinking due to human pressure. Fragmentation and reduction of habitat as a result of human population growth poses a threat to elephant populations in other sub-regions as well.

Encroachment by squatters and destruction of habitat in the Gonarezhou National Park in Zimbabwe (Sharman 2001; The Zimbabwean 30 November 2006), has decreased available habitat in south eastern Zimbabwe, home to one of Zimbabwe's four discreet elephant populations (Price Waterhouse 1996), and threatens the integrity of the emerging Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park, of which Gonarezhou is a part. (See also section 4.5).

Climate change poses an additional serious threat to elephant populations in Africa. Although modelling the changes in biodiversity in response to climate change currently presents significant challenges, there is evidence that climate change will increase species loss (Gitay et al 2002). Precipitation in Africa, upon which vegetation is particularly dependent, is likely to decrease, particularly in western and southern Africa (UNEP/CMS Secretariat 2006), thus probably further decreasing elephant range in these regions. Adaptation through migration of elephant populations into other areas will in many cases not be possible because of land-use patterns or fences disrupting migratory journeys.

4.2 Population size

The known continental elephant population in 2002, the latest year for which population data on a continental basis are available in the AfESG African Elephant Status Report, was 402,067. In addition, 59,024 elephants were estimated as "probable", another 99,813 as "possible" and another 99,307 as "speculative" (Blanc et al 2003). See the table in Annex 1 of the present proposal for population data in individual range States.

4.3 Population structure

The age and social structure of many elephant populations has been upset by poaching for ivory, which in particular targets adult animals with the largest tusks, i.e., old bulls and matriarchs (Cobb and Western 1989). Both poaching and culling have been reported to result in the breakdown of social structures among the surviving members of elephant societies (Bradshaw et al 2005, Nyakaana et al 2001) and thus affect the entire herd's chances of survival. The drastic decline of some elephant populations in the past has also resulted in a reduction in the amount of genetic diversity in the surviving populations, for example in Uganda (Nyakaana and Arctander 1999).

4.4 Population trends

Although it is difficult to assess population numbers accurately, it is thought there may have been three to five million African elephants in the 1930s and 1940s. During the 1970s and 1980s, the population declined significantly. In the 1980s, an estimated 100,000 elephants were being killed each year and up to 80% of herds were lost in some regions. Most of this decline is believed to be the direct result of illegal and unsustainable off-take for trade in ivory, coupled with habitat loss due to human population pressure (WWF 2004). Currently, there is not enough information on which to base an estimate of the current trend at the continental level (AfESG 2004a). Declines, however, can clearly be inferred for certain range states on the basis of recent information:

In the west African sub-region, only 35 isolated and very small populations remain; two-thirds inhabit the forest zone and consist of 50 or fewer animals, while only ten groups consist of more than 100 elephants. The estimated densities are much lower than those reported from other regions and probably reflect heavy hunting in the past. The ivory trade has played a key role in the decline of the west African elephant and continues to pose a particular threat to the remaining endangered populations (Anon 2005a).

In central Africa, elephant populations have been decimated by heavy poaching. It is important to note in this context that central Africa accounts for 42% of the estimated continental range, but knowledge of its current population size is the most limited (AfESG 2006). Only 16,450 elephants were "known" to exist in central Africa in 2002; a large proportion of the estimated population is literally a guess (Blake and Hedges 2004). With regard to the considerable uncertainty concerning population numbers (e.g. in central Africa) scientists have called for a "precautionary approach, which treats all threats as valid without clear linkage of cause and effect. This translates into a strong emphasis on protection of remaining populations and a reduction of threats faced by these elephants, including threats from the trade in ivory" (Blake and Hedges 2004). The MIKE report presented at CoP13 described the situation with regard to central African MIKE sites as follows: "even here, in some of the best conservation conditions available, the MIKE survey

suggests forest elephant range is shrinking due to human pressure, and that poaching of elephants for ivory and bushmeat is occurring widely. Two of the most important elephant populations, as determined by the survey (in Minkebe and Dzanga National Parks of Gabon and CAR respectively), are experiencing the highest recorded levels of poaching as indicated by the presence of carcasses, compared to the other 4 sites. In Salonga [DRC] and Bangassou [CAR], elephants appear to have been reduced to very small fractions of their former abundance, while poaching still proceeds apace at these sites. Unless poaching and the factors that promote it are reduced, the future of central Africa's remaining elephants remains under real and imminent threat" (CoP13 Doc. 29.3 Annex 9).

Within southern Africa, elephant population growth rates differ; numbers fluctuate when populations are driven by local events such as droughts, outbreaks of disease and human disturbance. Some elephant populations in southern Africa have been reported to be increasing (Kruger National Park in South Africa, northern Botswana and Khaudum Game Reserve in Namibia). Others have been reported as relatively stable (Etosha National Park and the Caprivi region in Namibia, and Hwange National Park and Sebungwe in Zimbabwe) while other populations may be declining (through Zambia's national parks including Luangwa and Kafue, and Malawi's Kasungu National Park) (van Aarde and Jackson 2007). The relative stability of Zimbabwe's populations noted by van Aarde and Jackson may be in doubt given the cumulative evidence of poaching and questions over methodology (see this section below and section 5). In Namibia, the increase reported in Khaudum Game Reserve following water supplementation may have been due in part to civil unrest in Angola, resulting in elephants seeking refuge in Namibia (van Aarde and Jackson 2007), while comparison of aerial survey results between 2002 and 2004 reveal a possible decline in Etosha National Park (see Table 1 below). Elephants have been reported to be "crowding" into Botswana from neighbouring countries due to the presence of poachers along the borders (Anon 2006a).

There have been numerous reports that Zimbabwe's elephant population is increasing, with figures of up to 100,000 or more quoted from official sources in the media. In 2002, it was reported to be growing at a rate of about 2.2 % (CITES Proposal 12.10). Some even claim a growth rate of 5-7% (Child 2004). These figures are questionable, however, in light of the numerous reports of poaching in recent years (see below and Annex 4 to the present proposal). A national elephant census has not been carried out since 2001 (Foggin 2003; Anon 2006b). Since then, figures quoted have been based on extrapolation using various estimated growth rates. In 2001, the population of north-west Matabeleland, which includes Hwange National Park and is home to Zimbabwe's largest elephant population, was reported as 49,310 (Prop. 12.10). However, the methods used for aerial counting have been criticised for being "extrapolated blindly, on the basis that the same number of elephants counted close to water sources will be found away from them", as well as because the counts were not carried out in the adjoining areas or countries simultaneously leading to the possibility of double counting (Pincott 2006). Pincott, a researcher in Hwange, concludes that "The number of elephants said to currently reside in Zimbabwe, particularly the number said to inhabit Hwange, leaves me disbelieving and confused". Full moon waterhole counts have been carried out annually in the dry season in Hwange National Park by Wildlife and Environment Zimbabwe (WEZ). In particularly dry seasons (when fewer natural pans have water), numbers ranged from 17,956 to 21,021, whereas in wetter seasons (many natural pans containing water), numbers were under 10,000; in 2005, 18,883 elephants were counted (WEZ 2006). Waterhole counting has also been criticised, but, if anything, numbers would be over-estimated as a result of double counting. Pincott states: "When game counters sit for 24 hours around the most popular pumped pans and watercourses in Hwange National Park, counting elephants in the hottest driest month of October (when they will not wander far from palatable water and may indeed, I know for certain, drink multiple times during a 24 hour period resulting in many being counted more than once) the counts are always tens of thousands of elephants short of the 50,000 + touted to be in Hwange National Park". At best, it seems there is considerable uncertainty regarding the actual size of Zimbabwe's elephant population, but it is likely to be lower than the figures claimed by official sources.

The US Fish and Wildlife Service funded an aerial survey and census of Zimbabwe's elephant populations in the north-west Matabeleland, mid-Zambezi/Matusadona Highlands, Sebungwe and Gonarezhou regions during the 2006 dry season (August-October). Results, however, are not available at the time of writing. Due to the significant overlap among the elephant populations in Zimbabwe, Botswana and Namibia, it has been suggested that timing and survey methods should be coordinated among the three countries; a coordinated approach, however, has not been taken since the mid 1990s (Blanc et al 2003).

A comparison of the population data in the 2006 MIKE report and that of the last African Elephant Status Report (Blanc et al 2003) seems to indicate serious declines for a number of populations in three African subregions. Methodology and survey areas differ in some sites, which may make some data sets relatively difficult to compare. However, in the following sites where declines are indicated, both surveys apparently

used the same method and covered the same area: Boumba Bek in Cameroon, Niassa in Mozambique and Etosha National Park in Namibia. The table below lists methodologies used and areas surveyed.

Table 1: Comparison of population estimates for selected sites. The first (earlier) data set for each site originates from the African Elephant Status report (Blanc et al 2003), the second (later) set of data from the 2006 Mike report (SC54 Doc.26.2 Rev.1)

Country	Site	Year	No. elephants	Method	Area km ²	Population density (no. of elephants per sq. km)
Cameroon	Boumba Bek	1998	1,250	DC	2,500	0.50
		2004	318	DC	2,485	0.13
	Waza	1996	1,600	IG	1,700	0.94
		2002	475	GS	1,700	0.28
C.A.R.	Bangassou	1996	1,600	DC	16,600	0.10
		2004	1000	DC	12,000	0.08
	Dzanga Sangha	2002	2,977	IG	4,743	0.63
		2004	869	DC	4,347	0.20
Congo	Odzala	2000	18,222	DC	7,818	2.33
		2005	13,545	DC	13,000	1.04
D.R. Congo	Salonga	2002	12,500	IG	49,690	0.25
		2004	1,186	DC	36,000	0.03
Gabon	Lopé	2000	8,132	DC	14,360	0.57
		2005	2,350	DC	4,486	0.52
Ghana	Kakum	1997	219	GD	372	0.59
		2004	164	DC	366	0.45
Mozambique	Niassa	2002	13,061	AS	42,341	0.31
		2004	12,477	AS	42,612	0.29
Namibia	Etosha NP	2002	2,417	AS	18,464	0.13
		2004	2,057	AS	18,551	0.11
Togo	Kéran	1998	16	IG	1,636	0.01
		2003	0	AT	1,402	0

Legend:

AS: Aerial Sample count
 AT: Aerial Total Count
 DC: Line Transect Dung Count
 IG: Informed Guess
 GD: Genetic Dung Count
 GS: Ground Sample Count

It is highly likely that population decreases are even worse outside of the protected areas where 84% of African elephants are assumed to live. Since MIKE sites are mostly within protected areas, these would not be detected.

4.5 Geographic trends

The range of the African elephant once spanned the entire continent (Mauny 1956; Douglas-Hamilton 1979). "Elephants occurred in parts of northern Africa until the beginning of the current era (Scullard 1971), and are presumed to have been widespread everywhere south of the Sahara" (Blanc et.al. 2003). The total range area (known and possible) reported in the 2002 African Elephant Status Report is nearly 8% smaller than it was reported to be in 1998. It is suggested, however, that this is due to better information. It should be noted that only 35% of the total reported range is considered to be in the "known" category, whereas 65% is in the "possible" category.

The trade in ivory has contributed significantly to the contraction of the range of the species (Douglas-Hamilton 1979; AERSG 1987). Although Africa still has vast expanses of suitable elephant habitat, pressure from poaching has, in many areas, either eliminated entire elephant populations or reduced population densities to very low levels (Burrill and Douglas-Hamilton 1987). It has been documented that from about 1970 onwards hunting rather than habitat loss has been the dominant influence on elephant

population dynamics. In 1987, elephant population size was estimated to be only 8% of the carrying capacity (Milner-Gulland and Beddington 1993).

While hunting has been the primary factor in elephant population trends, habitat loss is nevertheless substantial. Increasing human populations and droughts have confined elephants to isolated pockets of national parks and reserves in west Africa. In central Africa, thousands of square kilometres of lowland rainforest contain suitable elephant habitat; the range, however, is increasingly being fragmented due to habitat loss. In eastern Africa, loss of habitat due to human activity is one factor contributing to the decline, extermination and compression of elephant populations. In southern Africa, elephant habitat is highly fragmented by human activities. Locally high numbers have resulted from water supplementation, fencing and the reduction and fragmentation of landscapes (van Aarde and Jackson 2007).

Botswana: In their northern range elephant populations are expanding westwards into former range areas in the Okavango Delta. The largest concentration of elephants during the dry season is found along the Kwando-Linyati-Chobe river system, which follows the border with Namibia. Cross-border elephant movement occurs in the northern range into Namibia, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Angola during the dry season. Other dry season elephant concentrations occur along the Zimbabwean border in the east and movement between the Botswana and Zimbabwe populations occurs. Other elephant concentrations occur on the western side of the Okavango Delta and Northern Tuli Block. Elephant movement occurs from Botswana's Tuli Block into Zimbabwe and South Africa.

Namibia: Namibia's proposal for CoP13 stated that elephants were expanding into previously unused or rarely used parts of the Kunene region (CoP13 Prop. 7). These elephants, however, are now coming into conflict with farmers and it is unknown how many may have been killed (Reeve and Pope 2006). The creation of artificial water holes in the mid 1950s and the complete fencing of Etosha in 1973 have served to partially confine and artificially concentrate the population. The elephant population in Etosha, estimated at 2,057 in 2004 (see above), used to migrate to Botswana and Zimbabwe. Elephants were just temporary visitors to Etosha in the rainy season; one or two herds totalling up to 50 elephants used to come in from the north-east (Reeve and Pope 2006).

Namibia's proposal for CoP11 stated that "increasing numbers of elephants will be established on game ranches and commercial conservancies in future" (Prop. 11.22). This statement is omitted from subsequent proposals (Prop. 12.7 and CoP13 Prop. 7) presumably because the scheme proved unsuccessful.

South Africa: Elephants are confined largely to fenced protected areas and private reserves in 2% of the country's total range. An increasing proportion of the South African elephant population is now found in isolated private reserves scattered around the country, which are too small to sustain viable populations (Blanc et al 2003). In Kruger National Park, culling led to the movement of elephants from other areas into areas where culling was conducted, increasing numbers, which may have intensified the local impact of elephants (van Aarde et al 1999). The ongoing creation of transfrontier parks and conservation areas could lead to the expansion of elephant ranges in the future, but efforts are partly being frustrated by the deteriorating situation in Zimbabwe (see below).

Zimbabwe: As noted in section 4.1, human encroachment has been reported in Gonarezhou National Park (Blanc et al 2003, Gratwicke and Stapelkamp 2006, The Zimbabwean 30 November 2006). Settlers are claiming historical rights to about 11,000 ha of Gonarezhou (Gratwicke and Stapelkamp 2006). Emerging transfrontier parks have great potential to increase the range available to elephants. It was recently reported by The Zimbabwean, however, that multilateral agencies and conservation groups are refusing to fund the Zimbabwean component of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park, planned to unite wildlife areas in South Africa, Mozambique and Zimbabwe (The Zimbabwean 30 November 2006). The article cites a "surge in wildlife poaching" and the partial invasion by illegal squatters of Gonarezhou National Park, which was planned to be part of the new transfrontier park. Meanwhile, there have been numerous other reports of encroachment into conservancies and destruction of trees for firewood (e.g. Sharman 2001; Baldus and Child 2006, Reuters 18 October 2006). In a review of land use in Zimbabwe, McHugh et al (2006) state that "[w]ildlife is threatened by the destruction of natural habitats associated with human encroachment". In October 2006, Reuters reported conservationists as saying that "land seizures have seen some villagers settling in or near wildlife parks and involved in subsistence poaching while also giving cover to cross-border poachers" (Reuters 18 October 2006).

5. Threats

Ivory Trade

The illegal ivory trade has long been acknowledged as a major threat to elephant populations in Africa and Asia. ETIS data and other sources confirm that illegal ivory trade has clearly been increasing in the last decade. Recent seizures are some of the biggest since the ivory trade was banned in 1989. See more details in section 6.4 and a table with major seizures since CoP13 in Annex 2, Table A to the present proposal.

Poaching

The number of large seizures since CoP13 and the continued presence of active and, in some cases, expanding domestic ivory markets, indicate that large numbers of elephants are being poached to fuel the ivory trade. As pointed out in section 2, 38,130 kg of ivory and 352 tusks (i.e. an estimated total of 39,425 kg) are reported to have been seized between October 2004 and August 2006 (noting that further verification is merited as to whether the 7 tonnes reported to be in illegal trade in Zimbabwe in May 2006 has been seized). Using an average tusk weight of 3.68 kg (Hunter et al 2004) and 1.88 tusks per elephant (Parker and Martin 1982), these seizures equate to 5,699 dead elephants. If enforcement authorities seize 15% of contraband (a generous estimate) this means that almost 263 tonnes of ivory were in trade, equating to 37,990 dead elephants, in two years. (Note that this estimate does not include elephants killed to supply domestic markets.) It is therefore estimated that approximately 19,000 elephants (or possibly more considering the need to supply the substantial domestic markets) have been poached annually since CoP13. An earlier estimate by Hunter et al (2004) concluded that between 4,000 and 12,000 elephants were being poached annually at that time. These figures suggest, therefore, that there has been a twofold to fivefold increase in poaching since CoP13.

As pointed out in section 4.4, large numbers of elephants are being poached in central Africa.

In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), heavy poaching for ivory is reported to be the main direct threat to elephants in Salonga National Park, where elephant populations have been reduced to a small fraction of their former abundance. The elephant population in Salonga and its surroundings was estimated at 12,500 in 2002 (Blanc et al 2003), compared with 8,330 individuals counted inside the park in 1992 (WCS 2006). In 2004, a MIKE survey counted only 1,186 elephants (SC54 Doc.26.2 Rev.1 2006), suggestive of a total park population in the order of 1,825 elephants and a decrease of 78% compared with 1992 (WCS 2006). With an area of 36,000 km², Salonga is Africa's largest rainforest national park. The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) recently located 87 hunting camps, 39 of which were positively identified as elephant poaching camps, and large numbers of semi-automatic weapons, with 18 AK47's in a single camp in the southern sector of the national park. More than 200 snare lines were also found. It should be noted that Salonga National Park is described as one of the last strongholds of the species in DRC (WCS 2006). A recent study in Kahuzi Biega National Park concludes that "[e]lephants in Kahuzi Biega National Park are facing a severe unprecedented crisis" and that the "situation calls for immediate action to find and control the causes to save some of the local wildlife populations from extinction" (Mubalama and Bashige 2006). Alarming levels of poaching for ivory and meat is also reported in Virunga and Garamba National Park and Okapi Fauna Reserve (UNESCO 2005). In Garamba alone, nearly 250 elephants have been reported poached in 2006 according to figures issued by park wardens at Nagero during an information visit by the UN Mission in DRC. Poachers were reported to be both DRC nationals and foreigners (report by UN-sponsored Radio Okapi 7 December 2006). In some Congo basin forests it is estimated that 10% of the elephant population is poached annually. It is feared that as a consequence of recent CITES decisions the level of illegal killing will increase even further and tusks will be smuggled to countries where sales are legal. As censuses of forest elephants are difficult to conduct due to their dense habitat, very few populations are being monitored and extensive poaching could occur without detection (Elephant Listening Project 2006).

A recent report from Chad documented widespread and uncontrolled poaching in and around Zakouma National Park, with hundreds of elephants reported to have been killed in one year. Surveys counted 3,885 elephants in 2005 and only 3,020 in 2006 (National Geographic News 30 August 2006). Meanwhile, an aerial survey conducted in July 2006 in Yankari National Reserve in north-east Nigeria found 348

elephants, a slow growth rate (0.53%) and a high carcass ratio of 3.73%, giving cause for concern, particularly considering that this could be the only viable population of elephants left in Nigeria; four elephants are known to have been poached for their ivory in Yankari since January 2006 (Omondi et al 2006a). Even more alarming were the findings of an aerial survey conducted around the same time in Nigeria's Sambisa Game Reserve. No elephant was sighted during the census; illegal killing of elephants has apparently been active within the past three years with an estimated 5 elephants killed a week. Poachers were reported to originate from neighbouring states including Niger, Cameroon and Chad (Omondi et al 2006b).

Poaching is also a serious threat in other sub-regions. At a symposium on elephant conservation in Accra, Ghana in August 2006 (Anon 2006c), participants from wildlife authorities reported that poaching was the main cause of decline for elephants in CAR, Cameroon and Ethiopia and a serious threat in Niokolo Koba National Park in Senegal, as well as in Benin and Niger. Organised poaching syndicates also pose a challenge in Malawi. In Liberia, with the end of the civil war, poachers were reported to have returned to the bush. Poaching was confirmed to be a problem in Kakoum and Mole national parks in Ghana.

There have been reports of poaching in Tanzania and large shipments of ivory leaving the country. In 2002, eye witnesses were reported to have described "heavy poaching" in Game Reserves, particularly the Selous, Kisigo and Rungwa Game Reserves (Environmental Investigation Agency 2002). In July 2006, more than five tonnes of ivory shipped from Dar es Salaam was seized in two shipments in Taiwan (Annex 2 Table A). Almost two tonnes of ivory seized in Hong Kong arrived by ship from Tanzania in October 2003, while 3.2 tonnes were recovered in Dar es Salaam in January 2002 (Annex 2 Table B). The Lusaka Agreement Task Force (LATF) reports 8 seizures of ivory believed to have originated in Tanzania between January and September 2006; in the same period, LATF reports 4 seizures of ivory originating in Uganda (Annex 2 Table B).

In Kenya, despite an elaborate enforcement network in place, a total of 212 elephants have been confirmed poached to obtain their ivory since CoP13: 91 in 2004, 68 in 2005, and 53 from January to November 2006. Between January 2004 and November 2006, a total of 2,180.65kg of ivory and 55 pieces have been seized in Kenya. In 2006 alone, up to September there were 54 seizures of ivory totalling 907.1 kg and 18 pieces (Annex 2 Table C). The extent of poaching and illegal trade experienced by Kenya reflects the high demand for ivory on the illegal market.

Zambian elephants have come under heavy pressure from poaching. Six tonnes of ivory seized in the Philippines in January 2006 are believed to have come from Zambia. The country has also been confirmed as the source of 6.5 tonnes of ivory that were shipped from South Africa and seized in Singapore in 2002. The same route has allegedly been used 19 times before, involving 123.5 tonnes of ivory between 1994 and 2002, possibly also originating from Zambia (Manning 2006). The report of the CITES Panel of experts reviewing the situation in Zambia with regard to its elephant proposal and submitted to CoP12 in 2002 concluded that poaching accounted for up to about 800 animals a year at that time. In the Kafue region, the population had rapidly declined from about 10,200 elephants in 1991 to about 5,200 elephants in 1997, with a further but slower decline to fewer than 4,000 elephants in 2001. Furthermore, the survival of elephant populations in several areas in the country was reported in 2002 to be threatened. The elephants of West Lunga National Park in the north-west, those in Nsumbu National Park in the north, and those in Sioma Ngwezi National Park in the south-west all continue to be targets of cross-border incursions from neighbouring countries; owing to their remote location, there is little or no presence of the Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) in these areas (CITES CoP12 Doc.66 Annex 4). According to data from LATF, there have been 18 seizures of ivory originating from Zambia in 2006 (Annex 2 Table B).

