


Ongongo Natural Resource Report



maximising wildlife returns by minimising threats...



Wildlife removals – quota use and value

| Potential value estimates (N\$) for a | Ostrich 2 Springbok 4 | 2 | Animals actually used in 2022 | | | | | Potential | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------|-------------------------------|--------------|--------|---------|---------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|------------------------|
| single animal: • Potential trophy value - the average | Species | Total | Trophy | Other Use | Trophy | | Shoot & | Capture & Sale | Problem Animal | Total Use | Trophy Value N\$ | Other use Value N\$ |
| trophy value for that species in the conservancy landscape | Ostrich | 2 | | 2 | | Premium | | | | | | 810 |
| trophy values vary depending on trophy quality, international recognition of the hunting operator and the hunting area | Springbok | 4 | | 4 | | | | | | | | 702 |
| Potential other use value - the average 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 yearsand/orb) is shared with other conservancies | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Ongongo

Natural Resource Report continued...


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

A2


monitoring numbers and trends for a healthy conservancy...

Current wildlife numbers and status






Wildlife introductions



Wildlife mortalities




No change

No change,

rarely recorded

Increasing

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











Ongongo 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:February 2012Population (2011 census):680Size (square kilometres):501Registered members:378

Key Compliance Requirements

Was an AGM held?

Were elections held?

Were benefits distributed according to the BDP?

Is game managed according to the GMUP?

Was the financial report presented and approved?

Conservancy Governance

| Number of management committee | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------------------------------|------------|--------|-------|
| members | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| Attendance at AGM | | | |
| Atteriuance at AGIVI | | | |
| Date of the last AGM: | 01/12/2022 | | |
| Date of the next AGM: | Jul-23 | | |
| Other important issues | | | |
| Budget approved? | 4 | | |
| Work plan approved? | ✓ | | |
| Annual conservancy report approved? | ✓ | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Benefit Distribution

| Type Other Benefits | Description Hwc Offset | Beneficiary Members | Number 132 |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Employment

| | Male | Female | Total | |
|---------------------------------------|------|--------|-------|--|
| Conservancy staff (Incl. CGG & CRM) | 5 | 0 | 5 | |
| Number of Community Game Guards | 5 | 0 | 5 | |
| Number of Community Resource Monitors | | | | |
| | | | | |

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

| Performance Category | | | | 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 mana | gement | | | | The conservancy is effectively managing its finances | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Colour codes: | none | weak | modera | ite | strong | exceptional | | N/A | | |