



## Assessing Cost Effective Management Options of *Eichhornia Crassipes* in Ecotourism Ramsar Sites, Nepal

<sup>1\*</sup>Ram Asheshwar Mandal., <sup>2</sup>Pramod Kumar Jha., <sup>3</sup>Nir Krakaue., <sup>4</sup>Ajay Jha and <sup>5</sup>Tarendra Lakhankar

<sup>1</sup>Central Department of Botany, Tribhuvan University Kirtipur, Nepal., <sup>2</sup>Professor of Central Department of Botany, Tribhuvan University Kirtipur, Nepal., <sup>3,5</sup>City College, CUNY, New York, NY, USA., <sup>4</sup>Institute of Global Agriculture and Technology Transfer (IGATT), Fort Collins, CO, USA., Email Corresponding Author: ram.mandal@gmail.com

### Abstract

Ecotourism is growing business in Nepal due to domestic and international visitors. Specifically, natural lakes in Ramsar sites are very potential avenues for boating, scenic beauty and study the aquatic ecosystem. However *Eichhornia crassipes* has been threatening the beauty, ecosystem and eco-tourism business. This research was objectively carried out to explore income generation from ecotourism and determine socio-economic management of *Eichhornia crassipes* for manure or biobriquette. Four Ramsar sites namely Beeshazari, Maipokhari, Lakes Clusters of Pokhara and Jagdishpur Lakes were selected for the study. Data were collected through expert consultation organizing four workshops, direct observation and sampling. Meanwhile record of manpower, removal cost and utilization of *Eichhornia crassipes* were also collected. Affected sites of *Eichhornia crassipes* were calculated analyzing the current image of Google earth pro using ArcGIS. Samples were collected establishing sixty plots of 1m×1m and these were analyzed. Altogether about US\$ 785260 was earned from tourism business between 2011 to 2015. The highest income was generated about US\$ 397500 between 2011 to 2015 from visitors of Lakes of Pokhara. Removal cost of *Eichhornia crassipes* was the highest about US\$ 108.09 ha<sup>-1</sup> of Beeshazari Lakes in 2015. Farmers could save cost about US\$ 31931 using *Eichhornia crassipes* as manure and that could be nearly US\$ 38315 for biobriquette in 2015. The B/C ratio, NPV and Profit Index could be nearly 6.13, 96059.91 and 7175.11 using *Eichhornia crassipes* of Beeshazari Lakes as manure while 4.81, 105868.50 and 12415.63 using it as biobriquette. The study could contribute design the ecotourism policy.

#### Keywords:

Ecotourism,  
Economic  
analysis, Water  
hyacinth,  
Manure,  
Biobriquette

### 1. Introduction

Globally, billions people depend on wetland ecosystem services like rice growing, selling water, construction, fishing, weaving, medicine, transport and ecotourism etc (Levin et al, 1997, Mack and Wrase 2017). Valuing these scopes, numerous lakes, ponds, waterfalls, rivers and other water bodies have been listed under Ramsar sites to conserve and promote them (IUCN, 2015). The record showed that over 2,200 Ramsar sites were listed of 169 Ramsar contracting parties across the world. Out of that United Kingdom listed the highest number of sites with 170 (JNCC, 2015), and Bolivia recorded the greatest area of wetlands with over 140,000 square kilometers (WWF, 2013). There are twenty six Ramsar sites in India and ten sites in Nepal (RSIS,

2016). In reality, Ramsar sites are natural home for important floral species like *Trapa quadrispinosa*, *Ludwigia adscendens*, *Azolla imbricate*, *Lemna spp*, *Ceratophyllum demersum*, *Hydrilla verticillata* and *Najas minor* as well as faunal organisms namely *Aythya nyroca*, *Leptotilos javanicus*, *Lutra lutra*, *Crocodylus palustris* and *Varanus flavescens* and *Aythya nyroca* and *Kachuga kachuga* (MoFSC, 2014).