In Botswana's only MIKE site, Chobe National Park, the numbers of carcasses found have increased since 2003 (SC54 Doc.26.2 Rev.1). From 2000-2002, carcass counts are low or 0, but from 2003 they increase significantly. The numbers reported as illegally killed increase from 2004 onwards though are still relatively low. However, no information has been given as to how it was determined whether elephants were killed illegally or died from other causes or whether the MIKE site extends beyond the boundary of the park as with the east African sites. There could be more illegal killing of elephants outside the boundaries of the park. Considering the large elephant population in Botswana, even with deaths resulting from natural attritions the mortality figures are low.

Table 2. Total carcass counts by site and year for Botswana, Chobe National park
(From MIKE baseline information SC54 Doc.26.2 Rev. 1, 2006)

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
No. carcasses counted	5	18	0	59	73	153	82
No. of illegally killed carcasses found	0	0	0	0	5	7	6
No. of months that these totals are based on	5	12	12	12	12	12	8

According to the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) in Botswana, the number of elephants killed for ivory (mainly poaching in areas along the Botswana/Zimbabwe border) between 2000 and 2005 range between 2 and 42 elephants per annum with the highest number poached in 2001 (Botswana Press Agency 2006). Since none were reported illegally killed in the MIKE site, Chobe National Park, in 2001, presumably this mortality reflects poaching outside protected areas. (See Annex 5 of this proposal for other reports of poaching).

In relation to Namibia, data from the Caprivi Conservancy were only available at SC54 for 18 months in 2003 and 2004, reporting 2 illegally killed out of 18 carcasses found. In Etosha National Park, 2 out of 80 carcasses counted between 2000 and 2004 were reported as illegally killed (SC54 Doc.26.2 Rev.1). In its proposal to CoP13, Namibia reported a total of 83 elephants killed illegally between 1990 and 2003 (CoP13 Prop. 7 Annex 1) and stated that “incidents of illegal hunting of elephants in Namibia include cases of illegal shooting before or after elephants have damaged or have threatened to damage crops and farms, and where no attempt is made to collect the ivory”. It acknowledges, however, that it is “very difficult to separate illegal hunting with the intent to collect ivory from all hunting incidents, and illegal hunting is notoriously difficult to monitor.” (CoP13 Prop. 7). It is further stated in Namibia’s 2004 proposal that “[n]o elephant has been hunted illegally within Etosha N.P. for over two decades” (CoP13 Prop. 7). However, this information conflicts with the above data presented by MIKE in 2006 and is hard to reconcile with information in section 8.3.2 concerning the lack of capacity with respect to anti-poaching and monitoring in Etosha. Moreover, implementation of the MIKE programme in Namibia has apparently been frustrated by lack of patrolling and submission of forms (Reeve and Pope 2006).

In South Africa’s MIKE site, Kruger National Park, data are only available for 15 months between 2005 and 2006. That data indicates that none of the 62 carcasses reported was killed illegally. However, there are unconfirmed reports that there may be some limited poaching occurring in and around Kruger (Anon 2006a). In this context, it is of concern to note that rhino poaching appears to be increasing in South Africa. 18 rhino have been reported to have been poached in the country in 2006, 15 from Kruger alone; rhino poachers are reportedly active in the south of Kruger; they are also reported to come from Mozambique near the Olifants area, and are apparently present in the north near the borders with Zimbabwe and Mozambique (Anon 2006a).

For Zimbabwe, MIKE data were only available from 2000-2004. In Nyami Nyami, 19 out of 33 carcasses found (i.e. 58%) were reported to have been killed illegally within 35 months. In Chewore, 23 carcasses were found in 27 months, none reportedly killed illegally. However, several reports indicate that there has been widespread poaching in Zimbabwe (Anon 2006b, Baldus and Child 2006, Gratwicke and Stapelkamp 2006). Baldus and Child (2006) state: “The land redistribution exercise encouraged widespread poaching, which extended to the military and the Parks Authority itself. Law enforcement agencies often refused to take action against it, on the spurious pretext that the offences were a political act and thus outside their jurisdiction. Objective data as to the extent of the countrywide poaching is difficult to assemble, but knowledgeable observers believe 60 to 80% of the wildlife outside the Parks and Wildlife Estate has been slaughtered, with the situation in some parts of the country worse than in others. Additionally, there has been serious poaching in the Estate and the Party paid destitute people to destroy habitats on many farms through the wanton felling of woodland and its destruction with fire.”

Gratwicke and Stapelkamp (2006) state that: “Wildlife on most of the privately owned conservancies and game farms in the dryer areas of the country have been severely poached by a variety of people exploiting the break down of the rule of law”. They describe three major types of poaching in Zimbabwe: *Subsistence*, *Sport*, and *Commercial*. *Subsistence poaching*, they say, has arisen from a combination of poverty, lack of food, and the disintegrating economy and rule of law; many independent news reports affirm that thousands of rural people cut through wire fences on conservancies and commercial farms, then use this wire to make snares to catch wild animals for food, both on private land and in the bush. *Illegal sport hunters*, they state, most of which are visitors from South Africa, smuggle trophies into South Africa for commercial trade (see section 6.1), while *commercial poaching outfits* usually

operate for profit in the form of bush meat and/or trophies. Such outfits tend to be politically connected and therefore are allowed access to once-protected areas. They describe “occasional reports of “self-pillaging” by the government, including the worrying development that uniformed officials from the government and military are poaching animals in parks and on conservancies”, and cite incidents of poaching in national park areas and across national borders as indicating a break down in the rule of law and a reduction in the quality of management of core protected areas that would normally be a potential conservation safety net. “Accurate monitoring of the poachers’ toll is impossible”, they say. “Wildlife researchers and law enforcement are now barred from going into many former game farms and safari concessions, making any systematic appraisal impossible under the current regime. These areas often border National parks and it is likely that they represent wildlife sinks for animals that move beyond National Park boundaries.” (Gratwicke and Stapelkamp 2006).

African Indaba (2004) also reports official and military poaching: “The saga goes on with the Army and the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management [DNPWM] being accused of poaching activities in the country's conservancies. J. Rodrigues (ZCTF) told the Zimbabwe Independent that “it's a fact that the army is heavily involved in poaching in the Kariba/Chirara game area”. (African Indaba 2004). (Note that the DNPWM is now the Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority, ZPWMA.) An August 2005 report alleges army involvement around Chizarira National Park in transporting ivory (Karimkwenda 2005; see section 6.4). Another report quotes a “highly credible source” as saying that elephant poaching is a “major problem” involving government agencies and high-level corruption (Anon 2006b). Yet another report, in October 2006, states that a deputy government minister is under investigation for alleged poaching in the Gonarezhou National Park and Save Valley conservancies. Black rhino and other endangered species had been found dead from poaching over the previous two months in sanctuaries amid reports that senior army and police officials were behind the illegal hunting activities. (Zim Online 2006).

It is also believed that hunting for rations is out of control in Zimbabwe. In 2005, the Zimbabwe Conservation Task Force (ZCTF) revealed that Operation Nyama had taken place throughout 2004 in Hwange National Park. Its stated aim was to “provide meat for the people”, yet according to ZCTF “most of the elephant bulls that were, and still are being shot, have 60 to 70 pound tusks and are in their prime. Older bulls with broken tusks are not being targeted. We have had several complaints from tourists.” (ZCTF 2005; see also Munnion 2005). Dr Mtsambiwa, Director of ZPWMA, admitted that 186 elephants had been shot for rations in 2004, but said it was to provide “drought relief” for nine rural districts countrywide (Zimbabwe Daily Mirror 2005). In a recent report, three sources interviewed in Zimbabwe are reported as saying that hunting for rations is out of control, while according to a professional hunter “ivory is coming from the meat rations” (Anon 2006b). The report (Anon 2006b) also describes poaching of elephants in the Zambezi Valley by Zambians.

In 2000, the Secretariat reported increased poaching in Zimbabwe in late 1999 and 2000, shortly after the sale of ivory stockpiles to Japan in June 1999 (Doc. 11.31.1). After a visit in February 2000 to investigate, the Secretariat reported to CoP11 that elephant poaching had continued on a relatively regular basis, especially in the area of the Zambezi valley. They concluded that: “While the Secretariat remains concerned that the number of elephants killed illegally in Zimbabwe increased in 1999, it could find no evidence to link recent poaching events there with Zimbabwe’s legal trade in ivory and elephant products. Neither could it find any reason to establish a link between the illegal killing that is taking place and the decisions of the 10th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.” However, given that the Secretariat’s evidence seems restricted to that provided by the then DNPWM, this conclusion may not be entirely objective.

The table in Annex 4 of the present proposal contains 36 reports of elephant poaching and illegal ivory trade in or involving Zimbabwe (22 of them since CoP13). This likely represents just a part of the true picture. Most recently, in October 2006, Reuters reported the killing of 11 elephants in Chizarira National Park in central Zimbabwe. A ZPWMA spokesman blamed the incidents on human encroachment into wildlife sanctuaries, telling the state Herald newspaper that “Chizarira is a problematic spot because of the border and the communities encroaching into wildlife areas”. The elephants were apparently part of the “presidential herd” which President Robert Mugabe had undertaken to protect in 1991 from hunters and poachers (Annex 4 case 1). Two cases in August 2005 were linked with poaching in CAMPFIRE areas: Gokwe District (Annex 4 case 17) and Mafiro village in Guruve (Annex 4 case 18). Gratwicke and Stapelkamp (2006) warn that: “If CAMPFIRE’s market for wildlife through hunting and tourism is not maintained and cultivated, then there is the risk that the cost-benefit scales will tip against the wildlife. A recent report serves to illustrate this point, as locals in Guruve are cashing in on their elephants to sell the ivory on the black market.” The withdrawal of USAID and other support agencies in 2002 had profound repercussions on CAMPFIRE. “Suspension of donor funding crippled the capacity building program with

the result that the communities are unable to initiate and carry out programme activities as before” (Chizarura 2006).

Reports of poaching of endangered Asian elephant populations, whilst often concerning smaller numbers than in Africa, are no less important. For example, reports indicate that poaching is threatening to cause local extinction of Vietnam’s elephant population in the near future (Vietnam News 2006). In November 2006, a surge in poaching was reported in the State of Orissa in India; 40 elephants had been found dead since April 2006, compared with 9 found dead in 2005 (Chauhan 2006).

Other threats

Other threats to elephants include hunting for meat, habitat loss e.g. through increasing encroachment of human settlements (see section 4.5 regarding Zimbabwe), civil strife and war and human-elephant conflict. In the Caprivi region of Namibia and northern Botswana, anthrax also presents a threat. In October 2006, The Namibian reported the deaths from anthrax of about 32 wild animals, including 10 elephants, in the Caprivi Region since the end of September 2006. It was believed that the anthrax, whose spores can remain in the soil for decades, had spread to Namibia from Botswana through animals moving between the two countries; about 170 wild animals were reported to have died of anthrax in Chobe National Park (The Namibian 24 October 2006). Elephants in Etosha National Park are also at risk from anthrax. Following a severe drought in 1981, an anthrax epidemic killed probably more than 200 elephants (Berry 1982a). Subsequently there was "a relatively low incidence of sporadic cases, and distinct, localized outbreaks" (Lindeque, P.M. 1991). "The relative importance of mortality factors was determined from carcase [sic] records, and anthrax proved to be the single most important cause of death in all [elephant] age groups except calves where predation by lions was more important" (Lindeque, M.1988). Prior to this period, management activities in Etosha, such as the creation of gravel pits for road-building, the supply of water by artificial means, and the lack of rotation of these artificial water points, had served to spread and intensify the incidence of anthrax (Ebedes 1977, Berry 1981, 1982b, 1997). A second anthrax epidemic remains a risk in Etosha. Given the lack of a management plan for the park and capacity problems in Etosha and the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) as a whole (Berry 2005; section 8.3.2) it is questionable whether an outbreak could be contained.

There are also concerns that uncontrolled tourism may present a threat to the Kunene ‘desert’ elephants in Namibia (Reeve and Pope 2006).

6. Utilization and trade

6.1 National utilization

Elephants are utilised in a variety of ways in Africa: ivory, skin and hair are made into a variety of products; elephant meat is consumed in parts of west, central and southern Africa; elephants are hunted for sport; and live elephants are caught for entertainment purposes.

While Botswana has no legal domestic ivory market (except for allowing one-off transfers of ownership), Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe permit domestic sales of ivory. However, control of these markets is reported to be a problem in all three countries (see section 6.4 below).

All four countries have legalized sport hunting of elephants. In Zimbabwe’s 2002 proposal to CITES, it was stated that recreational ‘sport hunting’ was the principle form of utilization of elephants in Zimbabwe (see section 6.2 for export figures). At the time, the national export quota was 400 trophy hunted animals per annum (Prop. 12.10). The quota for 2006 is 500 animals (1,000 tusks), the highest quota submitted by any range State (CITES list of national export quotas for 2006). Problems are reported to exist with control of the industry. In a system that has been described as “self regulatory”, although ZPWMA has to formally approve quotas, new landowners are reportedly asking for high hunting quotas having determined their own sustainable off-take (Anon 2006b). A March 2004 press statement by ZCTF described how some new farmers in Matabeleland North had been given quotas of up to 55 elephants: “this amounts to one safari operator being allowed to shoot 2 bull elephants per week all the way through the hunting season. The experts feel that this practice of allocating 55 elephants to a single operator is nothing more than an unethical cull disguised as a hunt.”

Problems with unsustainable utilization and quota setting in Zimbabwe are confirmed by a recent parliamentary report. In April 2006, the state newspaper The Herald detailed a newly tabled report by the

Portfolio Committee on Public Accounts. Tabling the report, the committee chairman, Ms Misihairabwi-Mushonga said that the operations of the ZPWMA in conserving wildlife “were fraught with insufficient research conducted into wildlife dynamics as evidenced by the unsustainable utilisation of wildlife.” She is quoted as saying: “This was glaring in the authority's failure to carry out research before allocating and utilising quotas. The authority was allocating quotas to private landowners, rural district councils and other authorities without conducting the necessary research into wildlife population dynamics.” (The Herald 8 April 2006). The hunting quota in the Matetsi area of Zimbabwe is reported to be higher than in the directly neighbouring Chobe district in Botswana; at the same time, elephant density in Matetsi is reported to be lower than in Chobe (Anon 2006a).

Baldus and Child (2006) report in African Indaba, the newsletter of the African Chapter of Safari Club International; that “[t]here is reliable information that many hunting blocks have been taken over by political cronies of the party and government and that they exploit these areas in cooperation with unscrupulous operators and professional hunters unsustainably.” According to Gratwicke and Stapelkamp (2006), there are several reports indicating that South African based safari-hunting operations are bringing clients in to shoot trophies in unregulated situations such as game farms from which previous owners have been evicted. Moreover, evidence indicates an inability to control the illegal activities of hunting operators in Zimbabwe (see section 6.4).

In Namibia's 2004 proposal to CITES, it is stated that “Namibia has not exploited elephants directly for commercial trade or domestic consumption, except through sport hunting and photo-tourism” (CoP13 Prop.7). Namibia's export quota for 2006 is 180 tusks as hunting trophies from 90 animals (CITES list of national export quotas for 2006); this is up from 150 in 2002 and a relatively high number considering the AfESG estimates the total national population at between 7,700 and 11,500 animals (See Annex 1) and that trophy hunters target a small proportion of the population, i.e. older bulls. Sport hunting is the main form of utilization in Botswana where the annual export quota for 2006 is 540 “tusks and other hunting trophies from 270 animals” (CITES list of national export quotas for 2006). It has increased twice since 2000 when the quota was 360 (180 elephants). Elephant hunting occurs in most provinces in South Africa. The annual national export quota for 2006 is 100 elephants i.e. 200 tusks (CITES list of national export quotas for 2006); this compares with 43 elephants (86 tusks) in 2000.

Products made from elephant hair are sold in Namibia, seemingly as a bi-product of trophy hunting (e.g. elephant hair is used to make jewellery) (Reeve and Pope 2006). Zimbabwe's proposal to CoP12 (Prop. 12.10) reported that hide is recovered from animals mainly shot for problem animal control (PAC) as well as on legal hunting operations, or killed for other management reasons such as “mercy killing or killing in self-defence”. As of 2002, there was reported to be 30 tonnes of elephant hide in the central store (see section 6.2 for trade data). In South Africa, the hides from hunted PAC elephants can be sold (see section 6.2). In 2002, it was reported that “Botswana presently does not recover elephant hide from elephant killed in protection of property due to lack of storage”; it has been reported there is now a small legal trade in hides, mainly to Zimbabwe (Anon 2006a).

6.2 Legal trade

Populations of African elephants in Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe are currently listed on CITES Appendix II. There are two annotations limiting trade in elephants and their products from these populations (see Annex 3 of this proposal for the full text of the annotations). Zimbabwe is allowed to export ivory carvings, leather goods and hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes as well as hides and live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations. With regard to ivory, Namibia is allowed to trade in “individually marked and certified ekipas incorporated in finished jewellery for non-commercial purposes”. After elephant populations in Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe were downlisted to Appendix II in 1997 and a one-off sale approved, 50 tonnes of ivory were exported from government-owned stockpiles to Japan in 1999. In 2002, Botswana, Namibia and South Africa were given conditional approval to export a single shipment (up to 60 tonnes) of “registered government-owned stocks, originating in the State (excluding seized ivory and ivory of unknown origin)” and “only to trading partners that have been verified by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Standing Committee, to have sufficient national legislation and domestic trade controls to ensure that the imported ivory will not be re-exported and will be managed in accordance with all requirements of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) concerning domestic manufacturing and trade” and “not before the Secretariat has verified the prospective importing countries, and the MIKE programme has reported to the Secretariat on the baseline information”. This one-off sale has not yet taken place; it was decided at SC54 in October 2006 that the conditions had not been met, in particular the completion of baseline information by the MIKE programme. All other populations of African elephants are on Appendix I as are all populations of Asian elephants and thus subject to a ban on international trade in elephant products for primarily commercial purposes.

Namibia is only allowed to export “individually marked and certified ekipas incorporated in finished jewellery for non-commercial purposes”. In its proposal to CoP13, Namibia stated: “[a] minimum size will be prescribed for all items to be exported to facilitate a permanent marking system that will consist of a unique code and number engraved on the reverse side of all items. A certificate containing the same number will be issued, for each specimen, complying also with the requirements of CITES Appendix II export permits” (CoP13 Prop. 7). Two years later this system has not been implemented (see section 6.4). It should be noted further that “ekipas” are neither a defined nor a recognized wildlife product. No limitations exist with regard to the size and weight of ivory per individual ekipa or with regard to the total amount or weight of ivory ekipas that Namibia can export or that a buyer can export for non-commercial purposes.

No limitations exist either for Zimbabwe’s exports of ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes. By 2002, there were signs that the carving industry had grown despite the decline in tourism. Between 1997, when Zimbabwe’s exemption for exports of ivory carvings was approved by CITES, and 2002, the number of registered carvers in Zimbabwe increased from 40 to 65 (Prop. 12.10). Until July 2006, Zimbabwe’s ZPWMA sold ivory to local registered dealers with the proviso that any subsequent carved items were sold on a non-commercial basis. It has been reported that the dealers were limited to single lots not exceeding US\$500 in value, however the ivory was sold at very low wholesale prices (thus it would seem that large quantities could be purchased within this US\$500 limit), and further allegedly the dealers would arrive at the government store every Wednesday and buy their entitled lot (thus it would seem that over a few weeks one dealer could therefore accumulate very large quantities of ivory) (Anon 2006b). In August 2005, The Herald reported that ZPWMA had suspended sales of ivory to registered dealers, stating there was a need to monitor the “destiny of 430 tusks sold in May and June 2005 and to put in place “stringent monitoring measures” (The Herald 2 August 2005). The suspension happened a month after the arrest of Chinese nationals for attempting to smuggle 72 tusks, including 10 from the government store (see section 6.4). It is unknown when this suspension was lifted but sales appear to have resumed; an auction was apparently held in February 2006 where ivory was purchased for US\$10 per kg (Anon 2006b). In April 2006, it was reported that an Ivory Dealers Association had been formed to “help curb illegal trade in raw ivory in the country” (Newsnet 18 April 2006). But three months later, ivory sales were again reported as suspended (Association of Zimbabwe Journalists 24 July 2006). The article refers to corruption in the trade, the cheap price of ivory from ZPWMA, and the need for a monitoring system to control the domestic market. A committee had reportedly been established between ZPWMA and dealers to draft regulatory guidelines but as of August 2006 it was “still to meet” (The Herald 22 August 2006).

In September / October 2006, plenty of worked ivory for sale to tourists was observed in Zimbabwe despite the suspension of sales from the government store. A noticeable proportion of the carvings on sale were geared towards the Asian market; in Victoria Falls, which is visited by Chinese, Taiwanese and Japanese tourists, a showroom dedicated almost entirely to ivory carvings – including Asian-style statues and hanko blanks - was being constructed by Funo Arts (Pvt.) Ltd, whose proprietor is Chinese (Anon 2006b). CITES export permits are required for tourist souvenirs, but do not always seem to be provided by craft shops (Anon 2006b). (See section 6.4 for more on the illegal domestic market).

An analysis of trade from Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe using data from the UNEP-WCMC database from 1997 to 2005 reveals either that ivory trade has occurred in breach of CITES or misreporting is occurring on a regular basis.

Trade in ivory tusks:

The following one off-sales of registered raw ivory to Japan in 1999 are recorded in the CITES trade database: Botswana: 17,170.5 kg, Namibia: 12,366.4 kg and Zimbabwe: 19,916 kg.

