

Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention
REPORT ON NATIONAL REPORTS REQUIRED
UNDER ARTICLE VIII, PARAGRAPH 7(a), OF THE CONVENTION

The need for annual reports

1. There are two reasons why the submission of annual reports is of great importance.
2. – Firstly, the data in these reports provide the basis for monitoring the levels of trade in the species covered by the Convention. They have been of particular value in the reviews, by the Animals and Plants Committees, of significant trade in Appendix-II species.
3. – Secondly, the data provide very useful information on the implementation of the Convention and comparison of reports frequently gives indications of trade that might have been illegal.
4. To facilitate monitoring of the levels of trade, the Secretariat employs the services of the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) to maintain the data from the annual reports in a computerized database. This enables rapid calculations of the levels of trade and quick comparisons of the reports of importing and exporting countries.
5. But the data are of no use whatever if they are substantially incomplete or if they are very out of date. This is why the Secretariat emphasizes the need for annual reports to be submitted quickly and to contain all the information that is required.
6. There is an obligation on Parties to submit annual reports in accordance with Article VIII, paragraph 7(a), of the Convention.
7. Relative to this requirement, the Conference of the Parties has adopted decisions regarding the timing of submission of annual reports (see paragraph 9) and regarding the information to be included (see paragraph 20).
8. As for previous meetings of the Conference of the Parties, the Secretariat has requested the WCMC to provide an analysis of the annual reports, looking at both of these issues. The report of WCMC is annexed to this document. The report was written in English. Regrettably, for budgetary reasons, it has not been possible to provide a translation of the full report into the other working languages of the Convention. However, in the Spanish and French versions of this document, translations of the Summary and Conclusions of the report are appended to the Annex.

Timing of submission of annual reports

9. In Resolution Conf. 8.7, on submission of annual reports, the Conference of the Parties recorded its decision that **the failure of a Party to submit its annual report by 31 October in the year following the year to which it refers constitutes a major problem with the implementation of the Convention**. This is now recorded in Resolution Conf. 9.4, which replaced the earlier Resolution.
10. The same Resolution also gave the right to the Secretariat to approve valid requests for reasonable extensions of this deadline, if they are submitted in writing before the deadline and contain adequate justification for the delay.
11. The same Resolution records the decision of the Conference of the Parties that the failure of any Party

to meet the deadline of 31 October shall be reported by the Secretariat to the Standing Committee, for a solution in accordance with Resolution Conf. 7.5.

12. The relevant paragraphs of Resolution Conf. 7.5 are as follows:

*THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION*

RECOMMENDS:

- g) *that, if major problems with implementation of the Convention in particular Parties are brought to the attention of the Secretariat, the Secretariat work together with the Party concerned to try to solve the problem and offer advice or technical assistance as required;*
 - h) *that, if it does not appear a solution can be readily achieved, the Secretariat bring the matter to the attention of the Standing Committee, which may pursue the matter in direct contact with the Party concerned with a view to helping to find a solution; and*
 - i) *that the Secretariat keep the Parties informed as fully as possible, through Notifications, of such implementation problems and of actions taken to solve them, and include such problems in its report of alleged infractions.*
13. In relation to paragraph g), the Secretariat has written on a number of occasions to Parties that have submitted their reports late, or not submitted them at all, to urge them to submit their reports and to seek to understand better the problems encountered. Moreover, the Secretariat has offered to help Parties that really need it, by arranging to computerize the data from export permits that they have issued and from foreign export permits that they have accepted for specimens being imported. The computerization is done for the Secretariat by WCMC, which can, on request, make a print-out of the computerized data in the form of an annual report. Very few Parties have accepted this offer.
 14. In relation to paragraph h), the Secretariat has brought the matter to the attention of the Standing Committee at its 29th, 31st, 35th, 36th and 37th meetings.
 15. – At the 36th meeting of the Standing Committee (Geneva, January/February 1996), the Secretariat reported on the submission of reports for 1994, noting that only 44 per cent of the reports due had been received before the deadline. Consequently, at the request of the Committee, its Chairman wrote to the Parties that had failed to submit reports, to urge them to do so, to ask why the reports were not submitted on time and to suggest that Parties with problems should seek the assistance of the Secretariat. In the two months that followed, 14 reports for 1994 were received from Parties. Moreover, a few letters were received from Parties, indicating that submission of their annual reports had been delayed because of inadequate resources.
 16. – At the 37th meeting of the Standing Committee (Rome, December 1996), the Secretariat reported on the submission of reports for 1995, noting that again only 44 per cent of the reports due had been

received before the deadline. It was noted that half of the members of the Standing Committee were among the Parties that had neither submitted their annual report for 1995 on time nor sought an extension to the deadline in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.4. Although the Standing Committee had been instructed by the Conference of the Parties to seek a solution to the problem of late submission of annual reports, in accordance with Resolution Conf. 7.5, it took no action at its 37th meeting.

17. In relation to paragraph i), apart from distributing the minutes of the meetings of the Standing Committee with Notifications, the Secretariat also reminded the Parties in Notifications to the Parties No. 827 (15 September 1994) and No. 899 (28 February 1996) of the need to submit annual reports. In the latter Notification it also reported on the extent of the problem of late submission of annual reports.

18. The Secretariat has not attached to this document a list of the annual reports received from the Parties because it believes that such a list could misdirect the discussion on this subject. As it is important, however, to know which countries have persistent problems, it should be noted that, at the time of writing (April 1997) the Secretariat has not received the annual reports for 1994 or 1995 from the following countries:

Afghanistan	Guinea-Bissau
Burundi	Liberia
Cameroon	Pakistan
Costa Rica	Papua New Guinea
Djibouti	Rwanda
Ecuador	Saint Lucia
Egypt	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Gambia	Somalia

19. The Conference of the Parties has decided that the failure to submit a report on time is a major problem of implementation of the Convention and has directed the Standing Committee to seek a solution. However, the Standing Committee has been unable to do this.

Information to be included in annual reports

20. Article VIII, paragraph 7(a), of the Convention requires all Parties to prepare an annual report containing a summary of the information specified in paragraph 6(b) of the same Article. The information required is:

21. – the number and type of permits and certificates granted;
22. – the States with which trade in specimens of species included in Appendices I, II and III occurred;
23. – the numbers or quantities and types of specimens;
24. – the names of the species, as included in Appendices I, II and III; and
25. – where applicable, the size and sex of the specimens in question.

26. By the adoption of Resolution Conf. 9.4, however, the Conference of the Parties has agreed that additional information should be provided, as laid down in the Guidelines for the Preparation and Submission of Annual Reports (Notification to the Parties No. 788).

27. In its report in the Annex, WCMC has examined the extent to which the reports that have been submitted have followed the Guidelines. They have in particular considered the basis for reporting, the reporting of permit numbers, of the source of specimens traded (i.e. wild-taken, artificially propagated or bred in captivity) and of the purpose of each transaction, and the taxonomic level of reporting.

28. The Secretariat wishes to emphasize the importance of two of these topics: permit numbers; and the taxonomic level of reporting.

Permit numbers

29. An annual report should contain the number of the export permit for each shipment authorized. When these numbers are reported, it is possible to see whether the species and the number or quantity and type of specimens relating to each export permit is the same in the report of the importing country as in the report of the exporting country. Such comparisons by the Secretariat and WCMC have already given many indications of the abuse of permits and of the use of forged permits. These comparisons are done manually.

