

CSG STEERING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE 2ND MEETING OF THE
IUCN/SSC CROCODILE SPECIALIST GROUP
STEERING COMMITTEE - 8 OCTOBER 1989
WORLD CONSERVATION CENTRE
GLAND, SWITZERLAND

Present: Harry Messel, Wayne King, Ginette Hemley, Ted Joanen, Juan Villalba-Macias, Kevin van Jaarsveldt, Romulus Whitaker, Frank Antram (TRAFFIC observer), Stephen Edwards (SSC Executive Officer), Rene Honegger (CSG observer), Noboru Ishii (CSG observer), Yoshio Kaneko (CITES observer). Absent: Graham Goudie, Laurie Taplin.

The CSG Chairman, Professor Harry Messel, opened the meeting with a statement on new

procedures that, henceforth, would govern the operations of the CSG.

Minutes of Steering Committee meeting. The chairman informed the committee members that the minutes of this and all future Steering Committee meetings will be published in the issue of the CSG NEWSLETTER that immediately follows the meeting. This will keep the membership informed of the decisions taken by the committee. He asked Ginette Hemley and Wayne King to take notes which, when combined, will form the minutes of this second meeting.

The chairman then asked the committee members to suggest any corrections that might be needed on the draft minutes of the first meeting. There being none, the minutes of the first meeting were approved.

Governance of the CSG and the Steering Committee. The chairman announced that his method of chairing the CSG would be quite different from that of the previous chairman, and he intended to institute operating procedures which were more democratic, but which at the same time might appear less democratic, than past practices. Responsibility for virtually all CSG operations will be passed to the members of the Steering Committee. Their authority will only be exceeded by their responsibility. Each committee member will be responsible for all operations in his or her area of concern. All incoming inquiries and requests for assistance should be or will be directed to the appropriate committee member for response. The committee members will organize all contacts in his or her geographic region or area of special concern. In carrying out these duties, the committee members will act on behalf of the chairman, but will be responsible to the chairman. As set forth in the 'SSC Guidelines for Specialist Group Chairmen' (see CSG NEWSLETTER Volume 8, April-June 1989, pages 4-7), each committee member may speak on behalf of the CSG, but may not speak on behalf of the Species Survival Commission or the IUCN without prior clearance by these bodies. This decentralization of responsibility is much more democratic. However, the committee members serve the chairman, who in turn serves the SSC Chairman. They must keep the CSG Chairman completely informed of their important actions and promptly forward copies of all important

letters and documents to him. Any committee member who does not carry out these duties, who does not correspond, who does not respond to requests, who does not serve the members in his or her area, who acts irresponsibly, or who places the CSG or its chairman in an untenable position will be removed. This might appear to be less democratic, but it is essential for the smooth operation of the CSG as now constituted.

Membership and Representation. The chairman reminded the committee members that comments had been solicited from the members on how the Group should be changed (see CSG NEWSLETTER Volume 8, April-June 1989, page 3). The chairman was appreciative of the many comments he had received from the members. All the comments had been duly considered and had been invaluable in helping the chairman reorganize the structure of the CSG. After much deliberation, the chairman decided that henceforth, the CSG will have no 'Members.' The group will be made up of entirely of 'Correspondents' from which 'Officers' will be chosen by the CSG chairman. These officers shall serve as the Steering Committee of the CSG. In addition, the CITES Secretariat will be invited to provide someone who can attend as an observer, and the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the SSC will automatically be on the Steering Committee. The vice-chairmen will have primary responsibility in their area of concern and will attend the Steering Committee meetings. The deputy vice-chairmen will assist the vice-chairmen and will serve as alternates who attend committee meetings when vice-chairmen are unable to do so.

This ends the past confusion over who is a member and who is a correspondent. Anyone who is interested in crocodile biology, conservation, sustained yield management and utilization of the crocodile resource is eligible to be a Correspondent, and their names will be recommended to the CSG Chairman by the Vice-Chairman. The Chairman may add other names or make deletions when he deems it appropriate, and then will forward the final list to the SSC Chairman and Executive Officer for processing. Correspondents will be obliged to contact the CSG through their Vice-Chairman (with a copy to the CSG Chairman) at least once a year with information about what they are doing or what is happening with crocodilians in their region or area of concern; research,

management, farming, ranching, or trade. They also must provide up to date addresses, telephone and fax numbers. At the end of each calendar year, the list of Correspondents will be purged of those individuals who have not contacted the CSG in this manner in the last 12 months.

