

# SADC REGIONAL PROGRAMME FOR RHINO CONSERVATION

## STAKEHOLDERS PLANNING WORKSHOP

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA  
6-7 MARCH, 2000

PROCEEDINGS



COOPERAZIONE  
ITALIANA

ITALIAN COOPERATION

AID 5064



**IUCN**  
The World Conservation Union



## PROJECT DATA

**Project title :** **SADC Regional programme for Rhino Conservation**

**ID N.** AID 5064

**Donor :** Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MAAEE)  
Directorate General for Development Cooperation

**Executing agency:** CESVI Cooperazione e Sviluppo

**Regional implementing consortium:** Consortium including:  
  
CESVI  
SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordination Unit  
IUCN - The World Conservation Union - Regional Office for Southern Africa  
IUCN African Rhino Specialist Group  
WWF - World Wide Fund for Nature Southern African Regional Programme Office

**MAAEE/DGCS Contract:** Convenzione rep. N. 975 del 25.10.1996

**Reference agreement:** *Technical Framework for the SADC Rhino Programme* signed by Consortium members, SADC secretariat and MAAEE/DGCS.

**Starting date:** 24 September 1999

**Duration:** 3 years

**WORKSHOP REPORT COMPILED BY**

**Raoul du Toit  
Jonas Chafota  
Alaphia A. Wright**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2 SALIENT POINTS FROM THE MEETING, NOTED BY THE FACILITATOR (A. Wright)</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>2.1 Programme Outputs</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>2.2 Conditions For Support</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>2.3 Identification Of The Way Forward</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>3 PROCEEDINGS</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>3.1 Opening remarks</b> .....	<b>9</b>
3.1.1 T. Carrol, South African Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism .....	9
3.1.2 M. Pala, Embassy of Italy, Pretoria.....	9
3.1.3 A. Guillet, Directorate General for Development Co-operation, Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rome.....	9
<b>3.2 Background to the Programme</b> ..... (H. Nzima, SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordination Unit, Malawi) .....	<b>11</b>
<b>3.3 Institutional Roles of Partners in the Consortium</b> (Y. Katerere, IUCN-ROSA) .....	<b>12</b>
<b>3.4 Overview of SADC Rhino Programme</b> (R. du Toit, WWF-SARPO).....	<b>12</b>
<b>3.5 Programme Management for the SADC Rhino Conservation Programme</b> (G. Daconto, CESVI) .....	<b>15</b>
<b>3.6 Existing Structures for the Co-ordination of Rhino Conservation (Continental, Regional and National)</b> (M. Brooks, AfRSG).....	<b>17</b>
<b>3.7 Review of the Status and Conservation Biology of African Rhino</b> (R. Emslie, AfRSG) .....	<b>18</b>
<b>3.8 Rhino Conservation Principles: Genetic, Demographic and Management Issues</b> .... (R. Brett, Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Botswana) .....	<b>20</b>
<b>3.9 Priorities for Rhino Conservation</b> (M. Brooks, AfRSG).....	<b>22</b>
<b>3.10 Outline of Activities in Year 1</b> (R. du Toit, WWF-SARPO) .....	<b>22</b>
<b>3.11 Country reports</b> .....	<b>24</b>
3.11.1 Angola – An Overview of Wildlife Status (Nkosi Luta Kingengo).....	24
3.11.2 Botswana ( Isaac K. Theophilus) .....	25
3.11.3 Malawi (Gibson Y.A. Mphepo) .....	25
3.11.4 Mozambique ( S. B. Mahanjane and F. Longamane ).....	26
3.11.5 Namibia (P. Erb and R. Loutit) .....	27
3.11.6 South Africa ( R. Emslie and A. Hall-Martin) .....	28
3.11.7 Swaziland (R. C. Boycott) .....	29
3.11.8 Tanzania ( M.K.S. Maige).....	30
3.11.9 Zambia (W. J. Banda and C. Siachibuye) .....	32
3.11.10 Zimbabwe (F. Msipa).....	34
<b>Annex A: List of Participants</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>Annex B: Agenda</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>Annex C: Introductions and Expectations</b> .....	<b>39</b>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

A planning meeting of the SADC Rhino Programme Range States and Consortium Partners was held at the Randburg Towers Hotel, Randburg, South Africa from 6 – 7 March 2000. Some 31 participants from Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe attended the meeting. A full list of the delegates is given as Annex A. The proceedings were guided by a facilitator/moderator, Prof. Alaphia Wright, and followed the agenda that is included as Annex B.

After participants outlined their expectations (Annex C), the objectives of the meeting were agreed as:

- ◆ To clarify details and issues characterising the SADC Rhino Programme;
- ◆ To debate project development criteria and allocation of the programme's resources; and
- ◆ To agree upon structures and processes necessary for the successful implementation of the SADC Rhino Programme.

It was suggested that a fourth objective of the meeting should be to ensure “buy-in” to the programme by all the SADC rhino range states. However, the consensus of participants was that such an objective is made redundant by the fact that this programme has already been agreed to as a SADC programme at ministerial level. The member states do not have to be “sold” the programme at this meeting because they already “own” it, and as owners they must now have their say on how it should be implemented, within the SADC-agreed framework.

## 2 SALIENT POINTS FROM THE MEETING, NOTED BY THE FACILITATOR (*A. Wright*)

The discussions, in the main, centred on issues of the programme and how the range states would feature in its implementation. Two fundamental aspects (expected outputs from the programme and the 'conditions' for projects to be adopted or supported by/through the programme) were discussed at length.

### 2.1 Programme Outputs

The programme outputs developed to date were presented for discussion and 'buy-in' by the range states, namely:

Output #1: Development of institutional arrangements to achieve adequate coordination of rhino conservation efforts within and between SADC range states, and between SADC regional initiatives and international initiatives;

Output #2: Development of a reporting system and confidential database for all rhino populations in SADC range states;

Output #3: Implementation of rhino conservation projects that meet the criteria for support under the SADC rhino programme;

Output #4: Enhanced technical capacity of rhino management within SADC for undertaking the management, monitoring and protection of their rhinos;

Output #5: Enhanced awareness within local communities of rhino conservation obligations and opportunities, in pilot project areas;

Output #6: Better understanding within the region of technical, economic and socio-political factors that are relevant to rhino conservation, and

Output #7: Effective programme management and reporting established.

Outputs # 1, 2, 4 and 6 were considered by the group to be appropriate and should remain as they were. Output # 3 was reformulated to reflect the overall understanding of the 'conditions' projects have to meet, in order to be supported, sponsored or promoted by the SADC rhino conservation programme. Similarly, output # 5 was reformulated to take account of community participation in rhino conservation projects in pilot project areas, as opposed to simply 'raising awareness' as indicated in the original output # 5. Output #7, the management output, was renamed output # 8, and a new output #7 introduced, relating to sourcing of additional funding. This output was developed as a result of the discussions on 'conditions'. It was noted that the funds available to the programme would in no way be sufficient to fund 'all' projects meeting the conditions. As such provision will be made for the SADC Rhino programme to promote projects meeting the laid out conditions and facilitate the raising of the necessary funds from diverse sources. The rationale here is that the SADC programme will of necessity be in an authoritative position to assist individual range states in fund raising for deserving projects.

The updated set of programme outputs are:

Updated Output #1:	<b>Development of institutional arrangements to achieve adequate coordination of rhino conservation efforts within and between SADC range states, and between SADC regional initiatives and international initiatives;</b>
Updated Output #2:	<b>Development of a reporting system and confidential database for all rhino populations in SADC range states;</b>
Updated Output #3:	<b>Rhino conservation projects that meet the conditions for support under the SADC Rhino programme implemented;</b>
Updated Output #4:	<b>Enhanced technical capacity of rhino management within SADC for undertaking the management, monitoring and protection of their rhinos;</b>
Updated Output #5:	<b>Participation and / or enhanced awareness of local communities in Rhino conservation in pilot areas;</b>
Updated Output #6:	<b>Better understanding within the region of technical, economic and socio-political factors that are relevant to rhino conservation;</b>
Updated Output #7:	<b>Funding for additional conservation projects that meet the conditions of the SADC Rhino programme facilitated / promoted;</b>
Updated Output #8:	<b>Effective programme management and reporting established.</b>

## 2.2 Conditions For Support

Five 'conditions' were agreed upon as necessary to be met by projects requiring support from the SADC rhino conservation programme, namely:

1. Projects must be of a SADC regional nature or importance;
2. Projects must be limited to 'subspecies' *Ceratotherium simum*, *Diceros bicornis minor*, *D.b.bicornis*;
3. Fundamental rhino management issues such as land use economics, community involvement, etc. must be taken into account;
4. Both public and private rhino conservation projects will be considered, and
5. Implementation must make use of existing institutions and linkages.

## 2.3 Identification Of The Way Forward

All the range states present at the meeting expressed their full support for the SADC Rhino conservation programme. It was agreed that a "Consortium – Range States Forum" meet annually for the purpose of updating members of progress and making necessary decisions for the success of the programme.

It was therefore agreed that range states should submit the names of their 'focal points' to the consortium after consultations and agreement in their home countries. In particular, range state representatives were requested to pay attention to the fact that the forum will benefit from 'consistent representation'. This is taken to mean that given range states should ideally be represented by the same professional official over extended periods. In cases where this is not possible, all efforts must be made by the representative to report fully to colleagues on their return from consortium – range states forum meetings.

It was also agreed that, as far as possible, the dates for the consortium – range states forum should be such as to be able to take advantage of similar gatherings such as the Wildlife Sector meeting (May). However, the meetings should also be planned to synchronize with the project cycle of the regional rhino programme.

## 3 PROCEEDINGS

### 3.1 Opening remarks

#### 3.1.1 T. Carrol, South African Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism

On behalf of the South African Government and the Director-General of the Department of Environmental Affairs and tourism, I welcome you to the SADC Rhino Programme Meeting.

The South African Government always appreciates the opportunity to discuss common issues with our sister countries within the Southern African region and I am encouraged by the participation of so many rhino states.

In South Africa populations of southern white rhino, south western black rhino and the southern central black rhino. As these are the taxa that are addressed by the SADC rhino programme, South Africa expects to be actively and intimately involved with the programme.

South Africa wishes the meeting well. I hope we will have fruitful discussions and a productive outcome.

Enjoy your stay in our lovely country.

#### 3.1.2 M. Pala, Embassy of Italy, Pretoria

I would like to extend a warm welcome to the participants on behalf of Italian Cooperation. The Programme is funded by the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate General for Development Cooperation and its main aim is to strengthen the role of regional cooperation under SADC in the conservation of rhino species in Southern Africa. The Government of Italy is pleased to support critical capacity-building initiatives in the environment sector in this region and to facilitate the strengthening of regional cooperation in this endeavour among the member countries of the Southern Africa Development Community.

Therefore I look forward to your advice and guidance for the benefit of this programme, which is just going through its initial phase.

#### 3.1.3 A. Guillet, Directorate General for Development Co-operation, Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rome

Let me join the welcome extended by Mr. Pala on behalf of the Italian Development Co-operation to you all. I am particularly pleased to take the opportunity and contribute with a few introductory remarks to this pivotal event in the framework of the SADC Regional Programme for Rhino Conservation. A programme whose origins go back to a series of consultations held by the Italian Development Co-operation with the SADC Secretariat, institutions of range states and relevant international scientific and conservation organisations (early in the nineties) responding to the pressing need to support rhino conservation action in the region.