30. It should be possible to make the above comparison of export permit numbers automatically, by computer. Unfortunately this is not possible because of the non-standard format and length of permit numbers. The recommendation, in Resolution Conf. 9.3, that permit and certificate numbers be limited to eight characters is generally ignored. The Secretariat wishes to stress the importance of reporting permit numbers and to propose a change to the recommendation in Resolution Conf. 9.3, to make it more acceptable to the Parties and to facilitate computerized comparison of permit numbers.

Taxonomic level of reporting

31. CITES is a Convention established to protect **species** from over-exploitation for international trade. Authorization to export a specimen of a species in Appendix I or II requires a prior determination that the export will not be detrimental to the survival of the **species**. Yet many permits are issued that do not indicate the names of the species but rather the names of the genus or family.

32. The number of such cases is generally a small percentage of the total number of permits issued. According to the annual reports for the period 1990 to 1994, these cases accounted for less than nine per cent a year of records relating to reptiles, amphibians and fish and 10 to 16 per cent of those for plants. However, for invertebrates (notably corals) there is a bigger problem, the figure being 78 to 88 per cent.

33. For corals there is a special problem, that is dealt with in document Doc. 10.65. But there is an important question of principle applying to all species. If the name of the species in trade is not known, it is difficult to see how the required non-detriment finding can be made, except that, if the level of trade is extremely small, there might be an assumption that it will not be detrimental. Otherwise, however, it may be reasonable to conclude that any permit that does not indicate the name of the species has been issued contrary to the provisions of the Convention and is consequently invalid.

Recommendations

34. The attached report of WCMC contains a number of recommendations to which the Secretariat draws attention. The Secretariat does not suggest that these be adopted, but will discuss them with WCMC and will take them into account in establishing its own work programme related to the treatment of annual reports and liaison with the Parties.

35. The Secretariat recommends that the Conference of the Parties:

36. – should discuss and decide what action should be taken in cases where a Party does not submit its report on time or does not submit its report at all;

37. – should amend Resolution Conf. 9.3 to recommend that the identification numbers used on export permits and re-export certificates (which should be reported in annual reports) should always comprise 11 characters in the format:

XX/yyyy/zz

where XX represents the two-letter ISO code for the country; yyyy represents a five-digit serial

number; and zz represents the last two digits of the year; and

38. – should amend Resolution Conf. 9.3 to state that permits and certificates that do not indicate the name of the species concerned be considered as invalid, except in the cases where the Conference has agreed that the use of higher-taxon names is acceptable.

Doc. 10.26 Annex

A Report on Annual Reports Submitted by the Parties to CITES

prepared for the CITES Secretariat
by John Caldwell and Lorraine Collins
February 1997

1. Introduction

This report was prepared by the Wildlife Trade Monitoring Unit of the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) under the CITES Secretariat/WCMC Consultancy for 1996. It continues the process initiated in document Doc. 4.18, which dealt with the years 1979 and 1980, and documents Doc. 5.17 (Rev.), Doc. 6.17, Doc. 7.18, Doc. 8.17 and Doc. 9.21 that have covered the intervening period.

The aim of the report is to provide feedback to CITES Parties and to the CITES Secretariat on the annual report data supplied by the Parties. This report focuses on whether the data supplied are in accordance with Notification to the Parties No. 788 on Annual Reports and Resolution Conf. 9.4 on Annual Reports and Monitoring of Trade.

At the time of writing (January 1997) there are 134 Parties to the Convention. In the last decade, 46 countries have joined CITES, 24 between 1987 and 1991 and 22 between 1992 and 1996, the most recent being Mongolia, Saudi Arabia, Georgia and Turkey.

2. Annual Report Submissions

Some Parties question why they should submit annual reports to the CITES Secretariat.

- It is an obligation under the provisions of Article VIII, paragraph 7, of the Convention.
- It is necessary for the effective implementation of CITES as Resolution Conf. 9.4, adopted at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, indicates:

"RECOGNIZING the importance of the annual reports as the only available means of monitoring the implementation of the Convention and the level of international trade in specimens of species included in the appendices"

Monitoring the levels of trade in species listed in the appendices, and the identification of possible illegal trade, are among the prime reasons Parties are requested to submit annual reports. Clearly these exercises cannot be carried out effectively unless the reports are accurate and submitted in a timely fashion. Significant-trade studies are also hampered by the non-submission and late submission of annual reports.

The main problems with CITES annual reports are:

- Parties failing to report altogether
- Parties not submitting their report in good time
- Parties not reporting trade fully
- Parties not reporting trade to species level
- Parties reporting on the basis of permits issued rather than actual trade (although specifically allowed under the terms of the Convention, this can lead to an over-

estimation of the amount of trade and prevents data correlation).

2.1 Failure to submit annual reports

Table 1 shows the Parties, all of which joined the Convention prior to 1991, that have failed to submit annual reports on a regular basis. A summary of this information is given in Table 2. Four Parties have never submitted an annual report: Afghanistan, Djibouti (joined in 1992), Guinea Bissau and St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and a further five Parties: Egypt, Jordan, Rwanda, Somalia and the United Arab Emirates, have failed to submit at least 75% of the required reports. Some of these countries are experiencing difficulties with national communication, for example in cases where the country is undergoing a civil war, and Liberia has communicated to the Secretariat that they would be unable to provide annual reports due to the civil unrest in that country. An analysis of records in the WCMC *CITES Trade Database* was made to determine the nature and extent of trade with these Parties as reported by other Parties. Only records of trade during the years 1990 to 1995 were examined.

Afghanistan (Party since 1986): From information gathered from trading partners it appears that trade with Afghanistan is extremely limited and confined to Appendix-III species.

Djibouti (Party since 1992): There have been very few reported imports from Djibouti.

Guinea Bissau (Party since 1990): The largest trade involved live Appendix-III birds in 1992 (967 in total). Other trade has involved small numbers of Appendix-II primates and birds. Portugal appears to be the main importer.

St Vincent and the Grenadines (Party since 1989): France reported imports from St. Vincent and the Grenadines of 1,800 kg and 12,590 kg of *Strombus gigas* in 1993 and 1994 respectively. *Strombus gigas* (Queen Conch) was subject to the most recent review of significant trade (March 1995). The Review concludes – "Evidence of over-exploitation and illegal trade of Queen Conch demonstrates the need for more effective fishery management programmes, and better implementation of trade controls. Some scientists have also called for more effective regional cooperation in controlling exploitation. Successful implementation of these and/or other mechanisms to prevent depletion of Queen Conch populations will be necessary for effective implementation of CITES Article IV. Furthermore, more effective implementation of CITES permitting and reporting requirements will be necessary if the Convention is to assist with preventing over-exploitation" (IUCN/SSC, TRAFFIC, WCMC, 1996).

Egypt (Party since 1978): Import country data suggest that Egypt is a major exporter of birds of prey and live reptiles, particularly *Chamaeleo* spp., *Eryx* spp., *Testudo* spp. and *Uromastix* spp. to Europe, Japan and the United States of America. There is a strong indication that Egypt also acts as

a conduit for live animals and manufactured leather items from the Sudan and, more recently, Togo.

Jordan (Party since 1979): There appear to have been very few commercial exports from Jordan, the only significant record being the export of 30 live *Chamaeleo chamaeleon* to the United States of America in 1993.

Rwanda (Party since 1981): There have been very few reported imports from Rwanda.

Somalia (Party since 1986): There have been very few reported imports from Somalia, the only significant entry being the import of 76 skins of *Crocodylus niloticus* (Appendix I) by Japan in 1991.

United Arab Emirates (Party since 1975 but withdrew in 1988 and rejoined in 1990): The United Arab Emirates appears to be a major exporter, particularly to Japan, of *Geochelone elegans*, *G. giganteus*, *G. pardalis*, *G. sulcata* and *Uromastyx hardwickii*, none of which occurs in the United Arab Emirates.