The Vice-Chairman for Science is a new area of responsibility for the Steering Committee and was established in recognition of the importance of science to the work of the group. The expertise of the CSG is built on science.

All officers of the CSG/Steering Committee, with complete addresses, telephone and fax numbers, will be listed inside the back cover of the NEWSLETTER along with a statement that all inquiries should be directed to the appropriate officer.

[Subsequent to the 8 October 1989 Steering Committee meeting, the officers listed on the inside backcover were recommended to the SSC Chairman for appointment.]

The chairman indicated that some people might complain that some of the officers should not have been appointed because of their past involvement in some activity or other, but that he was not particularly interested in the past history of the officers. What he was interested in was the work the officers were going to do for crocodylian conservation and for the CSG. Any officer who does not work for conservation and the sustained yield management and utilization of the crocodile resource, or who violates the trust that accompanies appointment as an officer, will be removed.

One of the duties of the officers will be to collect an annual summary of conservation activities from each CSG Correspondent in their area of concern. These one-page summaries will be forwarded to the CSG Chairman for use in the NEWSLETTER and for compilation into a worldwide atlas of crocodylian conservation. As stated previously, if such a page is not presented annually and before 31 December of each year for a correspondent, the correspondent's name will automatically be dropped from the CSG Correspondent list.

Patrons. There will be one additional new category of CSG affiliation, 'Patrons.' People and/or organizations will become Patrons annually when they contribute money annually to the program and work of the CSG. The list of Patrons will be published inside the front cover

of the CSG NEWSLETTER in recognition of that support. The order in which they are listed will reflect the amount of money they contributed that year; the largest total contribution first and the smallest last. The names will be listed alphabetically when the contributions are of equal size.

The chairman then invited comments on his reorganization plan from the Steering Committee members present.

Stephen Edwards, SSC Executive Officer, indicated that the model was good, almost idealistic. He noted that passing responsibility to the Vice-Chairmen and Deputy Vice-Chairmen was in keeping with IUCN's goal of regionalization of IUCN, with local members responding to a regional office. However, he envisioned practical problems associated with maintaining records of all the Correspondents, if they are to be put on the mailing list for the SSC newsletter, SPECIES.

The chairman stated that the Vice-Chairmen and Deputy Vice-Chairmen would provide the Chairman with comprehensive lists of Correspondents, with complete addresses, telephone and fax numbers, who would pass them on to the SSC Chairman and SSC Executive Officer.

[As set forth in the 'Guidelines for Specialist Group Chairmen' (see NEWSLETTER vol. 8, April-June 1989, p. 5), the term of the Correspondents will run from one IUCN General Assembly (GA) to the next. However, they can be appointed at any time so it is not necessary to wait until the next GA. Correspondents will be nominated at the 21 April 1990 Steering Committee meeting. That list of nominees, as amended by the CSG Chairman, will then be forwarded to the Chairman of the Species Survival Commission (SSC) for his review and approval. At the moment, Vice Chairmen and Deputy Vice Chairmen are busy drawing up lists of Correspondents to be nominated at that meeting. These Correspondents will serve in the interim until their appointments are approved by the chairman of the SSC.]

Stephen Edwards also worried about policy statements coming from Vice-Chairmen. He indicated that Vice-Chairmen can speak on behalf of the CSG, but could not speak for the SSC or IUCN without first passing on to the SSC Chairman and the IUCN Council any policy statements that might impinge on IUCN/SSC

policy. In addition, copies of any such statement that overlaps with IUCN/SSC policy should be sent via the CSG Chairman to the SSC Executive Officer so that IUCN is kept informed of current issues and developing policy.

The chairman agreed with this, stating that the Vice-Chairmen and Deputy Vice-Chairmen will only speak for the CSG, and any time an issue arises that might have implications beyond the work of the CSG, they must forward it to the CSG Chairman for action, including passage on to the SSC Chairman. Should the issue involve IUCN policy, the SSC Chairman will pass it on to IUCN. With 104 specialist groups and 2,300 members, the SSC Executive Officer would be inundated with unnecessary correspondence unless it is filtered through the specialist group chairman and commission chairman.