Besides these stockpile sales the existing CITES annotations limit exports of tusks to hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes. However, the CITES trade database (UNEP/WCMC 2006) records that, in addition to exports of tusks for hunting trophies (source code H) and personal purposes (source code P), all four countries have exported tusks from wild elephants for commercial trade purposes (source code T). This is either due to incorrect reporting or it constitutes a breach of CITES. In this context it is worth noting that, for Zimbabwe and South Africa, export of tusks for commercial trade has been reported by *both* exporting *and* importing countries and that Zimbabwe issued a large number of permits for trade purposes. In the case of all four countries, permits were recorded to have been issued under the conditions for specimens listed in Appendix I as well as those listed in Appendix II for various trade purposes. This either constitutes a further breach of CITES or it may illustrate confusion among Parties with regard to the trade requirements applying for the four African elephant populations listed in Appendix II. The recorded number of transactions and the total amount reported exported by Zimbabwe for

commercial purposes from 1997-2005 are particularly significant (1,878 tusks and 6,965 kg). They include shipments with up to 2,954 kg or up to 175 individual tusks. Table 3 provides an overview of the trade figures between 1997 and 2005 reported by importing *and* exporting countries (in brackets) as these figures vary considerably between the two sources of reports.

Table 3. Trade in ivory tusks¹ from Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe, 1997–2005 as reported by importing and (in brackets) exporting country (UNEP/WCMC 2006)

	Import Purpose				Total
	Hunting Trophies	Personal Purposes	Commercial Trade	None/Others ²	
Botswana	623 (1,445)	22 (-)	13 + 45 kg (-)	16 (-)	674 + 45kg (1445)
Namibia	285 (493)	54 + 27.9kg (17)	6 (-)	4 (-)	349 + 27.9kg (510)
South Africa	197 (752)	63 (274)	4 ³ (3)	9 (2)	273 (1031)
Zimbabwe	1,120 + 27.8kg (325)	166 (-)	24 (1,878+ 6,965.26kg)	3 (7,407 kg)	1,390⁴ + 27. 8kg (2,295+14,372.26kg)

¹ One off sales of raw ivory to Japan in 1999 and tusks originating from seizures (source code I) and pre-convention specimens (source code O) have been excluded. Most tusks were recorded to originate from the wild; for some no source was given.

² South Africa reported export of 2 tusks for Educational purposes (Source E); in all other cases no purpose was recorded.

³ These four tusks are recorded to be originating from Botswana.

⁴ Including 3 “pairs” of tusks for personal use and 2 for hunting. Each “pair” has been counted 2 tusks.

Trade in ivory carvings and pieces:

Table 4 summarizes trade in ivory carvings and pieces from Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe between 1997 and 2005. Sources of exported specimens were reported to be from the wild, pre-convention specimens or from seizures. Although trade was mostly reported to be for personal purposes, import and export figures show that several transactions from South Africa and Zimbabwe were for commercial trade purposes, including ivory from wild sources. Zimbabwe reported to have exported 2,427 ivory carvings and 32 pieces for commercial purposes while South Africa reported to have exported 163 carvings and 17 pieces for commercial purposes. However, the existing annotations explicitly limit trade in ivory products from the four elephant populations in Appendix II to non-commercial trade in ivory carvings from Zimbabwe (starting from 1997) and individually marked and certified ekipas incorporated in finished jewellery from Namibia (starting from 2005); “all other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly”. In many cases and involving all four countries, permits were recorded to have been issued under the conditions for specimens listed in Appendix II, including for wild specimens. Permitting any trade in ivory for commercial purposes (outside the 1999 stockpile sales) and permitting non-commercial trade under Appendix II requirements (other than under the above-mentioned exemptions for Zimbabwe and Namibia) contravenes CITES.

In addition, several transactions reportedly occurring for personal purposes were of large volumes, questioning their non-commercial nature. For example, 103 ivory carvings from Namibia were recorded as traded to Australia in 2001; a number of transactions involving between 35 and 71 carvings or pieces from South Africa were reported in trade to Australia, Canada, Italy, New Zealand, Portugal, Switzerland, the UK and the US between 1999 and 2005; and transactions involving between 36 and 106 carvings or pieces from Zimbabwe were reported in trade to Australia, China, New Zealand, Portugal and South Africa between 1997 and 2004.

Table 4. Trade in ivory carvings and pieces from Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe, 1997–2005 as reported by importing and (in brackets) exporting country (UNEP/WCMC 2006)

		Import Purpose					Total ¹
		Hunting Trophies	Personal Purposes	Commercial Trade	Science/ Education	None / Others	
Botswana	Ivory pieces	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Ivory carvings	6 (-)	4 (-)	-	-	-	10 (-)
Namibia	Ivory pieces	-	5 (3)	-	-	8 (-)	13 (3)
	Ivory carvings	-	126 (169)	-	-	1 (-)	127 (169)
South Africa	Ivory pieces	-	126 (139)	- (17)	231 (132)	16 (4)	373 (292)
	Ivory carvings	-	731 (1,241)	129 (163)	-	47 (8)	907 (1,412)
Zimbabwe	Ivory pieces	5 (-)	69 (-)	308 (32)	-	7 (26)	389 (58)
	Ivory carvings	9 (-)	639 (5)	678 (2,427)	9 (-)	57 (1,093)	1,392 (3,525)

¹ Not included are: + 3 sets of ivory pieces and 82 sets of ivory carvings exported from South Africa and 5 Sets and 30.6 kg of ivory carvings exported from Zimbabwe.

Export of elephant skins:

South Africa and Zimbabwe are major exporters of elephant skins (see also section 6.1). In Zimbabwe, 80 tonnes of elephant hide were sold at international auctions in 1998 and 1999; the major buyers were from Japan, USA and South Africa. There were also direct regular sales of hides to registered trophy dealers (Prop. 12.10). In South Africa, the hide stocks from culls in Kruger National Park have largely been sold. Most were exported to Japan; some were also sold on the domestic market (Anon 2006a). It is worth noting that according to UNEP/WCMC data, South Africa started exporting elephant skins from wild sources for commercial trade purposes in 2001, before the listing of its elephant population in Appendix II of CITES entered into force in 2003. As mentioned in section 6.1, it has been reported that there is a small legal trade in hides from Botswana, mainly to Zimbabwe (Anon 2006a), though no exports are recorded in the UNEP-WCMC trade data available at the time of writing.

Table 5. Commercial trade in wild elephant skins and skin pieces from Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe (UNEP-WCMC 2006)¹

Export Country	Years	Import Term	Import Quantity	Export Quantity
South Africa	2002 - 2003	skins	12	90
South Africa	2003	skins	38,098 SQD	320,000 SQD
South Africa	2001 -2003	skins	2107.5 SQF	99,406.7 SQF
South Africa	2002	skins	18,400 SQM	3,340 SQM
South Africa	2003 -2004	skin pieces	5 pieces	16 pieces and 20.16kg
Zimbabwe	1997 - 2004	skins	16,370	11,977
Zimbabwe	2003	skins	0	2,474 SQF
Zimbabwe	1997 - 2004	skin pieces	8,449	15,170
Namibia	2003	skin pieces	0	471

¹ There are no export records for Botswana

Legend:

SQD: Square
Decimeters
SQF: Square Feet
SQM: Square
meters

6.3 Parts and derivatives in trade

Ivory (raw tusks and worked), skin, leather, hair, meat and live specimens are all traded.

6.4 Illegal trade

Overview:

An estimated 39 tonnes of ivory has been reported seized just since CoP13 in October 2004, the highest amount during a period between CITES conferences since African elephant populations were listed on Appendix I in 1989 (reports of major ivory seizures that form the basis for this estimate are summarized in Annex 2 Table A of this proposal, while Annex 2 Table B contains reports dating back to October 1998). In the same period (2004-2006), the price of raw ivory has increased by up to threefold in China (see this section below), providing a strong incentive for illegal trade and poaching. The major seizures reported in Annex 2 Table A represent a portion of the total seizures made as many are not reported to databases such as ETIS or in the media and thus remain unnoticed. Naturally, reported seizures only represent a fraction of the illegal trade that is taking place.

At SC54 in October 2006, the ETIS Director confirmed an “upsurge of seizures” in the last year. He also emphasized an increase in organized crime and reported that government stockpiles were disappearing in some countries; this is also confirmed in the Central African Elephant Conservation Strategy (Anon 2005b).

As noted above in section 5, illegal ivory trade continues to present a problem in Kenya. Between January 2004 and November 2006, there have been 132 incidents of ivory seizures (see Annex 2 Table C). During this period, a total of 2,180.65kg of ivory and 55 pieces have been seized in Kenya.

Botswana:

The transit of illegal ivory in and through Botswana is an issue of concern. Botswana's geographical position and membership of the Southern African Customs Union (SACU) renders it vulnerable to being used as a transit route for illegal ivory being channelled e.g. from Zimbabwe, Zambia and the DRC to international markets, mainly via South Africa. It is likely that Botswana's membership of SACU with its associated customs privileges makes it an attractive transit route to South Africa. SACU allows for the free flow of trade amongst its member countries and apparently containers sealed in any of the SACU countries (i.e. Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland) cannot be opened while inside the Union (Anon 2006a).

Annex 5 of this proposal provides details of reports of illegal ivory trade in Botswana, including seven incidents in 2006. Notably, Chinese nationals were reportedly caught in Gaborone in 2006 with 18 cut pieces of illegal ivory from Zimbabwe which they were in the process of transporting to China. Meanwhile, police arrested two Zambians at the Zambian border with ivory chopsticks and Chinese-style carvings, and an Indian national was reportedly caught with 22 pieces of ivory carvings bought from Zambians, also in 2006 (Anon 2006a).

A very small illegal domestic ivory market exists in Botswana (TRAFFIC 2004, Anon 2006a). In September 2006, ivory was found to be obtainable from a Zimbabwean curio vendor in Francistown who said that ivory carvings came from Zimbabwe and were brought across the nearest border by road (Anon 2006a).

Namibia:

A survey of jewellery stores and street markets in Windhoek, Okahandja and Swakopmund in August 2006 found an uncontrolled domestic ivory market in Namibia, including an uncontrolled ekipa market that appears to have been fuelled by Namibia's proposal to CITES in 2004 (Reeve and Pope 2006). In all, well over 700 ekipas of all sizes were documented for sale in retail outlets and street markets. Most were

unmounted, all were unmarked, and no certificates for individual pieces were available. In interviews with jewellers and stallholders, no evidence was forthcoming that a registration system for manufacturers and traders had been properly implemented (only one jeweller indicated some form of pro-active contact from the government regarding a registration scheme). No jewellery shop with ekipas on sale displayed evidence that it was registered to do so. Some retailers had heard of a proposed scheme but said it had not been implemented. When asked about requirements for export, several jewellers / shop assistants advised carrying, hiding or smuggling the ekipas out of the country; others said export was legal because they were "old" or "traditional" items. No export permits were offered (or proffered when specifically asked for). Apparently, this is because to obtain a permit a retailer would have to prove ownership but they cannot, so they advise tourists that no paperwork is required (Reeve and Pope 2006).

Of the 21 retail outlets (jewellery and craft shops) surveyed, 17 had ekipas for sale (81%); over 400 ekipas were seen displayed in these retail outlets. At least 65% were new; according to Reeve and Pope (2006), in many cases it was hard to be sure if the 35% which looked old were in fact old as claimed. Apparently carvers are making fake old ekipas. Genuine antique Namibian ekipas are almost all in private collections overseas or in Namibia; any real antique ones on the market now are reported to be most likely from southern Angola. Only two shops refused to sell new ekipas, one because they could not be sure of the source of the ivory and suspected it was illegal, and the other for aesthetic reasons. About 75% of the ekipas displayed for sale were unmounted. In just four shops alone there were 259 unmounted ekipas on display. Only about 25% of the ekipas displayed were as finished jewellery. Fifteen new mounted ekipas were on sale in Windhoek's Hosea Kutako International airport duty free.

The total number of ekipas offered for sale in the craft markets visited was at least 340: 95 % were unmounted and 5 % were mounted. Almost all were reported to be new.

The commercial market in new ekipas in Namibia is reported to have started about 1-2 years before Namibia's proposal to CITES in 2004, but to have increased since 2004. It is aimed mostly towards the tourist market.

The origin of the new and fake old ekipas on sale is unknown. Many traders said they came from the north of Namibia. However, some traders variously cited Angola, Congo and Zambia as the source of the ekipas.

In addition to the ekipas on sale, other carved ivory items were found to be displayed in craft shops and were openly on sale in street markets in Windhoek and Okahandja. Most were found for sale in Okahandja where an estimated 20 % of stalls were documented to be selling ivory; the items included ivory bead necklaces, bangles, letter openers, carved animals, pendant necklaces, rings, ivory hanko blanks and large pieces of tusks with carvings on them. Stallholders variously cited Caprivi, Rundu (in north east Namibia on the border with Angola) and Katima Mulilo (on the border with Zambia) as sources of the ivory on sale; Botswana and Zimbabwe were also cited as sources. (Note that the ivory from these sources is considered to be of a higher quality than the ivory from elephants in Etosha National Park which is brittle and flawed.) Namibia's Protected Resources Unit was reported to carry out occasional raids on the Okahandja markets. These, however, do not seem to have had a deterrent effect.

Through its uncontrolled domestic trade Namibia is failing to comply with the provisions of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev CoP12) regarding controls over internal ivory trade in 3 respects:

- 1) Lack of proper implementation of a registration system for "all importers, manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers dealing in raw, semi-worked or worked ivory products";
- 2) Lack of "a nationwide procedure, particularly in retail outlets, informing tourists and other non-nationals that they should not purchase ivory in cases where it is illegal for them to import it into their own home countries"; and
- 3) Lack of "a comprehensive and demonstrably effective reporting and enforcement system for worked ivory" to enable monitoring of the flow of ivory within the country.

Namibia also serves as a through route for illegal ivory trade (CoP13 Prop. 7). Annex 6 of this proposal contains reports of seizures and poaching in Namibia, including data back to 1989 from CoP13 Prop. 7 (note that this data only refers to tusks seized, not worked ivory). Although the numbers of seizures (as indicated in CoP13 Prop. 7) are relatively high, an internet search for news articles produced relatively few reports; thus there appears to be a failure to publicise seizures which, if done, could act as a deterrent. The inference in Namibia's proposal to CoP13 that high seizure levels point to successful law enforcement may not necessarily be the case. The number of ivory carvings openly on sale in Okahandja, and in Windhoek, in August 2006 points rather to ineffective law enforcement (see also section 8.3.2).

South Africa:

Evidence shows that South Africa is serving as a major through route for illegal trade (see the table of reported incidents in Annex 7 of this proposal). South Africa's controls over illegal ivory trade from or through its borders have come under scrutiny since the seizure of 6.5 tonnes of ivory in 2002 in Singapore. This large quantity of ivory had been poached in Zambia and smuggled through Malawi via South Africa. The shipment was probably destined for Japan. The same route had allegedly been used before in 19 previous shipments reported to involve the same smuggling syndicate and 123.5 tonnes of ivory (Manning 2006). South Africa is also reported to be a through route from elsewhere in Africa, particularly Zimbabwe (as an actual source of ivory, mainly carved) and Botswana (as a transit route) to international destinations, mainly the Far East (Anon 2006a and 2006b). Ivory is regularly smuggled through the Beit Bridge border post from Zimbabwe to South Africa. The table in Annex 7 cites seven incidents of smuggling ivory through the Beit Bridge border between February and October 2006, and an eighth in August 2004. According to a provincial enforcement officer, ivory imported from Zimbabwe and through Botswana is destined for the Vietnamese and Chinese markets. Over the period Jan 2005 to Sept 2006, 450kg of hankos and other worked ivory items destined for the Chinese market were seized in the Limpopo Province, which borders Zimbabwe (Anon 2006a).

Moreover, South Africa has an active legal domestic ivory market. The fact that permits are not required for the sale and possession of worked ivory in at least three provinces (Gauteng, North West and the Free State) potentially enables the laundering of illegally imported carved ivory from elsewhere in Africa (Anon 2006a). Several sources report that ivory from other African countries is sold in curio markets (TRAFFIC 2004, Anon 2006a). According to a provincial permit officer, carved ivory comes into South Africa from Zimbabwe in vehicles and is sold in flea markets in the country (Anon 2006a).

No national assessment of or control over the entire legal domestic ivory trade is possible in South Africa because:

- (1) Permits to possess and sell raw ivory are issued and recorded by each of the nine provincial authorities, and such data is not collated at a central, national level. There is therefore no national overview of the raw ivory trade.
- (2) While all provinces require permits for the possession and sale of raw ivory, not all provinces require permits for the sale and possession of processed ivory. Therefore there cannot be complete control over the entire legal domestic worked ivory trade.

Zimbabwe:

Evidence indicates that Zimbabwe has failed to control its ivory industry (see also section 6.2). The domestic ivory market and breakdown in law and order appears to have been exploited by Chinese dealers to allow illegal dealing in ivory. There is also evidence that ivory from government owned stockpiles has been sold in contravention of CITES regulations. In July 2005, The Herald reported that police had uncovered a stockpile of 72 elephant tusks in a Harare suburb and arrested a man and woman of "Asian" origin (actually Chinese nationals). The ivory had been concealed in crates, on top of which stone carvings had been placed ready for export. The 72 tusks comprised 10 registered tusks with official serial numbers (i.e. bought legally from the ZPWMA ivory store), and a further 62, which were illegal and believed to have come from elephants poached in the Zambezi Valley. The Herald said that police believed the two people arrested were "part of an intricate syndicate involved in the illegal export of ivory to unknown destinations" (The Herald 6 July 2005). Zimbabwean nationals were also arrested; one was a former MP who held a trophy dealers licence and had reportedly sold 67 tusks to the Chinese (The Herald 26 July 2005).

At SC54 in October 2006, the CITES Secretariat reported on the July 2005 incident, describing it as a "serious breach" of Zimbabwe's domestic controls that "could clearly have implications should the Secretariat have to assess Zimbabwe's suitability to trade internationally in the future" (SC54 Doc. 26.1 Rev. 1). One tonne of ivory, which would likely have been transported to China, was reported to be involved, some allegedly from legal government stocks, apparently bought by licensed traders at local ivory auctions and resold in breach of domestic ivory trade controls along with other pieces presumed to have come from other sources. The Secretariat had reason to believe this may not have been the first incident. At SC54, Zimbabwe informed the Standing Committee that ivory auctions had been suspended. However, the breach of Zimbabwe's domestic controls was not resolved. It was decided that a mission should be conducted to Zimbabwe by the Secretariat and a report presented at CoP14 (SC54 Sum. 9 (Rev. 1)).

In July 2006, The Sunday Times reported that “[t]wo months ago [i.e. May 2006] Zimbabwe police caught Chinese dealers with seven tons of ivory, of which four tons came from illegal sources” (implying that 3 came from legal sources) (The Sunday Times 16 July 2006). In Anon 2006b, another source is reported to have referred to this incident but alleged that 5 tonnes had been bought legally by the dealers from ZPWMA, while the remaining 2 tonnes was illegal. Further verification is merited, particularly considering the amount of ivory involved. The Sunday Times (16 July 2006) further reported that “[i]n the past seven months, Chinese dealers have bought 30 tons of ivory from Zimbabwe’s Parks and Wildlife Management Authority — representing the tusks of some 2,250 elephants”. A game ranger was quoted as saying “They’ve not only run the parks’ stockpile right down, but elephants are now being poached across the border from Botswana and other neighbouring countries to fulfil the demand, which seems to be bottomless.” (The Sunday Times 16 July 2006).

It has been alleged that Chinese dealers have sold huge amounts of finished ivory products via Zimbabwe-based internet sites. A former ZPWMA official claimed that these dealers had sold 30 tonnes of ivory products such as hanko, toothpicks and chopsticks via websites from where people in China could order personalised items, which were then shipped out from Zimbabwe by courier. It was understood that the ivory had been bought legally on the domestic market (Anon 2006b).

In 2004, TRAFFIC assessed that tracking of retail markets and law enforcement were only partially effective and that “a robust evaluation of the local control system [in Zimbabwe] was warranted” (TRAFFIC 2004). However, no evaluation has been carried out. Worked ivory from Zimbabwe has been reported to be on sale in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa (see this section above) and several seizures have been made of ivory from Zimbabwe in South Africa (Annex 7 of this proposal). Annex 4 of this proposal includes reports of illegal ivory trade in, and involving ivory from, Zimbabwe. As mentioned above, a major route out of the country is the Beit Bridge border post with South Africa. Other routes for smuggling ivory out of Zimbabwe are reported to be via Mozambique and through Zambia to Tanzania (Anon 2006b). A Zimbabwean journalist based in South Africa reportedly discovered that ivory was being shipped through the DRC; he alleged that army personnel on anti-poaching patrols had used helicopters to transport ivory. Much of the activity was “allegedly taking place at Chizarira National Park just south of Lake Kariba. The cargo is then shipped across the Lake to Zambia, onwards to the DRC.” (Karimakwenda 2005).

Evidence also indicates that, amid allegations of corruption, Zimbabwe has failed to control the hunting industry. In 2003, African Indaba reported: “Some South African hunters are taking advantage of the unsettled situation in Zimbabwe’s rural areas to run illegal safari hunting operations. Members of this network pay small “trophy fees” to the occupiers of wildlife properties. They then shoot whatever animals they can (including elephants) for meat, hides and trophies, which they market illegally.” (African Indaba 2003). In September 2005, a report implicated several (named) ZANU-PF officials in illegal hunting activities (Karimakwenda and wildlife activists 2005). It stated that investigations had “revealed direct trophy poaching, which sometimes involved the use of forged hunting permits and blank hunting quotas which do not show the name of the client or the type and location of animal to be hunted”, and referred to one firm using fake names to obtain pre-hunt permits. A tour operator also alleged that government officials were issuing blank pre-hunt forms; vehicle number plates were reportedly being removed and client names entered incorrectly on official documents (Anon 2006b). African Indaba (2004) stated: “Police sources revealed that senior officials at the Parks and Wildlife Management Authority may have been involved in faking professional hunting licenses in connection with the competency test to obtain a PH [Professional Hunter] license in Zimbabwe. It is reported that 60 fake licenses have been issued.” (African Indaba 2004). The report provides considerable detail about the alleged scam and states that investigations were apparently being conducted into “officials accused of corruptly giving out licenses and faking hunting licenses”. However, the safari industry reportedly told the media that the investigations were a smokescreen for problems in ZPWMA; there were allegations of corruption in “staffing, quota allocation, concessions and power abuse”. The report goes on to describe the allocation of hunting concessions to top ZANU-PF officials without going to tender (African Indaba 2004). It further states that two South African companies working with local politicians were involved in most of the illegal hunting in Zimbabwe but it seemed they were being prosecuted. In July 2006, it was reported that one notorious company had been banned from Zimbabwe (Hunting Report 2006). However, the ban does not seem to have been effective; they were reported to be still operating in the Hwange area a month later (Anon 2006b).

