

3 PRESENTATION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS

3.1 Criteria for Funding Support by the SADC Rhino Programme (Rob Brett, Programme Coordinator)

The agreed criteria or conditions for funding support by the SADC Rhino Programme were listed:

1. Projects must be of a SADC regional nature or importance. The Programme will concentrate on rhino projects and policies that area 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).
2. Projects must limited to 'subspecies' *Ceratotherium simum*, *Diceros bicornis minor* and *D.b.bicornis*. 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 in involve more than one SADC state (i.e. southern African subspecies: *Ceratotherium simum*, *Diceros bicornis minor*, *D.b.bicornis*).
3. Fundamental rhino management issues as well as land use economics, community involvement, etc. must be taken into account. 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.
4. Both public and private rhino conservation projects will be considered. The Programme will include public and private sector rhino conservation projects
5. Implementation must make use of existing institutions and linkages. The Programme will be designed and implemented to complement existing institutions and their linkages, particularly the SADC Wildlife Sector Technical Co-ordination Unit, existing national and regional rhino management committees (notably the Southern African Rhino Management Group) and the IUCN African Rhino Specialist Group (AfRSG).

Discussion

Mr du Toit recommended that the independence of proposed projects be used in rating procedure, since this would improve sustainability. Mr Nzima asked about the minimum conditions for funding support from the programme. Dr Brett said that the 5 conditions had to be satisfied, but the criteria for rating project proposals by the SADC Consortium still needed further development.

3.2 Presentation and Discussion of Project Proposals for funding in Semesters 4-6 (Martin Brooks, AfRSG Chair)

Each of the project proposals developed by range states and members of the SADC consortium were described in brief by the proponents (if present) or by the range state focal points or consortium representatives involved. Each proponent identified the primary output of the SADC rhino programme to which the proposed project would contribute. Each presentation was followed by queries, comments and discussion from plenary.

Following serial numbering of each proposal submitted at the October 2000 Consortium meeting, each proposal was numbered, and all are listed in Annex D, including summary information on each. The project proposals themselves (including subsequent revisions) have been compiled into a separate document for information and circulation to range state focal points.

Project Proposals

Proposal 20 – Ecological Studies to develop a management plan for the black rhino in Liwonde NP, Malawi (R Bhima). Primary Output 6 (6.1); Other Outputs: 1, 2, 3 & 4.

Discussion: Mr Nzima recommended that the perimeter fencing of Liwonde NP be included in the proposal. Dr Bhima said that small sections remained to be fenced.

Proposal 24 – Assessment and feasibility study for an IPZ for rhinos in Moremi GR, Botswana (M Tjibae). Primary Output 6 (6.1); Other Outputs: 1, 2 & 4.

Proposal 25 – Assessment of habitat, carrying capacity and management options for black and white rhinos in or near the KRS, Serowe (M Tjibae/R Brett). Primary Output 6 (6.1); Other Outputs: 1, 3, 5 & 6. Discussion: It was clarified that the new area of land acquired for the Khama RS was 5000 ha, close to but separated from the existing sanctuary.

Proposal 28 – Technical support to the Selous Rhino Project (M Maige). Primary Outputs 2 (2.1) and 4 (4.1); Other Outputs: 1, 3 & 6.

Proposal 35 – Madikwe GR as a model for developing a successful community rhino conservation programme. No proposal was ready for presentation at the meeting.

Proposal 38 – Improving and standardising methods for black rhino carrying capacity assessment (R H Emslie). Primary Output 4 (4.2); Other Output: 6.

Proposal 39 – Improved calibration of the RMG black rhino carrying capacity model (R H Emslie). Primary Output 4 (4.2); Other Output: 6.

Proposal 40 – Incorporation of benchmark Zimbabwean black rhino areas into the RMG black rhino carrying capacity model (R H Emslie). Primary Output 4 (4.2); Other Output: 6. Discussion: Ms Msipa asked for clarification on the rationale for inclusion of the Zimbabwe component, stressing that there had to be contact between the proponents and Zimbabwe before approval. Dr Emslie said that the project would make the developing carrying capacity model more applicable to Malawi habitats, and provide more data points to increase its power. Dr Brooks said that proponent and target countries must coordinate. Mr du Toit said that national coordination must also be sorted out in order to see clearly that national priorities mesh with SADC regional project proposals. Dr Brooks suggested that project proposals be circulated further in advance of meetings, including proposals sent to focal points of range states concerned for their endorsement prior to submission.

Proposal 44 – Scene of the Rhino Crime Training (R H Emslie). Primary Output 4 (4.1, 4.2). Discussion: Potential trainees could be drawn from Namibia, South Africa (several agencies), Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana.

Proposal 48 – Workshop on biological management to meet continental and national black rhino conservation goals (R H Emslie). Primary Output 1 (1.2). Discussion: Dr Emslie emphasised that the need for the workshop had been stimulated by the slow growth of some RMG populations, and the consequent loss of potential rhinos.