The infestation of obnoxious weed like *Eichhornia crassipes* (water hyacinth) is threatening the indigenous species (Simpson and Sanderson, 2002, Tobin et al., 2011, Mironga, 2014) and also ecotourism business. Though, scope of ecotourism business is expanding as a key source of income, the income trends of ecotourism from these sites were

not explored yet in Nepal. Since these Ramsar sites are seriously affected due to infestation of water hyacinth (EEA, 2012), the governmental, nongovernmental institutions and local communities have been paying high cost to remove the weed every year but these costs were unrecorded and not explored yet. On the other hand, if the removed water hyacinth could be used as manure or biobriquette production, the removal cost could be economically compensated. In this circumstance, such studies were significant to explore the income generation from ecotourism business of Ramsar sites in tropical and subtropical Nepal and determine the economic management of water hyacinth for manure or biobriquette production.

## 2. Materials and methods

Six Ramsar sites specifically Beeshazari, Ghodaghodi and Mai Pokhari Lakes, Jadishpur reservoir, Koshitapu wildlife reserve (WR) and Lakes of Pokhara were selected for the study (Table 1).

Primary and secondary data were collected to meet the research objectives applying the following methods and they were analyzed using economic analysis.

*Consultation:* The hotel professional, business men, boater, local people, administrative staff particularly army and arm force, local eco-club, buffer zone community (Chitwan – Beeshazari Lake and Koshitapu Wildlife Reserves), social worker and environmentalists were invited to participate in the workshop. Experts who involve in biobriquette and manure preparation business were also consulted. The workshop focused on finding the number of manpower required, times needed to remove water hyacinth, labour cost. Expert consultation was done to assess the raw materials required to produce the

biobriquette and manure and their management and production cost and selling price.

*Workshops:* Six workshops were organized with stakeholders involve to remove the water hyacinth manually at Ramsar sites namely Beeshazari and Associated Lakes, Ghodaghodi Lake, Jagadishpur Reservoir, Koshi Tappu Wildlife Reserve, Pokhara and Mai Pokhari to know about the manpower needed.

*Estimation of water hyacinth affected area:* The currently available image of Ramsar sites was downloaded from Google earth pro (Albright et al., 2004). The image was analyzed using ArcGIS to find the affected areas of water hyacinth in Ramsar sites.

*Observation and sampling:* Disturbed areas of water hyacinth in the Lakes were verified by the field observation. Altogether sixty samples were collected from Lakes to know the quantity of water hyacinth per unit area having 1m×1m plot size. The collected samples were dried in laboratory and recorded.

*Cost estimation:* The removal cost of water hyacinth and ecotourism was estimated asking with participants of the workshop. The removal cost was varied US\$ 30 to 50 ha<sup>-1</sup>. The cost of manure and biobriquette preparation was also varied US\$ 10 to 15 and 12 to 17 per ton respectively.

### Calculation of B/C ratio, NPV and PI

B/C = Benefit/Total management cost

NPV = Total present value – Total management cost

$$= \left[ \frac{CF_1}{(1+r)^1} + \frac{CF_2}{(1+r)^2} + \frac{CF_3}{(1+r)^3} + \dots + \frac{CF_n}{(1+r)^n} \right] - \text{Total management cost,}$$

PI = Total present value – Net cash outlay

Table1. Geographical description of Ramsar sites of Tarai, Nepal

| Name                            | Location (districts)          | Latitude degree N | Longitude degree E | Altitude m | Ramsar site ratification | Area ha |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|---------|
| Beeshazari and Associated Lakes | Chitwan                       | 27.61912          | 84.470415          | 286        | August, 2003             | 3,200   |
| Koshi Tappu Wildlife Reserve    | Sunsari, Saptari, and Udaypur | 26.5626           | 85. 56             | 75         | 1987                     | 34800   |
| Lake Cluster of Pokhara Valley  | Kaski                         | 28.2026           | 83.985             | 827        | February, 2016           | 26106   |
| Mai Pokhari                     | Ilam                          | 27.025            | 87.55              | 2150       | October, 2008            | 90      |

## 3. Results and discussion

### 3.1 Income from ecotourism

Altogether about US\$ 785260 was generated from the tourism business in five years between 2011 to 2015. The highest income was generated about US \$ 397500 between 2011 to 2015 from tourists of

Lakes of Pokhara. Generally income depends up on the number of tourists visited, days stayed, mode of transports used, goods and services purchased (Kunwar, 1997). Globally, about US\$ 7.6 trillion (10% of Gross Domestic Product: GDP) earned and 277 million jobs created in 2014 from tourism

business in and around the wetlands. About US\$ 0.68 million paid for staff at Sauraha, Chitwan in 2012 (Banskota, 2012).