Various reports have documented an active international trade in ivory in other parts of Africa, with ivory coming from central Africa to supply markets in the west and north of the continent (Courouble et al 2003, Martin and Stiles 2000). Unregulated ivory markets, fuelling illegal trade and poaching, continue to be of serious concern in many other African, and also Asian, countries and it is unclear whether any real progress has been achieved since the adoption of the “Action plan for the control of trade in African elephant ivory” at CoP13 in October 2004. Mozambique has one of the largest unregulated domestic ivory

markets in southern Africa; it was reported to have significantly increased, with five times as many ivory products on sale in 2005 than in 2002 (3,254 items were found on sale during a five hour survey in June 2005) (WWF / TRAFFIC 2005). Worked ivory continues to be offered in international departure lounges of airports, e.g. in Mozambique and the Democratic Republic of Congo (TRAFFIC/WWF 2006).

In Angola's capital, Luanda, ivory trade rapidly expanded between 2004 and 2005. Over 1.5 tonnes of worked ivory products were found during an investigation in 2005, with the trade presumably being supplied illegally from foreign countries, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Congo. As in many other countries, principal buyers are foreigners to the country, including from the USA, Europe and east Asia (Milliken et al 2006).

The ivory market in the Khartoum area in Sudan has been documented recently to have grown into one of the largest in the world. The ivory is reported to originate from new tusks from elephants poached mainly in Sudan and the DRC, but also from the Central African Republic (CAR) and Kenya. Sudanese poachers are reported to have decimated elephants in eastern CAR and northern DRC. About three quarters of buyers are thought to be Chinese nationals. Prices are reported to have increased more than threefold between 1997 and 2005 (Martin 2005). According to the Secretariat, the authorities in Sudan have apparently recently made seizures of ivory, though they had not been reported to ETIS. In June 2006, the Secretariat and TRAFFIC visited markets in Khartoum and Omdurman to survey the availability of ivory and other wildlife products and met with traders who had registered large ivory stocks with the government (SC 54 Doc.26.1 Rev. 1), but it was not reported what they found. As a consequence of Sudan's market, Egypt's domestic market is feared to be emerging again - 80% of Egypt's ivory is estimated to originate from Sudan (SC 54 Doc.26.1 Rev. 1; WWF/TRAFFIC 2005). In 2005, retail prices for worked ivory in Egypt were found to be from 2 to 4 times higher than that of late 1998 (Martin and Milliken 2005).

Various reports confirm that buyers of ivory in Africa include European and Asian diplomats, Asian businessman, French military, United Nations staff, west African traders, expatriates and tourists from Europe, America and Asia, and that significant quantities of worked ivory are being purchased for selling commercially elsewhere (Martin 2005, WWF / TRAFFIC 2005, Courouble et.al. 2003, Martin and Stiles 2000; Stiles and Martin 2001).

Uganda has been reported to be one of the smuggling routes out of eastern DRC. The most recent major seizure included in Annex 2 Table A involved 99 pieces weighing 253 kg seized in Kampala and suspected to have come from elephants poached in DRC. According to a report in The Monitor (15 December 2006), Uganda is believed to have been used as a transit route since the 1980's.

There is a huge trade in ivory tourist souvenirs from Asia, with the majority of ivory originating from African elephants. The largest retail market for these souvenirs in south and south-east Asia is Thailand (Martin and Stiles 2002), where trade in ivory was reported to be resurging in 2006 (with 7,230 items found on sale during random spot checks in Bangkok during January and March 2006). Illegal imports in Bangkok originate mostly from Africa. However, on the Thai side of the border town Mai Sai, ivory was reported to originate from Asian elephants in Myanmar (446 ivory items were found in 8 shops) (TRAFFIC/WWF 2006). The main customers for ivory items in Thailand and Vietnam are from EU member States (in particular France, Germany and Italy), Japan, Taiwan, Thailand, Singapore, China and the USA (Martin and Stiles 2002).

China has emerged as the main ivory manufacturing centre for all Asia, surpassing Hong Kong and Japan. The country continues to be a major destination for illicit trade in ivory (see also section 8.3.2). "Often with the involvement of Hong Kong businessmen, smuggling rings import African ivory, process it, and re-export it through Hong Kong and Macau to Europe, Japan, North America, Singapore and Thailand (the order of importance is unknown)" (Martin and Stiles 2003). China was identified in the 2005 CITES Secretariat Technical Mission Report as the single most important influence on the increasing trend in illegal trade in ivory since 1995 (SC53 Doc. 20.1 Annex). Evidence and intelligence indicates that citizens of China based in Africa are engaged in illegal trade (SC 54 Doc.26.1 Rev. 1). In May 2006, 3.9 tonnes of ivory shipped from Cameroon were seized in Hong Kong SAR and 1.8 tonnes of unknown origin were seized in Zhongshan. In July 2006 2.2 tonnes and more than 3 tonnes, both originating from Tanzania were seized in Taiwan. Moreover, 76 tusks (and possibly another 7 tonnes) of ivory from Zimbabwe (partly from government owned stockpiles) were reported to be destined for China; China is also reported to be a destination for illegal ivory being smuggled through South Africa (see this section above).

At CoP 12 in 2002, the Management Authority of China reported that almost 30 tonnes of ivory had been seized in China between 1996 and 2001. Four of the 31 seizures for which the country of export was

known reportedly departed from South Africa, four from Namibia and one from Zimbabwe. When analysing the reasons for increased illegal ivory trade, the Chinese Management Authority mentions the CITES decision to allow one-off sales of ivory as the first factor and states that many Chinese nationals misunderstood this decision and “believe that the international trade in ivory has been resumed” (Doc. CoP12 Inf.15). Prices for raw ivory decreased between 1989 and 2002 from USD 261-464 per kg at the time of the ivory trade ban to USD 120-170 in 2002 in Beijing and USD 200 in Hong Kong (Martin and Stiles 2003). In 2004, prices were reported to be USD 200-320 / kg in Hong Kong, USD 250 in Macau and USD 318 in Fuzhou (Martin 2006). However, in 2006 prices for raw ivory were reported to have increased up to more than threefold in China to USD 560-750 per kg. This price was confirmed by traders who were arrested in a recent ivory seizure in Guangzhou (IFAW 2006a). This not only illustrates a significant increase in demand, it acts as a strong incentive for further illegal ivory trade and poaching.

Other countries reported to have large and / or growing illegal ivory markets are Cameroon, Nigeria, Cote d'Ivoire, Zimbabwe and South Africa in Africa, and Japan, Indonesia, Myanmar and the USA outside Africa (TRAFFIC 2004; SC50 Doc. 21.1).

6.5 Actual or potential trade impacts

Heavy poaching for the international ivory trade has a profound influence on elephant populations in Africa. See sections 4.4, 5 and 6.4 for details.

7. Legal instruments

7.1 National

African elephants are subject to various degrees of legal protection in all range states.

Botswana's national legislation for implementing CITES has been assessed as category 2 (not meeting all the requirements for CITES implementing legislation), but as of 2 October 2006 the categorization was under review (SC54 Doc. 36 Annex). The main national legal instrument regulating international wildlife trade is the 1992 Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act (Chapter 38:01). Schedule 5 of the Act incorporates CITES into national legislation and lists species regulated by CITES. Under the provisions of the Act, people in possession of ivory trophies and any form of jewellery made of ivory are obliged to have a certificate of ownership or other evidence that the item legally belongs to them, and to have registered the ivory with the authorities (Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP)). Failure to prove that one possesses the items legally could result in a charge of illegal possession, which is the same whether it is ivory or whole elephant tusks (or even rhino horns). The penalty for the illegal possession of elephant tusks or ivory is Pula 50, 000 (US\$8,400) and 10 years imprisonment.

Under the terms of this Act there are no business dealers in ivory, although there are businesses of trophy dealers for which licences are issued by the Director of DWNP. The trophy dealer's licence is issued in respect of certain classes of trophies only and excludes ivory. The licence for trophy dealers is regulated through the provisions of the 1992 Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act. Whilst Botswana allows elephant hunting this is solely for personal use such as to acquire a trophy. Such trophies are marketed in line with CITES regulations and their owners are issued with an ownership certificate.

Namibia's CITES implementing legislation has also been assessed as category 2 under the CITES national legislation project, which means that not all requirements of CITES implementing legislation are met. The main national legal instrument is the 1975 Nature Conservation Ordinance (No.4. OG. No. 3469), signed under the Authority of the Administrator of South West Africa. Proclamation AG42 of 1980 provides additional controls over the use of controlled game products (any or all parts of elephants and rhinos). It is widely recognised that Namibia's wildlife legislation is out of date. There is a new piece of enabling legislation in the pipeline, the Parks and Wildlife Bill, but it has not been enacted; even when it is enacted implementing regulations will still be needed.

Namibia's proposal to CoP13 states: “Elephants are classified as a "Specially Protected" species under the Nature Conservation Ordinance (Ordinance 4 of 1975) in Namibia. Hunting, capture, transport, being in possession, and trade (the import, export, re-export), in raw ivory, live animals and other derivatives are subject to permits and conditions. Ivory and all other parts of an elephant are classified as "Controlled Game Products" under Proclamation 42 of 1980. The maximum penalty for contraventions related to controlled game products is N\$ 200,000 (approx. US\$ 18,200) and/or 20 years imprisonment. On the

basis of the Animal Diseases and Parasites Act (Act 13 of 1956), the import and transit of raw wildlife products, including ivory, are subject to permits issued by the Veterinary department.” (CoP13 Prop. 7).

In South Africa, national CITES implementing legislation had not entered into force at the time of writing despite promises that it would be imminent for several years now; thus, South Africa remains in category 2 under the CITES national legislation project. Draft regulations, the Threatened and Protected Species Regulations 2006, have been issued in terms of the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (10 of 2004) to introduce uniform national legislation regarding the implementation of CITES, as well as to regulate aspects of the hunting industry. However, until the regulations are promulgated and therefore become legally binding, legislation in each of the nine provinces will remain in force (and even after they are promulgated there may be need for further reform to ensure uniformity with respect to wildlife trade in general). Currently, the applicable laws in the different provinces are not uniform with the result that CITES is implemented in South Africa in a fragmented and inconsistent manner (Bürgener et al 2001). Hunting is also regulated through contradictory and piecemeal provincial legislation, resulting in a permit system that is often inconsistent and open to abuse (Bürgener et al 2005). All provinces require permits for the possession and sale of raw ivory. However, three provinces (Gauteng, North West and the Free State) do not require permits for the possession or sale of completely processed ivory. Two different and conflicting Ordinances seem to apply in the North West Province. There are also provincial differences as to the permit requirements for the inter-provincial movement of raw and processed ivory.

In Zimbabwe, the Parks and Wild Life Act of 1975 (as amended) and associated regulations are among the key pieces of legislation that make provision for the control of international and domestic trade in wildlife products, including ivory. Zimbabwe’s national legislation has been assessed as category 1 under the CITES national legislation project.

7.2 International

All populations of African elephants are on CITES Appendix I except those of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe, which are on Appendix II, subject to the Annotations noted in Annex 3 of this proposal.

8. Species management

8.1 Management measures

Management measures vary greatly throughout the continent. They range from creation of migration corridors and transfrontier parks and conservation areas (e.g. the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park and the Limpopo-Shashe and Kavango-Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Areas), translocation of animals, creation of artificial waterholes, fencing and deterring animals from crops to shooting of problem animals. Culling has not been employed as a management tool since Zimbabwe halted the practice in 1988 and South Africa in 1995.

South African National Parks (SANParks) has approved a revised management plan for Kruger Park, which foresees culling. However the plan has not been implemented and has been widely criticized. It has been argued for example, that South Africa’s perceived abundance of elephants is a consequence of a set of ecologically inappropriate management measures: confinement through fencing (on 2% of the country’s total area), the artificial provision of water, and the fragmentation and reduction of habitat. Deliberations to cull “excess” elephants and sell the ivory, along with claims that revenue would be ploughed back into elephant conservation (SANParks 2005) (e.g. more fences), seem to be based more on an agricultural model for raising livestock rather than on ecological principles.

Van Aarde and Jackson (2007) confirm that in southern Africa, agricultural rather than ecological paradigms drove many early management actions. These included measures to increase numbers (water supplementation and fencing) then measures to stabilise them (e.g. culling) at levels below their carrying capacity – which in some parks were lower than those dictated by *ecological* carrying capacity. The authors argue that management practices addressing local impact by curbing high numbers deal with symptoms and not the underlying causes. They advocate applying metapopulation principles to elephant management, and at the same time changing management practices that lead to locally high numbers. Thus the creation of networks of conservation areas which would allow dispersal from source to sink populations, e.g. through the creation of transfrontier parks and conservation areas, would limit numbers at a regional scale while also reducing their local ecological impact.

In Botswana, DWNP provides artificial water holes for elephants in the national parks as part of their elephant management programme. Thus, while Botswana's elephants are not as intensively managed as those in South Africa, there is still a strong element of "artificial" management, e.g. provision of water and use of fences. The 1991 Elephant Conservation and Management Plan is being reviewed and will be replaced by the 2006 elephant management plan. However, the new draft plan, which includes culling as a management option, has been criticised in its current form as "simplistic" and just continuing "a management policy of fences and boreholes for Botswana" (Anon 2006a).

The Namibian Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), responsible for management of wildlife in Namibia, has been criticised by a former Chief Warden of Etosha for not implementing Management Plans for any of its parks or reserves: "Despite numerous workshops, meetings, drafts, submissions, and years of work, none of the previous efforts resulted in a Management Plan that has been accepted, approved and put into practice for any of Namibia's game reserves.There is an impressive array of drafts and final plans, which now gather dust in storage or have simply been discarded." (Berry 2005). (See section 8.3.2 for more information on Namibia's capacity with respect to management in Etosha National Park.)

In Zimbabwe, management of elephant populations appears to be in disarray (see sections 5 and 6.1). In November 2006, what appears to be a new management measure was announced; it was reported that "communities living with elephants [will be allowed to] harvest up to about ten animals per annum and the proceeds will be used to build schools, clinics and other infrastructure for the locals" (Newsnet 13 November 2006). No indication is given as to how such a scheme (which could be perceived as a cull by another name) is to be controlled.

8.2 Population monitoring

The ability of range States to monitor elephant populations varies greatly. The MIKE programme monitors populations at specific sites in several range States but will not be able to provide information on total national or continental populations. The African Elephant Database, housed and managed by the African Elephant Specialist Group Secretariat, stores data from elephant population surveys beginning in 1976. The most recent update of the database is the 2002 African Elephant Status Report. The authors point out, however, that data quality varies considerably, depending, *inter alia*, on the methods used or the age of the data. For example, almost 50% of the range data in the most recent report was obtained before 1995 and more than 20% was even obtained before 1988 (Blanc et al 2003).

As Blanc et al (2003) point out, a coordinated approach to surveys between Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe has not been taken since the mid 1990s. There is a need for such an approach amongst these range States to avoid double counting of elephants.

8.3 Control measures

8.3.1 International

The ability of range States to manage elephant populations, to regulate legal take, and to prevent poaching, varies greatly. At the international level, agencies working on ivory trade, in addition to CITES, include the Lusaka Agreement Task Force (LATF) and ICPO-Interpol. Meanwhile, the new ASEAN Wildlife Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN) is expected to become increasingly active. Memoranda of understanding / cooperation between the agencies assist with international cooperation, though the enforcement needs at international level far outweigh the ability of agencies to meet them. LATF is the only agency able to participate in cross-border enforcement operations, but these are limited to the six Parties to the Lusaka Agreement (Congo, Kenya, Lesotho, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia). Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe are not parties to the Agreement (although South Africa has been a signatory since 1994).

MIKE:

The programme for Monitoring of Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) was agreed by CITES Parties in 1997 as a method for monitoring trends in elephant poaching (the objectives are set out in Res. Conf.10.10 Rev. CoP12). MIKE has an important role to play in providing technical and financial support to range States and developing their capacity for elephant monitoring. However, projected to cost US\$ 2 million per year, the program has repeatedly faced funding shortages and has had to be supported by a bridging loan from the CITES Trust Fund. Long-term funding continues to be an issue,

calling into question the long-term sustainability and financial viability of MIKE. At SC54, the CITES Secretariat stressed that MIKE must become self-sufficient at the national level; funding was currently available until 2011 in Africa but funding for the programme in Asia would be expected to finish by the end of 2006 (SC54 Doc.26.3).

It has been questioned whether MIKE is able to provide a comprehensive picture of the full extent of poaching across Africa. MIKE is biased toward representing the best conservation conditions available (Blake and Hedges 2004). MIKE sites only cover a sample of the continental elephant range and, except for sites in eastern Africa, are heavily biased towards protected areas; 84% of African elephants are believed to live outside protected areas where more poaching is likely to take place. This is confirmed in the MIKE report to CoP13 with regard to central Africa: "... in two of the three MIKE sites in which inventories were conducted both inside and outside national parks elephant abundance was several times higher within the national park boundary than beyond. Both the interpolation maps...and Table...highlight clearly the consistent, and in some cases enormous differences in signs of illegal killing of elephants and human pressure from hunting camps inside national park boundaries compared to the areas surveyed outside their borders where the legal basis for protection is less stringent, and conservation efforts may be reduced. In conclusion, the MIKE sites represent a relatively small sample of the population of forest elephants of central Africa. The sites are biased towards well-known and important national and international elephant populations, all of which are based in and around National Parks and protected areas, which have received heavy financial and technical support from the international community" (CoP13 Doc. 29.3 Annex 9). Moreover, an increase in elephant density within a protected area does not necessarily represent an increase in population size but may well be due to elephants seeking refuge from the higher hunting pressures existing outside protected areas (Blake and Hedges 2004). Although it has been generally acknowledged that it is impossible to ascribe an increase or decrease in illegal killing to certain causal factors, the SC54 MIKE report (SC54 Doc 26.2 Rev.1) included data on 29 "influencing factors", assigning particular causal patterns explaining elephant mortality. The assessment does not include a description of how these influencing factors have been assessed, or data on how CITES decisions may have influenced levels of illegal killing.

MIKE is only able to compile data on a small fraction of total elephant mortalities; for example, at SC54 in 2006, MIKE reported a total of only 2,343 elephant carcasses found over nearly six years (with sites beginning their data delivery in different years) (SC54 Doc. 26.2 Rev.1), while it is clear from seizure data and the volume of ivory offered in domestic markets, that the number killed for illegal ivory trade alone is several times higher. MIKE therefore needs further refinements in the absence of the pressure of trade to establish its effectiveness. In its present form, MIKE cannot serve as an early warning system as was originally anticipated by many Parties when establishing the programme. For example, several sources warned that elephants in central Africa were being poached at alarming rates some years before MIKE presented its final data to CITES Parties at SC54 in October 2006. Moreover, the SC54 MIKE report did not draw the attention of Parties to the poaching data and population declines of concern for certain range States. This only becomes apparent when comparing the MIKE data with earlier population surveys available for some of the sites.

ETIS shares the same objectives as MIKE (set out in Res. Conf. 10.10. Rev. CoP12) but aims to record and analyse levels and trends in illegal trade. It is run by TRAFFIC and based on an earlier database dating back to 1989.

8.3.2 Domestic

Trade control measures and law enforcement capacity vary greatly among the different range States. Many are unable to cope with increased levels of poaching and illegal trade.

Botswana:

Botswana seems to have kept its legal domestic ivory market small. However, its ability to control trade across its borders is questionable (see section 6.4). Agencies tasked with the responsibility of enforcing CITES, such as Customs, are reported to lack the training and resources to do so effectively. The lack of adequate human resources, of equipment such as scanners and of structured co-operation and information-sharing with other Customs authorities in other countries at a regional and international level all diminish Botswana's capacity to control the illegal ivory trade within and across its borders (Anon 2006a).

Namibia:

In relation to trade controls over worked ivory, CoP13 Prop. 7 states: "Possession, manufacturing and trade in all elephant specimens are regulated in Namibia. Persons or companies wishing to manufacture or trade worked ivory elephant [sic] have to be registered with the Management Authority and are required to maintain comprehensive records of stocks, manufacturing and trade in accordance with national legislation and Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12)". The same provisions apply to hides and leather and elephant hair goods (CoP13 Prop. 7). As pointed out in section 6.4, the findings of a recent survey (Reeve and Pope 2006) indicate that these controls are not being properly implemented.

In October 2006, MET had to defend itself before the Standing Committee on Public Accounts against charges of failing to properly administer and control the hunting industry. The alleged lax control over the hunting industry was unearthed in a Performance Audit carried out by the Auditor-General's office covering the period 1998-2001 (New Era 2006).

MET's capacity for effective management in Etosha National Park is reported to have become seriously compromised. In 2000, WWF carried out an evaluation of black rhino conservation and management in Etosha National Park (Stanley-Price and Dublin 2000). The report describes serious short-comings in anti-poaching: spending on park operations, including law enforcement, was found to be "way below" the minimum figure for effective conservation of rhinos; no proper patrolling records were kept; there was no systematic collection or storage of patrol information; an inability to enforce the keeping of a daily activity log by anti-poaching personnel was reported; it was thus impossible to measure anti-poaching effort; and there were fewer field patrols and more patrols sent out in the daytime (this was caused by the hiring of 120 untrained ex-combatants in 1999 and a fourfold rise in Subsistence and Travel allowance (S & T)). The report concluded that "there could be a persistent and low-level of poaching of rhino at the margins of the park which could go undetected". If anything the situation subsequently deteriorated. A SADC training programme for rhino monitoring (June – November 2004) reported staff problems, a severe shortage of transport, lack of basic field equipment, inadequate patrolling, lack of standardised GPS and problems with managing water supplies, concluding that "It is naïve to imagine that the current state of preparedness, particularly in Etosha, would be adequate to detect or contain a large scale poaching incursion" (Loutit 2004). Berry (2005) lists the present weaknesses in Etosha as follows: "the capacity and capability of management, poor continuity through rapid staff turnover, inadequate existing staff capacity and lack of motivation, pitiable social conditions, crumbling infrastructure, hopelessly insufficient funding, and scanty information from past research."

A July 2006 report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Accounts, which undertook a review of the Customs and Excise functionality in Namibia, in particular the operation of border posts, indicates serious short-comings (de Waal et al 2006). These include a chronic shortage of staff at all border posts visited by the Committee; insufficient equipment to carry out effective inspections; and lack of proper training. Moreover, the few inspections that were being carried out were not done so in accordance with regulations. Officers were unable to meet even the minimum requirement of inspecting at least 5% of all cargo.