Table 1. Parties failing to submit annual reports on a regular basis (as of 24 January 1997)

Country	Entry into force	Years missed	Total	% of expected annual reports missed
Afghanistan	28.01.1986	1986-1995	10	100%
Guinea Bissau	14.08.1990	1990-1995	6	100%
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	28.02.1989	1989-1995	7	100%
Egypt	04.04.1978	1978-1991, 1993-1995	17	94%
Somalia	02.03.1986	1987-1995	9	90%
Rwanda	18.01.1981	1981-1984, 1986-1987, 1990-1995	12	80%
United Arab Emirates	01.07.1975 09.05.1990	1975-1988 1990, 1995	16	80%
Jordan	14.03.1979	1979-1986, 1991-1995	13	76%
Honduras	13.06.1985	1987-1994	8	72%
Gambia	24.11.1977	1977, 1980-1990, 1994, 1995	13	68%
Benin	28.05.1984	1984-1990, 1995	8	67%
Bahamas	18.09.1979	1979-1985, 1989-1992	11	65%
Cyprus	01.07.1975	1978-1984, 1987-1990, 1993, 1995	13	62%
Nigeria	01.07.1975	1975-1986, 1990	13	62%
El Salvador	29.07.1987	1987-1990, 1994	5	55%
Brunei Darussalam	20.08.1990	1990-1991, 1995	3	50%
Burundi	06.11.1988	1989-1990, 1994, 1995	4	50%
Central African Republic	25.11.1980	1980-1982, 1984, 1990-1993	8	50%
Monaco	18.07.1978	1978-1984, 1993, 1995	9	50%
Sudan	24.01.1983	1983-1984, 1986-1988, 1993	6	46%
Zambia	22.02.1981	1981-1982, 1985, 1993-1995	6	40%
Costa Rica	28.09.1975	1979-1981, 1985, 1992-1995	8	38%
Algeria	21.02.1984	1984-1985, 1989, 1991	4	33%
Burkina Faso	15.01.1990	1990, 1994	2	33%
Ecuador	01.07.1975	1975-1976, 1978-1979, 1993-1995	7	33%
Guinea	20.12.1981	1981-1984, 1995	5	33%
Liberia	09.06.1981	1989-1991, 1994, 1995	5	33%
Papua New Guinea	11.03.1976	1981-1982, 1986, 1991, 1994, 1995	6	30%
Chad	03.05.1989	1989-1990	2	29%
Peru	25.09.1975	1975, 1981, 1987-1990	6	29%
Uruguay	01.07.1975	1975-1977, 1985, 1989, 1995	6	29%
Hungary	29.08.1986	1986, 1990, 1995	3	27%

Table 2. Summary showing percentage of expected annual reports missed

Country	% of expected annual reports missed
Afghanistan, Djibouti*, Guinea Bissau, St. Vincent and the Grenadines	100%
Egypt, Jordan, Rwanda, Somalia, United Arab Emirates	75-99%
Bahamas, Benin, Burundi, Central African Republic, Cyprus, El Salvador, Gambia, Honduras, Monaco, Nigeria	50-74%
Algeria, Burkina Faso, Chad, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guinea, Hungary, Liberia, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Sudan, Uruguay, Zambia	25-49%
* Party since 07.05.92	

2.2 Timeliness of annual report submission

CITES annual reports should be submitted by 31 October of the year following that in which the trade took place, however the Secretariat may approve a valid request for an extension to this deadline provided that the Party submits a written request containing adequate justification, before that deadline. Extensions have been granted to the following Parties:

- 1991: United Kingdom
- 1992: Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Finland, Namibia, Netherlands, South Africa, Sudan and United States of America
- 1993: Australia, Chile, Finland, France, Italy, Japan and South Africa
- 1994: Japan
- 1995: Jordan, New Zealand and United Kingdom

Figure 1 shows the proportion of Parties that submitted their annual reports by the deadline, or within the granted extension, during the period 1984 to 1995. It should be noted that the Secretariat has only recorded the date of submission for reports of 1992 onwards. For 1991 and earlier reports the date recorded was the date of receipt by the Secretariat. In order to allow better comparison of the earlier data with the more recent information, all reports received during the year following that in which the trade took place have been assumed to have been submitted within the deadline for the years 1984 to 1991.

The highest proportion of reports submitted on time (60%) occurred for the annual reports of 1993 but during the nine previous years the proportion only averaged 42%. It is likely that the peak for 1993 was the result of a combination of the reminders sent out by the Standing Committee and the Secretariat, and the occurrence of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties taking place in November 1994, shortly after the official deadline. It should be noted that the proportion of Parties submitting reports for 1994 and 1995 has again declined to less than 50% despite the reminders issued by the Standing Committee and Secretariat. This appears to show a disregard of Resolution Conf. 9.4 in which the Conference of the Parties decided **"that failure to submit an annual report by 31 October of the year following the year for which the report was due constitutes a major problem with the implementation of the Convention, which the Secretariat shall refer to the Standing Committee for a solution in accordance with Resolution Conf. 7.5"**.

Resolution Conf. 7.5, paragraph h) states **"if it does not appear a solution can be readily achieved, the Secretariat bring the matter to the attention of the Standing Committee, which may pursue the matter in direct contact with the Party concerned with a view to helping find a solution"**.

The number of Parties to CITES and the number of annual reports submitted annually between 1984 and 1995 is shown in Figure 2. The number of Parties given represents those that were party to the Convention during the year for which an annual report was required. The greatest number of annual reports received for any year was 101 for both 1992 and 1994. Document Doc. 9.21 Annex, where the latest reporting year was 1993, indicated that the peak of report submissions was for 1989 which suggested there was a three-year delay between the current year for which reports are required and the year for which the greatest number of annual reports have been submitted. The pattern was also noted in document Doc. 8.17 Annex and is almost certainly a function of the time taken for the reports to be prepared.

Figure 3 represents the data from Figure 2 shown as a percentage of the expected number of reports. Although the greatest percentage submitted was for 1992 (88%), it is interesting to note that, apart from a very poor level of submission for 1990, the overall percentage received for the years 1986 to 1994 has been remarkably consistent at between 81 and 85%. The percentage of expected reports for 1995 is, of course, lower owing to the relative proximity of the deadline.

Figure 4 shows late submission during the 12 months following the deadline for annual report years 1992 to 1994. The rate of submission for 1992 reports levels off about four months after the deadline, rises gradually for a few months and then rises quite sharply after 12 months. This sudden rise may well reflect the effect of the reminders sent by the Standing Committee and Secretariat and the occurrence of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, which, as discussed earlier, may explain the high level of submission for 1993. Interestingly, the submission rate for 1993 reports simply levels off after the initial high value.

In common with 1992 and 1993, the rate of submission for 1994 reports also shows a levelling off about four months after the deadline but then the rate begins to increase sharply approximately nine months after the deadline. This is almost certainly the result of reminders sent out by the Secretariat on 28 June 1996 and by the Chairman of the Standing Committee on 28 August 1996.

3. Basis for Annual Report Compilation

CITES Notification to the Parties No. 788 of 10 March 1994 states that **"As far as possible, the data in the report should record the actual trade that took place, i.e. the quantity of specimens that entered or left the country. If it is not possible to report the actual exports and re-exports, the data on such trade should come from each permit and certificate issued."**

The report should state clearly whether the data used for the records of imports and exports/re-exports are based on permits/certificates issued or on actual trade."

