

maximising wildlife returns by minimising threats...

Performance Indicators

Management performance in 2021

| Category | 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 indicator.

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

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

Most troublesome problem animals 2019-2021

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 2019-2021

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

Poaching

Number of incidents per year

Commercial poaching is a serious threat to conservancy benefits. The chart shows the number of incidents per category

Traps and firearms recovered

number of incidents per category

Arrests and convictions

number of incidents per category

Wildlife removals – quota use and value


| Potential value estimates (N\$) for a single animal: | Species | Quota 2021 | | | Animals actually used in 2021 | | | | | | Potential | |
|--|-----------|------------|--------|-----------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------|
| | | Total | Trophy | Other Use | Trophy | Own Use & Premium | Shoot & Sell | Capture & Sale | Problem Animal | Total Use | Trophy Value N\$ | Other use Value N\$ |
| <div><div>Potential trophy value</div><div>the average trophy value for that species in the conservancy landscape</div><div>trophy values vary depending on trophy quality, international recognition of the hunting operator and the hunting area</div><div>Potential other use value</div><div>the average live sale value of each high value species (indicated with an *). High value species are never used for meat</div><div>Fractions of animals indicate that a quota of 1 animal was awarded with conditions i.e.</div><div>a) over a period of several years and/or</div><div>b) is shared with other conservancies</div></div> | Gemsbok | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 2,916 |
| | Springbok | 45 | | 45 | | | | | | | | 702 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Effective monitoring is key to understanding the status of wildlife in the conservancy and for the effective management of these resources.


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




Wildlife introductions



Wildlife mortalities




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.

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



Predator monitoring



Wildlife provides a wide range of benefits. Some wildlife can cause conflicts, but all wildlife is of value to tourism, trophy hunting and a healthy environment.

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: | February 2001 |
| Population (2011 census): | 50 |
| Size (square kilometres): | 96 |
| Registered members: | 17 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| 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 | Description | Beneficiary | Number |
| Community Devp. | Backyard Gardens | Households | 21 |
| Meat Distribution | Meat To Members | Households | |
| Other Benefits | Meat To Ta | Ta | |

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

Governance Performance Rating

How well did the conservancy perform in the past year?

| <i>Performance Category</i> | <i>This Year</i> | <i>Prev. Year</i> | <i>Explanation of performance category</i> |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---|
| 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 |