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## 1. Introduction

This report provides summarized results and analysis of the annual game count held on the NamibRand Nature Reserve and the Pro-Namib Conservancy on the 25th of May 2019.

A game count briefing was held at the NamibRand Nature Reserve AGM on the day preceding the count where Control Warden Murray Tindall highlighted the objectives of the count and outlined the methodology and rules for the teams who would conduct the count. This helps to ensure consistency over consecutive years and allows a more accurate comparison from year to year.

Previous years data has been entered into a purpose designed database which generates the estimates used in this report in terms of total population, density and biomass. A few minor adjustments have been made to the database in order to improve its accuracy and this has slightly altered the figures for previous years as well as this years' count.

Surprisingly, even though this is the fifth year of drought the population estimates, as well as the overall density, showed marked increases this year. Individual populations of the two major grazers in this ecosystem, oryx and springbok, showed increases of $60 \%$ and $10 \%$ respectively. Overall, there was a significant increase in the majority of the different species populations this year ( $43 \%$ increase). However, the population of Ruppel's Korhaan was the only population that showed a decrease (36\%).

The distribution of animals across the reserve showed a slight trend of migration towards the northern parts of the NamibRand Nature Reserve. The majority of animals were concentrated near the north of the reserve, in plains/grassland areas (Zones 2, 3 and 4). The highest estimated populations of animals were seen in Zones 2 and 3.

It is worth reiterating that this census method is best suited to large plains game such as oryx, springbok and Burchell's zebra and is less suited to smaller species such as steenbok, or species with different habitat requirements such as kudu or mountain zebra. In addition, the estimates provided are intended to give an indication of population numbers and enable a comparison from year to year and may not be an entirely accurate reflection of the actual number of animals on the Reserve.

## 2. Summary

Data collected in the May 2019 game count was entered into our database and analyzed. The results are shown below bearing our three core objectives in mind:

## Objective 1: Population and biomass estimates:

Population estimates:
Table 1. Total number of game seen and the estimated numbers for May 2019.
Total estimated numbers of game (Zone 1-10; May 2019)

| Species | No. Counted | Estimate 2019 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Gemsbok | 1026 | 3480 |
| Springbok | 267 | 1351 |
| Kudu | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 65 | 175 |
| Ludwigs Bustard | 21 | 192 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 24 | 293 |
| B. zebra | 307 | 485 |
| Hartebeest | 16 | 66 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 4 2}$ |
| Giraffe* | 10 | 10 |

* Total numbers known

Biomass estimates
Table 2. Wildlife biomass estimates for May 2019.
Total wildlife numbers and wildlife biomass on NamibRand for May 2019 (Zone 1-10); 224209 ha)

| Species | Mean mass (kg) | Estimated wildlife numbers from <br> May 19 game count | Species <br> biomass (kg) | Biomass per ha (kg) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Gemsbok | 220 | 3480 | 765600 | 4,10 |
| Springbok | 180 | 1351 | 51338 | 0,27 |
| Kudu | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Steenbok | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Ostrich | 300 | 175 | 11900 | 0,06 |
| B. Zebra | 130 | 485 | 145500 | 0,78 |
| Hartebeest | $\mathbf{9 4 7}$ | 66 | 8580 | 0,05 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 5 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 6 2 4 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 2 6}$ |  |

* Total (estimate) numbers known


## Objective 2: Wildlife distribution and density

Table 3. Total number of animals counted per 100 km in each route and the respective density percentage per zone.

| Total no of animals counted per 100 km per route |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Route | Route length <br> $(\mathbf{k m})$ | No of animals <br> counted/100km | \% of total <br> animals counted <br> per 100km |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 61,3 | 131 | $4 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 51 | 286 | $9 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 50,3 | 121 | $4 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 45 | 480 | $15 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 69 | 710 | $22 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 35 | 243 | $8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 55 | 316 | $10 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 56 | 518 | $16 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 52 | 233 | $7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 53 | 177 | $6 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 7 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 1 5}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Objective 3: Population change

Table 4. The overall population estimate has decreased by 3.05\%

Total estimated numbers of game (Zone 1-10; May 2018 - May 2019)

| Species | May-18 |  | May-19 |  | Percentage change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. <br> Counted | Total estimated number | No. Counted | Total estimated number |  |
| Gemsbok | 995 | 3699 | 1026 | 3480 | -5,92\% |
| Springbok | 266 | 1720 | 267 | 1351 | -21,45\% |
| Kudu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,00\% |
| Steenbok | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,00\% |
| Ostrich | 54 | 130 | 65 | 175 | 34,62\% |
| Ludwigs Bustard | 0 | 0 | 21 | 192 | 0,00\% |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 12 | 119 | 24 | 293 | 146,22\% |
| B. zebra | 172 | 497 | 307 | 485 | -2,41\% |
| Hartebeest | 25 | 67 | 16 | 66 | -1,49\% |
| Total | 1524 | 6232 | 1726 | 6042 | -3,05\% |
| Giraffe* | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 11,11\% |