DOCUMENT NOT AVAILABLE ELECTRONICALLY

DOCUMENT NOT AVAILABLE ELECTRONICALLY

Table 3 shows the basis on which the most recent annual report submitted by Parties is compiled and has been derived from the introduction section of the annual reports where one exists. For entries in the table marked (?) the basis of report compilation has not been stated but there is some evidence to suggest what it was.

It is clear from the table that the majority of Parties fail to communicate the relevant information to the Secretariat. Only 30 Parties state the basis on which their reports are compiled and the probable basis can be suggested for another eight. As permits are frequently issued to cover many more items than are actually traded, studies of the volume of trade for any particular species may produce severe over-estimates, and therefore cause unwarranted concern. In some instances Parties may actually be acting against their own interests by reporting larger numbers than are really being traded, as reviews of significant trade might suggest the need for imposition of export quotas. Similarly, in the case where an importing country, reporting on the basis of permits issued, shows significantly higher figures than an exporting country reporting on the basis of actual trade data, concern over permit falsification or illegal trade arises.

WCMC has noticed that, at the time of issue, the Management Authorities of some Parties enter on permits the details that are meant to be completed by Customs officials at the point of export. This practice could result in illegal trade and has been reported upon in the *Review of National Reporting for Plants listed in the Appendices*, prepared by the WCMC on behalf of the Secretariat.

Table 3. Basis of most recent annual report compilation

Country	Year	Basis for compilation
Afghanistan	none	–
Algeria	1995	not stated
Argentina	1995	actual trade(?)
Australia	1995	not stated
Austria	1995	not stated
Bahamas	1995	permits issued
Bangladesh	1994	actual trade
Barbados	1995	not stated
Belgium	1995	not stated
Belize	1994	not stated
Benin	1994	not stated
Bermuda	1994	not stated
Bolivia	1995	not stated
Botswana	1995	not stated
Brazil	1995	permits issued(?)
Brunei Darussalam	1994	not stated
Bulgaria	1993	not stated
Burkina Faso	1995	not stated
Burundi	1993	permits issued
Cameroon	1992	not stated
Canada	1995	permits issued(?)
Central African Republic	1995	not stated
Chad	1996	not stated
Chile	1995	not stated
China	1995	not stated
Colombia	1995	permits issued
Congo	1995	not stated
Costa Rica	1991	not stated
Cuba	1995	permits issued
Cyprus	1994	not stated

Country	Year	Basis for compilation
Czech Republic	1995	actual trade + list of permits used or not (unknown)
Denmark	1995	not stated
Djibouti	none	–
Dominican Republic	1995	not stated
Ecuador	1992	not stated
Egypt	1992	not stated
El Salvador	1995	permits issued
Equatorial Guinea	1995	not stated
Estonia	1995	actual trade(?)
Ethiopia	1995	not stated
Finland	1995	actual trade
France	1994	not stated
Gabon	1995	actual trade(?)
Gambia	1993	not stated
Germany	1995	not stated
Ghana	1995	not stated
Greece	1994	actual trade
Guatemala	1995	not stated
Guinea	1994	not stated
Guinea-Bissau	none	–
Guyana	1995	actual trade(?)
Honduras	1995	not stated
Hungary	1994	actual trade
India	1995	not stated
Indonesia	1995	not stated
Iran	1995	not stated
Israel	1995	not stated
Italy	1995	not stated
Japan	1995	not stated
Jordan	1990	permits issued

Country	Year	Basis for compilation
Kenya	1995	actual trade
Liberia	1988	not stated
Liechtenstein	1994	not stated
Luxembourg	1995	permits issued
Madagascar	1994	not stated
Malawi	1995	permits issued
Malaysia	1995	not stated
Mali	1995	permits issued(?)
Malta	1995	not stated
Mauritius	1994	permits issued
Mexico	1996	actual trade
Monaco	1994	not stated
Morocco	1995	permits issued
Mozambique	1995	not stated
Namibia	1995	permits issued
Nepal	1995	not stated
Netherlands	1994	actual trade
New Zealand	1994	permits issued
Nicaragua	1995	not stated
Niger	1995	not stated
Nigeria	1995	not stated
Norway	1995	actual trade/permits issued
Pakistan	1993	permits issued
Panama	1995	not stated
Papua New Guinea	1993	not stated
Paraguay	1995	not stated
Peru	1995	not stated
Philippines	1995	not stated
Poland	1995	not stated
Portugal	1995	not stated
Republic of Korea	1994	permits issued
Romania	1995	permits issued
Russian Federation	1995	permits issued(?)
Rwanda	1989	not stated

Country	Year	Basis for compilation
Saint Kitts and Nevis	1995	not stated
Saint Lucia	1993	permits issued
Senegal	1994	not stated
Seychelles	1995	not stated
Singapore	1995	permits issued
Slovakia	1995	permits issued
Somalia	1986	not stated
South Africa	1995	permits issued
Spain	1995	not stated
Sri Lanka	1995	not stated
St Vincent and the Grenadines	none	–
Sudan	1995	not stated
Suriname	1995	actual trade
Sweden	1995	permits issued
Switzerland	1995	actual trade; export/ re-export:: permits issued
Thailand	1995	actual trade/permits issued
Togo	1995	not stated
Trinidad and Tobago	1995	not stated
Tunisia	1995	not stated
Uganda	1994	permits issued
United Arab Emirates	1994	not stated
United Kingdom	1995	not stated
United Republic of Tanzania	1995	not stated
United States	1995	not stated
Uruguay	1994	not stated
Vanuatu	1994	not stated
Venezuela	1995	not stated
Viet Nam	1995	not stated
Zaire	1995	not stated
Zambia	1992	not stated
Zimbabwe	1994	not stated

4. Annual Report Format

Resolution Conf. 9.4 urges every Party to consider whether the preparation of its statistical reports could be computerized, or undertaken under a contract between the Party and the Wildlife Trade Monitoring Unit of the World Conservation Monitoring Centre. Currently 26 Parties submit annual reports electronically on computer tapes, diskettes or by electronic mail; these are listed in Table 4. Of these 26 however, only 11 are in a suitable format to be down-loaded into the WCMC *CITES Trade Database* automatically (these

are marked with an asterisk in Table 4); the others, usually word-processed documents, need to be printed out and input to the database manually.

By far the majority of reports received by the CITES Secretariat are type-written documents or print-outs from databases or spreadsheets. However, hand-written reports are also received, as are copies of permits and certificates. The data from these are input manually into the existing database, which, despite sophisticated computerized checking techniques, means that errors could be inadvertently intro-

duced. It is believed that some Parties maintain their trade records in a structured database. Much effort and valuable

staff resources could be spared if these Parties submitted their annual report as a database file for automatic loading.

