maximising wildlife returns by minimising threats...

Conservancy status summary

Returns from natural resources in 2014
- the chart shows the main sources of returns and values and their percentage of the total returns
- Approximate Total Returns N$ 2,242,040

Cost of natural resource conflicts in 2014
- estimates are based on average national values
- Estimated human wildlife conflict cost N$ 75,530
- Estimated poached high value species loss N$ 0
- Total conflict cost estimate N$ 75,530

Natural resource cost–return ratio in 2014
- the chart shows the approximate ratio of returns to costs
- Natural resource returns outweigh approximate conflict costs
- Total returns: N$ 2,242,040
- Approximate conflict costs: N$ 75,530
- Approximate positive ratio 30 : 1

Management performance in 2014
- Category | Score | Performance
- 1 Adequate staffing | 3 | Adequate
- 2 Adequate expenditure | 3 | Adequate
- 3 Audit attendance | 6 | Adequate
- 4 NR management plan | 3 | Adequate
- 5 Zonation | 2 | Adequate
- 6 Leadership | 2 | Adequate
- 7 Display of material | 2 | Adequate
- 8 Event Book modules | 4 | Adequate
- 9 Event Book quality | 3 | Adequate
- 10 Compliance | 2 | Adequate
- 11 Game census | 4 | Adequate
- 12 Reporting & adaptive m/ment | 5 | Adequate
- 13 Law enforcement | 2 | Adequate
- 14 Human Wildlife Conflict | 2 | Adequate
- 15 Harvesting management | 3 | Adequate
- 16 Sources of NR income | 5 | Adequate
- 17 Benefits produced | 3 | Adequate
- 18 Resource trends | 1 | Adequate
- 19 Resource targets | 1 | Adequate

Wildlife status summary in 2014
- Key to the status barometer
- Wildlife status: 
  - Extinct
  - Very rare
  - Rare
  - Uncommon
  - Common
  - Abundant
- Success/threat flags:
  - Weak/bad
  - Reasonable
  - Good
- Management performance & other data

Wildlife status
- Mayuni
- Conservancy
- Private Sector

Wildlife removals – quota use and value
- Quota 2014 | Animals actually used in 2014 | Potential Trophy Values N$ | Potential Other use Value N$
- Species | Total | Trophy | Other Use | Trophy | Over Dile & Premium | Short & Sale | Capture & Sale | Problem Animal | Total Use | Potential Trophy Values N$ | Potential Other use Value N$
- Crocodile | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 16,750 | 16,750
- Elephant | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 16,750 | 16,750
- Hippo | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 21,850 | 21,850
- Kudu | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 21,850 | 21,850
- Lelwe | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 21,850 | 21,850
- Reedbuck | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 21,850 | 21,850
- Wildebeest | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3,680 | 3,680

Potential values estimates (N$) for species are based on:
- Potential trophy value: The average trophy value for that species in the conservancy landscape
- Trophy values vary depending on trophy quality, international recognition of the hunting operator and the hunting area
- Potential other use value: The average meat value for common species:
  - The average live sale value of each high value species (indicated with an “*”) (high value species are never used for meat)
monitoring numbers and trends for a healthy conservancy...

Current wildlife numbers and status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Animals Seen</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Count Trend</th>
<th>National Guideline</th>
<th>Desired Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Zebra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duiker</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impala</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenbok</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthog</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wildlife Status

- Count trend – gives the species status in the conservancy based on game count trend data.
- National guideline – gives the species status in the conservancy using national guidelines for the conservancy; for example, lions may cause local problems, but are of high value and are rare at landscape level.
- Desired number – gives the species status in the conservancy based on what the conservancy would like to have.

Wildlife introductions

- Dark orange – species is abundant
- Yellow – species is uncommon
- Light orange – species is very rare
- Red (extinct) – species needs to be reintroduced

Wildlife mortalitys

- Dark green – species is abundant
- Yellow – species is uncommon
- Light green – species is very rare
- Red (extinct) – species needs to be reintroduced

Locally rare species

- Not all data or species are shown on this report; use your Event Book for more information

Wildlife provides a wide range of benefits. Some wildlife can cause conflicts, but all wildlife is of value to tourism, trophy hunting and a healthy environment.

By using all the available information and adapting and improving activities, threats such as human wildlife conflict, poaching and other issues can be minimised.
Enabling wise conservancy governance...

Conservancy statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Registered:</th>
<th>December 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members:</td>
<td>3249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (square kilometres):</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constitutional adherence

- Approved constitution
- AGM held
- Management and utilisation plan
- Financial annual report
- Benefit distribution plan
- Audit of the constitution

Conservancy Governance

- Number of management committee members: 14
- Date of last AGM: 29 November 2014
- Attendance at AGM: Men: 106; Women: 103
- Date of next AGM: 29 November 2015

Other important issues

- Financial report approved?
- Budget approved?
- Work plan approved?

Employment

- Conservancy staff: Male 12, Female 3
- Community game guards: 9
- Community resource monitors: 0
- Lodge staff: Male 39, Female 27

Benefits

- Training On Hwc
- Transport
- Employment
- Meat Distribution
- Distribution
- Traditional Authority
- Funerals
- Church

Conservancy Self Evaluation

How well does the conservancy consider it has performed in the past year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness of implementation</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Explanation of effectiveness rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Game Utilisation and Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented most activities within the plan. Implemented most activities within the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented most activities within plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented most activities within plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Wildlife Conflict Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>There are delays in the payments of claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented most of the activities within the plan successfully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Financial Plan</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Income streaming in slowly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Distribution Plan</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management committee not following up on benefits and not giving advice on how benefits should be distributed in order to be more tangible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stadd managed according to policy and held accountable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular check of assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS Plan</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The conservancy could do more than what is currently being done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effectively communicating with members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>