[^0]
## 3. Count Methodology

The primary objectives of the game count are to determine the density and distribution of game and to estimate the total number of game in a given, or total, area. For this reason, the survey methodology used is a combination of the road strip census and game distribution map techniques. In layman's terms, these can be explained as follows:

## Road strip count

This is one of the most effective methods to use when counting in a relatively open and homogenous landscape. For the purposes of the count, the total area is divided into game count zones, each with its own standardized route, as shown in Figure 1 on the next page. The game count zones were, as far as possible, deliberately predetermined into homogenous habitats because the visibility of animals differs in each habitat. Each route forms a strip transect through its zone within which the animals are counted. A transect width of 1 km is used ( 500 m on either side of the road). During the count, all animals on either side of the road are recorded, and the distances (at right angles to the vehicle and road) from the road to the animal or group of animals is recorded. These distance records are important, as they shape the effective strip width (ESW) values, which are automatically adjusted each year when data is entered into the database.
The length of the transect (distance traveled) and its relation to the area represented in the zone is used to calculate the area correction factors for each zone, i.e. area represented/route length $=$ area correction factor. The respective effective strip width (ESW) values and transect width then determines the relevant species correction factors, i.e. transect width (1000m) divided by (ESW x 2 ) = species correction factor. The area correction factors and species correction factors, adjusted by the relevant effective strip widths, i.e. how far each species is readily seen, is then used to calculate the population estimates. So basically, the area correction factor multiplies the number seen up based on the percentage of the area sampled and assumes all animals within 500 m of the transect line are detected. The species correction factor then adjusts this estimate based on the detection curve (ESW) for the species. The correction factors and route distances as used in the 2015 game count methodology, along with the area represented per zone can be seen in table 5 below.

Table 5. Total count areas per zone (ha), route distances, area correction factors, effective strip widths and species correction factors for each species within each zone for 2019.

| Count areas, area correction factors, effective strip widths and species correction factors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route No. | Total area per zone (ha) | Area <br> represented <br> per route$\|$ | Route distance ( km ) | Area correction factor | Species | Effective strip width (m) | Species correction factor | Species | Effective strip width (m) routes 1-10 | Species correction factor (m) routes 1-10 |
| 1 | 18072 | 12513 | 52 | 2,41 | Gemsbok | 392 | 1,28 | Ostrich | 667 | 0,75 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Springbok | 328 | 1,52 | Kudu | 417 | 1,20 |
| 2 | 18310 | 13779 | 52 | 2,65 | Gemsbok | 310 | 1,61 | Steenbok | 51 | 9,80 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Springbok | 226 | 2,21 | Ruppells korhaan | 141 | 3,55 |
| 3 | 27039 | 26424 | 58 | 4,56 | Gemsbok | 463 | 1,08 | Ludwigs bustard | 208 | 2,40 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Springbok | 193 | 2,59 |  |  |  |
| 4 | 21038 | 20996 | 47 | 4,47 | Gemsbok | 622 | 0,80 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Springbok | 479 | 1,04 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 18038 | 17491 | 72 | 2,43 | Gemsbok | 540 | 0,93 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Springbok | 325 | 1,54 |  |  |  |
| 6 | 19352 | 11589 | 34 | 3,41 | Gemsbok | 541 | 0,92 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Springbok | 346 | 1,45 |  |  |  |
| 7 | 28343 | 18833 | 55 | 3,42 | Gemsbok | 509 | 0,98 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Springbok | 263 | 1,90 |  |  |  |
| 8 | 22452 | 19291 | 52 | 3,71 | Gemsbok | 607 | 0,82 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Springbok | 419 | 1,19 |  |  |  |
| 9 | 21710 | 21125 | 50 | 4,23 | Gemsbok | 400 | 1,25 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Springbok | 436 | 1,15 |  |  |  |
| 10 | 29855 | 24721 | 59 | 4,20 | Gemsbok | 324 | 1,54 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Springbok | 501 | 1,00 |  |  |  |
| Total | 224209 | 186762 | 531 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 1. The game count area shows the ten zones used in May 2017 for the NamibRand Nature Reserve (1-8, 10) and the Pro-Namib Conservancy (9).