Table 4. Format of reports submitted for the most recent annual reports received by WCMC

Year	Permits	Hard copy	Diskette/tape	E-mail
1996		Algeria		
1995	Argentina			
1995				Australia
1995		Austria	Austria*	
1995		Bahamas		
1994		Bangladesh		
1996		Barbados		
1995		Belgium		
1994		Belize		
1994		Benin		
1995		Bolivia		
1995		Botswana		
1995				Brazil*
1994		Brunei Darussalam		
1993		Bulgaria		
1995		Burkina Faso		
1993		Burundi		
1992		Cameroon		
1995			Canada*	
1995		Central African Republic		
1996		Chad		
1995		Chile		
1995		China		
1995		Colombia		
1995		Congo		
1991		Costa Rica		
1995		Cuba		
1994		Cyprus		
1995		Czech Republic	Czech Republic	
1995		Denmark	Denmark*	
1995		Dominican Republic		
1992		Ecuador		
1992		Egypt		
1995		El Salvador		
1995		Equatorial Guinea		
1995		Estonia		
1995		Ethiopia		
1994		Finland	Finland	
1994		France		
1995		Gabon		

Year	Permits	Hard copy	Diskette/tape	E-mail
1993		Gambia		
1995			Germany*	
1995		Ghana		
1994		Greece		
1995		Guatemala		
1994		Guinea		
1996	Guyana			
1995		Honduras		
1994		Hungary		
1995		India		
1995			Indonesia	
1995		Iran		
1995		Israel		
1995			Italy*	
1995			Japan*	
1990		Jordan		
1995		Kenya		
1988		Liberia		
1995			Liechtenstein	
1995		Luxembourg		
1994		Madagascar		
1995		Malawi		
1995		Malaysia		
1995		Mali		
1995		Malta	Malta	
1994		Mauritius	Mauritius	
1996	Mexico			
1994		Monaco		
1995		Morocco		
1995		Mozambique		
1995		Namibia		
1995		Nepal		
1994	Netherlands			
1994		New Zealand	New Zealand	
1995			Nicaragua	
1995		Niger		
1995		Nigeria		
1995		Norway	Norway	
1993		Pakistan		
1995		Panama	Panama	
1993		Papua New Guinea		
1995		Paraguay		
1995		Peru		

Year	Permits	Hard copy	Diskette/tape	E-mail
1995	Philippines			
1995		Poland		
1995		Portugal	Portugal	
1994		Republic of Korea		
1994		Romania		
1994		Russian Federation		
1989		Rwanda		
1995		Saint Kitts and Nevis		
1993		Saint Lucia		
1994		Senegal		
1995		Seychelles		
1995		Singapore		
1995				Slovakia
1986		Somalia		
1995			South Africa	
1995		Spain	Spain*	
1994		Sri Lanka		
1995		Sudan		
1995	Suriname			
1995		Sweden		
1995			Switzerland	
1995		Thailand		
1995		Togo		
1995		Trinidad and Tobago		
1995		Tunisia		
1994		United Arab Emirates		
1995		United Kingdom	United Kingdom	
1995		United Republic of Tanzania		
1995				United States*
1994		Uruguay		
1994		Vanuatu		
1995		Venezuela		
1995		Viet Nam		
1992		Zambia		
1995		Zaire		
1994			Zimbabwe*	

As noted in Section 2, comprehensive CITES data are normally three years out of date but in order to monitor trade levels adequately the data need to be both accurate and current. One way to improve this would be for Parties to submit trade data on a more regular basis, e.g. monthly. Currently WCMC regularly receives, via the CITES Secretariat, permits issued by Mexico and the Philippines (aquatic products only), and permits from Argentina, Guyana and Suriname on a less regular basis. Liaison with the Management Authority of Denmark has enabled direct transmission of permit information within a few days of the end of

each month by electronic mail. At one time the Management Authority of the Czech Republic made information available on a page of the World Wide Web and other Parties may consider similar possibilities for the future.

Submission of information in this way will naturally mean that the data are based on permits issued rather than actual trade and a solution to this might be for Parties to submit a short report based on returned permits at a later date. Subsequent alterations to the records in the WCMC *CITES Trade Database* would be made by staff at WCMC.

5. Are Guidelines for Annual Reporting Being Followed?

Notification to the Parties No. 788 Parties on "Annual Reports" sets out Guidelines for the Preparation and Submission of CITES Annual Reports. Each Party is required to submit to the Secretariat an annual report summarizing the following information:

- the number and type of permits and certificates granted;
- the States with which trade in specimens included in Appendices I, II and III occurred;
- the numbers or quantities and types of specimens and the names of species as included in Appendices I, II and III;
- the size and sex of the specimen in question;
- the source of the specimen;
- the purpose of the trade;
- a description of the specimen.

Notification No. 788 was prepared by the Secretariat to ensure that data submitted by the Parties are comparable and of the maximum utility. This section attempts to indicate how well individual Parties are complying with this Notification and if the various taxonomic groups are treated differently.

Please note throughout section 5, the number of records given does not equate to the number of specimens traded. One record could represent one specimen or even 10,000.

5.1 Reporting by each Party

Table 5 shows, for each Party, the total number of records reported¹, the percentage of records for which no source for the specimen or purpose of the trade was reported, and the number of animal and plant records reported to family and generic level. The percentages given have been rounded to the nearest whole number. A summary of the most significant deviations from the requirements as set out in Notification No. 788 are given below.

5.1.1 Reporting of source

Table 5 shows that 15 Parties failed to report the source of any specimens exported and another four Parties failed to report the source for 80% or more of the records contained in their annual reports. The German Management Authority informed WCMC that the source was left blank in all cases of specimens collected from the wild because of an old computer system. Since the beginning of 1996 this system has been replaced and the German 1996 annual report will contain the source code for all specimens (Stertz, *in litt.* 1996; WCMC, 1997).

5.1.2 Reporting of purpose

Nine Parties failed to report the purpose of any specimens exported, and another three Parties failed to report the purpose for over 80% of the records contained in their annual reports. In the New Zealand annual report for 1994, the vast majority of records of fauna were records of confiscations. Their purpose was given as 'illegal', and since Notification No. 788 asks that seized specimens be described under the 'source' of the specimen, a purpose was not recorded in the WCMC *CITES Trade Database* (see Section 7, Conclusions and Recommendations).

5.1.3 Reporting of CITES trade to family and genus level

Animals

Table 5 indicates that one Party, Monaco, reported all its CITES animal trade to family level. However this was only three records of re-exports of pre-Convention items so is clearly of no significance. Similarly, New Zealand reported 90% of its trade at genus level or above but the vast majority of these records were of confiscations of tourist items such as shells and pieces of coral reported as Tridacnidae spp. and Scleractinia spp. respectively. These items were not commercial shipments so are, again, of little significance. Yet another country in this category was Vanuatu for which 44% of the trade was unidentified shells and corals exported for personal use by tourists.

Of more serious concern is the case of Indonesia, where 80% of the 15,617 animal records were reported at genus level and a further 6% at family level, because these records concern commercial shipments of stony corals.

Plants

Three Parties reported all their CITES plant trade to family level: Belize, Equatorial Guinea and Viet Nam. Equatorial Guinea only exported one plant specimen. One Party, Vanuatu reported all of its CITES plant trade to genus level. Notable trade was as follows.

Belize reported exporting 34,577 and 23,424 live assorted orchids in 1993 and 1994 respectively. There is a concern about the possibility of rare species, such as *Rhyncholelia glauca*, being exported under the general heading "assorted live wild orchids" (WCMC, 1997).

In 1994 Vanuatu reported exporting 55 carvings of wild *Cyathea* spp. and in 1994 and 1995, Viet Nam reported the export of 52 suckers and 52 seeds of Cycad, and 105 live orchid pieces and 30,000 kg of dried *Dendrobium* spp.

5.2 Globally by taxonomic group

5.2.1 Reporting of source and purpose by taxonomic group

Reporting the purpose of transactions and the source of specimens traded is important since these often provide an indication of whether the trade was legal, e.g. in the case of Appendix-I specimens being traded for commercial purposes.

Until December 1992, the WCMC *CITES Trade Database* could only record the source of specimens of live animals bred in captivity and for artificially propagated plants. Since that time (i.e. for most 1991 annual reports onwards), source data have been recorded for all records if they have been reported. In addition, at the request of the CITES Secretariat, WCMC has not computerized records of trade in artificially propagated Appendix-II plants since 1992 unless the data were received in an electronic format and could be loaded into the database automatically. Such records were omitted from the analysis shown in Table 6, which provides information on the percentage of records in trade which contained a purpose code (1990 and 1994) and a source code (1992-1994).