The Italian Development Cooperation places priority on the conservation of biodiversity and its bearing on sustainable development policies, programmes and projects. Whilst being engaged in supporting a fairly large number of relevant

initiatives world-wide, its active involvement is growing significantly in the Southern African region.

In line with consultations with its SADC regional counterparts, the Italian Development Cooperation concurred on the expression that enhancing regional efforts to share resources, expertise and lessons learnt could be an efficient way to support rhino conservation in Southern Africa and the most effective complement to local and national initiatives.

As we know, recent population assessments both for the black and white rhinos, although with noticeable exception for subspecies, have shown some signs of positive trends. I trust that on the basis of today and tomorrow's contributions from the top international experts who have convened here, we shall all gain the most updated insight on relevant trends.

The region has undoubtedly built some excellent technical capacities and, beside, significant experience in managing rhino populations under various conditions is being gathered. Plenty of pursuits (maybe not always with positive results) but they all provide lots of lessons learned and vitally needed by our conservation endeavour which, alas, is up-hill and heavily pressing time-wise.

The conservation of viable rhino population may likely happen only through the management of subspecies meta-populations, and this can only be achieved through well-appraised, co-ordinated and concerted regional efforts.

On the one hand, taking stock of the dwindling resources available for conservation efforts, we need to devise and promote resilient and self-sufficient long-term wildlife management programmes, strongly based on local and national capacities. On the other hand, in the particular case of rhino conservation, available resources are to be directed towards carefully selected targets in order to achieve the required critical mass and hence a positive impact. Evidence strongly supports a call for a careful selection of intervention priorities and hence, for a severe concentration of financial resources on the same.

Therefore, while in this time of growing financial constraints for conservation and development assistance, Italy is ready to join hands and make available resources for this important biodiversity conservation challenge, at the same time, we must all have a strong belief in the conservation perspectives which rest behind the mobilisation of the large body of experience which has been accumulated at international level on rhino conservation, and particularly on objective criteria for selecting intervention priorities to ensure effective action.

Regional co-operation has a strong and fundamental role to play in rhino conservation. Consistently, this programme is meant to complement other ongoing rhino conservation initiatives, both national and regional ones. It is not meant to sustain a broad set of local initiatives, which are better supported through national programmes.

Its main objective is rather to build long term institutional capacities at regional level, based on solid national co-ordination mechanisms on issues such as information exchange, conservation planning, conservation policy analysis, development and replication of conservation models, support to meta-population management, etc. In doing so, the programme is not expected to provide direct financial assistance to national institutions, but rather to facilitate the flow of technical assistance to them in support of critical functions of regional relevance.

As will be explained by Mr. Nzima the programme is implemented through a consortium which includes the leading scientific authority in the sector, namely the African Rhino Specialist Group, on whose shoulders mainly falls the responsibility for the programme's scientific leadership; the leading conservation NGOs World Conservation Union and the Southern African Regional Programme Office of WWF;

the Italian NGO CESVI, which is actively involved in the environment and development sector; and last but not least, the SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Co-ordinating Unit, which chairs and guides the Consortium.

It goes without saying that in the implementation of this programme, the guidance by, the contribution and the active participation of national institutions is of paramount importance. This early consultation taking place at our workshop, is indeed planned at the inception of the programme with a view to enabling the relevant range states bodies to provide their objective views and constructive contribution towards the project drive and SADC goals. It is the utmost objective of the Italian Development Co-operation that the range states directly benefit from the programme and contribute with their experience to its regional pursuits. I trust that together with their genuine concern on the current needs for regional biodiversity conservation, all range states will share a sense of ownership of the programme.

We look forward with great interest to the discussion which will take place during these two days. The recommendations arising from this workshop will constitute a solid reference basis for programme planning and implementation during the next three years. Your task and constructive contribution today and tomorrow are going to be extremely important to this end.

### 3.2 **Background to the Programme** (H. Nzima, SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordination Unit, Malawi)

Agreement has been reached between a consortium of agencies to implement a regional programme of rhino conservation within SADC member states. The project is funded by the Italian Government to the level of approximately US \$2.4 million, over three years. This has happened following years of negotiations. The participating agencies are as follows:

SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordinating Unit (henceforth referred to as SADC WSTCU);

IUCN - The World Conservation Union, Regional Office for Southern Africa (henceforth referred to as IUCN-ROSA);

The Africa Rhino Specialist Group of the Species Survival Commission of IUCN - The World Conservation Union (henceforth referred to as AfRSG);

WWF-World Wide Fund for Nature Southern African Regional Programme Office (henceforth referred to as WWF-SARPO);

CESVI Cooperazione Sviluppo (henceforth referred to as CESVI).

The specific roles of these partner agencies are specified in Section 5.

The programme will concentrate on rhino projects and policies that are of a regional nature (e.g. those which involve sharing of expertise between SADC member states, involve sharing or exchange of their rhinos; are conservation models for potential replication elsewhere in the region, and/or have regional economic or political implications).

The programme will be limited to rhino "subspecies" whose historical range included more than one SADC state and whose future metapopulation management is also likely to involve more than one SADC state (i.e. Southern African subspecies: *Ceratotherium simum*, *Diceros bicornis minor*, *D.b.bicornis*).

The programme will be primarily concerned with fundamental rhino management issues and with clearly relevant aspects of land-use economics, community

interaction, applied research, etc. It will endeavour to assist SADC rhino range states, to the extent that they request, with the establishment of proactive measures to protect their rhinos from poaching but will not become involved in law enforcement or in the investigation of illegal activities. Information on numbers and distribution of rhinos will be kept to the level of confidence that is specified by each range state.

The programme will include public and private sector rhino conservation projects.

The programme has been designed and implemented to complement existing institutions and their linkages, particularly the SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordination Unit, existing national and regional rhino management committees (notably the Southern African Rhino Management Group) and the IUCN African Rhino Specialist Group (AfRSG).

Priorities for action within the programme will accord with the regional rhino conservation priorities, to be periodically determined by the implementing consortium using criteria that are outlined by AfRSG.

The programme implementation will be steered by an Executive Committee comprising representatives of the implementing agencies and chaired by SADC WSTCU.

In October 1999 the implementing consortium developed a budget and a work plan for a four-month inception phase, the main component of which is this workshop of rhino range states within SADC.

### **3.3 Institutional Roles of Partners in the Consortium (Y. Katerere, IUCN-ROSA)**

The regional consortium includes the following institutions:

SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Coordination Unit: chairs the Consortium and provides the linkages with SADC structures for decision-making on regional rhino conservation policies and programme implementation arrangements;

IUCN - The World Conservation Union: will provide support and assistance to the SADC-WTCU in motivating and coordinating the Programme at political and technical levels; the Rhino Programme Coordinator will be hired through IUCN and will be responsible chiefly of the direct supervision and coordination of the Programme implementation;

IUCN African Rhino Specialist Group: will provide scientific leadership on the direction and prioritisation of rhino conservation activities;

WWF - World Wide Fund for Nature Southern African Regional Programme Office: will provide technical support to the Programme and will implement, in conjunction with the relevant rhino management authorities, specific rhino projects as identified within the Programme.

CESVI will undertake the management of Programme's finances and administration, Programme monitoring and will facilitate programme management and reporting to the donor.

### **3.4 Overview of SADC Rhino Programme (R. du Toit, WWF-SARPO)**

The Technical Framework Agreement for the programme is between SADC-WSTCU, IUCN-ROSA, AfRSG, WWF-SARPO, CESVI and was signed in July-September 1999

The programme focusses on rhino conservation at a regional level but is intended to promote broader conservation of biodiversity, since rhinos are seen as flagship species: they are large mammals with requirements for extensive areas of diverse habitat and need professional management and protection from poachers, so any rhino conservation project tends to become an umbrella for the broader conservation of other species and habitats.

The SADC region as a whole does not lack the required expertise for rhino conservation but such expertise tends to be concentrated in a few countries. Hence good co-ordination is required to share expertise, equipment (e.g. translocation vehicles) and even rhinos at a regional level. In addition to the specific expertise that is required for rhino conservation per se, a broad range of professional inputs are required for holistic rhino conservation requirements since such programmes will have to be made sustainable in socio-political and economic terms as well as biological terms – so there is need for expertise in land-use economics, community outreach, general wildlife management, policy and legislation, etc. To ensure the full range of expertise, a consortium approach makes sense.

The programme is therefore established to provide expertise, specialized logistical support, training, information and catalytic funding in support of SADC regional conservation projects and policies for rhinos as flagship species; such projects and policies are to be aimed at maximizing population growth rates, enhancing overall biodiversity, ensuring economic sustainability, and stimulating local community conservation awareness and involvement in the protection and wise use of these species. By establishing regional co-ordination in the management of the endangered and charismatic rhino species, it is intended that a precedent will be created within SADC so that this co-ordination can be extended to other wildlife species that should be managed at a regional rather than at a local level.

The conditionalities (criteria) for the selection of projects within the programme have been set out in Section 4 of the Technical Framework Agreement.

*Programme goal:* Southern African rhino taxa maintained in viable and well distributed metapopulations as flagship species for biodiversity conservation within SADC region.

*Programme objective:* A pragmatic regional rhino strategy implemented within the SADC region following the acquisition of sound information on, firstly, the constraints and opportunities for rhino conservation within each range state and secondly, the constraints and opportunities for rhino metapopulation management at the region level.

Outputs and activities envisaged over a two and a half year period

*Output #1. Development of institutional arrangements to achieve adequate co-ordination of rhino conservation efforts within and between SADC regional initiatives and international initiatives.*

Activity # 1.1 Facilitate the establishment of national rhino committees for SADC range states which do not already have such committees (avoiding duplication with the RMG). These committees will have lead responsibility for national level implementation of all rhino projects as well as for ensuring the sharing of expertise, equipment, information, etc., with other SADC range states.

Activity #1.2 Facilitate the development and regular updating of national rhino conservation strategies and action plans.

Activity #1.3 Facilitate the establishment and functioning of a SADC Rhino Programme Committee consisting of a national representative from each National Rhino Committee as well as representatives from the international NGO's that are

directly engaged in the SADC Rhino Programme (to meet at least once per year under the chairmanship of the SADC WTCU Coordinator).

**Output #2.** Development of a reporting system and confidential database for all rhino populations in SADC range states.

**Activity #2.1** Facilitate surveys of remnant rhino populations within SADC range states. This activity will be highly dependent upon the security situation which prevails within these areas.

**Activity #2.2** Develop and maintain a SADC regional rhino database (in coordination with the Southern African RMG) through a standardized approach which allows for regular updating, classification of reliability of data, comparative analyses of demographic trends, etc.

**Activity #2.3** Expand this SADC rhino database through GIS to incorporate georeferenced data on pertinent biophysical and human influences, e.g. poaching patterns and threats to rhino habitats.

**Activity #2.4** Support the production of annual rhino status reports for the SADC region (one at a confidential level and one at a level for general dissemination), including assessments of driving forces, constraints, options and opportunities for rhino conservation within the region.

**Output #3.** *Implementation of and/or facilitation of funding for rhino conservation projects that meet the criteria for support under the SADC Rhino Programme.*

**Activity #3.1** Provide expertise, specialised equipment and other support to undertake specific and strategic rhino management and monitoring operations, in accordance with AfRSG recommendations and the decisions of relevant National Rhino Committees, such as translocations, radiocollaring and population surveys.

