maximising wildlife returns by minimising threats...

Conservancy status summary

Returns from natural resources in 2017
the chart shows the main sources of returns and values and their percentage of the total returns

Approximate Total Returns NS

No data available

- Combined tourism returns
- Combined hunting returns
- Wildlife returns
- Non-wildlife returns

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

Conservancy income NS

Employment

- Private Sector
- Conservancy

Cost of natural resource conflicts in 2017
estimates are based on average national values

Estimated human wildlife conflict cost NS 590,650
Estimated poached high value species loss NS 15,500
Total conflict cost estimate NS 606,150

Natural resource cost-return ratio in 2017
the chart shows the approximate ratio of returns to costs

Type of damage by problem animals 2015-2017
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 species

Human wildlife conflict

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

The most troublesome species in 2017 are on the right
The least troublesome species in 2017 are on the left

Potential value estimates (NS) for species are based on:
- 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 *)[high value species are never used for meat]

Key to the status barometer

Wildlife status

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

Management performance & other data

Returns data not available at time of printing

Wildlife status summary in 2017

Geneva 5 5
Aardvark 1 1
Antelope 3 3
Baboon 1 1
Buffalo 10 10
Bushpig 15 15
Elephant 5 5
Giraffe 10 10
Gnus 5 5
Hyaena 1 1
Jackal 15 15
Lion 5 5
Leopard 1 1
Lynx 1 1
Ostrich 10 10
Oryx 5 5
Potato 3 3
Rhino 20 20
Steenbok 15 15
Springbok 5 5
Warthog 5 5
Wildbeest 10 10
Zebra 5 5

Potential value estimates (NS) for species are based on:
- 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 *)[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 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>12 – 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtn. zebra</td>
<td>7 – 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich</td>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbok</td>
<td>179 – 480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenbok</td>
<td>3 – 200</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 more; light green (common) – the desired number is reached; yellow (uncommon) – there should be more; light orange (rare) – there should be more than triple; dark orange (very rare) – there should be more than triple; red (extinct) – the species needs to be reintroduced.

Locally rare species

Sightings indicator

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

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.

Wildlife introductions

Wildlife mortalities

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 (2001-2016).

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

- Date Registered: March 2011
- Population (2011 census): 1820
- Size (square kilometres): 1234

Key Compliance Requirements

- Was an AGM held? ✓
- Were elections held? ❌
- Is there a Benefit Distribution Plan? ❌
- Is there a Game Management and Utilisation Plan? ❌
- Was an Annual Financial Report produced? ✓

Conservancy Governance

- Number of management committee members: Men: 4; Women: 10
- Date of last AGM: Fri, September 29, 2017
- Attendance at AGM: Men: ; Women:
- Date of next AGM: Sat, July 28, 2018

Other important issues

- Financial report approved? ✓
- Budget approved? ✓
- Work plan approved? ❌
- Chairperson’s report approved? ✓

Employment

- Conservancy staff: Male 8; Female 1
- Community game guards: 6
- Community resource monitors: 0
- Lodge staff: Male 0; Female 0

Benefits

- Cash
- In Kind
  - Meat Distribution (springbok)
  - Meat Donation (springbok)

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>
<th>Explanation of effectiveness rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Game Management and Utilisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td>GMU Plan is nowhere to be seen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing went to members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Wildlife Conflict Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td>No plan is in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Business and Financial Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No mismanagement of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td>No plan in place yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing was done regarding staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Management/Register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No money to buy assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A plan is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managed to maintain communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>