

**UNITED REP. OF TANZANIA**
**Elemental mercury imports and exports**
**Data source:** UN DESA/ESD/UNSD - Comtrade statistics - downloaded 11Apr2006

**Tarif system:** SITC rev.2

**Tarif code:** 52216

**Filter:** Trade value ≥ \$US 0

**Comments:**

Period	Exporting partner countries		Target country: United Rep. of Tanzania				Importing partner countries			
	Country name	Reported exports to target country	Reported imports from partner country (on left)		Reported exports to partner country (on right)		Reported imports from target country		Country name	
Year	Country name	Kg mercury	Value (\$US)	Kg mercury	Value (\$US)	Kg mercury	Value (\$US)	Kg mercury	Value (\$US)	Country name
1995	Areas, nes			63	392					
1995	Finland			1375	8399					
1995	Germany	199	2000							
1995	Kenya	238	2006							
1996	Germany			296	1996					
1997	Areas, nes			2	11					
1997	United Kingdom	1	2047							
1998	Kenya			26011	21936					
1998	So. African Cust	0	2522	85	1070					
1998	United Kingdom			16	557					
1998	USA			10	2581					
1999	Areas, nes			3	415					
1999	United Arab Emirates			304	724					
1999	United Kingdom			41	6129					
1999	USA			29	770					
2000	Areas, nes			357	337					
2000	United Kingdom			148	5983					
2001	Areas, nes			65	501					
2002	Areas, nes			343	57					
2002	Mauritius			199	773					
2002	South Africa	66	592							
2003	Areas, nes			11	49					
2003	India			320	1006					
2003	Kenya			1500	1055					
2003	South Africa	70	966							
2004	Areas, nes			40	117					
2004	South Africa			82	951					

See last page for explanation of table entries

### ***Explanation of table entries -***

The purpose of the table above is to summarize all of the basic statistics for imports and exports of elemental mercury to and from the "target" country during 1995-2005. On the date of 11 April 2006, when these statistics were retrieved from the Comtrade database, the database was thought to be quite incomplete for the year 2005, mostly complete for the year 2004, and quite complete for previous years.

The six columns on the left side of this table present mercury flows from other countries into the target country. These six columns include four columns with details of the mercury import flows into the target country – two columns for reported mercury quantity, and two columns for reported mercury value. The rationale for presenting these four columns is quite simple. For a variety of reasons, the trade flow of mercury between the partner country (second column on the left) and the target country may have been recorded (and reported to Comtrade) by the partner country, by the target country, or by both countries. Regardless of which country or countries submitted trade statistics to the Comtrade database, and regardless of the details of the statistics submitted, all statistics concerning mercury flows into the target country are included in the left side of this table.

The five columns on the right side of this table list mercury flows from the target country into other countries. These five columns include four columns with details of the mercury export flows from the target country to each partner country (far right column) – two columns for reported mercury quantity, and two columns for reported mercury value. As described above, different countries may have submitted different sets of trade statistics to Comtrade. Regardless of which country or countries submitted trade statistics to the Comtrade database, and regardless of the details of the statistics submitted, all statistics concerning mercury flows leaving the target country are included in the right side of this table.

It is therefore possible that statistics submitted by some trade partners are not the same as those submitted by the target country. If the discrepancies are large, it could be useful for the reporting agencies of the partner country and the target country to compare their records in order to better understand the details of the mercury trade between their two countries. In the interest of improving its own understanding of global mercury trade and statistical challenges, UNEP Chemicals would be pleased to receive explanations of any such discrepancies investigated by the reporting agencies, as appropriate.