

Omatendeka Natural Resource Report




maximising wildlife returns by minimising threats...

Performance Indicators Management performance in 2020 **Performance** 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 management 13 Law enforcement 14 Human Wildlife Conflict 15 Harvesting management 16 Sources of NR income 17 Benefits produced 18 Resource trends 19 Resource targets **Key to performance indicators** weak/bad reasonable good Performance is assessed on a scoring system from zero (none) to a maximum of between 3 and 6 (strong/excellent) depending on the

Indicators 1-17 reflect the performance of the management team in place in the conservancy and an efficient team can achieve a good rating in all 17 indicators.


Indicators 18 & 19 are influenced by external factors and are not considered a reflection of conservancy management. They indicate the current status of wildlife in the conservancy in relation to a theoretical optimal situation.

Human wildlife conflict Human wildlife conflict trend



Most troublesome problem animals 2018-2020 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




Type of damage by problem animals 2018-2020


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 type

400



Poaching







Wildlife removals - quota use and value

Potential value estimates (N\$) for a single animal:

· 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

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

| | | Quota 2020 | | Animals actually used in 2020 | | | | | Pote | ntial | | |
|---|-----------|------------|--------|-------------------------------|--------|-------------------------|---------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|------------------------|
| | Species | Total | Trophy | Other Use | Trophy | Own Use & Premium | Snoot & | Capture & Sale | Problem Animal | Total Use | Trophy Value N\$ | Other use Value N\$ |
| | Baboon | 5 | 5 | | | | | | | | 600 | |
| | Eland* | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | 6,964 |
| | Giraffe | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 10,600 | |
| | Leopard | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 38,900 | |
| | Ostrich | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 2,000 | 810 |
| | Springbok | 10 | 6 | 4 | | | | | | | 2,700 | 702 |
| | Mtn Zebra | 4 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | 6,300 | 4,482 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ı | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Omatendeka

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

Natural Resource Report continued...

A2

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

Key to wildlife status





Wildlife status summary in 2020

Vegetation monitoring


Green vegetation index (NDVI). Maps show vegetation cover during Feb-Apr of the current year and the difference between the current year and the long-term average (2003-2019)

NDVI 2020






Wildlife mortalities




Locally rare species



Locally rare 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 flags 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











Omatendeka Institutional Report

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



Enabling wise conservancy governance...

Conservancy Statistics

Date Registered:March 2003Population (2011 census):1720Size (square kilometres):1619Registered members:760

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 | 3 | 12 |
| Attendance at AGM | | | |
| Date of the last AGM: | | | |
| Date of the next AGM: | | | |
| Other important issues | | | |
| Budget approved? | | | |
| Work plan approved? | | | |
| Annual conservancy report approved? | | | |
| | | | |

Benefit Distribution

| Type Cash Benefits | Description Cash To Members | Beneficiary People | Number 760 |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| Social Benefits | Funeral Assistance | Households | 8 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Employment

| | Male | Female | Total |
|---------------------------------------|------|--------|-------|
| Conservancy staff (Incl. CGG & CRM) | 12 | 2 | 14 |
| Number of Community Game Guards | 9 | | 9 |
| Number of Community Resource Monitors | | | |
| Lodge staff | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| | | | |

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

| Performance Category | | | This Year | Prev. Year | Explanation of performance category | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|--------------|---------------|---|-------------|--|-----|--|--|
| 1 Member engagement | | | | | The conservancy is adequately engaging its members | | | | | |
| 2a Benefit planning | | | | | The conservancy developed its BDP in a transparent and participatory manner | | | | | |
| 2b Benefit distribution | | | | | The conservancy distributes benefits to its members in a fair, transparent and equitable manner | | | | | |
| 3 Accountability | | | | | Conservancy members are holding the management committee accountable | | | | | |
| 4 Compliance | | | | | The conservancy is compliant with the standard operating proceedures (SOPs) | | | | | |
| 5 Stakeholder engagement | | | | | The conservancy maintains relationships with key external stakeholders | | | | | |
| 6 Financial management | | | | | The conservancy is effectively managing its finances | | | | | |
| Colour codes: | none | weak | modera | te | strong | exceptional | | N/A | | |