**Activity #3.2** Assist with the drafting and "marketing" of proposals for donor support or other funding as required to implement significant national rhino conservation projects within the SADC range states.

**Output #4.** *Enhanced technical capacity of rhino management agencies within SADC for undertaking the management, monitoring and protection of their rhinos.*

**Activity #4.1** Arrange for specific members of rhino management agencies to be trained ("on-the-job" as far as possible) to undertake specialised activities related to rhino conservation, e.g. radiocollaring, capture techniques, protection, monitoring of individual rhinos, population estimation techniques, provided that the applicability of this training is beyond doubt.

**Activity #4.2** Produce specific technical manuals, in relevant languages, for the use of members of wildlife management bodies who require guidance on aspects of rhino management, monitoring and protection.

**Output #5.** *Enhanced awareness within local communities of rhino conservation obligations and opportunities, in pilot project areas.*

**Activity #5.1** Produce appropriate leaflets, posters, audio-visual aids, etc., for use in community awareness programmes.

**Activity #5.2** Facilitate the establishment and publicity of informer reward schemes, where feasible, to give members of local communities legal incentives to report rhino poachers.

Activity #5.3 Identify and promote options for local communities to derive tangible and sustainable economic benefits from rhino populations that are conserved within or adjacent to their home areas.

*Output #6. Better understanding within the region of technical, economic and socio-political factors that are relevant to rhino conservation.*

Activity #6.1 Provide expertise and other resources to tackle specific regional priorities (as identified by AfRSG) for ecological and biological research, e.g. habitat assessments, population estimation techniques, genetic analyses.

Activity #6.2 Implement pilot projects to test "high-tech" options that may be practical in the regional rhino conservation context (e.g. new radio collar designs, transponder technology, DNA fingerprinting, dung odour analysis, pregnancy diagnosis).

Activity #6.3 Undertake economic analyses of rhino management in a land-use context, including the assessment of scenarios for controlled legal trade in rhino products. Clarify the positive and negative attitudes of stakeholders within SADC range states regarding such options, so that informed debate can take place within the SACE Rhino Programme Committee and policy briefs can be prepared under the auspices of this committee

*Output #7. Effective programme management and reporting established. Activities to be further elaborated as arrangements for programme administration are finalized.*

Activity #7.1 Establishment of Executive Board and selection of Programme Coordinator.

Activity #7.2 Establishment of detailed financial management and reporting procedures.

Activity #7.3 Formulation of general workplan.

Activity #7.4 Formulation of six-monthly technical progress reports.

Activity #7.5 Formulation of six-monthly consolidated financial reports.

Activity #7.6 Final report.

### **3.5 Programme Management for the SADC Rhino Conservation Programme (G. Daconto, CESVI)**

The SADC Regional Rhino Conservation Programme aims to support a co-ordinated regional effort in Southern Africa towards maintaining viable rhino populations. To this end the programme brings together leading rhino conservation expertise from the region; is firmly based on the accumulated regional experience on rhino management; and wants to complement and further support ongoing national and regional rhino conservation initiatives and institutions.

To achieve these broad goals, the programme was conceived through consultations with the key agencies in the region. Programme development took stock of the significant knowledge on rhino conservation gathered over the past. As a result, this programme, funded by the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate General for Development Co-operation (MAAEE/DGCS) and implemented by CESVI, is executed through a regional consortium which brings together key agencies in the rhino conservation field.

CESVI is an Italian NGO active in the development and environment sectors in a number of countries world-wide. CESVI implements projects funded by the Italian Cooperation, the European Commission, other donors and through public fund-raising. CESVI is the contractor for the Rhino Conservation Programme.

The regional implementing consortium was established before the programme inception, based on a Technical Framework agreement signed by the consortium partners, SADC Secretariat and MAAEE/DGCS. This agreement identifies the rationale, goals, objectives and expected results of the programme.

Goals, objectives and conditionalities of the programme have been presented by other speakers at this workshop; this presentation provides a brief summary of the fundamental programme management aspects included in the agreement and the management set-up developed during the inception phase.

Programme planning is co-ordinated and supervised through an Executive Board composed of representatives of each partner organisation within the consortium. The Board is responsible for:

- ◆ review and endorsement of workplans and reports;
- ◆ appointment of the Programme Co-ordinator;
- ◆ progress review and monitoring of the activities of the programme.

The Executive Board will meet regularly to review and approve workplans and reports and thus ensure a truly co-ordinated regional effort. The Programme Co-ordinator is responsible for overall technical co-ordination and supervision of the implementation, reporting to the Board on technical matters and through this and CESVI to DGCS.

The programme, started in September 1999, will last three years. The programme budget is 4,4 billion lire or approximately 2,2 million US Dollars. The programme is planned through a semi-annual cycle, whereas funds are released by DGCS every six-months upon reviewing the progress of the programme and the financial reports.

The inception phase had the following main goals:

- ◆ to undertake detailed consultations among consortium partners to define operational roles and responsibilities; in particular an initial consortium meeting was organised in November 1999;
- ◆ to prepare detailed administrative and management guidelines for the implementation of the programme: a protocol has been agreed upon by the partners and submitted to DGCS;
- ◆ to define the terms of reference of, select and recruit the Programme Co-ordinator: the selection is being finalised; and, last but not least,
- ◆ to undertake consultations with the range states on programme planning, to gather views, inputs and recommendations from national institutions responsible for rhino management, which will be the ultimate beneficiaries of the programme.

This workshop has been convened to this end, as initial consultation with the range states before the formulation of the operational plan for the project. Based on the recommendations arising from this workshop, the consortium will develop the general three-year workplan and a detailed workplan for the second semester.

### 3.6 Existing Structures for the Co-ordination of Rhino Conservation (Continental, Regional and National) (M. Brooks, AfRSG)

We have a good understanding of what constitutes effective rhino conservation, but each country requires a tailor-made strategy given its unique characteristics and situation. Often overlooked is the need for strategic alliances and linkages both within and outside the country, and the presence of effective structures which will result in the implementation of successful programmes. Co-ordinating structures are required to ensure that:

- ◆ Species survival objectives are met;
- ◆ Effective strategies and action plans are developed in collaboration with all the stakeholders;
- ◆ Techniques are developed to meet both security and biological management challenges;
- ◆ Information and expertise are shared;
- ◆ Major donors support the most important programmes;
- ◆ Effective rhino programmes are implemented.

Various structures operate at the continental, regional and local levels as follows.

The IUCN SSC African Rhino Specialist Group provides the global perspective required for the survival of the six taxa of African rhino, and also constitutes a framework, policy and technical umbrella for initiatives at the regional and national levels.

Regional security co-ordination mechanisms include, inter alia, the Rhino and Elephant Security Group, the Lusaka Agreement and the Endangered Species Protection Unit.

Other relevant "structures" include the African Rhinos Owners Association, bilateral programmes such as that between SA National Parks and Malawi, and WWF's African Rhino Working Group.

The SADC rhino programme will provide some co-ordination, direction and support for 10 range states that together conserve 95% of African rhinos and includes Namibia, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Swaziland which together comprise the Rhino Management Group of Southern Africa.

National committees are critically important as they are ultimately responsible for facilitating or achieving the actual implementation of rhino conservation programmes because they:

- ◆ Provide a national focus on rhino conservation; thus heightening its profile;
- ◆ Allow for full stakeholder participation (state, private sector and communities);
- ◆ Evaluate current policy and programmes and ensure that improvements are implemented.

It is very important for individuals with influence within countries to be active within these national communities, and that at least one such person sits on the regional (e.g. Rhino Management Group) and continental (African Rhino Specialist Group)

structures. In this way we can achieve synergy between continental and national initiatives, ensuring that common goals and strategies are followed.

### 3.7 Review of the Status and Conservation Biology of African Rhino ( R. Emslie, AfRSG )

All delegates at the meeting were given copies of the recently published (1999) IUCN African Rhino Status Survey and Conservation Action plan. This background talk presented at the meeting primarily presented key background information concerning the three subspecies of African rhino's covered by the SADC rhino programme. For further detailed background information interested readers are referred to the IUCN African Rhino Action Plan. The meeting was informed that the next continental statistics are due to be compiled by IUCN African Rhino Specialist Group at its May 2000 meeting to be held in Tanzania.

This background talk began with the population totals for the two African rhino species (Black 2,600, White 8,465) and three Asian rhino species (Indian 2,520, Sumatran 300 and Javan 60). Maps from the Action Plan were then used to show the historical distribution of both species of African rhino. In the case of the white rhino, the major geographical separation between the northern and southern white rhino was pointed out. The six African rhino subspecies recognised by the AfRSG were then listed and it was explained that the SADC rhino programme only covered three of these subspecies:- the southern white rhino (*Ceratotherium simum simum*), the southwestern black rhino (*Diceros bicornis bicornis*), and the South Central black rhino (*D.b.minor*). An overhead then showed which SADC states held populations of which rhino subspecies with Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe holding populations of southern white rhino; Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania and Zimbabwe holding populations of southern central black rhino; and Namibia and South Africa being the only range states with populations of south-western black rhino. The northern white rhino population in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the eastern black rhino in northern Tanzania, and the out-of-range eastern black rhino populations in South Africa do not fall within the ambit of the SADC rhino programme.

The rapid decline in numbers of black rhino from approximately 100,000 in 1960 to 2,475 in 1992 was described, showing that the number of range states with black rhino decreased from 1980 to 1982 from 18 to 13. It was then explained that since 1992 numbers of black rhino in Africa appeared to stabilise (primarily with increases in Namibia and South Africa cancelling out declines in some other range states) with a slight increase being recorded between 1995 and 1997. By 1997 there were an estimated 2,600 black rhinos in Africa spread throughout ten range states. Since 1980 it is presumed that the black rhino has gone extinct in Angola, Botswana, the Central African Republic, Chad, Ethiopia, Malawi (since reintroduced), Somalia, Sudan, Uganda and Zambia.

Black rhino estimates by country were then compared for 1980 and 1997. Over this period numbers only increased in Namibia and South Africa with black rhino also being re-established in Swaziland. The 1997 estimates also showed how four major range states conserve the majority of Africa's black rhinos with three of them being members of SADC, namely Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe (Kenya is the fourth major range state). Tanzania, Mozambique, Swaziland and the Malawi are the other SADC range states with lesser populations of black rhino. A map from the IUCN African rhino action plan was then shown, giving the current distribution of black rhinos by subspecies. It was mentioned that the boundaries between black rhino subspecies were not "hard-edged" like the boundary between the two white rhino subspecies. In 1997 there were five AfRSG-rated *Key1*, six *Key2* and 17 *Important* black rhino populations in Africa. The numbers and proportions of the four black rhino subspecies conserved by the SADC region were then shown. The two subspecies of

black rhino covered in the SADC rhino programme (740 south-western and 1,365 south-central) now only occur within the SADC region (i.e. 100%). Of the other two black rhino subspecies (excluded from the SADC rhino programme), only 57 eastern black rhino (12% percent of African total) and no western black rhino were conserved in SADC countries.