Stephen Edwards indicated that species are now more important within the program of IUCN, not only because species are important in their own right, but also because the public does not relate to issues such as biodiversity. They relate to species such as tigers, mountain gorillas, elephants, rhinoceroses, and crocodiles.

The chairman indicated that decentralization must occur if services are to be delivered to the members and the public in a timely and professional manner. Too many requests for assistance are received for any one individual to handle.

The deputy chairman, Wayne King, indicated that to be effective, the Vice-Chairmen and Deputy Vice-Chairmen must have access to telephones and fax machines. Presently one officer, Romulus Whitaker, has neither a telephone nor a fax and cannot be reached except by mail, which was slow.

Rom Whitaker responded by stating he had established an office in Madras and soon would have a telephone and fax.

Rene Honegger asked which Vice-Chairman would have responsibility for overseeing non-commercial captive-propagation of endangered crocodilians such as is carried out by zoos in Europe and North America. For example, the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums has a Crocodylian Advisory Group (AAZPA/CAG) that coordinates an active North American program for breeding endangered crocodilians. Which Vice-Chairman should the AAZPA/CAG work through?

The chairman responded that the Vice-Chairman for Trade could handle non-

commercial propagation efforts along with commercial farms and ranches.

Ginette Hemley indicated that the Vice-Chairman for Trade Monitoring would be a more appropriate individual to handle non-commercial propagation programs.

Stephen Edwards revealed there was a major interest in coordinating with zoos since the SSC already has a number of conservation projects in concert with zoos.

[Later, outside the meeting, the chairman indicated that Dr. Valentine Lance, Deputy Vice-Chairman for Science, could handle zoo breeding programs since he was on the staff of the San Diego Zoological Society which is a member of the AAZPA/CAG.]

The chairman asked the committee if one vice-chairman and one deputy vice-chairman was sufficient for Trade.

Kevin van Jaarsveldt responded by stating that both buyers and sellers should be represented because their concerns were so different. He also stated that the Japanese trade was important but was separate from the European and the North American trade.

Ted Joanen suggested that Don Ashley would be a good person to handle trade in North America.

The chairman indicated that he might increase the number of Deputy Vice-Chairmen in the future if additional coverage was needed.

Wayne King stated that there should not be so many officers that the Steering Committee becomes cumbersome.

Kevin van Jaarsveldt pointed out that Regional Vice-Chairmen could assist the Trade Vice-Chairman on trade issues in their geographic areas.

The chairman then indicated that he would appoint both a European and a Japanese Deputy Vice-Chairman for Trade.

Crocodile proposals that are on the agenda of the 7th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES. The ten crocodile proposals submitted for CITES consideration were reviewed; four seeking annual quotas without data on the status of the wild populations, one seeking an extension and expansion of an existing quota, and five seeking permanent transfers of their crocodile populations to Appendix II. Ginette Hemley opened the discussion of each of the proposals summarized below with a review of its strengths and its shortcomings.

Botswana is seeking to maintain its Nile crocodiles on Appendix II under provisions of Conf. 3.15 on Ranching. The proposal should be rejected because Botswana still has a reservation on the Nile Crocodile. Also, at the time the proposal was submitted, Botswana had not sent CITES the annual reports on its trade in crocodiles for 1986 and 1987 as required by Conf. 5.21; the population data are inadequate; and there is no good evidence of population trends. In addition, Botswana continues to export wild-caught adult crocodiles to South Africa and Namibia. The two croc farms in Botswana are registered as captive-breeding operations, so they will not be impacted by rejecting this proposal. Ranching should be encouraged and no quota allowed for marketing large hides or adults from the wild.

Stephen Edwards reminded the committee that a CITES Party that has a reservation in an Appendix I species can only export the species to a non-Party state or to another Party that has a matching reservation. He then asked where the Nile crocodiles were going, who was buying them?

Kevin van Jaarsveldt revealed that permits are not required for shipments between Botswana, Namibia, and South Africa because they share a common Customs boundary.