Proposal 49 – Compilation of RMG report: 'Status and management of black rhino in the RMG region: 1/99-12/00' (P M Brooks). Primary Output: 4; Other Output: 6.

Proposal 52 – Expert assessment of black rhino carrying capacity in one Swaziland reserve (E Reilly). Primary Output: 4; Other Output: 6 (6.1). Discussion: Mr Reilly said that two reserves needed carrying capacity assessment. Mkaya reserve had already assessed by R H Emslie, before addition of 20% more land area. There would be a need to move surplus animals on to Hlane, and an improved estimate of the carrying capacity for deciding on the point at which to remove.

Proposal 55 – Improving Security and management of rhino horn stocks in SADC rhino range states (R A Brett). Primary Output: 2. Discussion: Dr Brooks said that the progress of the project would

depend on the approval of government agencies. Dr Cumming said that TRAFFIC must already have the necessary government approval for this work. Mr du Toit said that MINMEC would be the forum for engagement with SA government and provincial authorities.

Proposal 59 – Trovan scanners and equipment for rhino identification (M Knight). Primary Output: 2. Other Output: 4.

Proposal 60 – Pilanesberg Security and Monitoring Centre (M Knight). Primary Output: 2. Other Output: 4.

Proposal 80 – DNFFB Institutional Strengthening, Research and Relocation of Rhino in Mozambique (F L Langa). Primary Output: 2. Other Outputs: 4 & 6. Discussion: Ms Langa said that Coutada 16 would be changed to a NP in November 2001. Mr du Toit said that a thorough feasibility assessment of Coutada 16 as rhino reintroduction area was required, including all things that needed to be in place (e.g. security, management, capacity etc.). Mr Chafota and Mr Daconto wondered about linkage of the project to the TFCA planning. Dr Brett and Mr du Toit were asked to work with Ms Langa on identifying the primary components of the proposal for further development.

Proposal 81 – Capacity Building in Rhino Monitoring (R Loutit). Primary Output: 4. Discussion: Mr Loutit said that a multi-disciplinary training team of MET and SRT would be the key component. The intention was to build up skills of new staff recently imported into MET (ex-combatants), and also community/conservancy members. 35 government and 12 NGO/communal staff would be trained, and rhino custodians would also be included.

Proposal 82 – Development of Hobatere Area in Kunene Region, Namibia, as a Rhino Sanctuary (R Loutit). Primary Output: 3. Other Output: 6. Discussion: Mr Loutit said that Hobatere had been proclaimed as a Nature Reserve, in preparation for reintroduction of rhinos in 2003. The funding requested from the SADC programme (\$50,000) was for infrastructure (fencing and ground dams), matched to \$180,000 input from MET. Mr Daconto said that this would be a suitable project as a pilot activity for communal land, but was not sure if the equipment alone was the best focus of project. It would be difficult to justify for SADC funding if it just including the fence. Mr du Toit said that this project was a good model for an area adjoining a NP, but was concerned about initial stocking at 1 rhino to 10 km². Mr Loutit said that the adjacent Kaross area had up to 45 rhinos.

Proposal 83 – Building bridges between communities and government for improved rhino management (video) (R Loutit). Primary Output: 5. Other Output: 6. Discussion: Ms Msipa said that Zimbabwe would like to develop a similar video. Messrs Hill and Chafota asked if the Namibia video might be used to extend or provide segments for use in other states. Mr du Toit said that the video would be focusing on the Namibia situation alone, and the focus on its application to Namibia community rhino conservation should not be diluted. Dr Brooks said that the linkage of Kunene to Hobatere was very promising as a potential model of a communal land rhino sanctuary. Mr Reilly cautioned on danger of promises or commitments made in visual material.

Proposal 84 – Attainment of carrying capacity for rhino on communal land of north-western Namibia (R Loutit). Primary Output: 4. Other Outputs: 5 & 6. Discussion: Mr Loutit said that the Kunene population was key 1, and had reached carrying capacity in its arid environment. It needed to be utilised in the country context, and SADC context with RSA. The project mainly entailed habitat assessment.

Proposal 85 – Upgrading of SRT Patrol & Training Bases at access points to Kunene/Erongo rhino range (R Loutit). Primary Output: 5. Other Output: 2 & 4. Discussion: Mr Loutit said that the proposal was developed in response to the difficulty of controlling and monitoring human access to rhino areas. Only 'courtesy stops' had been used so far.

Proposal 86 – Black Rhino Monitoring project on communal land north of the Hoanib River in Kunene Region, Namibia (R Loutit). Primary Output: 6. Discussion: Mr Loutit said that there were 10-11 rhinos in Kaokoland, north of the Hoanib river. There were limited water points, and there had been no population growth in recent years. This proposal complemented the carrying capacity proposal (84),

with the intention of expanding the rhino range to the north. Dr Brooks suggested that this proposal be combined with 84. Dr Emslie pointed to the need for research only aimed at making and facilitating decisions on when and how many rhinos to remove to stimulate further population growth.