For all animal taxa except invertebrates there have been significant improvements in the reporting of both purpose and source. In the case of invertebrates, the low percentage is primarily a result of the very high number of records of stony corals reported by Indonesia without either purpose or source being specified.

¹ The data, and the comments thereon, are derived from the most recent complete annual report data entered into the WCMC *CITES Trade Database* as of 21 October 1996 (shown in Table 5). Data concerning re-exports of manufactured items from Appendix-II and -III species, and trade in Appendix-II and -III artificially propagated plants have been excluded.

Table 5. Reporting on Taxon, Source and Purpose as Recommended in Notification No. 788 (based on the most recent report received)

Country (year of most recent annual report received)	Total records	No. with no source	No. with no purpose	Animal records	Recorded at family level		Recorded at genus level		Plant records	Recorded at family level		Recorded at genus level	
					No.	% of animal records	No.	% of animal records		No.	% of plant records	No.	% of plant records
Algeria (1995)	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	3	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
Argentina (1995)	582	0	165 (28%)	569	2	0.3	0	0	13	0	-	8	62
Australia (1994)	689	53 (8%)	0	590	31	5	27	5	99	0	-	29	29
Austria (1995)	515	6	1	498	2	0.4	29	6	17	4	24	0	-
Bahamas (1993)	132	8	0	127	1	0.8	0	-	5	1	20	1	20
Bangladesh (1993)	49	49 (100%)	0	49	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Belgium (1994)	1509	599 (40%)	25	1318	12	1	31	2	191	0	-	31	16
Belize (1993)	45	1	45 (100%)	12	1	8	0	-	33	33	100	0	-
Benin (1993)	342	342 (100%)	0	342	0	-	6	2	0	0	-	0	-
Bolivia (1993)	1	0	0	1	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Brazil (1994)	411	14	0	354	0	-	2	1	57	0	-	3	5
Brunei Darussalam (1994)	5	0	0	5	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Bulgaria (1993)	19	0	0	16	0	-	0	-	3	0	-	0	-
Burkina Faso (1993)	17	0	0	17	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Burundi (1993)	18	0	0	18	0	-	1	6	0	0	-	0	-
Cameroon (1992)	438	0	0	395	1	0.2	3	1	43	0	-	3	7
Canada (1993)	24805	0	0	24725	91	0.4	125	1	80	1	1	27	34
Central African Republic (1995)	103	103 (100%)	103 (100%)	103	0	-	2	2	0	0	-	0	-
Chad (1993)	6	0	0	6	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Chile (1994)	307	1	0	49	0	-	0	-	258	0	-	216	84
China (1994)	641	1	6	566	2	-	3	1	75	0	-	0	0
Colombia (1994)	1001	0	0	987	0	-	2	-	14	0	-	3	21
Congo (1993)	76	76 (100%)	0	41	0	-	0	-	35	0	-	0	0
Costa Rica (1991)	536	536 (100%)	84 (16%)	3	0	-	3	100	533	1	-	144	27

Country (year of most recent annual report received)	Total records	No. with no source	No. with no purpose	Animal records	Recorded at family level		Recorded at genus level		Plant records	Recorded at family level		Recorded at genus level	
					No.	% of animal records	No.	% of animal records		No.	% of plant records	No.	% of plant records
Cuba (1994)	62	0	4	62	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	-
Cyprus (1994)	18	7 (39%)	0	18	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	-
Czech Republic (1995)	1020	0	0	892	2	-	-	2	128	0	-	8	6
Dominican Republic	102	5	0	93	0	-	0	0	9	0	-	0	0
Ecuador (1992)	139	0	49 (35%)	41	7	17	15	37	98	0	-	48	49
Egypt (1992)	127	18	0	127	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
El Salvador (1993)	278	0	0	278	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Equatorial Guinea (1995)	12	0	0	11	0	-	0	-	1	1	100	0	0
Estonia (1994)	34	0	0	34	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Ethiopia (1995)	17	16 (94%)	0	17	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Finland (1994)	128	3	0	128	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
France (1994)	2458	1	1823 (74%)	2414	75	3	15	1	44	23	52	6	14
Gabon (1995)	29	4	0	29	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Gambia (1993)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Germany (1993)	6161	4956 (80%)	0	5581	10	-	1555	28	580	0	-	54	9
Ghana (1995)	624	0	0	590	0	-	0	-	34	0	-	1	3
Greece (1994)	52	1	0	52	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Guatemala (1994)	140	0	0	94	0	-	2	2	46	0	-	2	4
Guinea (1993)	599	0	0	599	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Guyana (1995)	328	0	0	328	0	-	1	-	0	0	-	0	-
Honduras (1995)	146	109 (75%)	146 (100%)	86	0	-	0	-	60	0	-	0	-
Hungary (1993)	161	6	158 (98%)	160	0	-	0	-	1	0	-	0	-
India (1994)	21	9 (43%)	1	18	0	-	0	-	3	0	-	0	-
Indonesia (1994)	15855	15855 (100%)	15855 (100%)	15617	995	6	12496	80	238	38	16	177	74

Country (year of most recent annual report received)	Total records	No. with no source	No. with no purpose	Animal records	Recorded at family level		Recorded at genus level		Plant records	Recorded at family level		Recorded at genus level	
					No.	% of animal records	No.	% of animal records		No.	% of plant records	No.	% of plant records
Israel (1994)	56	5	17 (30%)	56	0	-	1	2	0	0	-	0	-
Italy (1993)	988	0	0	836	3	-	35	4	152	0	-	0	-
Japan (1994)	13477	901 (7%)	2	10443	302	3	4429	42	3034	14	-	370	12
Denmark (1995)	1550	6	273 (18%)	1289	10	1	85	7	261	0	-	12	5
Kenya (1994)	65	0	6	65	0	-	3	5	0	0	-	0	-
Luxembourg (1995)	21	14	0	21	0	-	5	24	0	0	-	0	-
Madagascar (1993)	4178	0	3	2297	1	-	10	-	1881	16	1	307	16
Malawi (1995)	41	0	0	41	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Malaysia (1994)	803	0	0	775	0	-	3	-	28		-	7	25
Malta (1994)	164	0	9	156	0	-	4	3	8	0	-	0	-
Mauritius (1994)	134	0	0	134	0	-		-	0	0	-	0	-
Mexico (1995)	812	0	60 (7%)	678	0	-	0	-	134	1	1	15	11
Monaco (1994)	5	0	0	5	5	100	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Morocco (1994)	29	0	0	29	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Mozambique (1995)	133	0	0	133	0	-	16	12	0	0	-	0	-
Namibia (1995)	822	720 (88%)	102 (12.5%)	815	0	-	2	-	7	0	-	1	14
Nepal (1995)	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Netherlands (1994)	4367	15	0	3465	87	3	47	1	902	6	1	73	8
New Zealand (1994)	2262	8	1900 (84%)	2132	1879	88	36	2	130	1	1	59	45
Nicaragua (1994)	323	0	0	323	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Niger (1995)	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Nigeria (1994)	8	0	0	7	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Norway (1994)	214	3	1	207	3	1	26	13	7	0	-	0	-
Pakistan (1993)	29	29 (100%)	8 (28%)	29	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-