Rom Whitaker stated that the European Economic Community was supporting the proposal.

In response to that statement the chairman reminded everyone that the CSG will base its decision on scientific evidence and not on the decision of nations or intergovernmental bodies. He then asked Wayne King to speak for the CSG at the CITES sessions.

Kevin van Jaarsveldt stated Botswana's ranching proposal should be accepted, but the harvest of wild hides should be rejected in favor of ranching. In addition, Botswana must withdraw its reservation.

The committee members decided that the Botswana proposal should be rejected for the reasons stated above. However, if Botswana drops its reservation, the CSG will support a quota for ranched hides.

Kenya is seeking to maintain an annual export quota of 5,000 hides under Resolution Conf. 5.21. No supporting data accompanied the proposal, no population surveys. Two farms are established in Kenya, one of which has been operating more as a ranch than as a closed-cycle

operation. The proposal contains no information on any management program. Kenya should be encouraged to develop data on its populations and to submit a ranching proposal under Conf. 3.15 at a later date. The present proposal should be rejected or reduced.

The chairman stated that the lack of scientific data was sufficient grounds for rejecting the proposal.

Stephen Edwards revealed that the IUCN ANALYSES OF PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE CITES APPENDICES recommended the rejection of a number of proposals because they lacked scientific data. IUCN depends on good science.

Kevin van Jaarsveldt suggested that Kenya should be given a quota only for ranching. In addition, information should be made available on how many hides the Kenya farms are capable of producing. That number should then be deducted from the Kenya quota. If this is not done, unscrupulous individuals might attempt to move skins from other nations through the Kenya ranches.

Ginette Hemley indicated that Kenya's exports have not filled the CITES annual export quotas already assigned. Most exports have involved live animals -- 150 adults to a farm in Israel.

The chairman stated the CSG is prepared to help countries like Kenya, but only if they help themselves by demonstrating an interest in scientific management of the wild population.

The committee then recommended rejection of the Kenya proposal in favor of an annual quota involving only ranched hides, no direct removal of hides or adults from the wild.

Madagascar is seeking to retain its crocodile population on Appendix II under the provisions of Conf. 3.15 on Ranching. The annual export quota that Madagascar received in Buenos Aires (1985), and that was renewed in Ottawa (1987), has hurt the wild populations. The quota was for 1,000 skins a year, except for 1988 when a special quota was granted for 3,784 skins, therefore the total 1985-1989 approved quota was for 7,784 skins. During this time, 17,500 crocodiles were killed in Madagascar, mostly for the local market for manufacture into artisanal goods for sale to tourists. The proposal indicates there is no evidence of illegal trade, yet the tourists are not required to have export permits. The proposal should be rejected.

Kevin van Jaarsveldt agreed that the proposal should be rejected and indicated that large

numbers of vegetable tanned products are leaving Madagascar as tourist items. The Madagascar crocodiles could be returned to Appendix I.

The chairman stated the CSG should reject the proposal in favor of retaining the population on Appendix I.

Stephen Edwards asked whether retention on Appendix II with a zero quota be better than transfer to Appendix I?

Ginette Hemley stated that Appendix I gives stronger protection. She also indicated that an FAO crocodile management project will soon start in Madagascar.

Rom Whitaker commented that Olivier Behra will head the FAO project.

The committee agreed that the Madagascar proposal should be rejected and the population returned to Appendix I.

Malawi is seeking to retain its crocodiles on Appendix II under provisions of Conf. 3.15 on Ranching. This is a good proposal with a conservative quota.

The chairman stated that Malawi should protect its breeders by stopping all hunting of wild adults. An upper size limit should be established which would protect the breeders.

Kevin van Jaarsveldt suggested that quotas for wild and ranched skins must be separated.

Ginette Hemley agreed that hides exported under a quota that is divided into ranched and wild hides, as the 1987-1989 quota for Malawi has been, should specify whether the individual hides are ranched or wild.

Stephen Edwards suggested that the CSG should make a statement at the CITES conference to the effect that hides should not be taken directly from the wild except where the population has been downlisted to Appendix II on the basis of the Berne criteria, but that an annual export quota for ranched hides could be specified under Conf. 5.21.