## Game distribution maps

In order to determine and show the distribution and density of game in the various zones of the count area, monad grids are used to map the locality of the animals counted. Each route is supplied with a map containing the monad, with reference numbers, of the zone in which that route is set as seen in the image below.

During the count the monad grid number in which animal counted is seen, is recorded. This grid number is then used to map the distribution of each recorded animal.

| $\int^{2507-7553}$ | 2507_1554 | 2507_1555 | $2507 \_1556$ | 2507_1557 | 2507_1558 | $2507 \_1559$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2508-7553$ | 2508_1554 | 2508_1555 | 2508_1556 | 2508_1557 | $2508 \_1558$ | 2508_1559 | $2508$ |
| 2509_155 | $2509 \_1554$ | 2509_1555 | 2509_1556 | 2509_1557 | $25091558$ | $2509-1559$ | 2509 |
| 2510_1553 | $\text { 2 } 10 \_1554$ | $2510=1555$ | 2510_1556 | $2510 \_1557$ | 2510_1558 | 2510_1559 | 2510 |
| 2511_1553 |  | 2511_1555 | 2511_1556 | -2511_1557 | 2511_1558 | 2511_1559 | 2511 |
| $2512 \_1553$ | 2512.1654 | $2512 \_1555$ | $2512 \text { _ } 1558$ | 2512_1557 | $2512 \_1558$ | $2512 \_1559$ | 2512 |
| I |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |

Figure 2. Monad maps.

## 4. Objectives and results of the May 2019 count:

## Objective 1: Population and biomass estimates

## Population estimates:

The population estimates for individual species in the total count area are derived from the actual number of animals seen during the count and the relevant species and area correction factors that are applied to that number. The actual numbers seen is multiplied by the relevant area and species correction factors to get the population estimates.

S: Actual number of animals seen*
A: Area correction factor

Formula for calculating population estimates* (S x A) $\times \mathrm{B}=\mathrm{P}$

B: Species correction factor
*Known numbers
Note that where total numbers of species with small populations are known (e.g. for recently introduced species such as red hartebeest, Burchell's zebra and giraffe), these known totals are used for the final population estimates in reference to the above calculated estimates.

The total estimates per species per zone were then combined for all zones in order to determine the total population estimate for each plains game species in the count area (see Table 1 below).

Table 1. Total number of game seen and the estimated numbers for May 2019.

Total estimated numbers of game (Zone 1-10; May 2019)

| Species | No. Counted | Estimate 2019 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Gemsbok | 1026 | 3480 |
| Springbok | 267 | 1351 |
| Kudu | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 65 | 175 |
| Ludwigs Bustard | 21 | 192 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 24 | 293 |
| B. zebra | 307 | 485 |
| Hartebeest | 16 | 66 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 4 2}$ |
| Giraffe* | 9 | 9 |

* Total numbers known

Population estimates are multiplied by the mean weight of the species and divided by the total count area (ha) to get the estimated biomass per species.

E: Estimated wildlife numbers
M: Mean mass per species
H: Total no. of hectares

Formula for calculating biomass estimates
$($ ExM) $\div H=B$

B: Biomass estimate
Biomass estimates are important in terms of managing habitat conditions and inter-specific competition. Note that agricultural Livestock Units (LSU) are not used for determining the biomass of wildlife species, due to differences between domestic and wild animals. These two species are different in aspects such as grazing/browsing patterns and agricultural stocking. LSU are also in a fenced systems opposed to the open, unfenced system within the Reserve.

Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 below show the biomass estimates for this year, and the biomass estimates for previous years compared to this year.

Table 6.1 Wildlife biomass estimates for May 2019.

| Total wildlife numbers and wildlife biomass on NamibRand for May 2019 (Zone 1-10); 224 209 ha) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Species | Mean mass (kg) | Estimated wildlife numbers from <br> May 19 game count | Species <br> biomass (kg) | Biomass per ha (kg) |
| Gemsbok | 220 | 3480 | 765600 | 4,10 |
| Springbok | 38 | 1351 | 51338 | 0,27 |
| Kudu | 180 | 0 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Steenbok | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Ostrich | 68 | 300 | 175 | 11900 |

* Total (estimate) numbers known

The chart in figure 3 below shows the biomass composition of the different species across the total count area for the year 2019.

Figure 3. Biomass composition 2019.