### 3.2 Description of water hyacinth affected area

The density and affected areas of water hyacinth in Ramsar sites were varied from place to place. The water hyacinth was about 25.21 t ha<sup>-1</sup> in Beeshazari Lake which was about 26.21 t ha<sup>-1</sup> in Lakes of Pokhara. The affected area was 80.1 ha in Lakes of Pokhara valley and quantity of water hyacinth was nearly 1705.96 t. About 4000- 6000 ha area of Victoria Lake was affected due to infestation of water hyacinth between 1996 to 2001 (Albright et al., 2004).

### 3.3 Removal cost of water hyacinth

The removal cost of water hyacinth was the highest about US\$ 108.09 ha<sup>-1</sup> of Beeshazari Lakes in 2015 which was about US \$ 80.89 ha<sup>-1</sup> of Lakes of Pokhara valley. There are 4.52 million t of water hyacinth in Thailand which needs roughly US\$ 0.27 million annually to eradicate it at the rate of US\$ 2.68 t<sup>-1</sup> (Na, 2015). The cost was about US\$ 2800 to control water hyacinth from Lagoon Creek in 2006 (Veitch et al., 2007).

### 3.4 Managing water hyacinth as Manure

The farmers could save cost to use the manure of water hyacinth in their field despite using

chemical fertilizers. Specifically, farmers living near Lakes of Beeshazari could save about US\$ 31931 utilizing water hyacinth as manure in 2015 and this saving could be about US\$ 2212 of farmers of Lakes of Pokhara. The use of manure of water hyacinth helps to improve the soil fertility of degraded soil (Nyananyo et al, 2007, Cbukwuka and Omotayo, 2009, Vidya and Girish, 2014).

### 3.5 Managing water hyacinth as Biobriquette

If the water hyacinth of Beeshazari Lakes was used for biobriquette nearly US\$ 38315 income could generate in 2015 while this could be US \$ 3010 for Lakes of Pokhara. The biobriquette is very useful for cooking and heating (Frank and Akhiehiero, 2013, Rezanian et al., 2015). The government of Nepal has high priority to use the biobriquette as an alternative energy (KC et al., 2011).

The B/C ratio, NPV and Profit Index showed that nearly 6.13, 96059.91 and 7175.11 to use water hyacinth as manure which could be 4.81, 105868.50 and 12415.63 of Beeshazari Lakes to utilize water hyacinth for biobriquette. There is not only one use of water hyacinth significantly (EEA, 2012) so used it as manure and biobriquette are cost effective (Sanni and Adesina, 2012). Alternative use is more effective solution to manage water hyacinth (Njogu et al., 2015).

Table 2. Income (US\$) from ecotourism of Ramsar sites, Nepal

| Year  | Income (US\$) from Ramsar sites |                |                  |             |        |
|-------|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|--------|
|       | Beeshazari Lake                 | Koshi Tappu WR | Lakes of Pokhara | Mai Pokhari | Total  |
| 2015  | 20250                           | 23625          | 82500            | 675         | 148500 |
| 2014  | 27000                           | 31500          | 90000            | 500         | 178000 |
| 2013  | 24000                           | 29000          | 95000            | 457         | 174110 |
| 2012  | 16000                           | 22000          | 75000            | 375         | 133000 |
| 2011  | 10000                           | 18000          | 55000            | 321         | 151650 |
| Total | 97250                           | 124125         | 397500           | 2328        | 785260 |

Table 3. Infestation of water hyacinth in Ramsar sites, Nepal

| Description      | Beeshazari Lake | Koshi Tappu WR | Lakes of Pokhara | Mai Pokhari |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|
| Ton/ha           | 25.21           | 22.89          | 26.21            | 19.21       |
| Affected area ha | 105.09          | 72.88          | 80.1             | 22.82       |
| Total (t)        | 2649.32         | 1668.22        | 2099.42          | 438.37      |