The chairman agreed and indicated that the CSG review of every crocodile proposal should be consistent on this point.

Ginette Hemley stated that Malawi should specify how many hides will be taken during the next four years.

Kevin van Jaarsveldt reiterated that the CSG should encourage the ranching of crocodiles and the prohibition of the commercial hunting of adults. No hides should be taken directly from the wild.

Wayne King reported that some African

nations that have CITES annual export quotas under Conf. 5.21 inadvertently have sanctioned excess killing of crocodiles. Since large hides bring higher prices than small hides, hunters were encouraged to kill as many crocodiles as they could and then discard the smaller hides. This has resulted in two to three times more crocodiles being killed than is allowed in the quota.

Ginette Hemley reminded the committee members that Jon Hutton had addressed this problem in his draft resolution on annual quotas. The draft indicates the kill quota must be equivalent to the export quota.

Kevin van Jaarsveldt stated the Malawi proposal should be rejected in favor of a ranching quota for its crocodiles.

Wayne King indicated that it would be easier to monitor hide exports if the records included data on numbers and sizes of hides.

Both the chairman and Kevin van Jaarsveldt responded by pointing out the obvious, current sales practices mandates data on the size and numbers of the hides sold, therefore there is no excuse not to include these data in all reports on exports. In addition, all hides in international trade should be tagged with the standard self-locking CITES tag. If this was done, only illegal hides would be untagged.

Several committee members suggested that some hides might be available from wild adults as a result of eliminating nuisance crocodiles that prey on people and livestock. Conservation might be served better if these adults were captured and placed in a farm rather than killed.

Ted Joanen stressed that in the U.S.A. large mature nuisance alligators are not captured for placement on farms because past experience has shown these animals fight excessively and disrupt the breeding program. In the wild these animals defend large territories and they do not easily adapt to less space on farms. By contrast, animals hatched and raised in captivity do not require large territories and as a consequence they fight less.

The committee agreed that Malawi should be encouraged to stop killing adults in favor of collecting wild eggs for ranching.

Tanzania seeks an increase in its annual export quota established under Conf. 5.21. Tanzania did not submit any supporting data with its proposal, and has not complied with Conf. 5.21, has not reported on its exports, has not established a monitoring program, and has

not implemented a management scheme. The proposal should be rejected and the population returned to Appendix I, or the population should be retained in Appendix II with a zero export quota. In either case, the CSG is willing to assist the government of Tanzania to develop a good management program which could be approved by CITES.

Mozambique seeks retention of its crocodiles on Appendix II pursuant to Conf. 3.15 on Ranching. There is no evidence of illegal trade out of Mozambique. Reports on exports indicate the export quota was unused in 1985 and nearly so in 1986. Data on the 1987-88 exports have not been received. Neither is there evidence that the quota has resulted in excessive numbers of crocodiles being killed.

The committee agreed that Mozambique should be encouraged to end the hunting of wild crocodiles in favor of collecting eggs for ranching.

Somalia seeks an annual export quota of 2,000 crocodile hides under the provisions of Conf. 5.21. Information supplied with the proposal suggest a wild population of between 6,000 and 344,900 crocodiles in the Jubba River. This is based on extrapolating from five aerial surveys that counted between 200 and 3,500 crocs in the river. Clearly such wild estimates are no basis for establishing an export quota of 2,000. No management program is established, and there should be a demonstration of management before a quota is given. A much smaller annual quota is recommended, possibly 200, while Somalia moves toward a ranching scheme.

The committee agreed the Somalia proposal should be rejected in favor of a quota for the annual export of ranched hides.

Ethiopia seeks an annual export quota for its crocodiles under Conf. 5.21. Ethiopia is a new Party to CITES, its membership becoming effective on 4 July 1989. Information provided on the status of the Ethiopia's wild crocodiles suggests the population is healthy. A ranching operation is established, though there may be a problem with providing sufficient food for the stock of animals already held.

The committee agreed to support the Ethiopia proposal if it can be amended to allow collection of eggs for ranching and end any killing of wild adults.