Country (year of most recent annual report received)	Total records	No. with no source	No. with no purpose	Animal records	Recorded at family level		Recorded at genus level		Plant records	Recorded at family level		Recorded at genus level	
					No.	% of animal records	No.	% of animal records		No.	% of plant records	No.	% of plant records
Papua New Guinea (1993)	593	288 (49%)	14	524	3	1	151	29	69	0	–	4	6
Panama (1995)	348	348 (100%)	0	289	3	1	26	9	59	15	25	36	61
Paraguay (1994)	183	0	0	139	0	–	1	1	44	1	2	13	30
Peru (1993)	258	128 (50%)	8	258	0	–	2	1	0	0	–	0	–
Philippines (1994)	1284	0	15	1280	0	–	4	–	4	0	–	0	–
Poland (1995)	164	7	0	164	0	–	0	–	0	–	–	0	–
Portugal (1995)	1310	0	0	1310	1	–	0	–	0	0	–	0	–
Republic of Korea (1993)	91	5	0	91	0	–	0	–	0	0	–	0	–
Rwanda (1989)	50	50 (100%)	0	50	0	–	50	100	0	0	–	0	–
Saint Lucia (1993)	2	0	1 (50%)	2	0	–	0	–	0	0	–	0	–
Senegal (1994)	1389	1	1	1389	0	–	0	–	0	0	–	0	–
Seychelles (1995)	27	4 (15%)	0	27	0	–	3	11	0	0	–	0	–
Seychelles (1993)	7	0	1	7	0	–	0	–	0	0	–	0	–
Singapore (1994)	2846	0	0	2776	39	1	16	1	70	0	–	0	–
Slovakia (1994)	244	0	0	244	0	–	0	–	0	0	–	0	–
South Africa (1994)	4772	1683 (35%)	38	4160	0	–	3	–	612	0	–	6	1
Spain (1994)	1964	0	1	1889	2	–	20	1	75	0	–	2	3
Sri Lanka (1994)	18	1	0	18	0	–	0	–	0	0	–	0	–
Sudan (1995)	133	0	0	133	0	–	0	–	0	0	–	0	–
Suriname (1995)	848	0	0	832	0	–	5	1	16	3	19	0	–
Sweden (1995)	183	0	10	169	2	1	15	9	14	0	–	0	–
Switzerland and Liechtenstein (1994)	952	20	374(39%)	863	28	3	20	2	89	2	2	15	17
Tanzania, United Republic of (1994)	1924	0	0	1924	0	–	55	3	0	0	–	0	–

Country (year of most recent annual report received)	Total records	No. with no source	No. with no purpose	Animal records	Recorded at family level		Recorded at genus level		Plant records	Recorded at family level		Recorded at genus level	
					No.	% of animal records	No.	% of animal records		No.	% of plant records	No.	% of plant records
Thailand (1994)	7919	0	7699 (97%)	223	0	-	1	-	7696	0	0	104	1
Togo (1994)	718	0	0	718	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Trinidad and Tobago (1994)	158	158 (100%)	0	108	0	-	3	3	50	0	0	23	46
Tunisia (1995)	21	0	0	32	0	-	1	3	0	0	-	0	-
Russian Federation (1994)	783	1	2	770	5	1	0	-	13	0	0	1	8
Uganda	8	0	6	8	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
United Arab Emirates	163	150 (92%)	13 (8%)	163	1	1	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
United Kingdom (1994)	3415	2	97 (3%)	3142	23	1	344	11	273	4	1	52	19
United States (1993)	43809	79	14709 (34%)	35586	2341	7	8341	23	8223	664	8	873	11
Uruguay (1994)	36	36 (100%)	36 (100%)	36	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Vanuatu (1994)	107	0	0	84	37	44	0	-	23	0	-	23	100
Venezuela (1994)	282	1	1	238	0	-	5	2	44	0	-	8	18
Viet Nam (1994)	125	125 (100%)	0	123	3	2	0	-	2	2	100	0	-
Zaire (1994)	335	212 (63%)	0	211	0	-	2	1	124	0	-	1	1
Zambia (1992)	13	113 (100%)	113 (100%)	113	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-
Zimbabwe (1992)	1643	321 (19%)	1643 (100%)	1643	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	-

Table 6. Percentage of total records for which the purpose (1990-1994) and source were recorded (1992-1994)

Taxonomic group	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
Percentage of total records for which the purpose was recorded					
Mammals	69	72	75	72	98
Birds	70	92	82	85	97
Reptiles, Amphibians, Fish	77	87	71	77	88
Invertebrates	35	46	75	33	38
Flora	93	78	85	85	61
Percentage of total records for which the source was recorded					
Mammals	no data available	no data available	88	89	90
Birds			77	76	90
Reptiles, Amphibians, Fish			77	81	90
Invertebrate			73	32	35
Flora			74	89	93

The percentage of records containing a purpose code for plants is generally high but shows a sharp decline in 1994. This is mainly because of a change in the way in which Thailand has compiled its reports. The Thai annual report data used to be presented as 'summed trade' whereas the 1994 report contains details on a shipment-by-shipment basis and thus contained many more records. Since the purpose of Thailand's CITES trade is not reported, the total number of records lacking a purpose has greatly increased. This is an example of the way that improved reporting can negatively affect the reading of the statistics, amply demonstrating the need for careful analysis of CITES data before drawing conclusions. Reporting of the source for plant species improved steadily between 1992 and 1994.

5.2.2 Recording of trade to family and genus level by taxonomic group

Table 7 shows the percentage of records, by taxonomic group, reported to family and genus level for the years 1990 to 1994. A summary of the findings are given below. In general, the Parties are to be congratulated for the significant improvement in reporting to species level. Problems remain for invertebrates and plants which need addressing. Recommendations to improve plant reporting are discussed in the *Review and Improvement of National Reporting for trade in Plants listed in the Appendices of CITES* (WCMC, 1997).

Mammals

In 1990, 2.5% of records were reported to family level and 0.7% to genus level. Already good, this has improved to 0.6% and 0.4% respectively. This indicates that attention is given to recording the information accurately and that identification materials appear to be adequate.

Birds

In 1990, 0.2% of records were reported to family level and 2.2% to genus level. Whilst the percentage recorded at family level remains the same, which is due to the recording

of Falconiformes, only 0.9% of birds were reported to genus level in 1994. Again a significant improvement.

Reptiles, Amphibians and Fish

In 1990, 8.5% of records were reported to family level and 1.9% to genus level. This improved steadily to 3.4% and 1.6% respectively by 1993. The sudden decrease in percentage for reporting to family level in 1994 is misleading since the United States data for 1994, which are expected to contain a significant number of records reported as *Cheloniidae* spp. and *Elephantidae* spp., have not been received. Despite this however, there has been a real reduction in the number of records reported to family level.

Invertebrates

In 1990, 6.5% of records were reported to family level and 71.9% to genus level. This is the only group for which no improvement is shown. The percentages have remained high and in 1994 increased to 13% and 74.9% respectively. This is the result of the large volume of, and the high number of species, of corals in trade for which identification to species level is very difficult.

Plants

In 1990, 5.7% of records were reported to family level and 11.5% to genus level. By 1994 significant improvements have been made despite the sheer volume of the trade, 2.1% and 7.9% being reported respectively. However, the *Review and Improvement of National Reporting for trade in Plants listed in the Appendices of CITES* (WCMC, 1997) showed that an average of 45% of wild collected Cactaceae were being reported at family level each year so there is clearly some cause for concern. The report also noted that although the proportion of trade in Orchidaceae reported to family level is relatively small (4.2% in 1994), large quantities are reported to genus level, a practice specifically allowed under Resolution Conf. 9.4 for artificially propagated orchid hybrids.