South Africa:

South Africa's infrastructure, with international airports and seaports, and its borders with or proximity to countries where poaching is occurring or that are coping with civil strife, political instability and governance problems, make the country an important transit route for illegal ivory. Law enforcement capacity appears to be insufficient to prevent this trade. SARS (South African Revenue Service) Customs lacks the training, personnel and resources to effectively detect and prevent illegal ivory passing through South Africa; notably only 1% of goods are inspected (Anon 2006a). These shortcomings are evidenced by the transit of the 2002 Singapore shipment, as well as other consignments alleged to have passed through South Africa and illegal imports from Zimbabwe and via Botswana (see section 6.4). Furthermore, the disbanding of the Endangered Species Protection Unit (ESPU) of the South African Police Service in 2003 is perceived to have had a detrimental effect on South Africa's capacity to detect and control wildlife crime (Anon 2006a). Each province has its own legislation and is responsible for its own law enforcement of CITES. Furthermore, provincial nature conservation authorities have varying capacities to carry this out. Changes in the way that South Africa's borders are policed may also have an impact; in the past, the army were involved in policing the borders but this is apparently no longer the case (Anon 2006a).

Zimbabwe:

The widely acknowledged breakdown of governance, and allegations of corruption and involvement by officials and army personnel in poaching (see sections 5 and 6.4), compromises any ability to control the trade in ivory and hunting in Zimbabwe. Since 1998 (a year after Zimbabwe's elephant population was

downlisted) Zimbabwe has been sliding in Transparency International's corruption perceptions index. It ranks 130th out of 163 countries surveyed in 2006 (CPI score 2.4); this compares with 71st out of 102 in 2002 (CPI score 2.7) and 43rd out of 85 in 1998 (CPI score 4.2) (Transparency International 2006). Gratwicke and Stapelkamp (2006) list a few recent incidences of alleged corruption affecting wildlife management: the selling by game wardens of water pumps donated to National Parks by conservation groups; the suspension of the operations director of the Parks and Wildlife Management Authority following investigations into the theft and translocation of live game and the improper issuing of permits (he was re-instated due to a lack of evidence); and the confiscation of some game conservancies which were then distributed to politically connected individuals. They state that "[e]fforts to curb poaching incidents in national parks are hindered by the constant lack of resources and on occasions, direct interference by the State".

An audit by the Portfolio Committee on Public Accounts attributed an increase in elephant poaching in three provinces between 1996 and 2000 to "low scout-density ratio which stood at one scout per every 112,23 [sic] square kilometres instead of one scout for every 20 square kilometres. In some cases, general hands were being employed as scouts and there was suspicion that some of them were involved in the poaching as organised poaching syndicates." (The Herald 8 April 2006). A tour guide reported that basic equipment such as radios, and GPS were unavailable to ZPWMA staff in Hwange National Park, and that game scouts had to use items such as radios belonging to staff from concession areas (Anon 2006b). Another source cited stated that ZPWMA have "no resources to control poaching", and that as a consequence there was "chaos in wildlife conservation" (Anon 2006b). A former senior wildlife officer, reported as having had to "flee Zimbabwe when he threatened to expose poaching rings organized by parks wardens", said with regard to reports of poaching in Hwange: "It follows a pattern that has been established throughout Zimbabwe in national parks, hunting concession areas and private wildlife reserves. All the indications are that the country's game is being plundered and exploited with the connivance and encouragement of senior officials at a regional level and probably at a central government level as well. Trying to prove it is a different matter, as all these officials are senior members of the ruling Zanu-PF party and all those who know something are too frightened to talk about it." (Munnion 2005).

A 2003 Herald report highlighted a serious staffing issue in national parks; of the 3,000 staff complement needed the authority was operating at less than half that figure which had "impacted negatively on its operations." (The Herald 4 September 2003). Capacity problems in ZPWMA appear to persist; a senior official cited in Anon 2006b listed challenges in implementing CITES as lack of funds, lack of enough personnel, the lengthy transition from being a government department to a parastatal, loss of trained staff, need for training, lack of equipment and a limited operational budget. Fuel shortages in Zimbabwe have also had an impact on anti-poaching efforts. In July 2006, it was reported that a lack of fuel meant that ZPWMA were unable to carry out anti-poaching patrols (The Zimbabwean 3 July 2006).

The ETIS report to CoP13 noted in 2004 that "Zimbabwe also needs to improve law enforcement of its own domestic ivory market and, in particular, attempt to curtail sales of worked ivory to citizens of countries with stricter domestic measures in view of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) which calls for the establishment of "a nationwide procedure, particularly in retail outlets, informing tourists and other non-nationals that they should not purchase ivory in cases where it is illegal for them to import it into their own home countries". Since 2001, submissions from Zimbabwe to ETIS had reportedly been very few in number and sporadic (CITES CoP13 Doc.29.2 Annex). TRAFFIC has since provided training in Zimbabwe for a number of agencies, including National Parks (Anon 2006b).

There are serious concerns whether importing countries seeking to be designated as trading partners for legal stockpile sales have sufficient controls in place over domestic ivory trade and can prevent re-export of ivory, as well as laundering of illegal ivory through the legal trade:

Japan:

Japan, along with China, continues to be a major destination of ivory smuggled out of Africa (ETIS report, CoP13 Doc. 29.2 Annex). A recent seizure of 3 tonnes in August 2006 indicates that smugglers see an opportunity to launder illegal ivory into the system. The CITES Secretariat's report on its verification mission to Japan in 2006 (SC54 Doc.26.1 Rev. 1 Annex) illustrates that Japan's registration process is incomplete and that unregistered ivory items remain on sale, while some traders remain unaware of the registration requirement. A 2005 survey found that more than 40% of ivory retailers in Tokyo and Osaka were still unregistered; there had been no significant change since earlier surveys in 2002 and 2003 (Sakamoto 2006).

The reporting and enforcement system for worked ivory is ineffective since it depends heavily on voluntary compliance by ivory dealers and paper work, not on statutory control and pro-active enforcement with regular inspections and imposition of penalties. Laundering of illegally obtained ivory into the system is quite possible since the current controls cannot “monitor the flow of ivory within the State” as required by Res. Conf. 10.10 (Rev.CoP12): the level of stocks of whole tusks is unknown; there are separate regulatory systems for whole tusks and cut pieces that are not linked; it is not mandatory to mark cut pieces and finished ivory products; and transaction records cannot be verified as matching with actually sold items (IFAW 2006b). Moreover, finished products other than *hanko*, such as ornaments, accessories or musical instruments, are not regulated, even though non-*hanko* trade constitutes more than 90% of the entire ivory trade by weight (Sakamoto 2004). TRAFFIC reported at SC54 that Japan’s database, which is supposed to enable tracking of the flow of ivory and detect any trade between unregistered individuals and companies, is still under development and might take 1-2 years to complete.

Allowing personal possession of elephant ivory without registration has also been identified as a major deficiency. The CITES Secretariat reported that several tusks formerly held by private individuals for non-commercial purposes have been found to end up in commercial trade. Some of these tusks even derive from sources whose ownership of the raw ivory in question has been strictly commercial in nature, e.g. being used as security against loans and mortgages (SC54 Doc.26.1 Rev. 1 Annex). According to TRAFFIC and WWF, this questions whether Japan’s legislation complies with Res. Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) requiring “compulsory trade controls over raw ivory”. Further, the procedure for allowing unregistered stocks of raw ivory (e.g. from personal possessions) to become registered is not clear and needs further clarification so that there is confidence that stocks of ivory from illegal sources are not becoming part of the legal system in Japan (TRAFFIC/WWF 2006). Other reports confirm that proof of legal acquisition of tusks is lax since an application on paper accompanied by documentation and photos is generally considered sufficient (IFAW 2006b). No reliable proof of the legitimacy of the ivory is required; similarly, no physical examination or marking of ivory are required (Sakamoto 2006).

Finally, enforcement of existing regulations is hampered in Japan by the fact that the violation of record-keeping requirements does not lead to a criminal penalty, preventing the police from intervening and making it difficult to carry out investigations into smuggling. Japanese legislation actually prevents authorities responsible for monitoring compliance with the record-keeping system from providing information obtained in the process of verifying compliance to law enforcement authorities such as police and customs (Sakamoto 2006).

China

As noted already, China was identified by the CITES Secretariat as the single most important influence on the increasing trend in illegal trade in ivory (SC53 Doc. 20.1 Annex). (See section 6.4 for information on illegal trade from Africa.) The rising price of raw ivory on the illegal market - US\$ 560-750 per kg as of June 2006 (IFAW 2006a), representing a threefold increase since 2004 - is of particular concern. With regard to China’s compliance with Res. Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12), the CITES Secretariat stated at SC54 in October 2006 that it had recently received information questioning their prior verification work.

Ivory was allowed to be sold freely in China until 2004, when a registration system was introduced. A survey carried out in May and June 2006 reported that unregistered, illegal traders continue to outnumber registered ones. A total of 298 ivory dealers (including 17 registered retail stores) were found to be operating illegally in the nine cities surveyed (Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, Fuzhou, Nanjing, Changzhou, Yangzhou, Hangzhou and Suzhou). 261 (88%) of these were found to be engaging in black market ivory trade. Moreover, almost one third of the surveyed registered traders were not in compliance with China’s domestic regulations governing trade in ivory. Some registered traders used certificates only for government inspections and did not provide them to customers when selling small ivory products; one offered the same ivory carving for a higher price if accompanied by a certificate and a lower price without a certificate. Also, registered retailers were found to own illegal carving factories and several registered manufactures were found to be selling ivory products to illegal dealers. Some factories were found not to comply with the requirement that ivory products made from registered raw ivory must also be registered and sold with a certificate, preventing effective control of the production chain from tusk to carving and facilitating the laundering of illegal products. The fact that individual carved ivory products are not uniquely marked creates a significant loophole. One manufacturer found in previous investigations to be selling ivory illegally has since changed its name and obtained a permit by the State Forestry Administration, yet continued to conduct illegal business. It remains unclear how Chinese authorities verify the legal acquisition of ivory stocks. Another registered ivory manufacturer and its associated registered retail store were found to offer ivory products to the international market via a webpage in English and Chinese. Even registered traders were reported to advise foreign customers that they can take ivory products back home.

Illegal traders also offered to ship ivory abroad. Japan, Korea, USA, UK and European countries are the most popular consumer destinations for ivory products processed in China. Besides “antique markets”, illegal ivory is offered in arts and crafts stores and four and five star hotels catering primarily to foreign customers. Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan are the main transit points for smuggled ivory (primarily originating from African but also from Asian elephants) into mainland China (IFAW 2006a).

Like Japan, China does not comply with all provisions of Res. Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12), which require, *inter alia*, that it is ensured that legally acquired ivory is not re-exported and that all importers, manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers dealing in raw or worked ivory are registered. Although China has made some laudable progress on wildlife trade enforcement, it is questionable whether, given the size of China’s market in legal and illegal ivory, adequate monitoring and enforcement of ivory trade controls are feasible in the long term.

8.4 Captive breeding and artificial propagation

Captive breeding presents no direct benefit to *in situ* conservation of African elephants and is therefore not relevant to this proposal (AfESG 2004a).

8.5 Habitat conservation

African elephants occur in a number of protected areas, but these account for only 16% of their range (Blanc et al 2003); 84% of the species range is believed to lie outside protected areas.

8.6 Safeguards

No emergency mechanisms exist to halt ivory trade once it is proven to have escalated. The monitoring programmes MIKE and ETIS cannot fulfil that role (see section 8.3.1).

9. Information on similar species

The Asian elephant (*Elephas maximus*) has been listed on CITES Appendix I since 1976. Poaching for ivory and illegal trade continue to pose a threat to the small and fragmented populations of the endangered Asian elephant. As only male Asian elephants carry tusks and the sex ratio of many populations has been skewed through selective poaching in the past, increased demand for ivory will have a particularly devastating effect. Ivory from Asian elephants is also found in illegal trade, e.g. ivory from elephants in Myanmar has been reported on sale in Thailand and poaching for ivory continues to be a problem, for example in India.

10. Consultations

Part A of this proposal was sent to the management authorities of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe in December 2006 with a view to seeking their comments. The following response was received from South Africa: "I refer to your letter, KWS/8016 Vol. XII, dated 11 December 2006 received via e-mail on 12 December 2006. We take note of your possible proposal regarding the above-mentioned elephant populations. South Africa does not support the proposal and will submit substantive comments on the proposal once it has been received from the CITES Secretariat." Namibia sent their comments as follows: "...Namibia does not support this proposal. We will however provide detailed comments once the justification of your proposal is known to us" No response was received from Botswana or Zimbabwe by the time of submission. Ghana and Togo were consulted and strongly supported the proposal and its related working document on illegal Ivory trade and control of internal markets.

11. Additional remarks

It is highly questionable whether the ivory trade is an economically sustainable way to utilize elephants and whether revenues from the trade in ivory have made any contribution to elephant conservation. The high costs involved in policing the trade seem to exceed the potential benefits by far. These include monitoring costs for MIKE and ETIS, increased costs for anti-poaching and national law enforcement, technical missions to exporting and importing countries and so on. At the national level, the collective annual net revenue from ivory stockpile sales is reported to be small when compared to the costs involved, including for ivory storage, and compared to revenue from other sources (Care for the Wild 2004).

12. References

- AERSG (African Elephant and Rhino Specialist Group) 1987. Elephant Population Estimates, Trends, Ivory Quotas and Harvests. Report to the CITES Secretariat from the African Elephant and Rhino Specialist Group. Doc. 6.21, Annex 2, sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, Ottawa.
- AfESG 2004a. IUCN SSC African Elephant Specialist Group. *Loxodonta africana*. In: IUCN 2006. 2006 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Viewed 23 November 2006.
- AfESG 2004b. IUCN SSC African Elephant Specialist Group. Notes from the African Elephant Specialist Group on wild sourcing of African elephants for captivity. Pachyderm No. 36.
- AfESG 2006. IUCN SSC African Elephant Specialist Group Website <http://www.iucn.org/themes/ssc/sgs/afesg/aed/index.html>. Viewed 21 November 2006.
- African Indaba 2003. WWF on poaching in Zimbabwe. Vol. 1, Issue 5. September 2003 <http://www.africanindaba.co.za/Archive03/AfricanIndabaVol1-5.pdf>
- African Indaba 2004. Irregularities on Zimbabwe's Hunting Scene. Posting on Africa Conservation Forums, 19 July 2004. <http://www.africanconservation.org/dcforum/DCForumID21/66.html>
- Alexandre, D-Y. 1978. Le role disseminateur des elephants en foret de Tai, Cote-d'Ivoire. La Terre et la Vie 32: 47-72.
- Anon 2004a. CoP13 Inf. 33. Control system for worked ivory in Namibia. Namibian Ministry of Environment and Tourism. 13th Conference of the Parties to CITES, Oct 2004.
- Anon 2004b. CoP13 Prop. 7: Proposal by Namibia to amend the annotation regarding the population of *Loxodonta africana* of Namibia
- Anon 2005a. Strategy for the Conservation of Elephants in West Africa <http://www.iucn.org/themes/ssc/sgs/afesg/tools/>
- Anon 2005b. Strategy for the Conservation of Elephants in Central Africa. <http://www.iucn.org/themes/ssc/sgs/afesg/tools/>
- Anon 2006a. Elephant Conservation and Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana and South Africa. Unpublished report. November 2006
- Anon 2006b. Elephant Management and Ivory Trade in Zimbabwe. Unpublished report. November 2006.
- Anon 2006c. Minutes of Symposium on African Elephant Conservation, Accra, Ghana, 22–24 August 2006.
- Association of Zimbabwe Journalists 24 July 2006. Corruption forces Zimbabwe to suspend ivory sale http://zimbabwejournalists.com/story.php?art_id=733&cat=1
- Baldus, R.D and Child, G. 2006. Rebuilding the Wildlife Sector in a New Zimbabwe - A Pre-Feasibility Study and Proposals for Action by Donors and NGOs. African Indaba, Volume 4, Number 3, May 2006 <http://www.africanindaba.co.za/>
- Berry, H.H. 1981. Abnormal levels of disease and predation as limiting factors for wildebeest in the Etosha National Park. Madoqua 12(4): 242-253.
- Berry, H.H. 1982a. Total aerial census of Etosha National Park. Annual report of the biologist, Directorate of Nature Conservation, South West Africa / Namibia Government Service.
- Berry, H.H. 1982b. The wildebeest problem in the Etosha National Park: a synthesis. Madoqua 13(2):151-157.
- Berry, H.H. 1997. Aspects of wildebeest *Connochates taurinus* ecology in the Etosha National Park - a synthesis for future management. Madoqua 20(1): 137-148.

- Berry, H.H. 2005. Reflections on wildlife conservation, management issues, tourism and lion research in Namibia. *African Lion News* Vol. 6, Dec. 2005: 1-6.
- Blake, S., Hedges, S. 2004. Sinking the Flagship: The case of forest elephants in Asia and Africa. *Conservation Biology* 18:1-12.
- Blanc, J.J., Thouless, C.R., Hart, J.A., Dublin, H.T., Douglas-Hamilton, I. Craig, C.J. and Barnes, A.F.W. 2003. African Elephant Status Report 2002. An Update from the African Elephant Database. IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Botswana Press Agency 2006. Syndicate uncovered, 23 August 2006 http://www.gov.bw/cgi-bin/news.cgi?d=20060823&i=Syndicate_uncovered
- Bradshaw G.A., Schore A.N., Brown J.L., Poole J. & Moss C. 2005. Elephant breakdown. *Nature*, 433: 807
- Bürgener M., Snyman N. and Hauck M. 2001. Towards a Sustainable Wildlife Trade: An analysis of nature conservation legislation in South Africa with particular reference to the wildlife trade. Institute of Criminology, University of Cape Town: South Africa.
- Bürgener M., Greyling A. and Rumsey A. (2005) Status quo report on the policy, legislative and regulatory environment applicable to commercial and recreational hunting in South Africa. [Draft report] URL: <http://www.environment.gov.za> [Date accessed: 03 November 2006]
- Burrill, A. and Douglas-Hamilton, I. 1987. African elephant database project. Global Information Database, Case Study Series No. 3. Global Environment Monitoring System, United National Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Care for the Wild 2004. What's it really worth? Examining the true financial benefits of international ivory trade. CITES briefing document, October 2004.
- Carroll, R.W. 1988. Elephants of the Dzanga-Sangha dense forest of south-western Central African Republic. *Pachyderm* 10:12-15.
- Chauhan, C. 2006. Now, tuskers in death trap. *Hindustan Times*, 29 November 2006.
- Child, G. 2004. Elephant Culling in Zimbabwe, *Zimconservation Opinion* August 2004 1:1-6 <http://www.zimconservation.com/PDFs/Opinion1-Child.pdf>
- Chizarura, L. 2006. Impact of Globalisation on Rural Livelihoods in the Mid-Zambezi Valley (1980-2002). Seatini. <http://www.seatini.org/cotton/globalisationImpact.htm> Viewed 8 December 2006
- Cobb, S. and Western, D. 1989. The ivory trade and the future of the African elephant. *Pachyderm* 12: 32-37.
- Courouble, M., Hurst, F., and Milliken, T. 2003. More ivory than elephants: domestic ivory markets in three west African countries. TRAFFIC International, Cambridge.
- Cumming, D.H.M. and Jackson P. (eds.), 1984. The Status and Conservation of Africa's Elephants and Rhinos. International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, Gland, Switzerland.
- De Waal, Hon, J.C. et al 2006. Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Accounts. Review of the performance audit report of the Auditor-General on the Directorate of Customs and Excise of the Ministry of Finance, July 2006.
- Douglas-Hamilton, I. 1979. African Elephant Ivory Trade - Final Report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Typescript.
- Ebedes. H. 1977. Anthrax epizootics in Etosha National Park. *Madoqua* 10(2):99-118.

Elephant Listening Project 2006. Bioacoustics Research Program of the Cornell Laboratory of Ornithology, <http://www.birds.cornell.edu/brp/elephant/ELPforestelefacts.html>

Environmental Investigation Agency 2002. Back in Business. Elephant Poaching and the Ivory Black Markets of Asia.

Foggin, C. 2003. The elephant population problem in Zimbabwe: Can there be any alternative to culling? In Proceedings from an Expert Consultation on Control of Wild Elephant populations. Utrecht University, 7 & 8 November 2003 <http://elephantpopulationcontrol.library.uu.nl/paginas/frames.html> quoting figures from Dunham, K.M. and Mackie, C.S. 2002. Review of the 2001 National Aerial Survey and Census - National summary of aerial census results for elephant in Zimbabwe: 2001. WWF Southern Africa Regional Programme Office (SARPO) Occasional paper No. 1.

Gitay, H. Watson. R., Suarez, A. and Dokken, D. 2002. Climate change and biodiversity. Intergovernmental Panel on climate change (IPCC)

Gratwicke, B. and Stapelkamp, B. 2006. Wildlife Conservation & Environmental Management in an 'Outpost of Tyranny' Zimconservation Opinion. March 2006. 3: 1-39

The Herald 4 September 2003. Parks Authority acquires US\$2m new vehicles http://www.zimbabwesituation.com/sep4a_2003.html#link2

The Herald 6 July 2005. Police Bust Illegal Ivory Trade <http://www.wag.co.za/News/juldec/Police%20Bust%20Illegal%20Ivory%20Trade.htm>

The Herald 26 July 2005. Ivory Scam – Ex-MP Arrested <http://www.wag.co.za/News/juldec/Ivory%20Scam%20ExMP%20Arrested.htm>

The Herald 2 August 2005. Parks Authority suspends Ivory Sales <http://www.zimconservation.com/archives5-135.htm>

The Herald 8 April 2006. Poachers Kill 209 Jumbos in 4 Years http://www.africanconservation.org/cgi-bin/dcforum/dcboard.cgi?az=read_count&om=4529&forum=DCForumID3

The Herald 22 August 2006. Meeting On Resumption of Ivory Trade Delayed <http://www.zimconservation.com/archives6-86.htm>

Hunter, N., Martin, E. and Milliken, T. 2004. Determining the number of elephants required to supply current unregulated ivory markets in Africa and Asia. Pachyderm No.36, January-June 2004.

Hunting Report 2006. Out of Africa Principal Ousted by PHASA (Professional Hunting Association of South Africa) and Zimbabwe Parks, 26 July 2006. <http://www.huntingreport.com/worldupdate.cfm?articleid=269> [Hunting report is an on-line resource and information site for "Hunters who Travel"]

IFAW 2006a. Ivory Market in China. China Ivory Trade Survey report. June 2006.

IFAW 2006b. Business as Usual. A review of the regulatory systems in Japan to control domestic trade in elephant ivory. International Fund for Animal Welfare. September 2006

Karimakwenda, T. 2005. The Chinese, Chiyangwa & illegal ivory. SWRadioAfrica, 30 August 2005 <http://www.swradioafrica.com/news300805/ivory300805.htm>

Karimakwenda, T. and wildlife activists 2005. ZANU-PF officials implicated in illegal trophy hunting scams. Zimconservation archives (source SW Africa), 14 September 2005 <http://www.zimconservation.com/archives5-206.htm>

Lindeque, M. 1988. Population dynamics of elephants in Etosha National Park, S.W.A. / Namibia. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Stellenbosch.