Zambia requests retention of its crocodiles on Appendix II under provision of Conf. 3.15 for Ranching. As a result of several populations

being depleted under the present CITES annual export quota which includes 2,000 wild hides, Zambia shut down all wild harvest and revoked all croc hunting licenses and switched to ranching. The private ranching operations are operating successfully. Zambia has not fulfilled its annual reporting requirements under Conf. 5.21.

The committee agreed that we should support Zambia's proposal because the government has ended the killing of wild adults and is allowing only the collection of eggs for stocking ranches.

Indonesia wants to keep its populations of *Crocodylus porosus* on Appendix II under provisions of Conf. 5.21 but with an increase in the annual export quota from 4,000 to 6,000. At the time the proposal was submitted, it contained no information on the size of the wild population. In addition, illegal trade through Singapore is uncontrolled. Indonesia reported fewer than 2,000 hides were exported each year under the quota, but data indicates that between 5,000 and 7,000 hides were shipped to other CITES Parties. The proposed increase in the export quota is supposed to eliminate some of the illegal trade. The Indonesian proposal should be rejected for lack of data.

Yoshio Kaneko suggested that rejection of the Indonesian proposal might be counter-productive as it would put all the trade in the hands of the illegal dealers.

Frank Antram stated that the Indonesia wildlife management office had a new person at its head. This should change the method of operation. Rejection of the proposal might discourage any improvements in operations.

The chairman indicated that the crocodile proposals from Indonesia are always poor, and never seem to improve. He is in favor of rejecting the present proposal.

Rom Whitaker stated that Jack Cox, who is in charge of the FAO crocodile program in Irian Jaya is working against great odds and nevertheless is doing a good job.

Wayne King added that in the past, the wildlife officials in Bogor, Indonesia, had communicated far too little with the FAO project in Irian Jaya.

The committee agreed the Indonesia proposal should be rejected.

[These decisions of the Steering Committee on the CITES proposals were negotiating positions. In some instances, new data that only

became available at the CITES conference forced changes in the Steering Committee recommendations outlined above. For example, Jon Hutton arrived at the conference with advance copies of CITES AND THE NILE CROCODILE IN EAST/CENTRAL AFRICA AND MADAGASCAR: THE CITES NILE CROCODILE PROJECT, a report to the CITES Secretariat on the status and management of the crocodile populations in Botswana, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zambia. Data contained in this report, together with agreements arrived at following discussions with heads of delegations, allowed the CSG to support particular proposals after they were amended in committee or on the floor of the plenary session. The actions taken at the CITES conference are described by Ginette Hemley in CITES MEETING SUMMARY, page 11, below.]

Marking of crocodile hides. Frank Antram reported that Document 7.3 for the CITES conference contained a resolution that would require that all ranched, farmed, annual export quota, and look-alike species be marked with a tag approved by the CITES Animal Committee.

The committee members reiterated the CSG's goal of having all crocodile hides in international commerce tagged. However, the members felt the tagging requirement for hides should apply only up through tanning. Marking of retail products would be too cumbersome, though retailers and manufacturers should be required to maintain sufficient records to provide law enforcement officials with a 'paper trail' on the origin of all crocodilian products.

That concluded the committee discussion on CITES proposals.

10th Working Meeting of the CSG. Wayne King reported on the preparations for the 10th Working Meeting which is scheduled for 23-27 April 1990, in Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A. The committee was reminded that this date was fixed at the first Steering Committee meeting upon the recommendation of the hosts -- April is the month that least conflicts with activities in the Florida alligator management program.

Because conference space is not available on the University of Florida campus at that time, the meeting will be convened off campus, in the Holiday Inn West. Rooms will not be booked through the local host. Instead, all participants in the 10th Working Meeting will have to book

their rooms direct. The address of Holiday Inn West, together with its telephone and numbers, will be published in the CSG NEWSLETTER and sent to all CSG correspondents to facilitate bookings.

Dennis David, Allen (Woody) Woodward, Paul Moler, Michael Jennings, John Thorbjarnarson, Tracy Howell, and Wayne King are acting as an ad hoc committee for meeting arrangements.

The meeting will be hosted by the Florida Museum of Natural History. Florida Game and Fresh Water Game Commission has been asked to act as co-host, and similar requests will go forth to the American Alligator Farmers Association, the Florida Alligator Farmers Association, the St. Augustine Alligator Farm, and other organizations and businesses involved with alligator management and utilization.