Table 6.2 Wildlife biomass (2019) percentage change compared to the count of May 2018.

| Wildlife biomass on NamibRand for May 2018 and May 2019 (Zone 1-10) ; 224209 ha) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean mass (kg) | May-18 |  |  | May-19 |  |  |  |
| Wildlife species |  | Estimated wildlife numbers from May 2017 game count | Species Biomass (kg) | Biomass per ha (kg) <br> TOTAL | Estimated wildlife numbers from May 2018 game count | Species Biomass (kg) | Biomass per ha (kg) <br> TOTAL | Biomass percentage change |
| Gemsbok | 220 | 3699 | 813780 | 4,36 | 3480 | 765600 | 4,10 | -5,92\% |
| Springbok | 38 | 1720 | 65360 | 0,35 | 1351 | 51338 | 0,27 | -21,45\% |
| Kudu | 180 | 0 | 0 | 0,00 | 0 | 0 | 0,00 | 0.00\% |
| Steenbok | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0,00 | 0 | 0 | 0,00 | 0,00\% |
| Ostrich | 68 | 130 | 8840 | 0,05 | 175 | 11900 | 0,06 | 34,62\% |
| B. zebra | 300 | 497 | 149100 | 0,80 | 485 | 145500 | 0,78 | -2,41\% |
| Red Hartebeest | 130 | 67 | 8710 | 0,05 | 66 | 8580 | 0,05 | -1,49\% |
| Total |  | 6113 | 1045790 | 5,60 | 5557 | 982918 | 5,26 | -6,01\% |

Table 6.3 Wildlife biomass estimates from 2017-2019.
Total wildlife biomass estimates (kg/ha) on NamibRand May 2017 to May 2019

| Wildlife <br> species | May-17 | May-18 | \% change from <br> May-17 | May-19 | \% change from <br> May 18 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Gemsbok | 10,70 | 4,36 | $-59,28 \%$ | 4,10 | $-5,92 \%$ |
| Springbok | 0,62 | 0,35 | $-43,55 \%$ | 0,27 | $-21,45 \%$ |
| Kudu | 0,00 | 0,00 | $-100,00 \%$ | 0,00 | \#DIV/0! |
| Steenbok | 0,00 | 0,00 | $0,00 \%$ | 0,00 | $0,00 \%$ |
| Ostrich | 0,08 | 0,05 | $-40,83 \%$ | 0,06 | $34,62 \%$ |
| B. Zebra | 0,57 | 0,80 | $40,06 \%$ | 0,78 | $-2,41 \%$ |
| Hartebeest | 0,14 | 0,05 | $-66,67 \%$ | 0,05 | $-1,49 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 , 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{- 5 3 , 7 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 3}$ | $\mathbf{- 6 , 0 1 \%}$ |

## Objective 2: Wildlife density and distribution

To calculate the population density, the actual number of animals per species counted in each zone is divided by the respective route length and then multiplied by 100 to get the total number of animals seen per 100 km .

S: Actual number of animals seen
R : Length of route
K: Wildlife density - i.e. Animals seen per 100km driven

## Formula for calculating wildlife density

$(S \div R) \times 100=K$

For the purposes of this report, wildlife distribution is based on the amount of animals seen in each monad. During the game count, each sighting is marked to the corresponding monad the animal(s) was seen in. This data is then used to map the distribution of the animals (i.e. where animals were seen).

Please note that for the total wildlife distribution, all game species counted were used in the (mapping) calculation. The total wildlife (species) distribution and density are shown in the maps below. These densities were calculated using the formula prescribed above.
Note that the data is indicated on a gradient from light (low values) to dark (high values).


Figure 4.1 Total wildlife distribution


Figure 4.2 Total wildlife density


Figure 4.3 Distribution of gemsbok


Figure 4.5 Distribution of springbok


Figure 4.4 Density of gemsbok


Figure 4.6 Density of springbok


Figure 4.7 Distribution of B. zebra


Figure 4.9 Distribution of ostrich


Figure 4.8 Density of B. Zebra


Figure 4.10 Density of ostrich

The population densities and actual number seen for individual species per zone are shown in tables 7.1-7.7 below.