Lindeque, P.M. 1991. Factors affecting the incidence of anthrax in the Etosha National Park, Namibia. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Council for National Academic Awards, UK.

- Loutit, R. 2004. Phase I Training Report (SADC RPRC Semester 10 Task 4.1-3.2) for the period 1 June to 30 November 2004. Unpublished report. 30 December 2004.
- Manning, I. 2006. Zambia Elephant Mayhem. African News Dimension. 22 November 2006.
- Martin, E. 1985. Establishment of African ivory export quotas and associated control procedures. In African Elephants, CITES and the Ivory Trade. CITES Secretariat, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Martin, E., and Stiles, D. 2000. The ivory markets of Africa. Save the Elephants, Nairobi and London.
- Martin, E. and Stiles, D. 2002. The South and Southeast Asian Ivory Markets. Save the Elephants, Nairobi and London.
- Martin, E. and Stiles D. 2003: The Ivory Markets of East Asia. Published by Save the Elephants, Nairobi and London.
- Martin, E. and Milliken, T. 2005. No Oasis: the Egyptian Ivory Trade in 2005. TRAFFIC International, Cambridge, UK.
- Martin, E. 2005. Large Quantities of Illegal Ivory for Sale in Sudan. Care for the Wild International.
- Martin, E. 2006. Are we winning the case for ivory substitutes in China? Pachyderm 40, January-June 2006.
- Mauny, R.A. 1956. Repartition de la grande fauna Ethiopienne du nord-ouest africaine du peoleolithique a nos jours. Proc. 3rd Pan-African Congr. Prehistory, pp. 102-105.
- McHugh, A., Lynch, O., Jayme, D. and Chaudhry, S. 2006. Republic of Zimbabwe. Center for International Environmental Law CBPR Database, 20 September 2006 www.ciel.org/Publications/CBPR_Zimbabwe_9-20-06.pdf
- Milner-Gulland, E.J. and Beddington J.R. 1993. The Relative Effects of Hunting and Habitat Destruction on Elephant Population Dynamics over Time. Pachyderm 17.
- Milliken, T., Pole, A. and Huongo, A. (2006). No Peace for Elephants: Unregulated Domestic Ivory Markets in Angola and Mozambique. TRAFFIC International, Cambridge, UK.
- The Monitor 15 December 2006. Tax Body Impounds Ivory Worth Sh277m. <http://allafrica.com/stories/200612150056.html>
- Mubalama, L. and Bashige, E. 2006. Caught in the cross fire: the forest elephant and law enforcement in a region of instability, Eastern DRC. Pachyderm No. 40 January.
- Munnion, C. 2005. Tourists flee park elephants slaughter. The Daily Telegraph. 23 March 2005. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2005/03/23/wzim23.xml&sSheet=/news/2005/03/23/ixworld.html>
- The Namibian 24 October 2006. Anthrax Confirmed in Caprivi <http://allafrica.com/stories/200610240044.html>
- National Geographic News 30 August 2006. Elephant Massacre Revealed in Chad <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2006/08/photogalleries/elephants-massacre/photo2.html> viewed on 15 December 2006.
- New Era 2006. Environment Ministry Disputes AG's Report. 18 October 2006. <http://allafrica.com/stories/200610180475.html>
- Newsnet 18 April 2006. Ivory Dealers Association formed <http://www.newsnet.co.zw/index.php?nID=7286&pollid=55>
- Newsnet 13 November 2006. Zimbabwean elephants to benefit of locals [sic] <http://www.newsnet.co.zw/index.php?nID=9067>

- Nowak, R.M. 1991. Walker's mammals of the world. 5th Edition. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Nyakaana, S., Arctander, P. 1999. Population genetic structure of the African elephant in Uganda based on variation at mitochondrial and nuclear loci: evidence for male-biased gene flow. *Molecular Ecology* Volume 8 Issue 7.
- Nyakaana S., Abe E.L., Arctander P. and Siegismund H.R. 2001. DNA evidence for elephant social behaviour breakdown in Queen Elisabeth National Park, Uganda. *Animal Conservation* 4: 231-237.
- Omondi, P., Mayienda, R., Mshelbwala, J.H., and Massalatchi, M.S. 2006a. Total Aerial Count of Elephants, Buffaloes, Roan Antelope and other Wildlife Species in Yankari Ecosystem, Nigeria. For CITES MIKE programme. July 2006.
- Omondi, P. Mayienda, R., Mamza, J.S. and Massalatchi, M.S. 2006b. Total Aerial Count of Elephants and other Wildlife Species in Sambisa Game Reserve in Borno State, Nigeria. For CITES MIKE programme. July 2006.
- Parker, I.S.C., and Martin, E.B. 1982. How many elephants are killed for the ivory trade. *Oryx* 16 (3):235-239.
- Pincott, S. 2006. *A Year Less Ordinary, in the Company of Zimbabwe's Grey Giants*. ISBN 0-7974 – 3166-7. Published privately in Zimbabwe. Printed by ABF, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe.
- Price Waterhouse 1996 Elephant Census in Zimbabwe. An Analysis and Review. Funded by USAID and Commissioned by Ministry of Environment and Tourism and Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management
- Reeve, R. and Pope, S. 2006 Elephants and Ivory Trade in Namibia. An unpublished report.
- Reuters 18 October 2006. Zimbabwe recovers 22 tusks, poaching on rise <http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/L18445714.htm>
- Roca, A.L., N. Georgiadis, J. Pecon-Slattey, and S.J. O'Brien. 2001. Genetic evidence for two species of elephant in Africa. *Science* 293(5534): 1473-1477.
- Sakamoto, M. 2004. *Black and Grey – Illegal Ivory in Japanese Markets* (second edition). Japan Wildlife Conservation Society and International Fund for Animal Welfare, Tokyo.
- Sakamoto, M. 2006. Control of internal ivory trade in Japan - Compliance with Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12), Japan Wildlife Conservation Society, Tokyo.
- SANPARKS 2005. Report on the Elephant Management Strategy. Report to the Minister: Environmental Affairs and Tourism on Developing Elephant Management Plans for National Parks with Recommendations on the process to be followed. 8 Sept. 2005.
- Scullar, H.H. 1974. *The Elephant in the Greek and Roman World*. Aspects of Greek and Roman Life. Thames & Hudson. London.
- Sharman, Jenny 2001. ZANU PF's legacy to Zimbabwe, November 2001 <http://www.zwnews.com/conservancies.doc>; and Zimbabwe's Silent Minority, Swara. Vol. 24, No. 1. Jan-April 2001
- Sikes, S.K. 1971. *The Natural History of the African Elephant*. The World Naturalist. Weidenfeldt & Nicholson, London.
- Smith, R.J., Muir, R.D.J., Walpole, M.J., Balmford, A. and Leader-Williams, N. 2003. Governance and the Loss of Biodiversity. *Nature* 426: 67-70.
- Stanley-Price, M. and Dublin. H.T. 2000. Black rhino conservation and management in Etosha National Park, Namibia. Evaluation of Project 9F0084.14. August 2000.

Stiles, D., and Martin, E.B. 2001. Status and trends of the ivory trade in Africa, 1989–1999. *Pachyderm* 30:24–36.

The Sunday Times 16 July 2006. China's empire-builders sweep up African riches <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2089-2271971,00.html>

TRAFFIC 2004. Domestic ivory markets: Where they are and how they work; Briefing Document for CoP13.

TRAFFIC/WWF 2006. Joint Briefing for the 54th Meeting of the CITES Standing Committee. 29 Sept. 2006.

Transparency International 2006. http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi Viewed 9 December 2006.

UNEP/CMS Secretariat 2006. Migratory Species and Climate Change: Impacts of a Changing Environment on Wild Animals, Bonn, Germany.

UNESCO 2005. Promoting and Preserving Congolese (DRC) Heritage. Linking biological and cultural diversity.

van Aarde, R.J., Whyte, I. and Pimm, S.L. 1999. The consequences of culling for the dynamics of the African elephant population of Kruger National Park. *Animal Conservation* 2, 287–294.

van Aarde, R.J. and Jackson, T.P. 2007. Megaparks for metapopulations: Addressing the causes of locally high elephant numbers in southern Africa. *Biological Conservation* 134:289-297.

Vietnam News 2006. Gov't plan aims to save Vietnam's declining elephants. 13 September 2006 published on <http://english.vietnamnet.vn/tech/2006/09/611584/> viewed 15 December 2006.

WEZ 2006. Matabeleland Matters. WEZ Newsletter, Issue number 41, January – March 2006.

Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) 2006. Homepage <http://www.wcs.org/international/Africa/africanelephants/MIKE/MikeDRC> viewed on 28 Nov. 2006

WWF 2004. WWF Factsheet on *Loxodonta Africana*, presented at the 13th CITES CoP, Bangkok, October 2004.

WWF / TRAFFIC 2005. Joint Briefing on Domestic Trade in Ivory for the 53rd Meeting of the CITES Standing Committee. 27 June 2005.

ZCTF 2005. Zimbabwe Conservation Task Force press statement, 9 March 2005 <http://www.sanwild.org/noticeboard/news2005/OPERATIONNYAMA.html>

Zim Online 2006. Deputy minister implicated in poaching. Zim Online, 17 Oct 2006 <http://www.zwnews.com/issuefull.cfm?ArticleID=15341>

Zimbabwe Daily Mirror 9 April 2005. Wildlife Authorities dismiss poaching allegations http://www.zimbabwesituation.com/apr10_2005.html#link4

The Zimbabwean 3 July 2006. Illegal hunting, poaching reach crisis proportions <http://www.thezimbabwean.co.uk/viewinfo.cfm?id=1730>

The Zimbabwean 30 November 2006. Funding refused for Zim sector of Transfrontier Park <http://www.thezimbabwean.co.uk/viewinfo.cfm?id=2747> viewed 5 December 2006

Annex 1: Elephant population estimates, by country

From: 2002 African Elephant Status Report (Blanc et al 2003)

Country	Definite	Probable	Possible	Speculative	Country area	Range Area
West Africa						
Benin	1,101	504	504	0	112,620	17,314
Burkina Faso	2,031	833	1,059	0	274,200	18,834
Cote d'Ivoire	63	0	360	666	322,460	34,415
Ghana	530	428	1,100	303	238,540	31,519
Guinea	0	0	108	140	245,860	2,562
Guinea Bissau	0	0	0	35	36,120	361
Liberia	0	0	0	1,676	111,370	21,151
Mali	322	0	28	25	1,240,000	29,838
Niger	136	214	214	100	1,267,000	2,683
Nigeria	478	0	340	300	923,770	44,067
Senegal	2	0	0	48	196,190	8,396
Sierra Leone	0	0	5	205	71,740	2,894
Togo	4	0	112	0	56,790	5,834
Subtotal	5,458	1,188	3,039	3,498	5,096,660	219,868
Central Africa						
Cameroon	2,006	3,058	9,017	3,160	475,440	173,765
CAR	2,977	1,600	2,420	390	622,980	217,708
Chad	1,989	0	2,000	550	1,284,000	263,973
Congo	431	18,222	6,572	2,300	342,000	248,361
DRC	7,667	2,631	34,996	17,554	2,345,410	912,105
Equatorial Guinea	0	0	0	300	28,050	15,257
Gabon	0	8,132	14,712	58,309	267,670	229,594
Subtotal	16,450	32,263	64,477	82,563	5,365,550	2,060,763
East Africa						
Eritrea	83	0	17	20	121,320	5,275
Ethiopia	396	0	965	335	1,127,127	48,170
Kenya	22,036	1,101	3,097	2,572	582,650	109,071
Rwanda	34	0	0	66	26,340	1,095
Somalia	0	0	70	0	637,660	4,525
Sudan	20	0	280	0	2,505,810	333,109
Tanzania	92,453	17,231	18,501	2,285	945,090	456,555
Uganda	2,064	0	210	460	236,040	11,313
Subtotal	117,716	17,702	22,511	5,738	6,182,037	969,113
Southern Africa						
Angola	36	0	150	60	1,264,700	658,620
Botswana	100,629	21,237	21,237	0	600,370	99,099
Malawi	647	1,569	1,649	20	118,480	7,939
Mozambique	11,647	2,786	3,073	6,902	801,590	415,906
Namibia	7,769	1,872	1,872	0	825,418	147,349
South Africa	14,071	0	855	0	1,219,912	29,356
Swaziland	39	0	0	0	17,360	187
Zambia	12,457	8,961	7,631	235	752,610	208,072
Zimbabwe	81,555	7,039	7,373	291	390,580	113,602
Subtotal	246,592	23,722	26,098	7,508	5,973,020	1,680,130
Total	402,067	59,024	99,813	99,307	22,617,267	4,929,874

*Note that totals for the Definite, Probable and Possible categories are derived from pooling variances. As a result, totals do not necessarily match the simple sum of the entries within a category.

Annex 2: Incidents of illegal ivory trade

A. Significant ivory seizures since CoP13¹

Date of seizure	Country of seizure	Weight of ivory (kg)	No. of tusks	Country of origin / export	References / notes
Dec 04	Vietnam	800		Tanzania	LATF (Nov 06)
Dec 04	Congo (Odzala National Park)		37 ² sets	Congo	AFP (Dec 04)
11 Mar 05	The Philippines (Manila)	261		Zambia	Confidential Source
Apr 05	Ethiopia	500		Unknown	TRAFFIC (Dec 05)
May 05	Hong Kong	503		Tanzania	LATF (Nov 06)
Jul 05	Zimbabwe	1,000	(72)	Zimbabwe (10 tusks from government stockpile, 62 possibly from Zambezi Valley)	AC22 Doc. 5.1; The Herald (6 July 2005); SC54 Doc. 26.1 (Rev. 1)
Jul 05	Zambia (Lusaka)	377	(23)	Zambia	LATF (Nov 06)
Aug 05	Congo – Brazzaville (Airport, bound for Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire)	253		Unknown	LATF (Nov 06), SABC News (Aug 05)
2 Sep 05	The Philippines (Manila)	6,000		Zambia	Xinhuanet (Jan 06); Confidential Source
5 Sep 05	Cameroon		91	Republic of Congo	The Last Great Ape Organisation
16 Sep 05	The Philippines	286		Kenya	LATF (Nov 06)
25 Sep 05	The Philippines	472		Uganda	LATF (Nov 06)
27 Sep 05	Kenya (Garsen)	130	(22)	Kenya	KWS (Dec 06)
Jan 06	Kenya (Kirinyaga)	200		Kenya	LATF (Nov 06)
Feb 06	South Africa	233		Zimbabwe	News 24 (21 Feb 06); Anon 2006a; Anon 2006b
01 Apr 06	Kenya (Nyali-Mombasa)	185	(5)	Kenya	KWS (Dec 06)
May 06	Zimbabwe (reportedly destined for China)	7,000 ³		Zimbabwe (3,000 or 5,000 kg believed to be from government stockpile)	The Sunday Times (16 July 2006); Anon 2006b
May 06	Congo - Brazzaville	120	(26)	Congo (seized on road to Cameroon)	Accra Symposium, Aug 06 (Anon 2006c)
9 May 06	Hong Kong SAR	3,900		Cameroon	Accra Symposium, Aug 06 (Anon 2006c); Ireland Online (Jun 06)
29 May 06	China (Zhongshan)	1,800		Macao (origin unknown)	Confidential Source

¹ Incidents involving over 100 kg of ivory or the equivalent in number of tusks (27) using an average tusk weight of 3.68 kg (Hunter et al 2004).

² It may be that twice as many tusks have been seized as the seizure was reported as 37 "sets". As no clarification is available however, just 37 tusks have been included in the total.

³ It was reported that Chinese dealers were "caught" with this ivory (The Sunday Times 16 July 2006); it has been assumed that the ivory was seized. Further verification of this incident is merited.

June 06	South Africa		27	Zimbabwe	SAPA (June 21 2006), Anon 2006a, Anon 2006b
3 Jul 06	Taiwan (Kaohsiung)	2,158		Tanzania	The China Post (Jul 06); Confidential Source
3 Jul 06	Taiwan (Kaohsiung)	3,060		Tanzania	Daily News (Jul 06)
Aug 06	Japan (Osaka)	3,000		Indonesia (origin unknown)	Asahi Shimbun (6 Oct 06)
15 Dec 06	Kampala, Uganda	253		DRC?	New Vision (14 Dec 06); The Monitor (15 Dec 06); Xinhua (15 Dec 06)
Total		32,491	⁴155		

Small seizures⁵

Sum		5,639	197		
-----	--	-------	-----	--	--

Grand total		38,130	352		
--------------------	--	---------------	------------	--	--

Using an average tusk weight of 3.68 kg (Hunter et al 2004), 352 tusks is equivalent to 1,295.36kg. The total amount of ivory estimated seized since CoP13 is therefore over 39,425 kg.

⁴ Those tusks for which a weight was available (indicated by brackets) have been included in the total weight of seizures and excluded from the total number of tusks.

⁵ This figure is taken from *Ivory Update* (Born Free Foundation and Species Survival Network) prepared for SC54, October 2006.

B. Record of elephant ivory seizures from Oct 1998 to Nov 2006⁶ (Lusaka Agreement Task Force (LATF) 2006)⁷

Period	Place of Seizure	Quantity	Weight (kg)	Possible origin (Destination)
Oct-98	Paris France		600	Cameroon (China)
Apr-99	Moscow USSR		537	West/Central Africa (China)
Jul-99	Marallal/Samburu - Northern Kenya	57 tusks	402	Kenya
Aug-99	Jomo Kenyatta Intern. Airport, Kenya	188 tusks	700	Cameroon (China)
Oct-99	Lisbon Portugal	150 tusks	1500	Southern Africa (China)
Oct-99	Turkana - Kenya	28 tusks	247	Kenya
Dec-99	Entebbe International Airport, Uganda	35 assorted carvings		
Jan-00	Garissa town- Northern Kenya	2 tusks	24	Samburu-Kenya
Jan-00	Kafu Bridge Nakasongola, Uganda		50	
Mar-00	Kafu Bridge Nakasongola, Uganda	12 cut pieces		
Mar-00	Aswan		137	
Apr-00	Bangkok Airport Thailand		500	Zambia
May-00	Taiwan		2160	Cameroon
Jun-00	Nsambya, Kampala Uganda	1 tusk		Uganda
Aug-00	Kom Ombo Sudan		1530	(Egypt)
Sep-00	JFK airport USA	57 carvings		Ivory Coast
Oct-00	River Kafu Bridge Nakasongola, Uganda	5 tusk	9	Uganda
Mar-01	Vryburg, South Africa	26 tusks		Botswana
Mar-01	Karuma Masindi, Uganda	34 cut pieces		
Apr-01	Los Angeles Airport USA	38 tusks, 480 pieces of ivory cuts		West/Central Africa
May-01	Macau China		92	Rwanda
May-01	Qingdao China	295 tusks	2600	African/(CA)

⁶ This table excludes seizures in Kenya from Jan 2004 – Nov 2006 since these are contained in Table C

⁷ Not all major seizures included in Table A are included in this table.

May-01	Serena Hotel, Nairobi Kenya	46 assorted carvings		
Jun-01	Entebbe International Airport, Uganda	91 tusks	213	Uganda/DRC? (Bangkok, Thailand)
Jul-01	London- Gatwick Airport UK	58 tusks	445	Kenya
Aug-01	Brussels Belgium		150	Mali
Sep-01	Beijing China		76	Kenya
Sep-01	Dar Es Salaam (DIA) Tanzania		580	Tanzania (Bangkok)
Oct-01	Pietersburg South Africa	22 tusks		Botswana
Nov-01	Feila, Answan Egypt	230 tusks	850	Sudan?
Jan-02	JKI Airport Nairobi Kenya	Assorted carvings	4	Kenya
Jan-02	Dar Es Salaam Tanzania	1255 tusks	3207	Tanzania
Feb-02	Dar Es Salaam Tanzania	158 cut pieces, 5 tusks		Tanzania
Feb-02	Loita Narok district Kenya		15	Kenya
Mar-02	Moyale town Kenya/Ethiopia border	37 tusks	145	Kenya (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia)
May-02	Cairo Egypt		174	?Sudan
May-02	Beijing China	800 "items"		DRC
May-02	Uganda		194	Uganda (Thailand)
Jun-02	Thailand		213	Uganda (Thailand)
Jun-02	Brussels Belgium		10	DRC (Beijing, China)
Aug-02	Singapore	535 tusks, 42,000 hanko seals	6500	Zambia/East & Southern Africa?
Aug-02	Shanghai China	700 tusks	3334	DRC?
Sep-02	Manyoni-Tanzania	22 tusks		Tanzania
Feb-03	Laresoro-Marsabit, northern Kenya	33 tusks	319	Kenya
Apr-03	Kampala Bus Station Uganda	9 tusks	22	Uganda
Apr-03	Kigali Rwanda	32 tusks		Tanzania
Jun-03	Tabora-Tanzania	43 tusks		Tanzania
Jun-03	Bongoma town western Kenya	3 tusks	41	Kenya
Jul-03	Bangkok Airport Thailand	65 tusks, 1 rhino horn	501.1	Tanzania (Thailand)
Jul-03	Kampala Uganda		13	Uganda

Jul-03	Kampala Uganda	2 tusks	13	Uganda
Jul-03	Liwonde Malawi	10 tusks	127	Malawi
Oct-03	Rufiji-Tanzania	25 tusks		Tanzania
Oct-03	Hong Kong China		1900	Tanzania (Hong Kong)
Oct-03	Brazzaville Congo	201 assorted items	20	DRC
Dec-03	Dar Es Salaam Tanzania	73 tusks		Tanzania
Feb-04	Pointe Noire Rep. Congo	212 cut pieces	525	Congo/DRC? (Benin)
Apr-04	Entebbe Intern. Airport - Uganda	3 tusks		Uganda
Nov-04	Kidepo park Uganda	2 tusks		Uganda
Dec-04	Vietnam		800	Tanzania
Dec-04	Eastern Zambia	2 tusks		Zambia
May-05	Tianjin China	62 assorted items		Uganda
May-05	Hong Kong China		503	Tanzania
Jul-05	Lusaka Zambia	23 tusks	377	Zambia
Aug-05	Maya Maya Airport, Congo Brazzaville	66 cut pieces	253	Congo/DRC? (Abidjan, Ivory Coast)
Sept-05	Dar es Salaam Airport, Tanzania	13		Outside Tanzania
Sep-05	Manila, Philippines		6000 ⁸	Zambia
Sep-05	Manila Airport Philippines		286	Kenya
Sep-05	Manila Airport Philippines		472	Uganda
Nov-05	Dar es Salaam Airport Tanzania	15		(Italy)
Dec-05	Luangwa Boma Zambia	10 tusks	19	Zambia
Dec-05	Ifakara Tanzania	15 tusks	53	Tanzania
Jan-06	Arusha Tanzania	8 tusks		Tanzania
Jan-06	Iringa Tanzania	23 tusks		Tanzania
Jan-06	Zambia	2		Zambia
Jan-06	Zambia	2		Zambia
Jan-06	Zambia	2	9	Zambia

⁸ Unconfirmed reports from Zambian news media. Investigations in progress.