Fieldtrips are being organized by the local hosts. During the meeting, night-time airboat surveys will be run on Orange Lake which will enable participants to see how alligators are surveyed in prime Florida habitat. In addition, several post-meeting fieldtrips are planned to alligator farms in north Florida, and to farms in central and south Florida and the Everglades National Park.

The issue of the CSG NEWSLETTER, which will go to press as soon as the deputy chairman returns home following the CITES conference, will contain:

- a pre-registration form for the 10th Working Meeting
- accommodation booking information
- a preliminary agenda
- a call for papers, and information proper format for publication of the papers
- information on fieldtrips

In addition to the regular papers given by participants, the agenda will include workshop presentations by Dennis David on A MODEL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR MANAGING WILD CROCODILE POPULATIONS, and by John Thorbjarnarson on the ACTION PLAN FOR CROCODILE CONSERVATION.

The chairman opened the discussion on the 10th Working Meeting by indicating a desire for two additional workshops: one on CROCODILE FARMING chaired by Jon Hutton, and one on TRADE IN CROCODILIAN HIDES chaired by Ginette Hemley and Richard Luxmoore.

That suggestion, for a total of four workshops, was unanimously agreed by the committee members. In addition, the chairman indicated that there will be several invited presentations on scientific topics.

The chairman also stated that papers given in the regular sessions will be limited to 15 minutes length, with an additional 5 minutes for discussion. He was emphatic in his determination to hold speakers to that time limit rather than allow some to run over and delay the entire program.

Wayne King reminded the chairman that he was one of the worst offenders when it came to running overtime.

The chairman acknowledged that in the past he had indeed been guilty of running beyond his allotted time, but pledged that he would hold himself to the same time limit he set for everyone else.

The chairman also believes that past meetings with continuous sessions were too intensive. People who have come halfway round the world want time to talk to colleagues they have not seen for two years. It was then agreed that one afternoon of the meeting should be free to allow people more time for informal discussions.

Fundraising. As promised at the first Steering Committee meeting, the deputy chairman gave the committee members a detailed accounting of all funds that had been contributed in support of the CSG program in the last 24 months. He explained how all contributions are handled. Payment is made out to the Crocodile Specialist Group and sent to the Deputy Chairman in Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A. These contributions are acknowledged and then deposited in the University of Florida Foundation, a public not-for-profit foundation operating under the 501(c)3 code of the U.S. Internal Revenue Service. Any funds that are accepted in support of a particular program can only be used for that purpose. The foundation accounts are audited both by the State of Florida and by the U.S. federal government. The deputy chairman also showed the committee members copies of the complete record of receipts that must be submitted to the foundation to document the proper disbursement of all funds.

The deputy chairman asked if there were any questions concerning any of the funds received or the disbursements charged against them. Several members commended the deputy chairman for

the completeness of the records.

The deputy chairman then called the attention of the committee members to account entries showing that during the last two years, the chairman and the deputy chairman personally had made considerable monetary contributions to the CSG program.

The chairman then instructed the deputy chairman to start a new accounting for funds that have been received since the chairmanship had changed.

Next, the chairman explained the fundraising responsibilities of each committee member. He indicated that, unlike his predecessor, he had no intention of raising \$10,000 for each member of the Steering Committee so they could run their offices and attend committee meetings. Instead, each CSG officer must meet operating costs by either getting support from his or her employing institution or by raising the necessary funds from outside sources.

The chairman then indicated that the CSG had recently received contributions from:

- Mainland Holdings Ltd., Lae Papua New Guinea.
- Harry Freeman, Hartleys Creek Crocodile Farm, Queensland, Australia.
- Horiuchi Trading, Tokyo, Japan.
- World Wildlife Fund, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Each contribution had been acknowledged first by the chairman and then by the deputy chairman when the check arrived in Gainesville, Florida. Finally, when the money was deposited in the University of Florida Foundation, it was acknowledged by the foundation staff.