Table 7.1

| Gemsbok <br> Route |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | Route <br> length | Actual number <br> seen | Density |
| 1 | 61,3 | 69 | 112,56 |
| 2 | 51 | 70 | 137,25 |
| 3 | 50,3 | 58 | 115,31 |
| 4 | 45 | 176 | 391,11 |
| 5 | 69 | 362 | 524,64 |
| 6 | 35 | 18 | 51,43 |
| 7 | 55 | 86 | 156,36 |
| 8 | 56 | 84 | 150,00 |
| 9 | 52 | 79 | 151,92 |
| 10 | 53 | 24 | 45,28 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 7 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 4 , 4 7}$ |

Table 7.3

| Ostrich |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route | Route <br> length | Actual number seen | Density |
| 1 | 61,3 | 8 | 13,05 |
| 2 | 51 | 5 | 9,80 |
| 3 | 50,3 | 3 | 5,96 |
| 4 | 45 | 3 | 6,67 |
| 5 | 69 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 6 | 35 | 9 | 25,71 |
| 7 | 55 | 5 | 9,09 |
| 8 | 56 | 3 | 5,36 |
| 9 | 52 | 29 | 55,77 |
| 10 | 53 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Total | 527,6 | 65 | 12,32 |

Table 7.2

| Springbok |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Route | Route <br> length | Actual number <br> seen | Density |
| 1 | 61,3 | 3 | 4,89 |
| 2 | 51 | 61 | 119,61 |
| 3 | 50,3 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 4 | 45 | 5 | 11,11 |
| 5 | 69 | 14 | 20,29 |
| 6 | 35 | 58 | 165,71 |
| 7 | 55 | 25 | 45,45 |
| 8 | 56 | 25 | 44,64 |
| 9 | 52 | 6 | 11,54 |
| 10 | 53 | 70 | $\mathbf{1 3 2 , 0 8}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 7 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 , 6 1}$ |

Table 7.4

| Burchell's zebra |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| Route | Route <br> length | Actual number <br> seen | Density |
| 1 | 61,3 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 2 | 51 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 3 | 50,3 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 4 | 45 | 6 | 13,33 |
| 5 | 69 | 103 | 149,28 |
| 6 | 35 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 7 | 55 | 58 | 105,45 |
| 8 | 56 | 140 | 250,00 |
| 9 | 52 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 10 | 53 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 7 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 , 1 9}$ |

Table 7.5

| Red Hartebeest |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| Route | Route <br> length | Actual number <br> seen | Density |
| 1 | 61,3 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 2 | 51 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 3 | 50,3 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 4 | 45 | 12 | 26,67 |
| 5 | 69 | 4 | 5,80 |
| 6 | 35 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 7 | 55 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 8 | 56 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 9 | 52 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 10 | 53 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Total | 527,6 | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 0 3}$ |

Table 7.6

| Ruppell's korhaan |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| Route | Route <br> length | Actual number <br> seen | Density |
| 1 | 61,3 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 2 | 51 | 2 | 3,92 |
| 3 | 50,3 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 4 | 45 | 4 | 8,89 |
| 5 | 69 | 7 | 10,14 |
| 6 | 35 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 7 | 55 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 8 | 56 | 6 | 10,71 |
| 9 | 52 | 5 | 9,62 |
| 10 | 53 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 7 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 5 5}$ |

Table 7.7

| Ludwig's bustard |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| Route | Route <br> length | Actual number <br> seen | Density |
| 1 | 61,3 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 2 | 51 | 8 | 15,69 |
| 3 | 50,3 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 4 | 45 | 10 | 22,22 |
| 5 | 69 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 6 | 35 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 7 | 55 | 0 | 0,00 |
| 8 | 56 | 1 | 1,79 |
| 9 | 52 | 2 | 3,85 |
| 10 | 53 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 7 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 9 8}$ |

The total wildlife density for all game species (including Ludwig's Bustard and Ruppel's Korhaan) combined in each count zone for May 2019 is shown in Table 8 below, and the percentage distribution in each zone is shown in Figure 5 that follows.

Table 8. Total number of animals counted per 100km for each route in 2019.

| Total no of animals counted per 100 km per route |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Route | Route length <br> $(\mathbf{k m})$ | No of animals <br> counted/100km | \% of total <br> animals counted <br> per 100km |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 61,3 | 131 | $4 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 51 | 286 | $9 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 50,3 | 121 | $4 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 45 | 480 | $15 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 69 | 710 | $22 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 35 | 243 | $8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 55 | 316 | $10 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 56 | 518 | $16 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 52 | 233 | $7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 53 | 177 | $6 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 7 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 1 5}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Percentage of total animals counted per 100km in each route


Figure 5. Population density percentages throughout the count area.

The total wildlife density for all species (including Ludwig's Bustard and Ruppel’s Korhaan) combined per count zone in May 2019, compared to May 2018 and May 2019, is shown in Table 9 below.

