

**IUCN/SSC
ASIAN RHINO SPECIALIST GROUP
(AsRSG)
MEETING**

BRIEFING BOOK

**JALDAPARA SANCTUARY
WEST BENGAL, INDIA
6-10 DECEMBER 1993**

**SECTION 16
WWF/WCS COST BENEFIT STUDY**



PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT FOR WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE

P. O. BOX 63150, DAR ES SALAAM, TANZANIA. Telephone: 255-51-25593, Fax: 255-51-29355

12 November 1993

Dr TJ Foose
International Rhino Foundation
The Wilds
85 E. Gay Street, Suite 603
Columbus OH 43215
USA

Dear Tom

Re: Cost Benefit Study of Approaches to Rhino Conservation

Given that the conservation of rhinos is likely to be a major topic of debate at the upcoming Conference to the Parties of CITES in November 1994, WWF and WCS have agreed to co-fund a study of the most cost-effective approaches to rhino conservation. Both organisations wish to formulate a coherent and technically sound policy document that will address the best approaches to securing the future of rhinos in Africa and Asia. I have been asked to co-ordinate the project. In order to complete this task successfully, WWF and WCS would very much like the co-operation of other various conservation NGOs.

In your role as Executive Officer for the Asian Rhino Specialist Group, could I ask for your assistance to construct a table on spending by, and resources of, national conservation agencies in Asian range states. You may well have seen the enclosed table which was constructed by AERSG in the early 1980s, and I have used its material extensively. Nothing similar seems to be available for Asia, though I have odd snippets of data from individual countries. Would it be possible for you to write to the heads of the authorities of the various Asian range states and request them to bring or have their representative bring this information to your upcoming meeting of ARSG.

It would certainly be very intriguing to see how the Asian and African figures compare, and I would like to take this opportunity of thanking you in advance for any help you can give in this matter.

With many thanks
Yours sincerely

Nigel

N Leader-Williams



Country	Wild Life Conservation	Total Budget (US\$ x 10 ³)	Manpower Strength*				Budget/ man (US\$)	Budget/ km ² (US\$)	Equipment ¹					Foreign Aid (other than IUCN/WWF)
	Area (km ²)		1	2	3	4			1	2	3	4	5	
Bophuthatswana	560	3,360	226	200	1	5	14,867	6,000	0	0	2	12	-	No
Botswana	103,953	1,082	180	176	3	22	6,011	10	0	2	8	4	5	Yes
CAR	57,000	460	173	167	0	6	2,658	8	0	0	0	9	1	Yes
Ethiopia	23,770	1,345	298	179	4	41	4,513	57	0	1	3	27	1	Yes
Ghana	10,161	2,409	1,169	1,099	3	67	2,061	237	0	0	3	7	0	No
Mozambique	32,250	600	321	305	1	15	1,869	19.6	0	0	5	13	1	Yes
Niger	4,386	24	15	12	2	1	1,600	5	0	0	1	1	0	Yes
Nigeria	17,564	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No
Rwanda	2,740	-	126	110	0	8	-	-	0	0	2	9	1	Yes
Somalia	3,340	167	227	201	0	26	1,000	50	0	0	2	4	0	No
South Africa +	19,565	4,024	477	282	21	29	8,438	206	2	1	7	42	-	No
Tanzania	257,400	5,140	942	892	50	0	5,465	20	0	7	33	90	2	Yes
Uganda	7,607	2,717	1,054	990	22	42	2,578	357	0	4	8	17	4	Yes
Zambia	223,270	2,440	745	685	8	67	3,275	11	0	1	4	42	5	Yes
Zimbabwe	47,000	13,000	2,147	1,894	167	86	6,054	277	0	3	40	79	20	Yes

Table 1 Summary of resources available for protection in 15 African countries

(-) indicates information not provided or incomplete, (+) Data are for Kruger National Park and Addo National Park only and do not include tourist, mechanical and construction budgets, staff and equipment.

*Manpower strength: 1 = Total, 2 - Management, 3 = Research, 4 = Administrative

¹ Equipment 1 = Helicopters, 2 = Fixed wing aircraft, 3 = 5t or larger trucks, 4 = 4 wheel drive vehicles, 5 = Boats