

3.2 **Presentation: Ownership and allocation of rhinos: models and issues (Martin Brooks – AfRSG Chair)**

ASSUMPTIONS

- Model selection:
 - Expected performance of rhino population
 - Benefits accruing to Wildlife Authority
 - (Assume all sectors equally effective in all countries)

MODELS

- AUCTION SALE
- TENDER SALE
- FIXED-PRICE SALE
- LEASE "Rent-a-Rhino"
- LEASE "Share progeny"
- CUSTODIANSHIP
- DONATION

AUCTION / TENDER SALE

- Live auction: rhinos captured and viewed
- Catalogue auction: pre-capture (rhino-unknown)
- Tender: pre-capture, advertised, confidential bids
- Price not fixed → Highest bidder wins

AUCTION / TENDER SALE

- Pros:
 - Maximises revenue
- Cons:
 - Best area may not get rhino
 - ECC low to attract bidders
 - Founder populations small (cost, size)
 - Property choice limited to private sector (?)
 - Advertised fixed price → best property wins

FIXED PRICE SALE

- Pros:
 - High revenue
 - Best "available" property gets rhino
- Cons:
 - Property choice limited to private sector (?)
 - ECC threshold low to attract buyers (?)
 - Founder populations small (cost, size)

LEASE "Rent a Rhino"

- Annual rental set for certain period
- Compensation paid for rhinos dying
- Founders remain property of State Authority
- Advertised fixed rental → best property wins

LEASE "Rent a Rhino"

- Pros:
 - Moderately high revenue
 - Best "available" property gets rhinos
 - Ownership of founder retained
- Cons:
 - Revenue spread over lease period
 - Property choice limited to private sector (?)
 - ECC threshold low to attract lessees (?)
 - Founder populations small (cost, size)
 - Increased admin and management for State

LEASE "Share progeny"

- No rental - remain State property
- Options
 - State receives 50 % progeny
 - Fixed number of progeny (predicted)
 - Monitoring and mgmt standards set by State
- Progeny as payment → best property wins

LEASE "Share progeny"

- Pros:
 - Suitable model for all sectors (private, communal, State)
 - Very best property gets rhino
 - Optimal rhino population performance
- Cons:
 - No immediate returns (progeny)
 - Option (a) Returns not guaranteed
 - Verification of progeny difficult
 - Good monitoring required
 - Increased admin and mgmt for State

CUSTODIANSHIP

- Founders supplied at no cost
- Founders and progeny remain owned by State
- Monitoring and management standards set by State
- No charge → best property selected

CUSTODIANSHIP

- Pros:
 - Suitable for all sectors
 - Very best property gets rhinos
 - Optimal rhino population performance
 - State's rhino management costs "shared"
- Cons:
 - No immediate returns (progeny)

DONATION

- Founders supplied at no cost
- (Game swaps may be negotiated)
- No charge → best property selected

DONATION

- Pros:
 - Suitable for all sectors (mainly communal, State)
 - Very best property gets rhinos
 - Optimal rhino population performance
- Cons:
 - No returns received (unless swaps)

TENTATIVE RATING OF THE VARIOUS OWNERSHIP MODELS

(Based on ecological and economic considerations, and assuming that the private, communal and State sectors are equally effective)

Ownership Model	Pvt	Comm.	State	Benefits Rhino Conserv.	Benefits State Auth.	Outcomes
Auction/Tender sale	●			+	\$\$\$	Not ideal for rhinos Vigilance
Fixed Price sale	●			**	\$\$	Good for rhinos Vigilance
Lease - Rent a rhino	●			**	\$\$\$	Stagnant revenue
Lease - Share progeny	●	●	●	***	Rhino ✓✓✓	Reasonable returns
Custodianship	●	●	●	***	Rhino ✓✓	Best for rhinos
Donation		●	●	***	Conserv. Value	Altruism

CONCLUSIONS:

- Best options for rhino population growth is Lease "Share progeny",
- Custodianship and Donation ✓ because very best property can be selected
- Best financial returns for Wildlife Authority are Auction/Tender sale and Fixed-price sale

BASIC SELECTION CRITERIA

- Apply to all models:
 - Founder population viable (varies by model)
 - Property suitable and approved:
 - Within historical range
 - ECC adequate (varies by model)
 - Free ranging (no food supplements)
 - Good security (location, fences, staff)
 - Management capacity