maximising wildlife returns by minimising threats...

Conservancy status summary

Returns from natural resources in 2016
- the chart shows the main sources of returns and values and their percentage of the total returns
- Approximate Total Returns N$ 4,552,120

Cost of natural resource conflicts in 2016
- estimates are based on average national values
- Estimated human wildlife conflict cost N$ 106,340
- Estimated poached high value species loss N$ 0
- Total conflict cost estimate N$ 106,340

Natural resource cost–return ratio in 2016
- the chart shows the approximate ratio of returns to costs
- Natural resource returns outweigh approximate conflict costs
- Total returns: N$ 4,552,120
- Approximate conflict costs: N$ 106,340
- Approach positive ratio 43 : 1

Management performance in 2016
- Category
  1. Adequate staffing
  2. Adequate expenditure
  3. Audit attendance
  4. NR management plan
  5. Zonation
  6. Leadership
  7. Display of material
  8. Event Book modules
  9. Event Book quality
  10. Compliance
  11. Game census
  12. Reporting & adaptive m/ment
  13. Law enforcement
  14. Human Wildlife Conflict
  15. Harvesting management
  16. Sources of NR income
  17. Benefits produced
  18. Resource trends
  19. Resource targets

Wildlife status summary in 2016
- Species
  1. Cheetah
  2. Cossidze
  3. Gemsbok
  4. Jackal
  5. Leopard
  6. Ostrich
  7. Springbok
  8. Steenbok
  9. Ndc Zebra

Key to the status barometer
- Wildlife status
  1. Extinct
  2. Very rare
  3. Rare
  4. Uncommon
  5. Common
  6. Abundant
  7. Weak/bad
  8. Reasonable
  9. Good

Success/threat flags
- Conservancies reduce environmental costs while increasing environmental returns.
- Returns from wildlife can far outweigh human wildlife conflict costs.

Human wildlife conflict
- Trend
  - the chart shows the total number of incidents each year, subdivided by species, grouped as herbivores and predators
- Most troublesome problem animals 2014-2016
  - the chart shows the number of incidents per species for the last 3 years; the darkest bar (on the right) indicates the current year for each species
  - The least troublesome species in 2016 are on the right

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

Arrests and convictions
- number of incidents per category

Wildlife removals – quota use and value
- Species
  - Quota 2016
  - Potential Trophy Volume N$:
    1. Cheetah 16,300
    2. Cossidze 2,900
    3. Gemsbok 2,160
    4. Jackal 700
    5. Leopard 3,200
    6. Ostrich 2,400
    7. Springbok 2,950
    8. Steenbok 1,608
    9. Ndc Zebra 7,400

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 (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 2016</th>
<th>Estimated population range</th>
<th>Wildlife Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemsbok</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>229 - 650</td>
<td>Abundant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klipspringer</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>269 - 540</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>146 - 360</td>
<td>Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtn. Zebra</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1391 - 2650</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbok</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1900 - 3800</td>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenbok</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 based on 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) – there should be more;
- 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.

Wildlife introductions

Wildlife mortalities

Annual game count charts show the number of animals seen each year per 100 km driven during the game count and the difference between the current year and the long term average.

Annual rainfall

Vegetation monitoring

Green vegetation index (NDVI). Maps show vegetation cover during Feb-April of the current year and the difference between the current year and the long term average (2001-2015). 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: January 2001
Size (square kilometres): 3036

Conservancy Governance

Number of management committee members: 9
Date of last AGM: Fri, December 30, 2016
Attendance at AGM: Men: ; Women:
Date of next AGM:
Other important issues
  Budget approved?
  Work plan approved?

Employment

Conservancy staff: Male 12
  Female 5
Community game guards: 7
Community resource monitors: 0
Lodge staff: Male 27
  Female 26

Benefits

Cash
  Cash Benefits
  Traditional Authority
  Funeral Assistance
  Community Projects

In Kind
  Cash 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Wildlife Conflict Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes there are only older people at farm and no one to look after the livestock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Business and Financial Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Works well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Management/Register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We achieved this years target for our plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The area is too big to cover by sending a message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>