maximising wildlife returns by minimising threats...

Conservancy status summary

Returns from natural resources in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Adequate staffing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Adequate expenditure</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Audit attendance</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 NR management plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Zonation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Leadership</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Display of material</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Event book modules</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Event book quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Compliance</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Game census</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Reporting &amp; adaptive m英特尔</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Law enforcement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Human Wildlife Conflict</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Harvesting management</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sources of NR income</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Benefits produced</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Resource trends</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Resource targets</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conservancy income: N$ 1,409,470

Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>8 staff 233,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancy</td>
<td>23 staff 397,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost of natural resource conflicts in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost estimate N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated human wildlife conflict</td>
<td>117,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated poached high value species loss</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total conflict cost estimate</td>
<td>117,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Natural resource cost–return ratio in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total returns</td>
<td>6,143,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate conflict costs</td>
<td>117,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate positive ratio</td>
<td>1:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management performance in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate staffing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate expenditure</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit attendance</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR management plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display of material</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event book modules</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event book quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game census</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting &amp; adaptive m英特尔</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Wildlife Conflict</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvesting management</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of NR income</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits produced</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource trends</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wildlife status summary in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodile</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lelhwe</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wildlife status

- Buffalo
- Crocodile
- Elephant
- Hippo
- Lelhwe

Success/threat flags

- Success: ✓
- Threat: ×

Key to the status barometer

- High: ✓
- Medium: ×
- Low: ◯

Management performance & other data

- Approximate Total Returns: N$ 1,463,310
- Employment: Private Sector 8 staff N$ 233,840, Conservancy 23 staff N$ 397,800
- Cost of natural resource conflicts in 2016: Estimated human wildlife conflict cost N$ 117,570, Estimated poached high value species loss N$ 0, Total conflict cost estimate N$ 117,570

Most troublesome problem animals 2014-2016

- The most troublesome species in 2016 are on the left
- The least troublesome species in 2016 are on the right

Type of damage by problem animals 2014-2016

- The chart shows the number of incidents per category for the last 3 years
- The darkest bar (on the right) indicates the current year for each type

Wildlife removals – quota use and value

- Species
- Quota 2016
- Animals actually used in 2016
- Potential trophy value N$:
- Potential other use value N$

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 live sale value of each high value species (indicated with an *)

Key:

- High: ✓
- Medium: ×
- Low: ◯

Conservancies reduce environmental costs while increasing environmental returns. Returns from wildlife can far outweigh human wildlife conflict costs.
Current wildlife numbers and status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Animals Seen</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Wildlife Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Zebra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duiker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wildlife Status

- **Count trend** – 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.
- **National guideline** – gives the species status in the conservancy using national guidelines for the conservancy.
- **Desired number** – gives the species status in the conservancy based on what the conservancy would like to have.
- **dark green (abundant)** – there 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 and endangered species

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

#### Wildlife introductions

Charts show the number of sightings of each species per fixed route foot patrol each year.

#### Wildlife mortalities

Charts show the average number of animals seen per Event Book each year.

#### Annual rainfall

Charts show the number of sightings of each species per fixed route foot patrol each year.

#### Fixed route patrols

Charts show the average number of animals seen per Event Book each year.

#### Predator monitoring

Status barometers reflect the general sightings trend over the last 5 years.

#### Fire monitoring

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

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.
Institutional Report

Enabling wise conservancy governance...

Conservancy statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Registered:</th>
<th>November 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (2011 census):</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (square kilometres):</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conservancy Governance

- Number of management committee members: 10
- Date of last AGM: Sat, November 26, 2016
- Attendance at AGM: Men: 71; Women: 97
- Date of next AGM: Sun, November 26, 2017

Other important issues

- Budget approved?
- Work plan approved?

Employment

- Conservancy staff: Male 17, Female 6
- Community game guards: 6
- Community resource monitors: 2
- Lodge staff: Male 0, Female 0

Benefits

- Cash
  - Cash Benefits
- In Kind
  - Other Benefits
  - Social 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 Management and Utilisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Equipment is available but people are not trained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonation Plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Everything was done in accordance with the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Distribution</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Benefits were distributed equally and people were satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Wildlife Conflict Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Human wildlife management implemented according to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Business and Financial Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>A sustainable business and financial plan needs to be formulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Tourism expectation were not reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Staff management is done and books are up to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Management/Register</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Assets are still in good condition and they are monitored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Counselor in the conservancy, condoms distributed, people are taught about HIV/AIDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Communication is very effective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>