Table 9. Total number of animals counted per 100km for each route in 2019 compared to 2018 and 2017.

| Total no of animals counted per 100 km per route (May 2017-May 2019) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Route | May-17 | May-18 |  | May-19 |
| \% change (May-18 to May-19) |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 293 | 76 | 131 | $71,72 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 1775 | 224 | 286 | $27,80 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 979 | 279 | 121 | $-56,53 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 1589 | 409 | 480 | $17,36 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 780 | 381 | 710 | $86,39 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 1597 | 306 | 243 | $-20,63 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 427 | 469 | 316 | $-32,55 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 771 | 198 | 518 | $161,62 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 277 | 302 | 233 | $-22,95 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 91 | 186 | 177 | $-4,65 \%$ |
| Total | 588 | 281 | 327 | $\mathbf{1 6 , 4 2 \%}$ |

Total wildlife population density 2016 to 2018


Figure 6. Total wildlife density change from 2017-2019.

## Objective 3: Population change

The total estimated numbers of game for the May 2019 count is compared to those from previous years to illustrate the population change, and are shown in Tables 10 and 11 below. The overall population estimate has increased by $43 \%$ and the number of animals counted per 100 km per route has increased by $38.42 \%$.

Table 10. Population estimates for 2019 compared to 2018.

| Total estimated numbers of game (Zone 1-10; May 2018 - May 2019) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | May-18 |  | May-19 |  | Percentage change |
| Species | No. Counted | Total estimated number | No. Counted | Total estimated number |  |
| Gemsbok | 995 | 3699 | 1026 | 3480 | -5,92\% |
| Springbok | 266 | 1720 | 267 | 1351 | -21,45\% |
| Kudu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,00\% |
| Steenbok | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,00\% |
| Ostrich | 54 | 130 | 65 | 175 | 34,62\% |
| Ludwigs Bustard | 0 | 0 | 21 | 192 | 0,00\% |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 12 | 119 | 24 | 293 | 146,22\% |
| B. zebra | 172 | 497 | 307 | 485 | -2,41\% |
| Hartebeest | 25 | 67 | 16 | 66 | -1,49\% |
| Total | 1524 | 6232 | 1726 | 6042 | -3,05\% |
| Giraffe | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 11,11\% |

The long term total population estimates are presented in the table below.
Table 11. Population estimates for years 2009-2019.
Total estimated numbers of game (Jun 2009-May 2019)

| Species | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jun-09 } \\ (1-9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jun-10 } \\ (1-9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jun-11 } \\ (1-9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jun-12 } \\ & (1-10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jun-13 } \\ (1-10) \end{gathered}$ | May-14 (1-10) | May-15 (1-10) | May-16 $(1-10)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { May-17 } \\ (1-10) \end{gathered}$ | May-18 (1-10) | May-19 (1-10) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gemsbok | 5069 | 3972 | 6696 | 7493 | 8112 | 9087 | 7447 | 6650 | 10625 | 3699 | 3480 |
| Springbok | 11938 | 7359 | 9968 | 6225 | 5828 | 3024 | 3420 | 2944 | 3243 | 1720 | 1351 |
| Kudu | 31 | 10 | 15 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 733 | 448 | 365 | 748 | 183 | 220 | 218 | 145 | 226 | 130 | 175 |
| Ludwigs Bustard | 53 | 693 | 286 | 285 | 381 | 247 | 119 | 92 | 222 | 0 | 192 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 224 | 210 | 335 | 468 | 388 | 229 | 145 | 362 | 234 | 119 | 293 |
| B. zebra* | 318 | 350 | 370 | 470 | 320 | 352 | 367 | 510 | 509 | 329 | 485 |
| Hartebeest* | 80 | 110 | 125 | 177 | 204 | 197 | 220 | 149 | 174 | 67 | 66 |
| Giraffe* | 4 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 |
| Total population estimate | 18490 | 13160 | 18166 | 15888 | 15427 | 13363 | 11950 | 10861 | 15246 | 6073 | 6052 |
| Blesbok* | 23 | 19 | 18 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% change | 16,13\% | -28,83\% | 38,04\% | -12,54\% | -2,90\% | -13,38\% | -10,57\% | -9,11\% | 40,37\% | -60,17\% | -0,35\% |

The graphs in figure 7.1-7.4 below, show the total long term individual estimate changes for the four most common species. Please note that the figures of these graphs are taken from the respective species estimates from the maximum number of routes counted in each year.