The rapid decline in numbers of northern white rhino from an estimated 2,230 in 1960 in five range states to 25 in one population in one range state (DRC) in 1997 was described. The southern white rhino has shown an opposite trend, increasing from about 20 in one population in one range state in 1895 to a total of 8,440 in 248 populations in eight range states in 1997 within additional 650 in captivity world-wide. Indeed, the recovery of the southern white rhino is one of the world's great conservation success stories. The same four range states conserve most of Africa's remaining southern white rhino (South Africa 7,913, Zimbabwe 167, Namibia 141, and Kenya 137 out of range). In 1997 other SADC range states were Swaziland with approximately 50, Botswana 23, with small numbers out of range in Zambia (6) and the Ivory Coast (5). In 1997, there were five AfRSG-rated *Key1*, six *Key2* and 33 *Important* white rhino populations in Africa. White rhinos were reintroduced into Angola and Mozambique but have gone extinct in those countries for a second time. With the exception of out-of-range animals in Kenya and Ivory Coast, all remaining southern white rhino in the wild occur in the SADC region.

Using the IUCN Red List criteria, the south central black rhino is rated as *Critically Endangered*, the southwestern black rhino as *Vulnerable* and the southern white rhino as *Lower Risk-Conservation Dependent*.

In terms of CITES status, with the exception of South Africa's populations of southern white rhino which are listed on CITES Appendix II, (with an annotation regarding continued export of hunting trophies, and live sales to approved and acceptable destinations), all other black and white rhino populations are currently listed on CITES Appendix I.

The background talk concluded by mentioning a few factors relevant to the conservation management and ecology of rhinos, including listing some broad-scale factors which affect rhino densities.

It was mentioned that the historical distribution of grazing white rhinos is more limited than that for browsing black rhinos, with the latter species living in a wider range of habitats and densities.

The critical importance of obtaining good biological growth as a key component of any successful rhino conservation strategy was emphasised. The point was made that poor breeding is like poaching - one ends up with far fewer rhino. A key to achieving good biological growth includes maintaining populations in a productive state at densities at least 25% below estimated ecological carrying capacity. The importance of population monitoring was emphasised. Examples of annual population growth rates and inter-calving intervals for populations performing well (7% per annum, ICI < 2.5 yrs), averagely (5-6%, 2.8 yrs) or very poorly (<3%, >3.5 yrs) were given. Delegates were warned that non-experts generally grossly overestimate black rhino ecological carrying capacities, and this could lead to overstocking, poor performance and even death of animals. Fortunately estimation of ecological carrying capacity for black rhinos is improving. However apart from keeping rhinos stocked below ecological carrying capacity, there is a need to understand the influence of other factors (such as fire, browsers, plant succession and plant chemistry) on rhino performance.

A few key factors affecting rhino carrying capacity and hence densities were briefly mentioned. These included soils and geology which govern nutrient status and water availability with higher carrying capacities of rhinos being found on more nutrient-rich basalts and dolerite derived soils compared to more nutrient-poor soils on sandstone and granites. It was explained that the total and seasonal distribution of rainfall

influences carrying capacity, but that higher rainfall doesn't necessarily mean higher rhino carrying capacity. Bush and grass densities, species composition and size structure were also identified as key factors influencing carrying capacity. It was stressed that all trees and grasses are not good rhino food, as they may have poor digestibility, be nutritionally poor or contain high levels of secondary plant chemicals. In colder parts of southern Africa, frost can also reduce carrying capacity.

### 3.8 **Rhino Conservation Principles: Genetic, Demographic and Management Issues** ( R. Brett, Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Botswana )

Several key principles for successful rhino conservation are shared by African rhino ranges states, and have particular application for the management of rhinos in relatively small fenced areas (< 200 km<sup>2</sup>). These centre on the following issues: (a) effective field protection and surveillance; (b) genetic concerns; (c) demographic concerns; and (d) management issues.

Effective protection and surveillance of rhino populations depend on concentration of manpower and resources to sufficient levels (e.g. 1 scout/ranger per 10-30 km<sup>2</sup>) to ensure adequate patrol effort, detection of illegal activity and rhino mortalities. Adequate levels of surveillance are essential for monitoring rhinos, including confirming the presence and health of rhinos through individual identification, detection of matings, calves, and estimating population sizes. Provision of good information gathered in rhino surveillance engenders confidence in the capacity of the organization/conservation authority involved. Consolidation of vulnerable rhinos (e.g. away from international boundaries), exchange and removal of surplus rhinos, and establishing new rhino populations through translocation have all been key ingredients of successful rhino conservation programmes. A range of options for establishing rhino protection areas is described in the IUCN African rhino plan (page 15); these are helpful in developing solutions appropriate to the local situations, habitats and threats, and the limitations of funding and expertise.

Guidelines for the prudent genetic management of rhinos on the basis of least regret were agreed at a rhino conference held in Cincinnati in 1986, and have been adopted by AfRSG and used as a foundation for rhino management policy by most range states since then:

- ◆ Manage the agreed subspecies of the black and white rhinoceros separately.
- ◆ Use a minimum goal of 2,000 animals per subspecies, but use smaller short-term goals for very small national populations.
- ◆ Manage metapopulations through periodic translocation of animals between populations (1 immigrant per small population every generation: 12-15 years), but maintain at least one population of a locally adapted ecotype within a subspecies (e.g. highland vs lowland).
- ◆ Use a minimum of 20 animals to found new populations (ideally unrelated). Achieve high growth rates, and allow rapid expansion of populations in order to minimize loss of genetic diversity.
- ◆ Avoid inbreeding in small populations (e.g. father-daughter, mother-son matings) by rapid removal of surplus animals, substitution of single breeding males, or the addition of adult females.

Associated guidelines for the demographic management of rhinos are equally important, particularly in establishing healthy small populations of rhinos. Small populations are very vulnerable to unpredictable demographic upset or upheaval, and demographic problems are usually more of a short-term constraint on population

growth then genetic problems (e.g. inbreeding). Some of the following guidelines are based on more recent analysis of the main causes of mortality in rhino populations, and the need to minimise losses of translocated animals.

- ◆ Stock new areas with large founder groups; this also helps to minimize unpredictable losses of key animals. Maintain high growth rates, also as buffer against losses through poaching (see IUCN Rhino Action Plan, page 64).
- ◆ Found new populations in one event, with large groups of rhinos (e.g. a minimum of 20), rather than incrementally. Stock at low density, encourage dispersal of rhinos and/or move release sites.
- ◆ Move adults, preferably with more than 20 years of potential future fertility, and avoid moving subadults (especially females).
- ◆ Do not compromise the continued high growth rates and health of donor populations (e.g. by removal of too many females).

In practice, genetic guidelines are often achieved in sorting out demographic problems in small populations, and prudent early genetic management is more likely to avoid problems in the long term. Starting new populations successfully with fewer animals (e.g. < 5), and subsequent incremental stocking with more rhinos, is possible, but is likely to give more trouble and expense in the process and is unlikely to lead to sustained high growth rates. In small black rhino populations, high mortality and upheaval are to be expected from fighting between translocated rhinos and residents. Stocking with sex ratios biased towards females often leads to higher initial growth rates, and possibly also fewer problems with fighting, but this may cause problems with excess/surplus male rhinos in donor populations.

In all range states, it is vital that existing and potential areas for conserving rhinos are assessed for their suitability. This should include evaluation of management capacity (e.g. resources, staffing, maintaining electric fences), community setting (socio-political, community relations, potential for active involvement of local people) and threats (e.g. poaching, predation and disease). Most important is the achievement of sound estimation of Ecological Carrying Capacity, particularly in small areas where social capacity of adult males may also be an important limitation. ECC assessments need to be made regularly: rhino habitats are continually changing in response to environmental effects, and the effects of the rhinos themselves and other browsers/grazers. The capacity to expand (area and rhino population) will minimise the need for future management and interventions.

There are a number of wider concerns over the future performance of rhino populations in Africa associated with the practicability of achieving many of the management guidelines listed above. Development of single large populations of 2,000 rhinos is unrealistic in most range states. Metapopulation management and translocation of rhinos within and between populations is necessary in order to satisfy genetic and demographic concerns. This will depend on co-operative management of rhino populations within and between range states under range of management/ownership regimes. Because of the small protectable areas available for most black and white rhino populations in Africa, high levels of management capacity and resources will continue to be required. Large protected areas of good rhino habitat are and will be at premium, since there is less need for expensive interventions and management inputs, and undisturbed breeding of rhinos over long periods is possible. Finally, the high live value of rhinos, important for maintaining support for rhino populations by private sector and state conservation authorities, is limiting the development of new rhino populations of ideal minimum size. Few private land areas (and state authorities) have the resources to purchase at least 20 black rhinos at current market prices, and the result is an increasing proportion of undesirable small founder populations (e.g. < 5 animals), which are themselves relatively expensive to manage.

Consensus, followed by formal agreement on principles of rhino management is key to co-operation and development of partnerships between management authorities, custodians, and private owners, initially on a national basis. On a regional basis, co-operative management of subspecies, where countries may one day effectively share rhinos kept and exchanges under common management practices, may solve some of the problems outlined. This is one of the main objectives of the SADC rhino programme.

### 3.9 Priorities for Rhino Conservation (M. Brooks, AfRSG)

Dr. M. Brooks went through the AfRSG system for categorizing rhino projects, according to priority for donor funding. This system is outlined in the African Rhino Status Survey and Conservation Plan, published IUCN in 1999. This report was given to all participants and the system therefore does not have to be repeated in these proceedings.

The presentation of this priority ranking system led to some confusion at the meeting, since participants wondered how it might be applied within a regional programme that should involve even those member states that do not currently contain “key” or “important” rhino populations (as defined by AfRSG). Dr. Brooks and other members of the regional consortium clarified the debate by saying that range state representatives must be informed of the factors that give some populations a greater continental conservation priority than others, but it is not intended that these criteria should automatically apply to the SADC programme. Within this programme, attention must be given to regionally significant projects which may not currently include “key” or “important” populations but which have definite potential to do so, or which can be linked within a viable metapopulation plan (incorporating more than one population). Dr. A. Guillet endorsed this as a view that is shared by the Italian Government. He said that as far as his government is concerned, their aid should be not necessarily be used up equally in each country and nor should it be devoted only to those countries with the largest rhino populations. The funding should, first and foremost, be used to catalyse regional co-operation in rhino management.

### 3.10 Outline of Activities in Year 1 (R. du Toit, WWF-SARPO)

The remaining period of Year 1 is up until September 2000. Although the funding for the programme is significant, it will not go far if it is used to attempt major field projects in all the range states. If asked to state their primary requirements related to rhino conservation, most range states are likely to identify surveillance and management needs (for which the programme would not be a sustainable source of funding) and/or restocking and infrastructural needs (for which the programme simply does not have sufficient funding to achieve any regional impact). Therefore, it is the implementing consortium’s view that rather than trying to do a little bit here and a little bit there, the programme should focus on achieving a target that would be catalytic and strategic at the SADC level: the creation of a framework for the sharing of information, expertise and other resources within range states and between range states. Thus the emphasis of the programme must be on process (co-ordination, strategic planning and motivation of rhino conservation initiatives, taking advantage of the political impetus of SADC) rather than on fragmented products.

Activities within Year 1 of the programme should concentrate on developing or enhancing the institutional and co-ordination arrangements that are required within each country as well as at the regional level (i.e. Output #1 listed in the Technical Framework for the SADC Rhino Programme – see Section 6). Once such

arrangements are functional, they will generate a flow of project proposals, some of which will be sufficiently regional in nature to qualify for funding from the programme during Year 2. Baseline information on the status and distribution of rhino populations is required before national conservation strategies can be developed, and programme priorities can only be developed for a range state once a strategy has been approved.