Proposal 87 – Education & awareness of state of black rhino and habitat (R A Brett). Primary Output: 5; Other Output: 6. Discussion: Mr du Toit recommended a review of the situation in the Midlands since 1993/94 (when last assessment carried out by Dr Emslie), perhaps hand in hand with a complete census (e.g. 1994). This was supported by Ms Msipa, who added that the data collected from the area since 1993 had been unreliable.

Proposal 88 – RESG Meeting in Namibia (R H Emslie). Primary Output: 1; Other Output: 2. Discussion: Dr Emslie stressed the value of the revitalised RESG, for which this meeting would 'piggyback' on a ECTG meeting. Mr du Toit cautioned on taking on too many phases at once with the new RESG. It would be better to take a first step, have the meeting, and define past and future activity (i.e. as a precondition for project 89).

Proposal 89 – RESG Coordinator's Desk (R H Emslie). Primary Output: 2; Other Outputs: 4 & 6.

Proposal 90 – Madikwe rhino ear-notching programme (M Knight). Primary Output: 2 (2.2, 2.4); Other Outputs: 4 (4.1). Discussion: Dr Emslie asked how, since animals were photographed regularly, ear-notching would assist in monitoring. Mr Daconto said that the regional component of this proposal needed to be enhanced. There had to be a clear demonstration of need.

Proposal 91 – Habitat evaluation for the reintroduction of the black rhino in priority parks in Zambia (G Kampamba). Primary Output: 4; Other Output: 1, 3 & 6. Discussion: Dr Kampamba said that the evaluation would include former black rhino range areas (NLNP, SLNP, Kafue NP, Lower Zambezi NP). It was clear that habitat availability was not the problem in selecting future areas for black rhinos in Zambia. What was needed was capacity building, and commitment of ZAWA staff. Zambia's inclusion in the SADC RRG would assist. Dr Brooks said that habitat assessment of all areas, including models to be applied in each, would take too long. The project should be limited to a couple of priority areas. Dr Cumming said that there was need to prioritise areas, even if NLNP had already been identified. Dr Kampamba said that there had been commitment from FZS for long-term assistance to NLNP. Dr Emslie recommended that the other areas be examined as future areas, with NLNP as seed population. Dr Brooks agreed that only a peripheral assessment of other areas was needed for now.

Proposal 92 – Formulation of policy for rhinoceros management in Zambia (G Kampamba). Primary Output 1. Discussion: Dr Brooks recommended that the development of the policy be followed by an action plan.

Proposal 93 – Study tour to rhino conservation areas in the southern African sub-region (G Kampamba). Primary Output 4 (4.1). Discussion: Dr Brooks suggested that membership of RRG should provide information/awareness for members on rhino conservation models to be applied.

Proposal 94 – Building capacity for rhino surveys and monitoring in selected rhino areas in Zimbabwe (R A Brett/F Msipa). Primary Output: 2; Other Output: 4.

Proposal 95 – Development of approaches to community involvement in rhino conservation (G Daconto). Primary Output: 5. Discussion: Mr Daconto said that community involvement has not been a key component in rhino conservation to date, but with rather traditional means (PAs, and relationships with neighbours). The project would examine what are the commonalities in terms of community participation in rhino conservation, what could be built for a regional agenda. Each project proposal listed (Annex D) was indicated for inclusion if there were general community aspects. Mr Reilly said that 58% of visitation to parks in Swaziland was by locals, and fulfilled a vital awareness function. Drs Katerere and Emslie said that a critical analysis was needed, possibly using a carefully designed questionnaire, and focusing on the link with conservation benefit in terms of rhino population performance indicators.

Proposal 96 – Management and Conservation of remnant black rhino population and reintroduction of white rhino in Angola (R Brett). Primary Output: 1. Discussion: In the absence of an Angolan representative, it was thought that this would be ideal proposal for RRG to tease out the priority items, given the huge scope (and difficult operational conditions).

Proposal 97 – SADC Rhino Recovery Group (RRG) inaugural meeting (H Nzima). Primary Output 1. Discussion: Following approval for formation of the SADC RRG, an inaugural meeting requires funding in semester 4, including the drawing up of terms of reference, and future organisation as a group. A proposal was not presented or developed at the meeting, but was included for approval of outline budget by the SADC rhino consortium. Mr du Toit said that there was continuing need for review of rhino conservation situation in other countries. The venue of the RRG meeting could allow for demonstration of principles of re-establishment of new populations. Dr Cumming said that there was a future need for development of regional projects at a regional forum, rather than the present country-by-country focus.

Proposal 98 – Management of white rhinos in Mosi-oa-Tunya NP (G Kampamba). Primary Output: 6. Discussion: There had been no growth in the population, and the area and its management needed a specific evaluation. Dr Brooks suggested that this be included within project 91.

Proposal 99 – Translocation of black rhino to North Luangwa NP, Zambia from South Africa (M Knight) Primary Output: 3.