maximising wildlife returns by minimising threats...

**Conservancy status summary**

Returns from natural resources in 2017
- Total Returns N$: N$ 0
- Combined tourism returns N$: 0 ( %)
- Combined hunting returns N$: 0 ( %)
- Veld product returns N$: 0 ( %)
- Other returns (e.g., interest) N$: 0 ( %)

Two of the most significant returns for the conservancy:
- Cash income to the conservancy to cover running costs and invest in developments
- Employment to conservancy residents

Cost of natural resource conflicts in 2017
- Estimated human wildlife conflict cost N$: N$ 0
- Estimated poached high value species loss N$: N$ 0
- Total conflict cost estimate N$: N$ 0

Natural resource cost–return ratio in 2017
- Returns data not available at time of printing

Costs
- Adequate staffing Adequate expenditure Audit attendance NR management plan Zonation Leadership Display of material Event Book modules Event Book quality Compliance Game census Reporting & adaptive m/ment Law enforcement Human Wildlife Conflict Hunting management Sources of NR income Benefits produced Resource trends Resource targets

Returns from wildlife can far outweigh human wildlife conflict costs.

**Human wildlife conflict**

**Poaching**

Number of incidents per year
- Subsistence
- Commercial
- High Value

Most troublesome problem animals 2015-2017
- The least troublesome species in 2017 are on the right
- The most troublesome species in 2017 are on the left

**Type of damage by problem animals 2015-2017**
- The chart shows the total number of incidents each year, subdivided by species, grouped as herbivores and predators

**Wildlife status summary in 2017**

**Wildlife status**
- Extinct
- Very rare
- Rare
- Uncommon
- Common
- Abundant

**Success/threat flags**
- Success
- Benefit created
- Weakness
- Action needed

**Management performance in 2017**
- Adequate staffing
- Adequate expenditure
- Audit attendance
- NR management plan
- Zonation
- Leadership
- Display of material
- Event Book modules
- Event Book quality
- Compliance
- Game census
- Reporting & adaptive m/ment
- Law enforcement
- Human Wildlife Conflict
- Hunting management
- Sources of NR income
- Benefits produced
- Resource trends
- Resource targets

**Wildlife removals – quota use and value**

**Wildlife status summary in 2017**

**Key to the status barometer**
- Extinct
- Very rare
- Rare
- Uncommon
- Common
- Abundant

**Success/threat flags**
- Success
- Benefit created
- Weakness
- Action needed

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 2017</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.
- **Landscape status** – gives the species status in the focal landscape; for example, lions may cause local problems, but are of high value and may be 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;
- **Red** (extinct) – the species needs to be reintroduced.

Locally rare species

- **Sightings indicator**

Annual rainfall

- **In millimetres**

Annual game count

Charts show the number of animals seen each year per 100 km driven during the game count. As a point of reference the dashed horizontal line represents the combined 10 year average in Palmwag and Etendeka concessions. 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.

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 (2001-2016).

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>March 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (2011 census):</td>
<td>1372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (square kilometres):</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conservancy Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of management committee members:</th>
<th>Men: ; Women:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of last AGM:</td>
<td>Wed, October 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at AGM:</td>
<td>Men: ; Women:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of next AGM:</td>
<td>Sun, September 30, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other important issues

- Financial report approved? [x]
- Budget approved? [x]
- Work plan approved? [x]
- Chairperson's report approved? [✓]

Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservancy staff:</th>
<th>Male 4</th>
<th>Female 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community game guards:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community resource monitors:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodge staff:</td>
<td>Male 0</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>In Kind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meat Distribution</td>
<td></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>Prev. Year</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></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></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of effectiveness rating

- Game guards work voluntarily
- No zoning plan in place
- Only meat distributed but no cash as there is no income
- No plan in place; herding not effective
- No income
- Still ideas to build though leasehold has been obtained
- No training was done and no contracts were signed
- No income to buy assets
- No plan in place, only awareness
- Not effective