Jan-06	Zambia	2		Zambia
Jan-06	Kirinyaga Kenya		200	Kenya ⁹
Jan-06	Arusha Tanzania	14		Unknown
Feb-06	Zambia	2		Zambia
Feb-06	Zambia	2	4	Zambia
Feb-06	Zambia	2	2	Zambia
Feb-06	Zambia	2	1	Zambia
Feb-06	Zambia	2		Zambia
Feb-06	Zambia	2		Zambia
Feb-06	Zambia	1	8.5	Zambia
Mar-06	Dar es Salaam Airport, Tanzania	25		DRC (Belgium)
Mar-06	Zambia	2		Zambia
April-06	Tanzania	13		Unknown
Mar-06	Zambia	8		Zambia
April-06	Lolmoljoi, Tanzania	12		Tanzania
April-06	Uganda	1		Uganda
May-06	Tsavo West, Kenya	6	48	Mgagao-Mwanga Tanzania
May -06	Tanzania	12		Unknown
May-06	Tanzania	1	35.5	Tanzania
June-06	Sabatio Karatu, TZ	12		Tanzania
June-06	Kampala, Uganda		6.5	Uganda
June-06	Ikwiriri Rufiji, Tanzania	84		Tanzania
Jul-06	Busia-Uganda	12	8	Uganda
Jul-06	Sioma-Ngwezi, Zambia	1	15	Zambia
Jul-06	Sioma-Ngwezi, Zambia	59	21.6	Zambia
Jul-06	Shangombo, Zambia	7	39.4	Zambia
Aug-06	Ndola Airport, Zambia	119	70.8	South Africa

⁹ This was not reported in the KWS data.

Aug-06	Kafu River/Kwempe-Kampala, Uganda		65	Uganda
Sept-06	Lusaka Intern. Airport-Zambia	20	0.3	Tanzania (China)
Total		138 carvings 684 cut pieces 325 tusks 1085 unknown items	39,976.7	

C. Record of elephant ivory seizures in Kenya from Jan 2004 to Nov 2006 (Kenya Wildlife Service 2006)

Date of recovery	Quantity		Area	District	No. of persons arrested
	in Kgs	Pieces			
08. Jan 04	8.2	4	AMBOSELI	KAJIADO	0
08. Jan 04	15	2	MBALAMBALA	GARISSA	0
21. Jan 04	14	3	KINNA TRADING CENTRE	MERU	0
23. Jan 04	8	1	KINNA TRADING CENTRE	MERU	0
04. Mar 04	48.5	9	KAPENGURIA	KAPENGURIA	2
25. Mar 04	10	2	KWALE	KWALE	2
23. Apr 04	63	2	KAHEHO-ABERDARE	NYERI	4
26. Apr 04	5.5	4	LOITOKITOK	KAJIADO	1
14. May 04	50	6	KOMBAMI ROAD BLOCK	MOMBASA	2
19. May 04	15	3	SAMBURU	KWALE	2
19. Jul 04		4	KIUNGA	LAMU	
26. Aug 04	23	12	MWALUPHAMBA	KWALE	2
16. Sep 04		2	TULU GARSEN	TANA RIVER	
06. Oct 04		2	LOITOKITOK	KAJIADO	
01. Nov 04	4	3	ABERDARE	NYERI	3
03. Nov 04	62	17	JOHN POWER	MT. E LGON	10
21. Nov 04	21	2	KIPSING	ISIOLO	0
28. Nov 04		1	MARA ESCARPMENT	TRANSMARA	2
07. Dec 04	9	2	NGOMBENYI -T/EAST	TAITA TAVETA	1
14. Dec 04	10	5	ISIOLO TOWN	ISIOLO	2
01. Jan 05	20	2	MOYALE TOWN	MOYALE	3
07. Jan 05	19	11	LMD	ISIOLO	1
08. Jan 05	15	4	KHADIJA ESTATE	MOMBASA	2
08. Jan 05	17	1	NYERI TOWN	NYERI	4
13. Jan 05	2	9		MAKUENI	0
27. Jan 05	1	2	J.K.I.A	NAIROBI	0

05. Feb 05	9	9	MTONGWE	MOMBASA	1
09. Feb 05	7	3	ENDARASHA	NYERI	5
09. Feb 05	26	11	MAMBADA	KWALE	1
23. Feb 05	3	2	DUSE	MERU	0
24. Feb 05	55.5	2	CHUMVI YARE	ISIOLO	0
16. Mar 05	10.7	2	KINNA TRADING CENTRE	MERU	0
29. Mar 05	46	4	KWA HOLA	MOMBASA	3
08. Apr 05	2.5	1	AMAGORO-TESO	MT. ELGON	
11. Apr 05	48.5	8	GETA FOREST	NYERI	2
13. Apr 05	0.9	35	KWS HQS	NAIROBI	0
28. Apr 05	2	1	LOITOKTOK	KAJIADO	
14. May 05	64	2	NAROK	NAROK	
07. Jun 05		1	MBIRIKANI	MAKUENI	2
08. Jun 05		1	NAROK	NAROK	
09. Jun 05	13.5	1	ISINET	KAJIADO	2
29. Jun 05	30	2	WILSON AIRPORT	NAIROBI	
06. Jul 05	13	2	TAVETA	TAITA TAVETA	0
15. Jul 05		2	CHUKA	MERU	0
19. Jul 05	17	2	KIVUTI VILLAGE	KITUI	
23. Jul 05	0.6	2	KANAUNI	MERU	2
26. Jul 05	2	2	AKIRIAMET	MT. ELGON	0
28. Jul 05	2	1	GILGIL WAY BRIDGE	NAKURU	2
01. Aug 05	20	2	ISIOLO TOWN	ISIOLO	1
06. Aug 05	18.5	7	KINORO	MERU	3
06. Aug 05	14	2	SATAO ROCK CAMP	MAKUENI	
07. Aug 05	53	10	MARALAL TOWN	SAMBURU	2
12. Aug 05	12	6	NAIVASHA	NAKURU	2
19. Aug 05		1	KIHARI	NYERI	
26. Aug 05	43	2	KAMBU-T/WEST	MAKUENI	3
27. Aug 05	130	22	KIBUSU- GARSEN DIVISION	MALINDI	3

19. Sep 05	1	1	CHESEGON	WEST POKOT	1
24. Sep 05	10	5	KAMBI GABRA	ISIOLO	1
27. Sep 05		15	JKIA CUSTOMS OFFICE	NAIROBI	0
27. Sep 05		2	RUKINGA RANCH	TAITA TAVETA	
16. Oct 05	11	2	NASOLOT	TURKANA	
27. Oct 05	3	1	KANGAITA	KIRINYAGA	3
29. Oct 05		2	KANGAITA	LAIKIPIA	1
29. Oct 05	20	2	NAIVASHA KWS STATION	NAKURU	0
30. Oct 05	7.4	2	GATURI	MERU	4
01. Nov 05	16.5	2	HULUGHO	LAMU	0
03. Nov 05	33	2	HULUGHO	IJARA	
11. Nov 05	11	1	VOI TOWN	TAITA TAVETA	1
20. Nov 05	15	2	KISANJANI - AMBOSELI	KAJIADO	1
27. Nov 05	3	1	KINABA NGARUA	LAIKIPIA	1
01. Dec 05	4	1	ISIOLO	ISIOLO	
04. Dec 05	5	2	ISIOLO	ISIOLO	
07. Dec 05	1	1	ONGATA RONGAI	KAJIADO	1
14. Dec 05		2	SAGANTE	MARSABIT	
15. Dec 05	1.75	6	MUINDI MBINGU STREET	NAIROBI	1
23. Dec 05	7	2	SASOMA	GARISSA	
30. Dec 05		2	KITIRUA	KAJIADO	
31. Dec 05	40	2	KIBURU	NYANDARUA	4
10. Jan 06	12	2	LALI	TAITA TAVETA	0
12. Jan 06	7	4	SABA SABA	MOMBASA	1
21. Jan 06	2.5	1	SOSOMA	GARISSA	0
01. Feb 06	5	1	CHIRAA	LAMU	0
03. Feb 06		1	MKOGODO FOREST	ISIOLO	0
03. Feb 06		1	MUGONGONDO FOREST	ISIOLO	
06. Feb 06		2	DOLDOL	LAIKIPIA	0
15. Feb 06	7.4	2	NJUKINI/ROMBO	TAITA TAVETA	0

16. Feb 06	20	2	KIPSING	ISIOLO	1
20. Feb 06	24	3	RIVER ROAD	NAIROBI	1
22. Feb 06	1.5	1	SERA	LAMU	0
25. Feb 06	1	2	POWERLINE	MAKUENI	2
04. Mar 06	4	2	LOROGON	MT. ELGON	0
18. Mar 06	3	1	NGINYEI	LAIKIPIA	0
24. Mar 06		2	SABARWAWA	ISIOLO	2
31. Mar 06	5	4	NGURUMANI	KAJIADO	1
01. Apr 06	3	1	KIRISIA	SAMBURU	
01. Apr 06	2	1	MUGUNDA	NYERI	
01. Apr 06	185	5	NYALI ESTATE	MOMBASA	1
01. Apr 06		6	NYALI ESTATE	MOMBASA	
02. Apr 06	67	2	GALANA DUESS	LAMU	
04. Apr 06	2	2	NDII	MAKUENI	2
12. Apr 06	3	2	GARSEN	LAMU	
11. May 06	3.5	2	KIAWARA	NYERI	1
12. May 06	11	1	SIYAPEI	NAROK	1
21. May 06	5	1	OPIROI	SAMBURU	0
02. Jun 06	5	1	KABUKWO	MT. ELGON	1
03. Jun 06	37	1	KITIRUA - AMBOSELI	KAJIADO	1
09. Jun 06	20	4	MUTOMO	KITUI	1
15. Jun 06		1	MAUNGU	MAKUENI	
15. Jun 06	1.5	4	SAGARE KAJIRE	TAITA TAVETA	1
27. Jun 06	30	1	KONYAO	MT. ELGON	0
03. Jul 06	6	2	TRANSMARA	TRANSMARA	0
17. Jul 06	0.5	1	ENGWATA	TAITA TAVETA	0
05. Aug 06	27.5	7	SHABAA	SAMBURU	0
20. Aug 06	36	2	NTULELE	NAROK	3
29. Aug 06	5.9	4	SKOT	MERU	0
07. Sep 06	87	5	WESTLANDS	NAIROBI	1

11. Sep 06	86	22	NAIBOR	LAIKIPIA	1
21. Sep 06	20	3	HURI/LALE	GARISSA	0
22. Sep 06	7	3	LORIAN	ISIOLO	0
25. Sep 06		1	KIANGONDU	MERU	
28. Sep 06	16		NTIMARU	KURIA	1
09. Oct 06	3		MOYALE TOWN	MARSABIT	0
09. Oct 06	12		NAROK TOWN	NAROK	3
12. Oct 06	13.8	19	JKIA	NAIROBI	1
17. Oct 06	4	4	NYERI TOWN	NYERI	1
18. Oct 06		2	MOYALE	MARSABIT	
24. Oct 06	36		NGOSUANI	NAROK	2
30. Oct 06		2	NAMWAMORU	TURKANA	
10. Nov 06	6	2	OSINYAI	TAITA TAVETA	0
16. Nov 06	8	2	KIJIRJIR VILLAGE	NAROK	2
18. Nov 06	13	2	TAITA RANCH	TAITA TAVETA	0
20. Nov 06	52	12	ISIOLO TOWN	ISIOLO	3
Total	2180.65	482			131

Annex 3: Annotations to the Appendix II listings of African elephants

1. Populations of Botswana, Namibia and South Africa (listed in Appendix II):

For the exclusive purpose of allowing:

- 1) trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes;
- 2) trade in live animals for *in situ* conservation programmes;
- 3) trade in hides;
- 4) trade in leather goods: for non-commercial purposes for Botswana; for commercial or non-commercial purposes for Namibia and South Africa;
- 5) trade in hair for commercial or non-commercial purposes for Namibia;
- 6) trade in individually marked and certified ekipas incorporated in finished jewellery for non-commercial purposes for Namibia; and
- 7) trade in registered raw ivory (for Botswana and Namibia, whole tusks and pieces; for South Africa, whole tusks and cut pieces of ivory that are both 20 cm or more in length and 1 kg or more in weight) subject to the following:
 - i) only registered government-owned stocks, originating in the State (excluding seized ivory and ivory of unknown origin) and, in the case of South Africa, only ivory originating from the Kruger National Park);
 - ii) only to trading partners that have been verified by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Standing Committee, to have sufficient national legislation and domestic trade controls to ensure that the imported ivory will not be re-exported and will be managed in accordance with all requirements of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) concerning domestic manufacturing and trade;
 - iii) not before the Secretariat has verified the prospective importing countries, and the MIKE programme has reported to the Secretariat on the baseline information (e.g. elephant population numbers, incidence of illegal killing);
 - iv) a maximum of 20,000 kg (Botswana), 10,000 kg (Namibia) and 30,000 kg (South Africa) of ivory may be traded, and despatched in a single shipment under strict supervision of the Secretariat;
 - v) the proceeds of the trade are used exclusively for elephant conservation and community conservation and development programmes within or adjacent to the elephant range; and
 - vi) only after the Standing Committee has agreed that the above conditions have been met.

On a proposal from the Secretariat, the Standing Committee can decide to cause this trade to cease partially or completely in the event of non-compliance by exporting or importing countries, or in the case of proven detrimental impacts of the trade on other elephant populations.

All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly.

2. Population of Zimbabwe (listed in Appendix II):

For the exclusive purpose of allowing:

- 1) export of hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes;
- 2) export of live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations;
- 3) export of hides; and
- 4) export of leather goods and ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes.

All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly.

To ensure that where a) destinations for live animals are to be appropriate and acceptable and/or b) the purpose of the import is to be non-commercial, export permits and re-export certificates may be issued only after the issuing Management Authority has received, from the Management Authority of the State of import, a certification to the effect that: in case a), in analogy to Article III, paragraph 3 (b) of the Convention, the holding facility has been reviewed by the competent Scientific Authority, and the proposed recipient has been found to be suitably equipped to house and care for the animals; and/or in case b), in analogy to Article III, paragraph 3 (c), the Management Authority is satisfied that the specimens will not be used for primarily commercial purposes.

Annex 4: Reports of elephant poaching and illegal ivory trade in and linked with Zimbabwe (reports involving Botswana and South Africa are also included in Annexes 5 and 7)

Report	Date	Details	Source
1	Oct 2006	<p>Poaching of elephants in Chizarira National Park, Zimbabwe.</p> <p>The elephants were part of the “presidential herd” which President Robert Mugabe had undertaken to protect in 1991 from hunters and poachers. The police in Matabeleland North province under which Chizarira falls said an anti-poaching team disrupted about five people as they were “...dehorning the elephants...”. The poachers fled the scene leaving behind a .303 rifle and about 22 tusks. Reports that two people were arrested while some of the poachers fled to Zambia through Botswana.</p>	<p>Poachers kill elephants in national park (Zim Online, 10 Oct 2006) http://www.zimbabwesituation.com/oct10a_2006.html#Z3)</p> <p>Zimbabwe recovers 22 tusks, poaching on rise (Reuters, 18 Oct 2006) http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/L18445714.htm</p>
2	Oct. 2006	<p>A black rhino killed by poachers within Hwange National Park. The poachers reportedly left behind three elephant tails and fresh game meat. The killing of the rhino was witnessed by a number of Wildlife & Environment Zimbabwe (WEZ) volunteers. APU teams managed to track down a group of four poachers but failed to arrest them after they crossed into Botswana.</p>	<p>Zimbabwe Conservation Task Force. Update on Hwange National Park (posted 18 Oct 2006) www.swradioafrica.com/pages/zctf181006.htm</p> <p>Zimbabwe: \$54 Million Jumbo Tusks Recovered (The Herald, 18 Oct 2006) http://allafrica.com/stories/200610180414.html</p>
3	Oct 2006	<p>Attempted smuggling of ivory from Zimbabwe through Beit Bridge.</p>	<p>A report of the South Africa Police Service (12 Oct 2006) http://www.saps.gov.za/dynamicModules/internetSite/newsBuild.asp?myURL=705</p>
4	Sept 2006	<p>Worked ivory from Zimbabwe on sale illegally in Francistown, Botswana. A curio vender said he had ivory carvings for sale, which came from Zimbabwe.</p>	<p>Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana and South Africa (Anon 2006a).</p>
5	Sept 2006	<p>Report of Elephants being poached in Chizarira National Park during 2006. Reported that poached ivory was being smuggled to China.</p>	<p>In Zimbabwe, loyalists of wild kingdom rush to the rescue (The Boston Globe, 18 Sep 2006) http://www.boston.com/news/world/articles/2006/09/18/in_zimbabwe_loyalists_of_wild_kingdom_rush_to_the_rescue/</p>
6	Sept 2006	<p>Seizure of 30 carved ivory pieces at Beit Bridge (South African side). South African Police Service officers on duty at Beit Bridge border informed investigators that in Sept 2006 they had seized at least 30 carved ivory pieces—carved animals, cut-off pieces of tusk that had been carved, and a small pile of ivory bangles.</p> <p>The ivory had come from Zimbabwe and was being smuggled into South Africa.</p>	<p>Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana and South Africa (Anon 2006a).</p>

7	Aug 2006	Mozambican national arrested aboard a bus heading towards Harare with two elephant tusks in his luggage.	Mozambican National Found with two Elephant Tusks (The Herald, 24 Aug 2006) http://www.zimconservation.com/archives6-93.htm
8	Aug 2006	Poaching of an elephant in Matetsi Six area. Three of the poachers were shot by mobilised anti-poaching units. At least one of the poachers was Zambian.	Professional hunter cited in Anon 2006b.
9	June 2006	Seizure of 27 ivory tusks and carved ivory pieces, Randburg, South Africa. A Zimbabwean was arrested in Paulshof, Randburg, South Africa, for illegally trading in ivory products worth between R500,000 and R1 million. A police spokesman said it was “...established that the ivory was from Zimbabwe.”	Zimbabwean arrested for Ivory Trade (SAPA, 21 June 2006) http://www.queensu.ca/samp/migrationnews/article.php?Mig_News_ID=3260&Mig_News_Issue=18&Mig_News_Cat=8
10	June 2006	Seizure of two ivory tusks in controlled operation by South African Police. A woman was arrested in Johannesburg after she sold 2 tusks, in a controlled operation, to police. The tusks were said to have come from Zimbabwe.	Zimbabwean arrested for Ivory Trade (SAPA, 21 June 2006) http://www.queensu.ca/samp/migrationnews/article.php?Mig_News_ID=3260&Mig_News_Issue=18&Mig_News_Cat=8
11	June 2006	A man was arrested on 20 June at a house in Sunninghill (northern Johannesburg). Police confiscated 400 ivory ornaments, which had been illegally imported from Zimbabwe. Documents were found containing the details of curio shops, individual customers and large businesses who were apparently linked to trading in ivory.	Six arrested for ivory and plant possession (Independent Online, 27 June 2006) http://www.save-the-elephants.org/news.asp?linkID=34&articleID=1537&rYear=
12	May 2006	100 carved ivory pieces seized at Beit Bridge (Zimbabwean side). 2 South African immigration officials, stationed at Makhado, and a Zimbabwean man were arrested after attempting to smuggle five bags containing over 100 ivory pieces and 400 bricks of cigarettes out of Zimbabwe.	Jail for Zimbabwean and South African Immigration Officials (zimbabwejournalists.com, 19 June 2006) http://www.zimbabwesituation.com/jun_20_2006.html#Z15 and Beit Bridge Officials Convicted (News 24, 24 May 2006). http://www.news24.com/News24/South_Africa/News/0,6119,2-7-1442_1938373,00.html
13	May 2006	Chinese dealers were caught with 7 tonnes of ivory in Harare. 3 or 5 tonnes of this ivory was believed to have been purchased from Parks stockpile, with the remainder coming from illegal poaching. The incident does not appear to have been reported in the local Zimbabwean press and needs verification.	China's empire-builders sweep up African riches (Sunday Times, 16 July 2006) http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2089-2271971,00.html Senior ex-Parks employee cited in Anon 2006b.

