


# Doro!nawas Natural Resource Report



## maximising wildlife returns by minimising threats...



#### Wildlife removals – quota use and value

Potential value estimates (N\$) for a			Quota 2021		Animals actually used in 2021				Potential			
single animal: • Potential trophy value - the average	Species	Total	Trophy	Other Use	Trophy	Own Use & Premium	Shoot & Sell		Problem Animal	Total Use	Trophy Value N\$	Other use Value N\$
trophy value for that species in the conservancy landscape	Baboon	5	5								600	
trophy values vary depending on trophy	Gemsbok	2	2								4,300	
quality, international recognition of the	Leopard	0.33	0.33								38,900	
hunting operator and the hunting area	Springbok	8	4	4							2,700	702
Potential other use value - the average meat value for common species	Mtn Zebra	3	3								6,300	
meat value for common species												
or												
the average live sale value of each high												
value species (indicated with an *). High value species are never used for meat												
Fractions of animals indicate that a quota of 1 animal was awarded with conditions i.e.												
a) over a period of several years												
and/or b) is shared with other conservancies												
-,												




#### **Doro!nawas**

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

### Natural Resource Report continued...

# monitoring numbers and trends for a healthy conservancy...

#### **Current wildlife numbers and status**



**Desired Number** – gives the species status in the conservancy based on what the conservancy would like to have.

dark green (abundant) - reduce a lot; light green (common) - reduce a little; yellow (uncommon) - keep numbers the same;


light orange (rare) - double numbers;

Key to wildlife status


Increasing

rare


dark orange (very rare) - more than double numbers.



#### Wildlife introductions



#### Wildlife mortalities




No change

No change,

rarely recorded

#### Locally rare species




### 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 flags reflect the general count trend over the last 5 years.


decreasing


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




#### **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











# Doro!nawas Institutional Report

Not all institutional data are shown on this report: use your **Governance** institution audit for more information

# С

## Enabling wise conservancy governance...

#### **Conservancy Statistics**

Date Registered:December 1999Population (2011 census):1110Size (square kilometres):4135Registered members:1080

#### **Key Compliance Requirements**

Was an AGM held?

Were elections held?

N/A

Were benefits distributed according to the BDP?

✓

Is game managed according to the GMUP?

Was the financial report presented and approved?

#### **Conservancy Governance**

	Male	Female	Total
Number of management committee members	9	7	16
Attendance at AGM	87	75	163
Date of the last AGM:	04/12/2021		
Date of the next AGM:	Mar-22		
Other important issues			
Budget approved?	✓		
Work plan approved?	×		
Annual conservancy report approved?	<		

#### **Benefit Distribution**

Туре	Description	Beneficiary	Number
Community Devp.	Drilled Borehole (conservancy Office)	Households	35
Social Benefits	Death Benefits	People	34
	Youth Sport	People	21
Other Benefits	Traditional Authority	People	

#### **Employment**

	Male	Female	Total
Conservancy staff (Incl. CGG & CRM)	8	3	11
Number of Community Game Guards	4	1	5
Number of Community Resource Monitors	4	0	4

#### Governance Performance Rating How well did the conservancy perform in the past year?

Performance Category			This Year	Prev. Year	Explanation of performance category						
Member engagement					The conservancy is adequately engaging its members						
Benefit planning					The conservancy developed its BDP in a transparent and participatory manner						
Benefit distribution					The conservancy distributes benefits to its members in a fair, transparent and equitable manner						
Accountability					Conservancy members are holding the management committee accountable						
Stakeholder engagement					The conservancy maintains relationships with key external stakeholders						
Financial management					The conservancy is effectively managing its finances						
Colour codes:	none	weak	modera	ite	strong	exceptional		N/A			