Table 4. Removal cost (US \$) of water hyacinth form Ramsar sites, Nepal

| Year | Beeshazari Lake | Koshi Tappu WR | Lakes of Pokhara | Mai Pokhari |
|------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|
| 2015 | 108.09          | 76.89          | 80.89            | 20.82       |
| 2014 | 97.28           | 69.20          | 72.80            | 18.38       |
| 2013 | 87.55           | 62.28          | 65.52            | 17.75       |
| 2012 | 78.80           | 56.05          | 58.97            | 11.50       |
| 2011 | 70.92           | 50.45          | 53.07            | 10.41       |

Table 5. Value of manure of water hyacinth (US \$)

| Year | Value of manure prepared from water hyacinth (Us \$) |                |                  |             |
|------|--|----------------|------------------|-------------|
|      | Beeshazari Lake                                      | Koshi Tappu WR | Lakes of Pokhara | Mai Pokhari |
| 2015 | 31931  | 406            | 2212             | 466.4       |
| 2014 | 23539.5  | 40.5           | 1341             | 296.8       |
| 2013 | 20925.25   | 20.3           | 1174.6           | 237.55      |
| 2012 | 17213.93   | 77.36          | 854.22           | 258.75      |
| 2011 | 12612.23   | 100.21         | 409.32           | 160.05      |

Table 6. Value of biobriquette of water hyacinth (US\$ )

| Year | Value of biobriquette prepared from water hyacinth (US\$ ) |                |                  |             |
|------|--|----------------|------------------|-------------|
|      | Beeshazari Lake  | Koshi Tappu WR | Lakes of Pokhara | Mai Pokhari |
| 2015 | 38315  | 805            | 3010             | 626         |
| 2014 | 28327.5  | 340.2          | 1939.5           | 416.5       |
| 2013 | 25186.95   | 286.2          | 1707.3           | 343.9       |
| 2012 | 20751.08   | 138.06         | 1296.72          | 347.8       |
| 2011 | 15265.33   | 34.164         | 1093.97          | 226.6       |

Table 7. Economic analysis showing water hyacinth using as manure or biobriquette

| <i>Using Water Hyacinth for manure</i>       |                 |                |                  |             |
|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|
| Economic Analysis Tools                      | Beeshazari Lake | Koshi Tappu WR | Lakes of Pokhara | Mai Pokhari |
| B/C ratio                                    | 6.13            | 0.08           | 0.63             | 0.85        |
| NPV  | 96059.91        | 5120.31        | 10446.23         | 2123.34     |
| PI   | 7175.11         | 12096.56       | 13908.95         | 2373.24     |
| <i>Using water hyacinth for Biobriquette</i> |                 |                |                  |             |
| B/C ratio                                    | 4.81            | 0.20           | 0.85             | 1.03        |
| NPV  | 105868.50       | 11720.70       | 18927.11         | 3604.92     |
| PI   | 12415.63        | 12417.08       | 14610.53         | 2504.32     |

#### 4. Conclusion and recommendations

Water hyacinth has been creating problems in Ramsar sites of Nepal, though these sites are high sources of income for ecotourism purposes. Local people and government pays very high costs every year to remove the water hyacinth from the Ramsar listed sites. However, if the weed is used for manure or biobriquette production removal cost could be economize. Therefore, It is recommended to find the alternative sustainable, social and economic cost effective management options of the weed.

#### Acknowledgement

We would like to heartily acknowledge stakeholders, institutions and experts who supported to carry out this research work.

#### References

1) Albright, T. P., Moorhouse, T. G. and McNabb T. J. (2004). The Rise and Fall of Water Hyacinth in Lake Victoria and the Kagera River Basin, 1989-2001. *Journal of Aquatic Plant Management*, 42: 73-84.

2) Banskota, K. (2012). Impact of Tourism on Local Employment and Incomes in Three Selected Destinations: Case Studies of Sauraha, Nagarkot and Bhaktapur. *Nepal Tourism and Development Review* 2, 2012.

3) Cbukwuka, K. S. and Omotayo, O. E. (2009). Soil Fertility Potential of Tithonia Green Manure and Water Hyacinth Compost on Nutrient Depleted Soil in South Western Nigeria Using Zea mays L. as Test Crop, *Research Journal of Soil Biology*, 1(1):20-30.

4) EEA. (2012). The Impacts of Invasive Alien Species in Europe. European Economic Area Technical Report No 16/2012. Luxembourg Publications.