14	Feb 2006	Seizure of 233kg of high-quality ivory carvings, Beit Bridge, (South African side). Ivory was smuggled across into South Africa from Zimbabwe. Ivory was valued at R163,000 (US\$23,000). [Docket number for this case is <i>Musina CAS 172/02/2006</i> .]	Zim-SA ivory ring suspected (News 24, 21 Feb 2006) http://www.news24.com/News24/Africa/Zimbabwe/0,6119,2-11-1662_1885714,00.html
15	2006	Chinese nationals were caught in Gaborone with 18 cut pieces of illegal ivory from Zimbabwe, which they were in the process of transporting to China. The Chinese have been arrested and charged and the case is pending.	Source: Botswana police official cited in Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana And South Africa (Anon 2006a)
16	Sept 2005	8 tonnes of ivory from Parks stockpile allegedly sold to China in part payment for thousands of Kalashnikov rifles. The ivory was estimated to be worth almost US\$1million. The report states that it was being investigated by Interpol and the Geneva-based secretariat of CITES. The alleged facts of this case are very similar to another reported to have occurred in May 2000 (case 36 below). It is unclear whether they are two separate incidents, or the same incident incorrectly reported with different dates. If the same case, it was investigated by CITES and allegations judged to be “unfounded”.	Mugabe's Guns-For-Ivory Deal With China Exposed (Zimdaily, 6 Oct 2005) http://64.233.183.104/search?q=cache:c6Y8bJa2_VsJ:weekender.zimdaily.com/news/article.php/20051004165320816/print+%22Ivory+Deal+With+China+Exposed%22&hl=en&gl=uk&ct=clnk&cd=4 and http://64.233.183.104/search?q=cache:r5Uvdgc0r9Ij:www.zimdaily.com/news2/article.php%3Fstory%3D20051004165320816%26mode%3Dprint+%22Deal+With+China+Exposed%22&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=2
17	Aug 2005	14 tusks recovered in the town of Gokwe. It was suspected that the elephants were poached in the CAMPFIRE areas in Gokwe District. Tusks (weighing 200kg) were worth over Z\$60 million or US\$237,108	14 Ivory Tusks Recovered in Gokwe (The Herald, 22 Aug 2005) http://www.wag.co.za/News/juldec/14%20Ivory%20Tusks%20Recovered%20in%20Gokwe.htm Brian Gratwicke and Brent Stapelkamp, “Wildlife Conservation & Environmental Management in an ‘Outpost of Tyranny’” (March 2006) http://www.zimconservation.com/opinion.htm
18	Aug 2005	11 elephant tusks recovered by police during a road block check in Harare (linked to Dande Safari Area /Mafiro village, Guruve). The tusks were being smuggled into Harare through Malborough, along Mazowe Road as the suspects tried to avoid a roadblock. The elephant tusks were believed to have come from elephants poached in Mafiro village in Guruve, a CAMPFIRE area. The ivory in question weighed 48kg and was valued at over Z\$50 million (US\$ 200,000).	Police Recover 11 Jumbo Tusks (The Herald, 15 Aug 2005) http://www.wag.co.za/News/juldec/police_recover_11_jumbo_tusks_t.htm 14 Ivory Tusks Recovered in Gokwe (The Herald, 22 Aug 2005) http://www.wag.co.za/News/juldec/14%20Ivory%20Tusks%20Recovered%20in%20Gokwe.htm

19	July 2005	<p>72 tusks seized from Chinese nationals in Harare. 10 of these tusks were registered, complete with official serial numbers, and had been bought legally from the Parks ivory warehouse.</p> <p>Parks believe that the remaining 62 ivory tusks came from elephants poached in the Zambezi Valley.</p>	<p>Police Bust Illegal Ivory Trade (The Herald, 6 July 2005) http://www.wag.co.za/News/juldec/Police%20Bust%20Illegal%20Ivory%20Trade.htm</p> <p>See also Standing Committee Report, SC54 Doc. 26.1(Rev.1) www.cites.org/eng/com/SC/54/E54-26-1.pdf)</p>
20	May 2005	Ivory allegedly being smuggled from Zimbabwe to China, hidden in containers filled with glass.	Zimbabwe Conservation Task Force e-mail alert issued on 27 May 2005
21	April 2005	12 tusks seized, after a poaching ring was busted in Mukwichi National Park.	Zimbabwean Police Bust Elephant Poaching Syndicate (CRIEnglish.com, 30 April 2005) http://www.zimconservation.com/archives6-48.htm
22	March 2005	<p>Reports of eight tusks and other elephant body parts seized at Schipol Airport, Amsterdam. An illegal shipment of African elephant body parts was seized by Dutch customs officials at Amsterdam airport. The cargo included 22 feet, eight tusks, eight ears, three tails, a skull and an entire hide." The consignment originated in Zimbabwe. According to ZCTF, the body parts were apparently intended for buyers in Spain, Portugal and the Czech Republic. ZPWMA Director Dr Mtsambiwa issued a six-page press release-cum-letter on national parks headed paper ("Response to an article "Operation Nyama" being circulated by the Wildlife Conservation Taskforce") suggesting that Zimbabwe was unaware of the Schipol seizure and had not been contacted by the Dutch authorities.</p>	<p>Tourists flee park elephants slaughter (Daily Telegraph, 23 Mar 2005) http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2005/03/23/wzim23.xml&Sheet=/news/2005/03/23/ixworld.html</p> <p>Zimbabwe Conservation Task Force – Operation Nyama press Release, 9 Mar 2005 http://www.sanwild.org/noticeboard/news2005/OPERATIONNYAMA.html</p>
23	Aug. 2004	<p>11.8kg of ivory seized at Beit Bridge border post on bus going to South Africa.</p> <p>11.8kg of ivory was found during a search of a bus coming from Zimbabwe at the Beit Bridge border post by South African Revenue Service's customs anti-smuggling team, and two Kenyan women suspects arrested. They were also in possession of other ivory items such as jewellery.</p>	Cited in: Independent Online, 5 Aug 2004. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
24	Post-2004	A hunting outfit who until recently used a lodge close to Hwange, were found to have buried 16 elephant tusks in the garden of the lodge.	Wildlife researcher cited in Anon 2006b.
25	Pre-2004	Poaching alleged of circa 300 elephants near Kazangula (border post with Namibia) using a helicopter and machine guns. Army involvement was suspected in this poaching exercise. (Incident needs verification.)	Former senior Parks official cited in Anon 2006b.

26	Late 2003 / early 2004	Poaching of 5 bull elephants, Victoria Falls. Killing of elephants was apparently the work of the Zimbabwean army, war vets and commercial poachers.	ZCTF e-mail bulletin from 27 Jan 2004
27	Nov 2003	76 pairs of elephant tusks (and an undisclosed number of rhino horns) on sale in Gokwe area.	E-mail alert (" <i>Elephant Tusks and Rhino Horns</i> ") issued by the Zimbabwe Conservation Task Force, 5 Nov 2003
28	Sept 2003	Report of poaching of elephants and rhinos in 2003 (mainly Zambezi Valley). 139 elephants were reported killed by poachers since 2002. At least 50 were killed between January and July 2003. 7 suspected Zambian poachers were killed by game wardens in Hwange National Parks and Victoria Falls	Parks Authority acquires US\$2m new vehicles." (The Herald, Sept 2003) http://www.zimbabwesituation.com/sep4a_2003.html#link2)
29	March 2003	Two elephant tusks recovered from suspected Zambian poachers, gunned down in Dashinga Game Park. Three AK47 rifles and 56 rounds of ammunition recovered.	Source: Zimbabwe Police. Cited in: The Times of Zambia, 25 Mar 2003 (See also IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
30	1999 – 2003	"WWF survey" allegedly counted 3800 elephant carcasses in the Zambezi Valley over the four-year period. (Survey not located.)	Zimbabwe – Wildlife Crisis as elite grabs hunting ban (Sunday Times, 31 Aug 2003) http://www.zimbabwesituation.com/aug10_2003.html#link6
31	2002	Seizure of ivory en-route from Zimbabwe to China	A senior Parks official cited in Anon 2006b.
32	May 2002	15 poachers arrested after they killed an elephant and ransacked a lodge in Chewore	"Suspected Poachers Shot Dead" (The Herald, 10 May 2002)
33	April–May 2002	More than 8 elephants killed in Charara (Kariba) and Chewore areas by poachers.	"Suspected Poachers Shot Dead" (The Herald, 10 May 2002)
34	April 2002	1 elephant killed by poachers at a lodge near Chewore.	Elephant poaching reports from 2000. HSUS http://www.hsus.org/wildlife/issues_facing_wildlife/wildlife_trade/elephant_trade_fact_sheet/elephant_poaching_and_ivory_seizures/elephant_poaching_summary_and_2002_reports_through_may_21/ (Citing article in The Herald, 29 April 2002)
35	March 2002	7 elephants killed by poachers.	Elephant poaching reports from 2000. HSUS http://www.hsus.org/wildlife/issues_facing_wildlife/wildlife_trade/elephant_trade_fact_sheet/elephant_poaching_and_ivory_seizures/elephant_poaching_summary_and_2002_reports_through_may_21/ (Citing article in The Harare Herald – April 29 2002)
36	May 2000	8 tonnes of ivory from Parks stockpile sold to China as part payment for arms supplies. CITES	Zim probed for illegal sale of ivory to China (Zim Financial Gazette, July

	<p>investigated claims made in this news report, but did not find sufficient evidence to verify the allegations and judged them to be '<i>unfounded</i>' (CITES No. 2000/060 Geneva, 3 Nov 2000, http://www.cites.org/eng/notif/2000/060.shtml)</p> <p>The alleged facts of this case are very similar to another incident reported in Sept 2005 (case 16 above). It is unclear whether they are 2 separate incidents or the same incident incorrectly reported with different dates.</p>	<p>2000) http://www.zimbabwesituation.com/jul24.html#link8a</p> <p>Illegal ivory sale buys guns for Mugabe (Sunday Times, July 2000) http://www.zimbabwesituation.com/jul10.html#link1</p>
--	---	---

Annex 5: Reports of poaching and illegal ivory trade in Botswana

Date	Details	Source
Sept 2006	Worked ivory from Zimbabwe was found to be for sale illegally in Francistown, Botswana	Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana and South Africa (Anon 2006a)
2006	An Indian national was caught in Botswana with 22 pieces of ivory carvings bought from Zambians.	Source: Botswana police official cited in Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana And South Africa (Anon 2006a)
2006	Chinese nationals were caught in Gaborone with 18 cut pieces of illegal ivory from Zimbabwe, which they were in the process of transporting to China. The Chinese have been arrested and charged and the case is pending.	Source: Botswana police official cited in Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana And South Africa (Anon 2006a)
2006	Police arrested two Zambians at the border between Zambia and Botswana with ivory chopsticks and Chinese-style carvings. No other information was provided.	Source: Botswana police official cited in Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana And South Africa (Anon 2006a)
Feb –Mar 2006	3 people were arrested for the illegal possession of elephant tusks at Tsolamosese on the outskirts of Gaborone. One of the three persons was convicted to 24 months imprisonment with 10 months suspended for two years.	"Police arrest trophy dealers" 24 March 2006 http://www.gov.bw/cgi-bin/news.cgi?d=20060324&i=Police_arrest_trophy_dealers
Feb –Mar 2006	4 Zimbabweans were arrested for illegal possession of elephant tusks. One of them was sentenced to 18 months imprisonment.	"Police arrest trophy dealers" 24 March 2006 http://www.gov.bw/cgi-bin/news.cgi?d=20060324&i=Police_arrest_trophy_dealers
Feb –Mar 2006	3 people were arrested in Good Hope in possession of elephant tusks.	"Police arrest trophy dealers" 24 March 2006 http://www.gov.bw/cgi-bin/news.cgi?d=20060324&i=Police_arrest_trophy_dealers
Nov 2005	30 people (including 4 foreigners) were arrested in connection with possession of government trophy. 36 elephant tusks were recovered.	"30 nabbed for possessing elephant tusks" 2 November 2005 http://www.gov.bw/cgi-bin/news.cgi?d=20051102&i=30_nabbed_for_posessing_elephant_tusks
Jan – Nov 2005	Wildlife and National Parks Director Rapelang Mojaphoko says her department has recorded 13 cases of illegal possession of elephant tusks since January 2005.	"30 nabbed for possessing elephant tusks" 2 November 2005 http://www.gov.bw/cgi-bin/news.cgi?d=20051102&i=30_nabbed_for_posessing_elephant_tusks
2005	The Narcotics and Diamond Squad of the Botswana Police recorded 12 cases involving 21 pieces of elephant ivory and three rhino horns worth more than P580,000 in the year 2005. 24 people were arrested in connection with the illegal possession of ivory.	"Police arrest trophy dealers" 24 March, 2006 http://www.gov.bw/cgi-bin/news.cgi?d=20060324&i=Police_arrest_trophy_dealers Source: Detective Superintendent Monthusi Ben of the Narcotics and Diamond Squad. Source: Botswana police official cited in

		Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana And South Africa (Anon 2006a)
2004	2005 Annual Report for the Diamonds and Narcotics Unit, CID, shows that in 2004 there were 6 cases of police seizing tusks. 18 tusks in total were seized and 15 people were arrested.	Source: Botswana police official cited in Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana And South Africa (Anon 2006a)
2000 2005	According to the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) the number of elephants killed for ivory (mainly poaching in areas along the Botswana/Zimbabwe border) between 2000 and 2005 range between 2 and 42 elephants per annum with the highest number poached in 2001.	Syndicate uncovered, 23 August, 2006 http://www.gov.bw/cgi-bin/news.cgi?d=20060823&i=Syndicate_uncovered
2003	2005 Annual Report for the Diamonds and Narcotics Unit, CID, shows that in 2003 there were 7 cases of police seizing tusks. 13 tusks in total were seized along with 2 rhino horns (total value P1058747-35). A total of 7 people were arrested.	Source: Botswana police official cited in Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana And South Africa (Anon 2006a)
2003	In 2003, poachers came from Zambia and killed about 16 elephants in Chobe. Three of the poachers were shot dead, and none were prosecuted.	Source: Botswana police officer cited in Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana And South Africa (Anon 2006a)
16 Mar 2003	1 elephant tusk weighing 3kg was seized by Customs at Ramokgwebane on 16 March 2003.	Source: Customs official cited in Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana And South Africa (Anon 2006a)
Mar 2003	5 elephant tusks (weighing 20kg) were seized by Customs at Kasane Airport.	Source: Customs official cited in Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana And South Africa (Anon 2006a)
Sep 2001	Two tusks were seized from poachers armed with AK-47 rifles in Chobe Forestry Reserve on 12 September 2001.	Source: Police Officer Commanding, Senior Superintendent Olefihle Maswabi. Cited in: Botswana Daily News Online, 19 September 2001. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
2001	In 2001, 42 elephants were poached from Chobe near the Zimbabwe border - it is suspected that the poachers were Zimbabweans.	Source: DWNP official cited in Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana And South Africa (Anon 2006a)

Annex 6: Reports of illegal ivory trade and poaching in Namibia

Date	Details	Source
July 2004	Four elephant tusks were seized by the Erongo branch of the Protected Resources Unit of the Namibian Police from four suspects. The seizure was conducted in the week of July 12. The suspects have appeared in court and were not granted bail.	Cited in: The Namibian, July 20, 2004. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
2003	A total of 41 tusks seized in 10 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
2002	A total of 29 tusks seized in 13 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
April 2002	A number of Chinese nationals were arrested at Walvis Bay. One man was found in possession of 2 elephant tusks and a rhino horn. Weapons were also seized.	"6 Chinese nationals arrested at Walvis Bay", The Namibian, 8 April 2002.
Feb 2002	One elephant calf was poached in Khorixas on 11 February 2002.	Source: Namibian Police Protected Resources Unit. Cited in: Report of the Unit. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
Jan – April 2002	From January to April 2002, eight tusks and four pieces of tusks were seized by government officials. Weights not recorded.	Source: Namibian Police Protected Resources Unit. Cited in: Report of the Unit. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
2001	A total of 41 tusks seized in 18 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
Aug 2001	A piece of ivory measuring 10 cm, and three rhino horns, were confiscated from an Austrian police officer in August 2001 at the Hosea Kutako International Airport. The man pleaded guilty and was fined N\$5000 (US\$700).	Cited in: The Namibian, 21 August 2001. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
2000	A total of 47 tusks seized in 24 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
1999	A total of 77 tusks seized in 19 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
1998	A total of 84 tusks seized in 21 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
1997	A total of 126 tusks seized in 53 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
1996	A total of 153 tusks seized in 47 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
1995	A total of 414 tusks seized in 71 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
1994	A total of 611 tusks seized in 70 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
1993	A total of 893 tusks seized in 69 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
1992	A total of 456 tusks seized in 40 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
1991	A total of 222 tusks seized in 44 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
1990	A total of 203 tusks seized in 30 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)
1989	A total of 1074 tusks seized in 22 seizures	CoP13 Prop. 7 (Annex 2)

Annex 7: Reports of illegal ivory trade in and through South Africa

Date	Details	Source
Oct. 2006	Attempted smuggling of ivory from Zimbabwe into South Africa through Beit Bridge.	Report of the South Africa Police Service, 12 October 2006 http://www.saps.gov.za/_dynamicModules/internetSite/newsBuild.asp?myURL=705
Sept. 2006	<p>Seizure of 30 carved ivory pieces at Beit Bridge (South African side). South African Police Service officers on duty at Beit Bridge border informed investigation team that in September 2006 they seized at least 30 carved ivory pieces– carved animals, cut-off pieces of tusk that had been carved, and a small pile of ivory bangles.</p> <p>The ivory had come from Zimbabwe and was being smuggled into South Africa.</p>	Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana and South Africa (Anon 2006a)
June 2006	A Zimbabwean was arrested in Paulshof, Randburg, South Africa, for illegally trading in ivory products worth between R500,000 and R1 million. 27 ivory tusks and carved ivory pieces were seized. A police spokesman said it was “...established that the ivory was from Zimbabwe.”	Zimbabwean arrested for ivory trade (SAPA – June 21 2006) http://www.queensu.ca/samp/migrationnews/article.php?Mig_News_ID=3260&Mig_News_Issue=18&Mig_News_Cat=8
June 2006	A man was arrested on June 20 at a house in Sunninghill (northern Johannesburg). Police confiscated 400 ivory ornaments, which had been illegally imported from Zimbabwe. Documents containing the details of curio shops, individual customers and large businesses linked to trading in ivory, were also found and confiscated. The ornaments confiscated included: necklaces, mantelpieces, carved statues, bangles, earrings, polished cylinders, and pendulums all made from ivory. Carved hippo teeth were also seized.	Six arrested for ivory and plant possession Independent Online June 27, 2006 http://www.save-the-elephants.org/news.asp?linkID=34&articleID=1537&rYear=
June 2006	<p>Seizure of two ivory tusks in controlled operation by South African Police.</p> <p>A woman was arrested in Johannesburg after she sold 2 tusks, in a controlled operation, to police. The tusks were said to have come from Zimbabwe.</p>	Zimbabwean arrested for ivory trade (SAPA – June 21 2006) http://www.queensu.ca/samp/migrationnews/article.php?Mig_News_ID=3260&Mig_News_Issue=18&Mig_News_Cat=8
May 2006	<p>100 carved ivory pieces seized at Beit Bridge (Zimbabwean side).</p> <p>2 South African immigration officials, stationed at Makhado, and a Zimbabwean man were arrested after attempting to smuggle five bags containing over 100 ivory pieces and 400 bricks of cigarettes out of</p>	<p>Jail for Zimbabwean and South African Immigration Officials (June 19 2006 – zimbabwejournalists.com) http://www.zimbabwesituation.com/jun20_2006.html#Z15</p> <p>and</p> <p>Beit Bridge Officials Convicted (News 24 – May 24 2006).</p>

	Zimbabwe and into South Africa.	http://www.news24.com/News24/South_Africa/News/0,6119,2-7-1442_1938373,00.html
Feb 2006	Seizure of 233kg of high-quality ivory carvings that were smuggled from Zimbabwe into South Africa via Beit Bridge. Ivory was valued at R163,000	Zim-SA ivory ring suspected (News 24 - February 21 2006) http://www.news24.com/News24/Africa/Zimbabwe/0,6119,2-11-1662_1885714,00.html Confidential source. [Docket number for this case is <i>Musina CAS 172/02/2006</i> .]
Jan 2005 – Sept 2006	Over the period Jan 2005-Sept 2006, 450kg of hankos and other worked ivory items destined for the Chinese market were seized in the Limpopo Province.	Source: Provincial enforcement officer interviewed, cited in Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana and South Africa (Anon 2006a)
Aug 2004	11.8kg of ivory was found during a search of a bus at the Beit Bridge border post by South African Revenue Service's customs anti-smuggling team, and two Kenyan women suspects were arrested. They were on their way to Johannesburg, and were also found in possession of other ivory items such as jewellery.	Cited in: Independent Online, August 5, 2004. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
July 2004	691 pieces of ivory were seized in Zambia by the Drug Enforcement Commission from two Lusaka businesswomen while attempting to transport it to South Africa.	Cited in: Times of Zambia, July 22, 2004. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
May 2003	2 elephant tusks weighing 4kg were seized from four men in a Durban city street by Ezemvelo KwaZulu-Natal Wildlife and the South African Police.	"Escalating Elephant Poaching in KwaZulu-Natal Province a Major Concern for Conservationists" (May 20, 2003) Press Release from International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) http://www.savetheelephants.org/news.asp?linkID=35&articleID=1172&rYear Cited in: The Independent, May 11 2003 (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
May 2002	4 pieces of raw ivory suspected to be from South Africa, were seized on 15 May 2002.	Source: SAPA. Cited in: Financial Times. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
April 2002	Seven elephant tusks, weighing 90 kg, were seized from one South African and two Batswana nationals who tried to sell the ivory to undercover detectives. The three ivory dealers were arrested.	Source: Police spokesperson, Superintendent Gert Ackron, Endangered Species Protection Unit. Cited in: The Citizen, 10 April 2002. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
June 2002	6 tonnes of illegal ivory were seized in Singapore. Investigations revealed that the majority of this ivory had been poached in Zambia and smuggled through Malawi via South Africa	Environmental Investigation Agency 2002 SA News Reports – "SA police seize Zim's ivory" (June 21, 2006) by Michael Appel. http://www.andnetwork.com/index?service=direct/0/Home/top.titleStory&sp=l40208 Manning, I. 2006. Zambia Elephant Mayhem. African News Dimension, November 22,2006

2002	19 suspicious shipments of ivory (totalling 123.5 tonnes) from elephants poached in Zambia were allegedly smuggled through Malawi and via South Africa, before being shipped to Asia.	Manning, I. 2006. Zambia Elephant Mayhem. African News Dimension, November 22, 2006
Oct. 2001	22 tusks, weighing 140 kg and worth 200,000 Rand, possibly having originated in Botswana, were found in a storeroom in Pietersburg, Northern Province.	Source: Captain Ronel Otto, provincial police spokeswoman. Cited in: African Eye News Service, 15 October 2001. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
March 2001	In March 2001, 26 tusks, valued at R250,000 to R500,000, and believed to have come from Botswana, were seized from a North West Province farm, where they were found buried. The owner of the farm was arrested.	Source: Endangered Species Protection Unit and Supt. Bernadine Benson. Cited in: Wildnet Africa, 23 March 2001 and News24, 23 March 2001. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
Sept. 2000	8 elephant tusks were seized from five Pretoria men, who were arrested.	Source: South African Police Service's Endangered Species Protection Unit. Cited in: The Pretoria News, 12 September 2000. (IFAW ivory seizure and elephant poaching database.)
August 1999	Chinese customs officials arrested six men, following the seizure of 221 elephant tusk pairs (weighing more than 2 metric tonnes) from a shipment originating from South Africa.	CITES News - Environment: Kenya pushes for total ivory trade ban Inter Press Service (22nd February 2000) http://www.savetheelephants.org/news.asp?linkID=35&articleID=1183&rYear=
1994	800kg of left-over ivory was found in a vegetable garden (no mention of where or whose garden) after poachers had cut up the tusks. Apparently 50-60% of ivory is lost in the cutting up process. The original amount of ivory was therefore 1600kg. If an average tusk equals 10kg, then 800 kg of left-over ivory represents about 160 tusks or 80 elephants	Source: ex-ESPU officer, cited in Elephant Conservation Management and the Ivory Trade in Botswana and South Africa (Anon 2006a)