Activities and responsibilities are suggested as follows.

1.) The Programme Co-ordinator should compile a systematic and confidential review of the existing or potential co-ordination arrangements in each range state, to answer questions such as:

Does the range state have formalized structures for co-ordination of rhino conservation at the national (or sub-national) level?

Is the range state co-ordinating its rhino conservation activities in any concerted way with any other range state(s)? Are there any existing bilateral arrangements between range states (e.g. South Africa and Malawi) of direct relevance to rhino conservation?

Is there a national rhino strategy in place, and if so how detailed and effective is it? Can the programme facilitate the development or updating of strategies by providing expert advice?

If there are no existing co-ordination arrangements, who is the focal person with whom the co-ordinator should liaise in order to facilitate appropriate arrangements?

What information gaps (including inadequate information on rhino numbers and distribution) or policy questions need to be attended to in order to develop a sensible national rhino strategy or to make an existing strategy more effective?

What priority projects, meeting the conditionalities of the SADC programme, can be identified through the national strategic planning process to put forward for programme funding in Year 2? (The Programme Co-ordinator should draw attention to issues which are identified as national priorities by more than one country). Baseline surveys should be planned for areas where the conservation status of surviving rhinos is unclear, and the programme should support such surveys in Year 2.

Another question might be: does the range state necessarily want to engage with the SADC programme in the development or review and updating of its national rhino strategy? It is of course the prerogative of each range state to decide if and how its national rhino conservation strategy should be developed, but one way or another a clear national strategy will have to be in place, and endorsed by AfRSG, in order that the country can receive project funding or technical assistance through the programme beyond what may be required for initial baseline surveys.

This review will require extensive visits to each range state, by the Co-ordinator in some cases, or by members of the implementing consortium or by consultants. The review should be completed by September 2000.

2.) For the comprehensive appraisal of the situation in some range states, or for the imparting of the full range of advice to range states that want to develop or to update their national strategies, the Programme Co-ordinator will call upon expertise from various NGO members of the implementing consortium. For instance, the appraisal of the situation in Selous Game Reserve requires a team effort by several professionals (the specific plans for which are being elaborated by AfRSG). A review of the legal and policy frameworks for rhino conservation in each range state must be undertaken, looking at issues such as management authority, ownership and custodianship of rhinos, reporting and control of rhino horns from legal and illegal sources, penalties for illegal activities, importation/exportation policies, etc. This review would also be the primary responsibility of the Project Co-ordinator and should

be completed by September 2000. WWF-SARPO would work with the Project Co-ordinator to outline the rhino conservation models (IPZs, conservancies, community projects, etc.) that have been tested within the region, and to specify the legal and policy issues that are pertinent to each model.

3.) In the light of information that is gathered during the country reviews, TRAFFIC, WWF and AfRSG might well develop a proposal for a regional project to achieve systematic, standardized reporting on horn seizures, to streamline arrangements for biochemical "fingerprinting" of horns of unknown origin, and to revive a project (that was started under CITES but has lost momentum) to develop standardized indicators of success in rhino conservation, measuring changes in levels of illegal hunting and the status of rhino populations in the range states. This will require an investment of manpower during Year 1 to establish the information needs, protocols and funding needs for the system to be put in place in Year 2.

4.) Although various attempts have been made within Zimbabwe, South Africa and Namibia to develop suitable collars for rhinos, no design has yet been perfected to ensure that the collar does not damage the rhino and remains on the animal for long enough to make radiotracking a cost-effective tool for routine monitoring of rhinos. A workshop should be held to pool ideas from about 5-10 regional experts and to plan a co-ordinated programme (for Year 2) for the testing of new collar materials and designs.

5.) On the basis the country reviews, any opportunities for improving and standardizing rhino population databases will be investigated and expertise will be mobilized within the programme to assist range states or the managers of sub-national populations in this regard. Zimbabwe has already requested assistance in the development of a national rhino database.

### **3.11 Country reports**

#### **3.11.1 Angola – An Overview of Wildlife Status (Nkosi Luta Kingengo)**

Area: 1 246 700 sq km. Population: 10 920 000.

Natural Vegetation: Predominantly miombo woodland and other forms of woodlands and grassland savannas, with patches of lowland rainforest in the north, small forest patches on the western escarpment, montane forest in the highlands, and arid subdesert formations in the southwest. Due to this wide biogeographical spectrum, the country is richly endowed with a diversity of species of plants and wildlife, many of which remain to be studied, inventoried and evaluated in order to promote their sustainable use as a part of national development process.

Wildlife is recognised to be a complex natural resource that has positive as well as negative effects in relation to human needs. It has an important role in the nutrition of rural and urban populations, but also has other economic and cultural values.

The instability occurring in the country has encouraged poaching. From 1975 to 1988 hunting was not officially authorised, but from 1989 to date, hunting was legally instituted. In 1998, 140 hunting permits were issued by the Department of Wildlife and Protected Areas of the Institute of Forestry Development (IDF), providing US\$4 916 as income. According to the available data 3 302 animals of several species were shot.

Since 1975, no survey has been carried out to determine the status of the great mammals of Angola, in particular to the black rhino species. The last survey was done in 1971 at Iona National Park during which 30 rhinos were enumerated (Brian J. Huntley, 1973). According to Huntley other information related to the existence of the

species in certain areas of Cunene and Kuando Kubango provinces but no data indicates their occurrence in the north of the country.

The existing data on white rhino refers to the introduction of ten to Kissama National Park in 1968. Since 1975 no white rhino has been found in the Park, so it is assumed that the ten were poached. The two species are classified as protected species in Annex I of the hunting legislation.

The Ministry of Fisheries and Environment is the organ responsible for environmental matters. The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development through the Institute for Forestry Development and National Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry has the responsibility of implementing policies and strategies regarding the sustainable use and conservation of wildlife and forestry resources.

During the last 24 years no study had been carried out to determine the status of the wildlife resources in the country due to several factors, like the instability occurring in the country since 1975, and the lack of national plan or programme on wildlife management. In order to ensure sustainable utilisation of wildlife resources and to protect biodiversity, Angola requires technical assistance to outline a national management programme for natural resources focussing on the wildlife and Protected Areas and outlining the role that wildlife can play in the rural development process of the country.

### 3.11.2 Botswana (Isaac K. Theophilus)

Black rhinos are believed to be nationally extinct. We however hope to reintroduce some starting with a deal between Namibia and Botswana. White rhinos were extinct in the 1960s and were reintroduced from Natal in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The population started building up but was severely depleted by heavy poaching in the early 1990s. Government then undertook to capture and translocate all remaining wild populations to secure protected areas. Botswana is currently developing a long-term management plan for rhino conservation. This document is expected to guide all would-be rhino owners. The long-term goal is to reintroduce rhinos back into the protected areas where they will be monitored.

### 3.11.3 Malawi (Gibson Y.A. Mphepo)

First documented evidence of black rhino dates back to 1922 when "they were found virtually everywhere." (Bhima and Dudley, 1996, quoting Dudley and Stead, 1977). In the 60s and 70s when most areas were declared national parks and wildlife reserves, black rhinos existed in 6 out of 9 protected areas (Vwaza, Kasungu, Nkhotakota, Lionde, Lengwe and Mwavi) (Ansell and Dowset, 1988). By 1985, black rhinos only existed in two protected areas: Kasungu and Mwavi (Bhima and Dudley, 1996). By 1990, black rhinos were declared extinct in Malawi (Bhima and Dudley, 1996).

Two mature black rhinos (6 years of age, a male and female) were translocated in 1993 from Kruger National Park to Lionde National Park in Malawi. In 1999, two more black rhinos (a male and a female) were translocated from South Africa to the same park, Lionde

The translocated rhinos were initially kept in bomas to assess their adaptability to Lionde. While in the boma, they were given branches of different grass and tree species to assess their food preference, rate of defaecation and urination and body

condition were also examined. They are currently kept in a 1.5 hectare sanctuary fenced with electrified wire. An artificial water hole was dug to avoid water shortage during the dry season. The rhinos are heavily guarded by law enforcement scouts working on shifts. Research is being done to monitor their movements, food preference and interaction with other mammals.

The rhinos have adapted well to Lionde. Body condition has improved, they are feeding on the dominant vegetation type, mating, interacting well with other mammals etc. The first female translocated has given birth twice (both young are females)

There have been a few problems: some tree species, such as *Euphorbia ingens*, are heavily browsed to the extent of dying; overbrowsing is likely to occur if the size of the sanctuary remains as it is now.

The rhinos will remain in the sanctuary until their security can be assured in the wider area of the park. Funds permitting, future translocations are proposed for other protected areas where rhino existed some time back. The size of the sanctuary will have to be increased with the increase in number of the rhinos and other mammals in the sanctuary.

#### REFERENCES:

Ansell, W. F. H and R. Z. Dowsett (1988). Mammals of Malawi. The Trendrine Press, Zennor, St Ives, Cornwall.

Bhima, R and C. O. Dudley (1996). Observations on the two black rhinos in Lionde National Park, Malawi. Pachyderm No. 21.

#### 3.11.4 Mozambique ( S. B. Mahanjane and F. Longamane )

In Mozambique wildlife has traditionally been an integral component of livelihood systems of the people. It has provided meat and skins as well as being an important part of ceremonies and culture in general.

Portugese settlers hunted for sport, meat, skins, ivory and horn as they spread into the interior of the country. In the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, the big game hunters were still prevalent. Combined effects of commercial hunting meant that the numbers of large mammals had declined to such an extent that the colonial authorities established some protected areas. The relative isolation of the Niassa Reserve from any major centres of population may have protected to a limit extent the wildlife population during the 1960s and 1970s when illegal off-take in the rest of Mozambique is said to have been high.

As the Maputo Special Reserve was offering habitat in good condition for rhino, in 1969 70 white rhino were introduced from Umfolozi Game Reserve, South Africa. After a few years the species was extinct once more. During the civil war period, mammal populations in the country were severely affected.

Rhinos in Mozambique are presently rare and almost extinct. However, some areas still provide sporadic reports on rhino presence, such as:

The presence of black rhino within the Niassa Game Reserve, in Angonia District (Tete Province), and in Coutada 16 as well as in Massingir District in Gaza Province;

In November 1995, spoor of black rhino was found near the Meulu River in the Niassa Game Reserve in Northern Mozambique;

In May 1994, the locals around Montepuez in Cabo Delgado Province spoke of the existence of rhino in northern Mozambique. Enquiring en route from Nyamapanda

through Tete, Malawi, Milange, Molumbo, Gurue, Alto Molocue, Nampula, the general view on rhino in the north seemed to be positive. However, nobody seemed to be able to confirm these reports.

Judging from evidence and talking to the Mecula administrator, the population of rhino in Niassa is assumed to survive around the east and west banks of the Lugenda, stretching from the junction of the Lugenda and Metapire Rivers in the west, across to the southbound road to Marrupa. The lack of restriction on human habitation and/or settlement in the Reserve can only be undermining the present game population. Nevertheless settlement seem to have progressed in the form of large villages which could mean potential for Integrated Conservation Development Projects (ICDP) or CBNRM projects. There was no sign of permanent human settlement in the rhino area, but according to the local authorities, there is a reasonable flow of people from Tanzania and the neighbouring province of Cabo Delgado. In September 1996 the last black rhino was seen in the Niassa Game Reserve by the staff and after that it is not known if the species is still present. The rhino was seen at 11°57'S, 38°10'E.

