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$ 9,940

Cost of natural resource conflicts in 2014
- estimates are based on average national values
- Estimated human wildlife conflict cost N$ 9,940
- Estimated poached high value species loss N$ 0
- Total conflict cost estimate N$ 9,940

Natural resource cost-return ratio in 2014
- the chart shows the approximate ratio of returns to costs

Management performance in 2015
- the chart shows the approximate ratio of returns to costs

Key to the status barometer
- Success/threat flags
  - green: success / benefit created
  - red: weakness / action needed

Conservancy income
- NS

Employment
- Private Sector
- Conservancy

Adequate staffing
- 0.76

Adequate expenditure
- 1.14

Audit attendance
- 0.76

NR management plan
- 0.76

Zonation
- 1.14

Benefits produced
- 1.14

Resource trends
- 0.76

Resource targets
- 1.14

Conservancy income N$

Wildlife status summary in 2015

Human wildlife conflict
- the chart shows the total number of incidents each year, subdivided by species, grouped as herbivores and predators

Poaching
- Commercial poaching is a serious threat to conservancy benefits. The chart shows the number of incidents per category

Wildlife removals – quota use and value
- Species
  - Gemsbok
  - Jackal
  - Springbok

Potential value 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 meat value of each high value species (indicated with an *) (high value species are never used for meat)

Conservancies reduce environmental costs while increasing environmental returns. Returns from wildlife can far outweigh human wildlife conflict costs.
monitoring numbers and trends for a healthy conservancy...

**Current wildlife numbers and status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Animals Seen 2015</th>
<th>Estimated population range</th>
<th>Wildlife Status</th>
<th>Count Trend</th>
<th>National Guideline</th>
<th>Desired Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemsbok</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klipspringer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtn. zebra</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>3665 - 4660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbok</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7 - 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenbok</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
- dark green (abundant) – should be less;
- light green (common) – the desired number is reached;
- yellow (uncommon) – there should be more;
- light orange (rare) – there should be more than double;
- dark orange (very rare) – there should be more than triple;
- red (extinct) – the species needs to be reintroduced.

**Locally rare species**

Locally rare and endangered species are not found very often in the conservancy and need special conservation attention.

**Annual wildlife introductions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Animals Seen 2015</th>
<th>Estimated population range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gemsbok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual predator mortality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Animals Seen 2015</th>
<th>Estimated population range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gemsbok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual game count**

charts show the number of animals seen per 100 km driven during the game count status barometers reflect the general count trend over the last 5 years.

**Predator monitoring**

charts show the average number of animals seen per Event Book each year status barometers reflect the general sightings trend over the last 5 years.

**Annual rainfall**

Yearly rainfall, 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

- **Date Registered:** July 2003
- **Members:** 152
- **Size (square kilometres):** 1748

Conservancy Governance

- **Number of management committee members:** 7
- **Date of last AGM:** Tue, April 28, 2015
- **Attendance at AGM:** Men: ; Women: 
- **Date of next AGM:** Fri, April 1, 2016

Other important issues

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

Employment

- **Conservancy staff:**
  - Male: 8
  - Female: 0
- **Community game guards:** 8
- **Community resource monitors:** 0
- **Lodge staff:**
  - Male: 0
  - Female: 0

Benefits

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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Wildlife Conflict Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Financial Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Distribution Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>