

Sheya Shuushona **Natural Resource Report**




maximising wildlife returns by minimising threats...

Human wildlife conflict Performance Indicators Management performance in 2022 Human wildlife conflict trend **Performance** 1 Adequate staffing Leopard 2 Adequate expenditure Elephant 200 3 Audit attendance 180 160 4 NR management plan 140 5 Zonation 120 100 6 Leadership 80 60 7 Display of material 40 8 Event Book modules 20 9 Event Book quality 10 Compliance 11 Game census 12 Reporting & adaptive management 13 Law enforcement 14 Human Wildlife Conflict 90 80 15 Harvesting management 70 60 16 Sources of NR income 50 40 17 Benefits produced 30 20 18 Resource trends 19 Resource targets Elephant **Key to performance indicators** weak/bad reasonable good Performance is assessed on a scoring system from zero (none) to a 200 maximum of between 3 and 6 (strong/excellent) depending on the 150 Indicators 1-17 reflect the performance of the management team in 100


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.




Most troublesome problem animals 2020-2022

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 2020-2022

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







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

| ta doc and | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|--------------|--------|-------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|------------------------|
| | (| Quota 2022 | 2 | | Anin | nals actua | ılly used i | n 2022 | | Poter | ntial |
| Species | Total | Trophy | Other Use | Trophy | Own Use & Premium | Snoot & | | Problem Animal | Total Use | Trophy Value N\$ | Other use Value N\$ |
| Duiker | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | 8,200 | |
| Elephant* | 0.33 | 0.33 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 304,700 | |
| Ostrich | 4 | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | 15,400 | 810 |
| Springbok | 40 | 5 | 35 | | 3 | | | | 3 | 2,800 | 702 |
| Steenbok | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | 3,300 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |


Sheya...


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






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











Sheya Shuushona Institutional Report

С

Enabling wise conservancy governance...

Conservancy Statistics

Date Registered: September 2005

Population (2011 census): 2960

Size (square kilometres): 5067

Registered members: 35400

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 | | 12 | 20 | |
| | 57 | 76 | 133 | |
| | 03/12/2022 | | | |
| : | Nov-23 | | | |
| s | | | | |
| dget approved? | ✓ | | | |
| plan approved? | ✓ | | | |
| eport approved? | ✓ | | | |
| | | | | |
| | : s idget approved? plan approved? | ent committee 8 57 03/12/2022 Nov-23 s udget approved? | ent committee 8 12 57 76 03/12/2022 Nov-23 s udget approved? | ent committee 8 12 20 57 76 133 03/12/2022 Nov-23 s idget approved? |

Benefit Distribution

| Type Meat Distribution Other Benefits | Description Game Meat Hwc Offset | Beneficiary Schools Farmers | Number 2 |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| Other Delicins | Meat To Ta | Ta | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Employment

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

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 | |