Table 7. Reporting of CITES trade to family and genus level by taxonomic group, 1990-1994

Taxonomic group	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
Percentage of total records reported to family level					
Mammals	2.5	2.2	1.2	1.0	0.6
Birds	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Reptiles, Amphibians, Fish	8.5	5.8	4.6	3.4	0.5
Invertebrates	6.5	12.8	13.7	9.9	13.0
Plants	5.7	3.6	4.8	4.5	2.1
Percentage of total records reported to genus level					
Mammals	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.4
Birds	2.2	2.1	1.6	1.0	0.9
Reptiles, Amphibians, Fish	1.9	1.7	1.5	1.6	0.3
Invertebrates	71.9	69.2	65.4	79.3	74.9
Plants	11.5	21.6	14.9	10.6	7.9

5.3 Reporting of country of import and (re-)export

Records were examined to see if the country of consignment and the country of destination were well reported. For example, some permits are issued for export

or re-export to multiple destinations; in some annual reports there are instances where the last country of export is shown simply as a region (e.g. Africa) or is unknown. As is shown in Table 8, this aspect of reporting has improved from 1% in 1990 to only 0.2% in 1994.

Table 8. Percentage of total records where the importer/exporter is given as: XC (Caribbean), XE (Europe), XF (Africa), XM (South America), XS (Asia), XX (Unknown) or XV (Various)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
Export records	0.6%	0.50%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%
Import records	0.4%	0.25%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%
Total	1.0%	0.75%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%

6. Reporting of Permit Numbers

6.1 Permit numbers

Notification to the Parties No. 788 asks that annual reports show, in the case of an export or re-export, the number of the permit or certificate issued to cover each shipment. In the case of imports, the number of the export permit, re-export certificate or other certificate issued by the competent authority of the exporting or re-exporting country should be shown. In this regard it should be noted that the WCMC *CITES Trade Database* can store numbers from import and export permits and re-export certificates and any combination of these relating to any transaction.

The importance of accurate reporting of permit numbers is twofold.

- The CITES Secretariat are frequently asked, particularly by Parties importing from countries that are not the original country of export, to verify whether the goods were legally exported from the country of origin.
- In analyses of trade data, the presence of a permit number allows greater accuracy for cross-matching shipments reported by an importer with those reported by an exporter. They may, for example, clarify whether one of the trading partners is reporting on the basis of permits issued and the other on actual trade, or may indicate that the original export occurred during the

year before that in which the import took place. In some case, accurate reporting of permit numbers may allow illegal trade to be detected.

Almost all Parties report their own export and re-export permit numbers adequately. The only major trading Parties which do not report their export permit numbers are Switzerland and Liechtenstein. These countries submit a combined report and the records are summed data, not reported on a shipment by shipment basis.

Almost 60 percent of the Parties submitting reports record import trade to some degree but of these, 35 percent do not report the export/re-exporters permit or certificate number. Most of these Parties have negligible import trade so the lack of a permit number is, perhaps, of minor significance. However, included among the more important importing nations that do not report the export/re-exporters permit or certificate number are Germany, Panama, the Russian Federation and Switzerland and Liechtenstein. Germany does record these data but they are not included in the electronic version of their annual report that is sent to WCMC for inclusion in the database. The United Kingdom reports some permit numbers but, where these are included, they are the country of origin permit number rather than the country of last re-export and so are only of limited value for data analysis.

6.2 Standardization of permit numbers

Permit numbers have many varied formats. They range from a simple string of digits, with perhaps an indication of the year of issue, e.g. 001/95 issued by Gabon, 01234 issued by Mexico, 017251 issued by Argentina, etc., to very complex combinations of letters and digits and other characters, e.g. CA-AG-NF-0182-94 issued by Canada, 4120/VI/PA-5/SIE/1995 issued by Indonesia, T-AG-94-100053(W) issued by Japan, S/6/MY9121953 issued by Malaysia, etc. It is common practice for Parties to truncate these longer and more complicated permit numbers when compiling their annual report, thus in the example above the Indonesian export permit number 4120/VI/PA-5/SIE/1995 may be reported by the importer simply as 4120/95, or even just 4120. Clearly some of the usefulness of the permit number is lost if its characteristic format is altered in this fashion.

Resolution Conf. 9.3 recommends that, for data-processing purposes, permit and certificate numbers be limited to eight characters (digits, letters and spaces). However eight characters may be insufficient to allow accurate cross-matching of permits by computer, and it would seem that, as a minimum, information identifying the issuing country and the year of issue should also be included.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

The Parties are to be congratulated on their endeavours to produce annual reports that are both useful and informative.

Currently the most serious problems of implementation of the Convention with regard to annual reports are non-reporting and lateness of submission. Since this affects the quality of the CITES reviews of significant trade, which aim to identify unsustainable levels of trade, it is imperative that Parties take measures to address this issue.

The report on how to improve the effectiveness of the Convention (Doc. SC.37.6) produced by Environmental Resources Management reached very similar conclusions about annual reports and indicated a need for technical assistance to enable Parties to fulfil their obligation in this regard.

It is clear, as shown in Section 5 of this report, that considerable efforts have been made to report trade in CITES-listed species according to the guidelines contained in Notification to the Parties No. 788. However further improvements are needed, particularly in the reporting of plants and invertebrates to species level. Ways to improve the reporting for plants are already being discussed by the CITES Plants Committee and similar attention needs to be paid to increasing the ability of Parties to identify invertebrates, especially corals.

Considerable assistance can be provided to the Parties experiencing reporting problems. The CITES Information Management Strategy (IMS) paper, document Doc. 10.82 highlights the key issues that need to be addressed in order to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of CITES implementation. These include: capacity to manage CITES information, issuance of documents and annual reporting, cross-checking of permits and shipments, and identification of specimens. The IMS seeks to achieve its goal by building capacity in relevant authorities to access, manage, interpret and use information.

WCMC already computerizes the data from the permits of several Parties and can produce an annual report on their behalf if requested.

From this analysis of CITES annual reports for the years 1990-1994, the following are recommended to improve the quality of the data:

- a standard Annual Report Submission Form, in the three working language of the Convention, be distributed to the Parties with a Notification. This form should seek to gather all the details necessary for firmer conclusions to be drawn from analyses of annual report data;
- Parties make every effort to collect used permits and to report on the basis of actual trade, particularly where the trade involves specimens collected from the wild;
- that Parties holding their annual report data in a database provide the data to WCMC in a database format rather than producing a separate report;
- that, where possible, Parties submit trade data on a more regular basis, e.g. monthly;
- that, for data-processing purposes, measures be taken to develop a standard format for permit numbers. It is recommended that this should include, as a minimum, information identifying the issuing country and year of issue, and should consist of no more than twelve characters (digits, letters, hyphens, obliques, etc.);
- that Parties play a more active part in monitoring levels of trade, the effectiveness of reporting, and the implementation of CITES. The Secretariat and WCMC can facilitate this by the provision of CITES trade data, for which a guide to interpretation and full enquiry support can be provided by WCMC; and
- that, where a specimen has been confiscated, this information be provided in addition to the source of the specimen.

8. References

- Environmental Resources Management (1996). *Study on How to Improve the Effectiveness of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora*. A report to the Standing Committee of CITES (Doc. SC.37.6).
- IUCN/SSC, TRAFFIC, WCMC (March 1996). Review of Significant Trade in Animal Species included in CITES Appendix II. Detailed reviews of 24 species. Final report to the CITES Animals Committee.
- Stertz, German Management Authority for CITES. *In litt.* to World Conservation Monitoring Centre, 13 May 1996.
- WCMC (1997) *Review and Improvement of National Reporting of trade in Plants listed in the Appendices of CITES*. A report prepared on behalf of the CITES Secretariat, January 1997 by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge, UK.

9. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Rose Warwick of WCMC and Jonathan Barzdo of the CITES Secretariat, for their valuable assistance in preparing this report.