The chairman then asked each committee member if he or she had raised any money for the CSG since the last meeting. Apart from the Deputy Chairman, as recorded in the accounting he had presented to the committee, and Ginette Hemley, who helped raise the contribution from WWF, none of the members present had. The chairman pointed out that he had raised the contributions from the first three on the list above. He then urged the members to get busy and raise funds for the CSG and for their own mail, telephone, fax, secretarial support, and travel.

Publications. The deputy chairman reviewed the status of the CSG publications:

- **CSG NEWSLETTER** - The deputy chairman will continue to compile and edit the newsletter. The time spent editing and producing the camera ready copy for the printer is contributed by the deputy chairman. The cost of printing the next three issues of the newsletter has been paid for by Mainland Holdings Ltd. and Harry Freeman. The cost of mailing the newsletter is borne by the Florida Museum of Natural History, but if the CSG continues to grow it may be necessary to pick up these costs in the coming years. To produce the newsletter, a file is created on the computer into which news is entered as correspondence is received. At the end of three months, the newsletter is essentially complete and the file only has to be formatted and printed on a laser printer. This eliminates the frenzy of last minute typing that is required to compile the usual newsletter from a three month accumulation of letters and articles.
- **SPANISH LANGUAGE PUBLICATION ON CROCODILIAN FARMING** - This publication should be finished before the end of 1989, and sent to the printer shortly thereafter. The cost of production was underwritten by Jacques Lewkowicz and Société Nouvelle France Croco.
- **ACTION PLAN FOR CROCODILE CONSERVATION** - Following the workshop presentation at the Gainesville meeting in April 1990, the Action Plan will be finished and published.
- **PROCEEDINGS OF THE 9TH WORKING MEETING** - The deputy chairman asked if any committee member wished to edit the papers from the Lae meeting and arrange for their publication. He then stated that he did not intend to edit the proceedings personally, but would supervise the task if funds were allocated for hiring a University of Florida graduate assistant. Funds are available in the UF Foundation, but the deputy chairman would not authorize their expenditure for this purpose without approval of the committee. After some discussion, the committee approved the commitment of \$7,000 for a one-third time graduate assistantship to run from now through May 1990.

[Subsequent to the committee meeting, the chairman decided that henceforth all papers in the PROCEEDINGS would be published just the way they are handed in by the authors. The PROCEEDINGS is a record of the papers given at the Working Meeting and as such requires no editing. If the author turns in an error-filled manuscript, that is the way it will be published. Save for numbering the pages consecutively and adding a table of contents, the volume will be unedited. With editing eliminated, the approval for hiring an assistant to edit the PROCEEDINGS of the Lae meeting was withdrawn.]

Stephen Edwards announced that there were funds in the SSC 1990 budget for the cost of publishing the ACTION PLAN FOR CROCODILIAN CONSERVATION. The deputy chairman agreed that the plan would be finished by mid-1990, in plenty of time to take advantage of the offer.

Kevin van Jaarsveldt indicated that he would attempt to raise the funds for publication of the PROCEEDINGS of 10th Working Meeting in Gainesville.

Other Business. Romulus Whitaker indicated that India's excellent crocodile conservation program had encountered an unexpected snag in the form of bureaucratic reluctance to allow farms to sell hides (see A SURPLUS OF MUGGER CROCODILES on p. 18 below). India's program originally had been conceived as one which first would conserve the wild crocodiles and then at some later date would provide income through regulated utilization. That was the basis upon which India received assistance from FAO experts in initiating the program. The hatcheries and head-starting programs had produced many crocodiles and gharial for stocking sanctuaries and areas of suitable habitat. The gharial and saltwater crocodile populations were still recovering, but so many muggers have been released that no more releases are planned. All available mugger habitat has been restocked, local people are beginning to complain about the numbers of muggers they encounter, and the farms have all the muggers they can hold. The government of India has agreed to supply mugger crocodiles to Pakistan for restocking habitat in that nation, but that will not long relieve the space problems facing the farms. The government of India refuses to grant the farms permission to harvest hides from their surplus

muggers for fear that any trade in crocodile hides, no matter how rigorously controlled, will stimulate poaching and illegal trade. Unless the government can be convinced to allow a controlled commercial utilization, the farms have no choice but to put an end to captive breeding programs.

The date and venue of the next Steering Committee meeting was set for Saturday, 21 April 1990, in Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by the chairman.