

Output 1. Development of institutional arrangements. These were vital at a national level, along with technical plans put in place, followed by political endorsement and adoption. National plans can be reinforced by regional co-operation and internal stakeholder co-operation. Even in countries without rhinos at present, some structure is needed for demands of managing rhinos. The SADC regional institutional approach may also be possible for other species.

Output 2. Reporting system. Co-ordination of information on rhino conservation status within and between range states was important to ensure no duplication of effort. Surveys of rhinos, and status reporting were valuable for gauging the success of conservation measures.

Output 3. Implementation of projects. Where funding and implementation of field projects by the Programme was not appropriate, then the Programme could catalyse other funding.

Output 4. Capacity building. (e.g. technology, training, manuals, guidelines). It was important that there was consistency on range state representation (focal points), and range states were requested to keep key staff members involved.

Output 5. Community participation. Here there was need for innovation, particularly through education and awareness on key aspects of rhino conservation, and integration of local communities and rhino management. This effort needed to be focused, and had received little attention so far under programme.

Output 6. Understanding of rhino conservation factors, and provision of expertise. (e.g. on habitat assessment, application of technology). The programme would promote a sustainable use view, and use of land for wildlife with rhinos as a catalyst. There was a need for regional understanding of options for realising the economic value for rhinos, not just through tourism.

Output 7. Facilitation of funding. Use of SADC programme to catalyse additional or alternative funding sources for rhino conservation.

Output 8. Programme Management.

A set of criteria had been developed for use in identifying projects to be supported by the Programme, with conditions agreed at last workshop. After reviewing range state's needs during the country review process, a flow of project proposals had started. However it was clear that a number of project proposals submitted were not reaching the regional conditionalities.

1.5 Review of Progress by SADC RPRC: Overview of Semester 2-3 Projects (Rob Brett – Programme Coordinator)

Dr Brett began by emphasising the importance of the informal contacts between individual focal points, particularly in maintaining effective communication on rhino conservation issues of shared concern. The activities of the programme in the last 12 months (semesters 2 and 3) were summarised, with information presented in the form of tables outlining progress against tasks planned for semester 2 (Annex C – Table 1), the contribution of these tasks to programme activities (Annex C – Table 2), and progress against tasks planned for semester 3 (Annex C – Table 3). After a slow start after the first year of the programme, progress on projects had improved in Semester 3 following approval of project proposals submitted to a meeting of the SADC rhino consortium in October 2000.

1.6 Range State Reports

Angola

Unfortunately, the meeting could not be attended by the focal point for Angola (Nkosi Luta Kingengo) and no report on the current situation for rhino conservation in Angola was forthcoming. However, the IDF in Angola did submit one project proposal for review at the Range States Meeting.