The information from Tete Province indicates that in Angonia District there are some black rhino. A religious group reported to DNFFB from 1995 to 1996 that some people tried to sell fresh rhino horns. After the information our staff member travelled to the site and the local people who were asked suggested the existence of rhino in small numbers in the middle of the forestry area where accessibility was difficult. Unfortunately, nobody was able to verify the reports.

From Gaza safari operators, in January this year, we were informed that the Coutada 16 area has two white rhino and another one was killed last year. Also this year a report from Gaza Province showed that a man was arrested and accused of killing a rhino whose horns he was found with. There are another three poachers accused of killing rhino in the area. Near the area where they were arrested, the guards saw part of the head of a rhino and the poachers said that they burned the head with the horn, which is not true, because it was possible to see that the horn was removed before burning the head.

There are two possibilities for the survival of the Mozambique rhino gene pool.

The setting up of an intensive protection zone of at least 100 ha within Niassa Game Reserve, where black rhinos could be re-introduced. This area should be electrically fenced and have guards to intensively patrol the area in order to discourage poachers. Once boundaries have been set up, it would be beneficial to arrange for villagers from villages in Niassa, situated outside the IPZ, to be paid to guard the area surrounding the IPZ. Monitors and guards should then be hired to protect the IPZ interior.

For the white rhino in Coutada 16, as the area is under a TFCA project it is expected that it will be divided to form a protected area and concessions for ecotourism. The rhinos could be given intensive protection in the protected area.

For such projects to be successful, rhino specialists from other countries should train the locals.

### 3.11.5 Namibia (P. Erb and R. Loutit)

Namibia has 700 black rhino in formal conservation areas, communal land and on private farming land. This makes Namibia one of the four important range states for black rhino together with South Africa, Kenya and Zimbabwe. Namibia has 163 white rhino.

The rhino conservation goals in Namibia are:

- ◆ To establish a long-term viable population of at least 2000 black rhino in suitable habitat and similarly, 500 white rhino.
- ◆ To institute a utilisation scheme for black and white rhino to achieve and justify the above mentioned goal in accordance with CITES regulations.
- ◆ To investigate and institute a National Rhino Conservation Plan, an annual Action Plan and research projects to cover actions such as de-horning, vaccination, translocation and sale of live animals; in co-operation with regional and international organisations as far as possible.

Active rhino management in Namibia has been underway since 1966, with the black rhino population being consolidated in Etosha. Up until 1985 this subspecies of black rhino occurred in only two populations in Namibia. Since then rhino have been re-introduced into their former range in South Africa and into conservation areas and private land in Namibia. In Namibia 10 new populations have been established since 1989, when a national rhino plan was developed for both black and white rhino, with the establishment of the Wildlife Protection Service in 1989. Dehorning of selected rhino populations was undertaken to combat a flare-up of poaching around Independence in 1990. Translocations have been undertaken within or into Etosha (57 black rhino, 26 white rhino) and out of Etosha (99 black rhino).

The black rhino population in Etosha National Park currently represents the largest black rhino population in a single conservation area and 70% of all *Diceros bicornis bicornis*. Censusing and monitoring this large population effectively is a challenge. 12,360km<sup>2</sup> of Etosha seem to be good black rhino habitat with a very conservative estimated carrying capacity of 0.05 rhinos/km<sup>2</sup> (618 on 12,360 km<sup>2</sup>). Sub-population density reaches 0.2 rhinos/km<sup>2</sup>.

A national Rhino Advisory Committee includes representatives from different rhino areas and MET top management, meeting every three months.

### 3.11.6 South Africa ( R. Emslie and A. Hall-Martin)

This talk briefly described the historical successes of rhino conservation in South Africa, mentioning the overall increase in white rhino numbers up to 7,913 in 1997 (from only 20 in 1895) and black rhino numbers up to 1,043 by 1997 (from only 115 in 1930). In 1997, South Africa conserved 976 south- central black rhino, 34 or south-western black rhino and 33 out of range eastern black rhino. All white rhino in the country are southern white rhino.

Most of the details of this talk can be found in pp 51 to 55 on the IUCN African rhino status survey and conservation action plan handed out to all delegates at the meeting.

Conservation in South Africa is complicated with nine provincial conservation agencies and SA National Parks having responsibility for conservation on State-owned and -run Parks and Game Reserves. The private sector also plays an important conservation role with both black and white rhinos being owned and traded. Sales of surplus rhinos from State-run reserves generate substantial revenue that helps subsidise the high costs of successful rhino conservation.

Issues addressed in the talk included a brief overview of the rhino conservation measures being taken (concentrated law enforcement, use of intelligence networks, routine ongoing rhino monitoring and translocation with a view to increasing metapopulation growth rates, community conservation programmes, generation of revenue from conservation, plus recent heavy sentencing of convicted rhino offenders with up to ten-year jail terms).

The important role of the Rhino Management Group (RMG) and its revised Conservation Plan for the Black Rhinoceros in South Africa was discussed. It was mentioned that recent RMG data seemed to be indicating that metapopulation performance is beginning to decline, and that some populations may need increased removals to return them to higher levels of productivity. The recent translocation of some of the out of range eastern black rhino from Addo National Park back to East Africa was mentioned, as was the consolidation and increase in size of Addo with a view to creating a park with a carrying capacity for over 100 south-western black rhino. The export of a sizeable founder herd of south-central black rhino to Malilangwe in Zimbabwe in 1998 was mentioned.

The new draft strategy for the conservation and sustainable use the wild populations of southern white rhino in South Africa was outlined. Key components of this strategy involve biological management, security, protection and law enforcement, sustainable use, animal welfare, community involvement and co-ordination. The important role of the private sector in rhino conservation in South Africa was discussed. Results of the most recent survey of white rhinos on private land in October 1999 by Daan Buijs revealed that numbers of white rhinos continued to increase on private land with over 1,920 rhinos in 164 different populations.

Problems outlined included how to maintain conservation standards in State-run protected areas in the face of declining government grants, and how to maintain economic incentives for the private sector and communities to encourage them to buy and conserve white rhino and other game, and in so doing increase in the country's carrying capacity for white rhino.

### 3.11.7 Swaziland (R. C. Boycott)

The situation in Swaziland is unique in that Swaziland's rhino populations are in private game reserves. Swaziland's rhino populations are small with approximately 10 black rhino (*Diceros bicornis minor*) and 50 white rhinos (*Ceratotherium simum*). The private game reserves are land-locked within Swaziland and do not abut any international borders of either South Africa or Mozambique. The situation seems to have made these populations safe from poachers from other countries. No recent illegal operations have been reported, the last incident being in 1992 at Big Bend.

In 1995 the last 3 white rhino in Mlawula Nature Reserve (a reserve managed by the Swaziland National Trust Commission) were translocated to one of the private game reserves as a precautionary measure. The location of Mlawula on the border of Mozambique had enabled poaching to take place. The move of the rhino into a land-locked private game reserve has enabled Mlawula Nature Reserve to improve its security. Mlawula is being game-fenced and the fence electrified and once the area again becomes safe for rhino the rhino will be returned. Mlawula Nature Reserve borders Mozambique and there are opportunities under regional initiatives such as the Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs) and the Lubombo Spatial Development Initiative (LSDI).

Mololatja Nature Reserve in north-western Swaziland shares common border with Songimvelo Game Reserve in South Africa which has an important rhino population. Through joint management programmes Mololatja forms an important buffer zone for Songimvelo. While Malolatja does not suitable rhino habitat the reserve has received two elephants from the Songimvelo herd that moved down the Nkomati valley into Malolatja in 1992. The elephant are faring well and future management of these elephants is under review. Similar to the situation in eastern Swaziland and Mozambique, there are new opportunities for Mololatja Nature Reserve becoming an important part of a Transfrontier Conservation Area with Songimvelo Game Reserve.

Another recent development is the establishment of Swaziland's first conservancy in north-eastern Swaziland. The conservancy is composed of a number of partners namely Mlowula Nature Reserve, Mbuluzi Game Reserve, Hlane Game Reserve, Shewula Game reserve (a community reserve on Swazi National Land {SNL}) and Sisa Ranch. This represents a partnership between state- and privately-managed nature reserves and the local community.

In the late 1970s a survey of Nationally Protection Worthy areas was conducted in Swaziland. This resulted in the proclamation of Mlawula and Malolatja Nature Reserves. It is our intention to revisit the other identified areas as part of the Swaziland Environmental Action Plan. Hopefully further suitable areas will be identified that will be able to support additional rhino populations. The Swaziland National Trust Commission would appreciate input from the Rhino Specialist Group in this exercise.

### 3.11.8 Tanzania ( M.K.S. Maige)

Tanzania has two different taxonomic groups of black rhino, *Diceros bicornis michaeli* and *Diceros bicornis minor*. The white rhino, *Ceratotherium simum*, does not occur in Tanzania.

During the 1960s it was estimated there were about 70,000 black rhinos in Africa (Cumming, du Toit and Stuart, 1990), with approximately 10,000 of these animals in Tanzania in the 1970s (Anon, 1993). Tanzania was popularly considered to hold one of the largest concentrations of black rhinos in Africa. Two of the four recognised black rhino subspecies, the southern-central *Diceros bicornis minor* and the eastern *D. b. michaeli*, occur in Tanzania (du Toit, Foose and Cumming, 1987). Their historic distribution extended virtually throughout the country to include the dry Acacia savannahs in the north, the *Brachystegia* woodlands in the south and west, and the coastal forest savannah mosaics in the east. They additionally occurred in highland forests, swamplands and dry thickets.

At this time rhinos were frequently seen and their large numbers permitted them to be shot on license by hunters and captured for international zoological gardens. Goddard (1967) recorded 108 individual rhinos on the floor of the Ngorongoro caldera during the period 1964–1966. However, within 23 years Kiwia (1989) recorded this figure as having dropped to 25 animals. Such was the carnage being inflicted by poachers on Tanzania's once prolific rhino population. The increased demand from about the 1970s, by Yemen and East Asian countries, for rhino horns to be carved into traditional 'jambiya' or dagger handles and for their purported medicinal properties, further reduced rhino numbers.

By 1984 it was estimated that Tanzania's rhino population had been reduced by 70% from 10,000 to around 3,000 animals. Since 1984 Tanzania fell from being the foremost black rhino range state holding a quarter of all Africa's black rhino, to being a minor range state holding less than 1%. By 1990 black rhino numbers in Tanzania had been reduced by over 97% to less than 100 animals.

The severe decline in elephant and rhino numbers, and the extent of poaching of all species throughout the country, prompted the Government of Tanzania to launch an unprecedented nation-wide crackdown on poachers, illegal dealers and traders in wildlife products named "Operation Uhai" in 1989. The operation was undertaken by members of the army, police, Wildlife Division, Tanzania National Parks and the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority, and with special magistrates assigned to hear wildlife cases immediately they were brought to court. The operation was most successful and poaching was greatly reduced since then.

However, the operation managed to secure rhino populations of *D.b.michaeli* in the north of the country which are generally well looked after. In the southern part, the lesser known *D. b. minor* consisted of at least five small, unassessed populations, and a number of isolated animals in the Selous Game Reserve. In addition there were occasional reports of single animals, with possibly little or no chance of survival scattered about the southern half of the country.

It is believed that the present status of the black rhino has changed only marginally since the early 1990s, though their distribution and numbers within the country are now becoming better understood.