5) Frank, O. O. and Akhiehiero, T. E. (2013). Fuel Briquettes from Water Hyacinth-Cow Dung Mixture as Alternative Energy for Domestic and Agro-Industrial Applications. *Journal of Energy Technologies and Policy*, 3(6): 56-62.

6) IUCN. (2015). IUCN-Ramsar Collaboration. Supporting the Wise Use of Wetlands. Gland. Switzerland: IUCN

7) JNCC. (2015). Designated and Proposed Ramsar sites in the UK and Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies, Joint Nature Conservation

Committee URL:<http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-1389>  
Retrieved date: 3.31.2017.

8) KC, S., Khanal, S., Kumar, A., Shrestha, P., Lamsal, B. (2011). Current status of renewable energy in Nepal: Opportunities and challenges. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 15 (1): 4107–4117.

9) Kunwar, R. R. (1997) Tourism and Development. Kathmandu: Science and Industry Interface.

10) Levin, S. A., Grenfell, B., Hastings, A., and Perelson. A.S.1997). Mathematical and computational Challenges in Population Biology and Ecosystem Science, *Science*, 275: 334-343.

11) Mack, E. A. and Wrase, S. (2017). Correction: A Burgeoning Crisis? A Nationwide Assessment of the Geography of Water Affordability in the United States. *PLOS ONE* 12(4): e0176645. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0176645>

12) Mironga, M. J. (2014). Lessons for Effective Management of Water Hyacinth (*Eichhornia Crassipes* (Mart.) Solms) in Kenya *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(9): 118-126.

13) MoFSC. (2014). Nepal National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation, Singh Durbar Kathmandu Nepal.

14) Na, S. S. (2015). Ayuttaya Financial Evaluation to Select the Best Water Hyacinth Harvester to Improve Water Resources in Thailand. *Kasetsart Journal of Natural Science*, 49(1): 1022–1035.

15) Njogu, P., Kinyua, R., Muthoni, P., Nemoto, Y., (2015). Biogas Production Using Water Hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*) for Electricity Generation in Kenya. *Energy and Power Engineering*. 7(1):209-216.

16) Nyananyo, B. L.; Gijo, A. H. and Ogamba, E.N. (2007). The Physico-chemistry and Distribution of Water Hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*) on the river Nun in the Niger Delta. *Journal of Applied Science Environment Management*, 11(3): 133–137.

17) Rezaia, S., Mohanadoss, P. M., Mohmad, D. F., Rahman, S. A., Mohmad, S. F., Shreeshivadasan C. (2015). The diverse applications of water hyacinth with main focus on sustainable energy and production for new era: *An overview Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 41 (1): 943–954

18) RSIS (2016). List of Wetlands of International Importance. The Secretariat of the Convention on Wetlands, Rue Mauverney 28, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland, Ramsar Sites Information Service.

19) Sanni, K. O. and Adesina, J. M. (2012) Response of water hyacinth manure on growth

attributes and yield of *Celosia argentea* L (Lagos Spinach). *Journal of Agricultural Technology*, 8(3): 1109-1118.

20) Simpson, D. and Sanderson, H. (2002). *Eichhornia crassipes*. Royan Botanic Gardens. Blackwell Publishing Limited. 108. Gowly Road, Oxford United Kingdom. 28-34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8748.00326>, retrieved date: May 18, 2016.

21) Tobin, P. C., Berc, L. K. and Andrew, M. Liebold. (2011). Exploiting Allee effects for managing biological invasions. *Ecology Letters*, 14: 615–624.

22) Veitch, V., Damien, B., Dave, H. and Barry, B. (2007). Removal of Aquatic Weeds from Lagoon Creek, Herbert Catchment North Queensland: Trialling Novel Removal Methods and Demonstration of Environmental Benefits Great Barrier Reef Coastal Wetlands Protection Program Department of Environment and Water Canberra.

23) Vidya, S. and Girish, L. (2014). Water Hyacinth as a Green Manure for Organic Farming. *International Journal of Research in Applied, Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(6): 65-72.

24) WWF, (2013). Bolivia designates world's largest protected wetland, World Wildlife Fund, Bolivia. URL:<http://wwf.panda.org/?207471/Bolivia-designates-worlds-largest-protected-wetland>  
Retrieved date: March 31, 2017.