Figure 7.1


Figure 7.2
Springbok population change 2009-2019


Figure 7.3


Figure 7.4
Red hartebeest population change 2009 2019


The graph in Figure 8 below shows long term total population estimate change compared to the average annual rainfall received for the same period. Please note that as with the previous graphs, the figure for this graph was taken from the total population estimates and from the maximum number of routes counted in each year.

Figure 8. Total population change 2005 to 2019 compared to average rainfall.


## 5. Discussion and conclusions

## Gemsbok

Interestingly while the number of actual gemsbok seen was slightly higher than the previous year, the estimated population was slightly lower. This can happen if the animals were closer to the road and therefore easier to see and be certain of the total numbers in each herd. When the species correction factor is applied there is no accounting for any observation error and the estimated population is closer to the actual number counted.

The results of the 2019 gemsbok population estimate show a decrease of 5.92\% (3,480 gemsbok) from last year's estimate (3,699 gemsbok).

The highest density of gemsbok was recorded in Zone 5, which had a total of 524 gemsbok per 100 km . This is consistent with the previous year indicating a preference for the habitat found in this zone. The second highest density of gemsbok was in Zone 4 ( 391 gemsbok per 100 km ). This distribution pattern is closer to the long term trend and shows a definite shift from the 2017 count where animals were concentrated in the plains in the northern parts of the Reserve.

## Springbok

Similar to the population estimates of gemsbok, the actual number of Springbok seen was almost exactly the same as the previous year and yet the estimated population showed a marked decrease. This can be explained for the reasons listed above.

The estimated number of springbok for this year is 1,351 , which is a decrease of $21.45 \%$ from last year's estimate of 1,720 .

The springbok were predominantly concentrated in Zones 6, 10 and 2. This distribution pattern is almost the opposite of the gemsbok distribution and shows how the habitat selection of the two animals keeps them from direct competition for food.

## Ostrich

This year's ostrich population estimate is 175 . This is an $34.62 \%$ increase from last year's population estimate of 130 . The majority of the sightings were in Zone 9 ( 29 ostrich) followed by zones 6 and 1 ( 9 and 8 ostrich respectively).

## Burchell's Zebra

This year, a total of 307 zebra were counted to give a total estimated population of 485.

## Red Hartebeest

The estimated number of red hartebeest increased from 149 in 2016 to 174 in 2017, a $16.78 \%$ increase. This population estimate however might be a bit low, because they were only seen in two zones. There was 61 hartebeest seen in Zone 2 and only 1 seen in Zone 5.

## Giraffe

There were no giraffe sightings during this year's game count. Although there were no sightings there are regular sightings that suggest there are 9 giraffes on the reserve. There are 6 giraffes in the southern parts of the reserve, and 3 found in the northern parts of the reserve. It is unlikely that the population of giraffes will change in the near future, because the cows and bulls were separated during the relocation of a group of 4 to the southern part of the reserve.
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## 7. Appendix

## Results per count route per zone

Tables 12.1 to 12.11 list the data collected on each route in May 2019, which were used as a basis for the analysis.

Table 12.1

| Route 1 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Species | Route length | Total number <br> counted | Density | Estimated <br> population |
| Gemsbok | 61,3 | 69 | 113 | 180 |
| Springbok | 61,3 | 3 | 5 | 9 |
| Kudu | 61,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 61,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 61,3 | 8 | 13 | 12 |
| Ludwig's Bustard | 61,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 61,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| B. zebra | 61,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hartebeest | 61,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 1 , 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ |
| Jackal* |  | 2 |  |  |
| H. Zebra* |  | 19 |  |  |

*Not included in count

Table 12.2

| Route 2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Species | Route length | Total number <br> counted | Density | Estimated <br> population |
| Gemsbok | 51 | 70 | 137 | 305 |
| Springbok | 51 | 61 | 120 | 365 |
| Kudu | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 51 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| Ludwig's Bustard | 51 | 8 | 16 | 52 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 51 | 2 | 4 | 19 |
| B. zebra | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hartebeest | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |
| Lappet Faced Vulture* |  | 1 |  |  |

[^1]Table 12.3

| Route 3 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Species | Route length | Total number <br> counted | Density <br> Estimated <br> population |  |
| Gemsbok | 50,3 | 58 | 115 | 329 |
| Springbok | 50,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kudu | 50,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 50,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 50,3 | 3 | 6 | 12 |
| Ludwig's Bustard | 50,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 50,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| B. zebra | 50,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hartebeest | 50,3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 0 , 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 1}$ |