Rhinos presently occur in small fragmented populations both in and outside protected areas. Locations where they occur within a national park, game reserve, or in the Ngorongoro Conservation Area are designated as Rhino Protected Zones (IPZs) or Rhino Sanctuaries. Tanzania presently has one Sanctuary and two IPZs. Current manpower densities are not as high as they should be and need to be increased if they are to truly qualify for IPZ status.

The *D. b. michaeli* are now restricted to four small naturally-occurring populations located in three protected areas; one population on the Ngorongoro crater floor; another population in the Moru kopjes in southern Serengeti and an undetermined population in northern Serengeti National Park. There is one reintroduced population in the Mkomazi Game Reserve rhino sanctuary.

The present status of *D. b. minor* is less well known. They occur in restricted, fragmented and undetermined sub-populations within the Selous Game Reserve (Laurie, 1991). Further field investigations may justify some of these areas being ultimately upgraded to IPZ status. Scattered as they are, it is still necessary to know the rhinos' demographics, population size and actual distribution in order to manage them properly and to be able to monitor their population changes. It is known so far that two major rhino sub-populations occur in two different sites within the expansive Selous Game Reserve: the Kidahi and Lukuliro populations. However, as a result of its status as a Game Reserve of over ninety years standing, and the sheer vastness of its size, an undetermined number of relatively small discrete sub-populations and isolated rhinos still exist in the more inaccessible areas of the Selous Game Reserve.

Before making any decision as to the most appropriate management system for these remaining animals, it is important that a comprehensive survey be undertaken to determine their relative distribution, densities, numbers and demographics. While carrying this out, ultimate security of all localities has to be ensured. With this in mind, Tanzania Wildlife Division intends to embark on a program to survey the most promising of these sub-populations in the Selous, notably the Lukuliro area. The Lukuliro, a thick forested area, is seen a potential habitat for rhinos covering a dry season core area of c.250km<sup>2</sup> and possible wet season dispersal area of c.800km<sup>2</sup>. Mechanisms for protecting such extensive areas are required.

In 1997 Tanzania, helped by WWF, collected and sent rhino dung samples from Lukuliro to the University of Cape Town in South Africa for highly polymorphic DNA analysis. The programme involved DNA extraction from 25 samples of rhino dung supplied from known localities within the Lukuliro. These were used to determine identity of individual rhinos. Tentative findings provided in 1998 indicated the area having a probable population of more than 10 animals. More efforts need to be put to place to be able to sight even more rhinos in the area. WWF no longer assists this programme for the time being.

Isolated or 'outlier' animals, are purported to still exist in non-viable numbers scattered about the south-east of the country in the Mbeya, Songea, Singida and Manyoni areas. The high costs of their detection, capture and relocation to a protected area outweighs the chances for their long term survival.

The Tanzania populations of *D. b. michaeli* and *D. b. minor* constitute the respective southern and northern limits of the range of these two sub-species in Eastern Africa. Any further decline in their numbers will increasingly separate members of both sub-species, and might ultimately reduce the southern limit of the range of *D. b. michaeli* and the northern limit of the range of *D. b. minor* to the extent that the black rhino becomes extinct in Tanzania.

The Draft Policy and Plan document for Rhino conservation currently operating in Tanzania stipulates that, rhino management in any one of the potential rhino sites must adopt one of the following strategies.

**Status-Quo Management.** With the exception of the Kidai rhinos, that receive a greater degree of surveillance and security from external financial support, all other sub-populations receive about 10 days of general surveillance and security per month. Financial and manpower restrictions do not allow for a greater commitment by the Wildlife Division.

**Metapopulation Management.** With donor support, establish a specifically trained, fully equipped, highly mobile and motivated team responsible for the full-time surveillance, monitoring and security of all rhino sub-populations within the Selous.

**IPZ Management.** With donor support, select one or more viable sub-populations for intensive management, leaving the remaining animals to be protected as at present.

As is advocated by other African rhino range states, whatever form of management is decided upon, it must be accompanied by an effective external detection and deterrent system and the co-operation of the local communities.

The Wildlife Division as part of the management of the national wildlife sector appeals to the international community to assist with funding for protecting this valuable flagship species in the Selous Game Reserve.

#### REFERENCES

Anon. (1993). Policy and Management Plan for the Black Rhinoceros in Tanzania. Unpubl report. Department of Wildlife. 11 pp.

Cumming, D. H., du Toit, R. F. & Stuart, S. N. (1990). African elephants and rhinos: Status survey and conservation action plan. IUCN/Species Survival Commission, African Elephant and Rhino Specialist Group. 72pp.

du Toit, R. F., Foose, T. J. & Cumming, D. H. M. (1987) Proceeding of African Rhino Workshop, Cincinnati, October, 1986. Pachyderm 9: 1-33

Goddard, J. (1967). Home range, behaviour, and recruitment rates of two black rhinoceros populations. East African Wildlife Journal 5: 133-150

Kiwiya, H.Y.D. (1989). Ranging patterns of the black rhinoceros (*Diceros bicornis* (L)) in Ngorongoro Crater, Tanzania. African Journal of Ecology 27: 305-312

Laurie, W. A. (1991). Survey report and recommendations. In: Tanzania Rhino Conservation Project – Final Report. Unpubl. Report. Frankfurt Zoological Society. 94 pp.

#### 3.11.9 Zambia (W. J. Banda and C. Siachibuye)

The black rhino (*Diceros bicornis minor*) was once distributed naturally throughout Zambia, except portions of Luapula, Western and North Western Provinces. Zambia

had the highest densities of black rhino in Africa, with Luangwa Valley having the highest estimates of numbers ranging from 4,000 to 12,000 (Tembo, 1992). Although the black rhino is said to still exist in some parts of Zambia, there have been no reliable sightings to confirm their current status, in terms of numbers and distribution. However, there are indications that there might be some remnant individuals in the South Luangwa National Park, Lupande Game Management, Lower Zambezi and Kafue National Park. There is need for a more intensive research surveys to confirm the existence of the black rhino in Zambia, since no comprehensive field surveys have been undertaken to confirm the numbers and distribution of the black rhino in the wild.

On the other hand, the white rhino (*Ceratotherium simum*) is not endemic to Zambia but is found in Mosi-oa-Tunya National Park where it was first introduced in the early 1960s from Umfolozi Game Reserve, Zululand, South Africa (Mwima, 1996). The white rhinos that were introduced to this park consisted of two bulls and two pregnant cows. The animals increased to 13 and later some were poached while others died naturally, so this population died-out. In February 1994 white rhino from Sable Ranch in South Africa were re-introduced in Mosi-oa-Tunya National Park for the second time. These comprised of four cows and two bulls. They were immediately dehorned before being released into the park. In August 1994 (or 1995?), one cow gave birth to calf bringing the number of rhinos to seven (four cows and three bulls). In November 1994, one rhino cow drowned in the Zambezi River and this reduced the number to six animals. There was a further loss of one cow which was put down when it failed to recover after a second dehorning exercise, leaving the number of animals to date at five (two cows and three bulls).

The establishment of sanctuaries is an effective conservation and management strategy for the rhino, but in Zambia it has not been implemented due to lack of funds. However, in Mosi-oa-Tunya National Park, after the six white rhinos were released into a semi-wild situation, more than ZK20 million was spent on electrical fencing of a 9km stretch.

As indicated in a project proposal prepared for the African Rhino Specialist Group, suitable areas will have to be identified which will be managed for the protection of black rhino. In order to reduce human interference on these areas, the areas will have to be fenced.

The Zambia Wildlife Act. No. 12 of 1998 provides for the protection of the Rhino and other endangered and threatened species and restricts trading in products thereof in conformity with CITES. For instance any person contravening the Act in offences involving rhino or elephant suffers the following penalties:

for a first offence; to a term of imprisonment not less than five years but not exceeding twenty years without the option of fine;

for a second or subsequent offence, to a term of imprisonment of not less than seven years but not exceeding twenty five years without the option of a fine.

Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) took over the responsibilities of the former National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) on 1 January 2000. The ZAWA is mandated by the Government of the Republic of Zambia to preserve the biodiversity, on which continued human adaptability depends, to manage National Parks, and to promote and develop wildlife as a productive, profitable and environmentally sound land-use option of particular significance to rural land holders.

Anti-poaching operations will continue to be the most important function in the ZAWA in protecting rhino, while on the other hand the Intelligence and Investigations Unit will continue to investigate offences related to poaching of rhino and other endangered species and illegal trafficking of rhino and elephant products.

There has been no specific research undertaken on black and white rhino to date. However, some interesting observations have been made especially on the behaviour of the white rhino which will form the basis of the future research work.

Community participation in the Administrative Management Design for Game Management (ADMAGE) was introduced to serve as a vehicle to solicit local community support in wildlife management through community based programmes. The communities are benefiting from wildlife utilisation by receiving a share of the revenue earned from the use of wildlife in their areas.

Zambia Wildlife Authority through the government is working towards putting into place a Rhino Management Policy, which will guide rhino management activities in Zambia.

Some of the major considerations of ZAWA for effectively managing the black and white rhino in the range areas are as follows:

- ◆ Research, carrying out intensive field surveys to determine existence of the black rhino in the identified operational areas;
- ◆ Identification and recruitment/attachment of relevant personnel and training in rhino management;
- ◆ Acquisition of the equipment and materials for use in the project, i.e. radio telemetry, cameras, computers, vehicles, fencing material, etc.
- ◆ Provision of adequate and effective protection of white rhino and individual animals by providing 24-hour guard, tightening security at entry gates and the rest of the park.
- ◆ Proper arming and equipping the scouts guarding the white rhino in the Mosi-oa-Tunya National Park.

### **3.11.10 Zimbabwe (F. Msipa)**

Ms Msipa referred participants to the 1999 IUCN African Rhino Status Survey and Conservation Action Plan (pp. 58-60) which contains an overview of the Zimbabwe situation. She provided an update on national population totals, saying that Zimbabwe currently holds about 464 black rhinos (*D.b.minor* subspecies) and about 180 white rhinos. Of the black rhinos, about 300 are on private land and 160 on stateland, and of the white rhinos 78 are on private land and 102 on stateland.

