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$ 138,840
- No data available

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

No data available at time of printing

Poaching
- Number of incidents per year
- Commercial poaching is a serious threat to conservancy benefits
- The chart shows the number of incidents per category
- Firearms recovered
- Traps/snare recovered

Arrests and convictions
- number of incidents per category
- Arrows
- Convictions

Cost of natural resource conflicts in 2016
- estimates are based on average national values
- Estimated human wildlife conflict cost N$ 138,840
- Estimated poached high value species loss N$ 0
- Total conflict cost estimate N$ 138,840

Natural resource cost–return ratio in 2016
- the chart shows the approximate ratio of returns to costs

Management performance in 2016
- 1 Adequate staffing 2.28
- 2 Adequate expenditure 2.28
- 3 Audit attendance 1.14
- 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 Harv/sting management
- 16 Sources of NR income
- 17 Benefici produced
- 18 Resource targets
- 19 Resource trends
- 20

Wildlife status summary in 2016
- Kudu*
- Gemsbok
- Duiker
- Cheetah
- Caracal
- Leopard
- Other Predators

Wildlife removals – quota and value use
- Species
- Quota 2016
- Animals actually used in 2016
- Potential Trophy Value N$
- Potential Other use Value N$

Wildlife status
- Extinct
- Very rare
- Rare
- Uncommon
- Common
- Abundant
- Weak/bad
- Reasonable
- Good

Key to the status barometer
- 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 2016</th>
<th>Estimated population range</th>
<th>Wildlife Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemsbok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klipspringer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtn. zebra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 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) – 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 species
Not all data or species are shown on this report; use your Event Book for more information.

Wildlife introductions

Wildlife mortalities

Annual game count
No count done

Annual rainfall

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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Registered:</th>
<th>May 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (2011 census):</td>
<td>2130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (square kilometres):</td>
<td>1159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constitutional adherence

- Approved constitution: ✅
- AGM held: ✅
- Management and utilisation plan: ✗
- Financial annual report approved at AGM: ✗
- Financial report external review: ✗
- Benefit distribution plan: ✗

Conservancy Governance

- Number of management committee members: 15
- Date of last AGM: Thu, September 15, 2016
- Attendance at AGM: Men: 80; Women: 80
- Date of next AGM: 
- Other important issues: 
  - Budget approved?: ✗
  - Work plan approved?: ✅

Employment

- Conservancy staff: Male 3, Female 0
- Community game guards: 3
- Community resource monitors: 0
- Lodge staff: Male 0, Female 0

Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>In Kind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>The area is too bushy making patrols and monitoring difficult. There is no food for game guards to stay longer in the field.</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>These activities were effectively implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Business and Financial Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>The conservancy doesn’t have income yet, but HWC payments are reported to community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>This was effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Management/Register</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>We don’t have assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effectively implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>The plan was well implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conservancy statistics

Date Registered: May 2012
Population (2011 census): 2130
Size (square kilometres): 1159

Conservancy Governance

Number of management committee members: 15
Date of last AGM: Thu, September 15, 2016
Attendance at AGM: Men: 80; Women: 80
Date of next AGM: 
Other important issues
- Budget approved?: ✗
- Work plan approved?: ✅

Employment

Conservancy staff: Male 3, Female 0
Community game guards: 3
Community resource monitors: 0
Lodge staff: Male 0, Female 0

Benefits

Cash: 
In Kind: 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>The area is too bushy making patrols and monitoring difficult. There is no food for game guards to stay longer in the field.</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>These activities were effectively implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Business and Financial Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>The conservancy doesn’t have income yet, but HWC payments are reported to community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>This was effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Management/Register</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>We don’t have assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effectively implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>The plan was well implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>