Table 12.4

| Route 4 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Species | Route length | Total number <br> counted | Density | Estimated <br> population |
| Gemsbok | 45 | 176 | 391 | 660 |
| Springbok | 45 | 5 | 11 | 24 |
| Kudu | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 45 | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| Ludwig's Bustard | 45 | 10 | 22 | 112 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 45 | 4 | 9 | 66 |
| B. zebra | 45 | 6 | 13 | 14 |
| Hartebeest | 45 | 12 | 27 | 56 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 4 2}$ |
| Bat Eared Fox* |  | 3 |  |  |
| Lappet Faced Vulture* |  | 1 |  |  |

[^2]Table 12.5

| Route 5 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Species | Route length | Total number <br> counted | Density | Estimated <br> population |
| Gemsbok | 69 | 362 | 525 | 850 |
| Springbok | 69 | 14 | 20 | 55 |
| Kudu | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ludwig's Bustard | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 69 | 7 | 10 | 63 |
| B. zebra | 69 | 103 | 149 | 131 |
| Hartebeest | 69 | 4 | 6 | 10 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0 9}$ |
| Jackal* |  | 1 |  |  |
| Lappet Faced Vulture* |  | 4 |  |  |

${ }^{*}$ Not included in count

Table 12.6

| Route 6 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | Route length | Total number counted | Density | Estimated population |
| Gemsbok | 35 | 18 | 51 | 55 |
| Springbok | 35 | 58 | 166 | 278 |
| Kudu | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 35 | 9 | 26 | 22 |
| Ludwig's Bustard | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| B. zebra | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hartebeest | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 35 | 85 | 243 | 355 |
| Jackal* |  | 4 |  |  |
| Bat Eared Fox* |  | 3 |  |  |
| H. Zebra* |  | 6 |  |  |

[^3]Table 12.7

| Route 7 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Species | Route length | Total number <br> counted | Density | Estimated <br> population |
| Gemsbok | 55 | 86 | 156 | 289 |
| Springbok | 55 | 25 | 45 | 163 |
| Kudu | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 55 | 5 | 9 | 0 |
| Ludwig's Bustard | 55 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| B. zebra | 55 | 58 | 105 | 0 |
| Hartebeest | 55 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 6}$ | 0 |
| Giraffe* |  | 1 |  | $\mathbf{5 6 4}$ |

*Not included in count

Table 12.8

| Route 8 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | Route length | Total number counted | Density | Estimated population |
| Gemsbok | 56 | 84 | 150 | 238 |
| Springbok | 50 | 25 | 50 | 103 |
| Kudu | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 50 | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| Ludwig's Bustard | 50 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 50 | 6 | 12 | 73 |
| B. zebra | 50 | 140 | 280 | 241 |
| Hartebeest | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 50 | 259 | 518 | 671 |

Table 12.9

| Route 9 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | Route length | Total number counted | Density | Estimated population |
| Gemsbok | 52 | 79 | 152 | 401 |
| Springbok | 52 | 6 | 12 | 28 |
| Kudu | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 52 | 29 | 56 | 88 |
| Ludwig's Bustard | 52 | 2 | 4 | 20 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 52 | 5 | 10 | 72 |
| B. zebra | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hartebeest | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 52 | 121 | 233 | 609 |

Table 12.10

| Route 10 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | Route length | Total number counted | Density | Estimated population |
| Gemsbok | 53 | 24 | 45 | 173 |
| Springbok | 53 | 70 | 132 | 326 |
| Kudu | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ludwig's Bustard | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| B. zebra | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hartebeest | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 53 | 94 | 177 | 499 |

Table 12.11

| Total number of Game |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Species | Total Route <br> length | Total number <br> counted | Density | Estimated <br> population |
| Gemsbok | 527,6 | 1026 | 194 | 3480 |
| Springbok | 527,6 | 267 | 51 | 1351 |
| Kudu | 527,6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steenbok | 527,6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ostrich | 527,6 | 65 | 12 | 175 |
| Ludwig's Bustard | 527,6 | 21 | 4 | 192 |
| Ruppel's Korhaan | 527,6 | 24 | 5 | 293 |
| B. zebra* | 527,6 | 307 | 58 | 485 |
| Hartebeest* | 527,6 | 16 | 3 | 66 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 2 7 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 4 2}$ |
| Jackal** |  | 7 |  |  |
| Bat Eared Fox** |  | 6 |  |  |
| Giraffe** |  | 1 |  |  |
| Lappet Faced Vulture** |  | 6 |  |  |
| H. Zebra** |  | 25 |  |  |


[^0]:    * Total (estimate) numbers known

[^1]:    *Not included in count

[^2]:    *Not included in count

[^3]:    *Not included in count