\* \* \* \*

## Annex A: List of Participants

NAME	POSITION	COMPANY	ADDRESS	TEL	FAX	E -MAIL
Ryan Hill	Interim Project Coordinator	IUCN	Box 745, Belgravia, Harare, Zimbabwe	+ 263-4 728266	+263-4 720738	ryh@iucnrosa.org.zw
N L Kingengo	Advisor	Institute for Forestry Dev.	PO Luanda, Angola	+ 244 323 934	+244 2333934	
Mahanjane S B	Head of Cites	DNFFB	Box 1406 Maputo 1402	+2581 460036	+258 1460060	fauna@dnffb.imoz.com
F Longamane	Biologist	DNFFB	Box 1406 Maputo Mozambique	+258 1 460036	+258 1 460060	fauna@dnffb.imoz.com
D Cumming	Programme Director	WWF - SARPO	Box CY 1409, Causeway, Harare Zimbabwe	+263 4 252533/703902	+263 4 252533/703902	dcumming@wwf.org.za
E Chidziya	Chief Ecologist	Dept. of National Parks	Box CY 140, Causeway, Zimbabwe	+263 4 792786	+263 4 724914	
R Emslie	Scientific Officer	IUCN SSC Affairs	Box13053, Cascades, Pietermaritzburg, RSA	+27 33 845 1472	+27 33 845 1498	remslie@kznnncs.org.za
R Brett	Senior Wildlife Biologist	DWNP Botswana	Box 131, Gaborone, Botswana	+267 371 405	+267 371 857	robrett@mega.bw
A Wright	Dean	University of Zimbabwe	MP 167 MT. Pleasant Harare	+263 4 303 211	+263 4 303 280	alwright@africaonline.co.zw
M Brooks	Chairman	IUCN SSC Affairs	Box 13053, Cascades, 3202 RSA	+ 2733 845 1471	+27 33 845 1498	mbrooks@kznnncs.org.za
SL Mamba	Chief Executive	SNTC	Box 100, Lobamba 107, Swaziland	+ 268 416 1489	+268 416 1875	
R Jiah	Head of WSTCU	SADC WSCTU	Box 30131 Lilongwe Malawi	+265 740 367	+265 740 367	
H Nzima	Deputy Director	Parks and Wildlife	Box 30131, Lilongwe 3	+265 782 702	+265 780 650	
M Maige	Principal Game officer	Wildlife Division Tanzania	Box 1994, Dar es Salaam	+255 51 866 418	+255 51865 836	wild-life-division@twiga.com
Y Katerere	Regional Director	IUCN	6 Lanark Road, Belgravia, Harare	+263 4 728266	263 4 728266	
R Boycott	Acting Director of Parks	Swaziland National Trust Commission	Box 1797 Mbabane Swaziland	+268 442 4241	+268 442 4241	staff@swazimus.org.sz
I Theophilus	Assistant Director	Wildlife and National Parks	Box 131, Gaborone Botswana	+267 371 405	+267 312 354	Dwnp@gov.bw

NAME	POSITION	COMPANY	ADDRESS	TEL	FAX	E -MAIL
C Siachibuye	Wildlife Warden	Zambia Wildlife Authority	Box 60086, Livingstone, Zambia	+260 3 321396	+260 3 321396	
WJ Banda	Senior Warden Human Resources	Zambia Wildlife Authority	P/Bag 1 Chilanga Zambia	+260 278 555	+260 278 244	
Thea Carroll	Environmentalist	DEAT	Box 447 Pretoria 0001 South Africa	+2712 310 3799	+12 320 7026	tbrits@ozone.pwv.gov.za
G Daconto	Environmental Advisor	CESVI	23 Northwood Rise MT Pleasant Harare	+263-4-884 492	+263-4 822 243	gida@icon.co.za
M Pala	Second Secretary	Italian Embassy	796 George Ave Pretoria South Africa	+ 27 12 435 541	+ 27 12 435 547	pala@esteri.it
A Guillet	Referee for the Environment	Italian Ministry of Foreign affairs	25VIA Contarinr Roma DO194 Italy	+39 06 369 16215	+39 06 324 0585	guillet@esteri.it
G Mhepo	Wildlife Research Officer	National Parks and Wildlife	Nyika National Park Private Bag 6 Rumphu, Malawi	+265 332 113		
F Msipa	Ecologist – Rhino Coordinator	DNPWLM Zimbabwe	Box CY 140 Causeway Harare Zimbabwe	+263-4 792786	+263-4-724914	
P Erb	Park Warden	Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Box 6 Okanknejo, via Ontjo Namibia	+ 264 67 229854	+264 67 229853	eei.staff@mweb.com.za
R du Toit	Project Executant	WWF-SARPO	10 LANARK Rd, Harare, Box CY 1409, Causeway, Zimbabwe	+ 263 4 252533 703902	+ 263 4 252533 703902	rdutoit@wwf.org.zw
A Hall Martin	Director : Conservation Development	SA National Parks	Box 787, Pretoria, 0001, RSA	+ 27 12 343 9770	703,902	jndyj@parks-sa.co.za
R Loutit	Senior Warden	Ministry of Environmental Tourism	P/Bag 13306, Windhoek, Namibia	+ 264 61263 131	+264 61259101	specres@iafrica.com.na
J Chafota	Programme Officer	WWF-SARPO	10 Lanark Road, Belgravia, Harare, Zimbabwe	+ 263 4 252533/4 703902	same as tel.	jchafota@wwf.org.zw
L Gora	Programme Secretary	WWF SARPO	10 Lanark Road, Belgravia, Harare Zimbabwe	+ 263 4 252533/4 703902	same as tel.	lgora@wwf.org.zw

## Annex B: Agenda

### Range States Meeting - SADC Rhino Programme

#### DAY 1: March 6, 2000

First session           Chaired by SADC - WSTCU

0845 – 0855:           Welcome by dignitary of host nation

0855 – 0905:           Opening by Italian dignitary – M. Pala / A. Guillet

0905 – 0930:           Outline of the background to the programme and the guiding principles:  
specification of the goals of the conference – H. Nzima, SADC – WSTCU

0930 – 0940:           Self-introduction by participants - Facilitator

0945 – 0945:           Conference administrative matters

0945 – 1020:           Tea / Coffee Break

#### Second Session

1020 – 1050:           Review of rhino species and “subspecies”, including historical and present  
distribution and status of each taxon and ecological requirements,  
by R. Emslie (AfRSG);

1050 – 1130:           Rhino conservation principles (genetic, demographic and management  
issues) perspective from the Kenyan experience, by R. Brett (DNP  
Botswana)

1130 – 1150:           Existing structures for the coordination of rhino conservation  
(continental, regional and national) by M. Brooks (AfRSG)

1150 – 1210:           Identification of priorities for rhino conservation (populations and  
projects), by M. Brooks (AfRSG)

1210 – 1300:           Discussion on presentations in session 1 and session 2

1300 – 1400:           Lunch Break

#### Third Session

1400 – 1510:           Country reports (rhino status and existing conservation plans)  
Country Paper – Angola, by Nkosi Luta Kingengo  
Country paper – Botswana, by Isaac K. Theophilus  
Country paper – Malawi, by Gibson Y. A. Mphepo  
Country paper – Mozambique, by F. Logamane  
Country paper – Namibia, by P. Erb  
Country paper – Zambia, by William J. Banda

1510 – 1530:           Tea / Coffee Break

#### Fourth Session

1530 – 1640:           Continuation of country reports  
Country paper – South Africa, by M. Brooks  
Country paper – Swaziland, by R. Boycott

Country paper – Tanzania, by Matthew K. S. Maige  
Country paper – Zimbabwe, by Florence Msipa

1640 – 1645: Closure of first day

DAY 2: March 7, 2000

Fifth Session

0830 – 0900: Overview of the SADC Rhino programme (as defined by the consortium agreement in terms of goal, objective, conditionalities and outputs) by R. du Toit (WWF –SARPO)

0900 – 0915: Linkages with other SADC initiatives especially SADC Wildlife Protocol – SADC WSTCU

0915 – 0930: Institutional roles of partners in the consortium – by Y. Katerere (IUCN ROSA)

0930 – 1000: Discussion of the above

1000 – 1030: Tea / Coffee Break

Sixth Session

1030 – 1040: Project management aspects, by G. Daconto (CESVI)

1040 – 1100: Outline of programme activities and process for developing new projects, by R. du Toit (WWF)

1100 – 1115: Coordination within SADC (identification of focal persons within range states, reporting and flow of information, linkage with other SADC initiatives, etc. ) IUCN and SADC WSTCU

1115 – 1230: Discussion of the above

1230 – 1330: Summary of key issues and consensus – Facilitator  
Closing comments by SADC WSTCU

\* \* \*

## Annex C: Introductions and Expectations

NAME	INSTITUTION	WORKSHOP EXPECTATIONS
Jonas Chafota	WWF-SARPO	Range States Rhino Conservation issues
Yemi Katerere	I.U.C.N - ROSA	SADC Range States define priorities for people centered Rhino Conservation
Maige Mathew	Wildlife Division Tanzania	Funding for SADC Regional Rhino Conservation effected
Felismina A Longamane	National Directorate of Forestry and Wildlife (DNFFD)	To have an overview of Rhino Status in the region to find out conservation principles for the region
Sansao Bonito Mahanje	National Directorate of Forestry and Wildlife (DNFFD)	The meeting will be very interesting, useful informative for the success for survival of rhino
Ryan Hill	I.U.C.N-ROSA	Support of Range States
Rob Brett	D.W.N.P Botswana	Active involvement of all SADC Range States in rhino conservation.
Isaac Theophilus	D.W.N.P Botswana	Clear understanding of what the project has to offer member states.
Florence Msipa	D.N.P.W.L.M Zimbabwe	To come up with new and effective ideas towards rhino management and conservation, and funding towards those ideas.
Edison Chidziya	D.N.P.W.L.M Zimbabwe	Practical and sustainable regional approach to rhino conservation.
David Cumming	WWF-SARPO	Consensus on Programme Design and way forward.
Ramosh Jiah	SADC WSTCU Malawi	Funds accessibility defined/agreed - support Programme in Region
Alaphia Wright	University of Zimbabwe (Facilitator)	Output which is useful for the Rhino Programme
Anthony Hall-Martin	South Africa National Parks	Progress towards unifying efforts towards Rhino Conservation in SADC.
Thea Carroll	National Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism	Consensus regarding Rhino Conservation Programme (all SADC countries agree.
Rudi Loutit	Rhino Co-ordinator Ministry of Environment and Tourism -Namibia	To understand what is expected of Namibia as a Range State with Rhino in the SADC context.
Peter Erb	Ministry of Environmental and Tourism Namibia	To find out more about the programme to see how Namibia fits in, can contribute and benefit.
Raoul du Toit	WWF-SARPO	Achieve agreement on regional structure and process to coordinate Rhino Conservation
Richard Emslie	I.U.C.N SSC Africa Rhino Specialist Group	- Buy in - Inform SADC on Rhino Conservation - Programme explained - Discuss potential project/approaches- increasing rhino

		numbers and coordination in SADC
<b>Martin Brooks</b>	African Rhino Specialist Group I.U.C.N SSC	Buy-in by SADC Rhino Range States to the SADC Rhino Programme.
<b>Kingengo Nkosi Luta</b>	Institute for Forestry Development (IDF) /Minader/DWPA- Angola	- Improve knowledge on the species - To know the experiences achieved on rhino management by other SADC member states
<b>Gibson Mphepo</b>	Department of National Parks and Wildlife (Malawi)	Develop and discuss Rhino Conservation plans for Range States.
<b>Crispin Siachibuye</b>	Zambia Wildlife Authority	Review the Rhino Conservation Plan regionally.
<b>William Banda</b>	Zambia Wildlife Authority	Review progress on the Rhino Conservation Programme.
<b>Mamba Sinaye L.</b>	Swaziland National Trust Commission	Learn more about the Rhino SADC Project funded by Italian Government.
<b>Boycott Richard</b>	Swaziland National Trust Commission	Effective Rhino Conservation and Management Programmes and co-ordination. To see an improvement between Range States.
<b>Guissepe Daconto</b>	CESVI	- Programme review/plan - Get views from countries.
<b>Humprey Nzima</b>	Ministry of Touris, Parks and Wildlife- MW (SADC-WSTCU)	-Implementation arrangements clarified and agreed. - Project development criteria clarified and agreed. - Resource allocation developed and agreed.
<b>Alfredo Guillet</b>	Ministry of Foreign Affairs Italy DGCS	Update different participants on how Regional Rhino priorities are perceived by individual parts and contribute for the programme to meet its objectives by reflecting them and be effective