4th People and Parks Conference:
Richards Bay 2010

CONFERENCE REPORT

Directorate: Protected Areas Planning and Development
This report presents an overview of the fourth People and Parks Conference held in Richards Bay from the 29th August to the 1st September 2010.

The conference included detailed presentations and discussions by invited guests, community representatives and government officials. This report has been prepared so as to provide a summary of this content in a user friendly and informative way. Content has been taken directly from presentations and speeches and summarized where appropriate. The aim of this report is to provide a detailed account of the conference proceedings to support an ongoing engagement with the learning’s of the event. Conference content has not been interpreted, simply presented in a user-friendly manner.
### Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBBEE</td>
<td>Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Operations Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Convention on Biological Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBNRM</td>
<td>Community Based Natural Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Community Property Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRDP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Rural Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPWP</td>
<td>Expanded Public Works Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCAs</td>
<td>Indigenous and Community Conservation Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Integrated Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>The World Conservation Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>KwaZulu Natal Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEDET</td>
<td>Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHWP</td>
<td>Lesotho Highlands Water Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEC</td>
<td>Member of Executive Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METT</td>
<td>Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINTEC</td>
<td>The Ministerial Technical Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPTA</td>
<td>Mpumalanga Parks and Tourism Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARYSEC</td>
<td>National Rural Youth Service Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBF</td>
<td>National Biodiversity Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTL</td>
<td>National House of Traditional Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPAES</td>
<td>National Protected Areas Expansion Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoWPA</td>
<td>Programme of Work on Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLCC</td>
<td>Regional Land Claims Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALGA</td>
<td>South African Local Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANBI</td>
<td>South African National Biodiversity Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANParks</td>
<td>South African National Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRPP</td>
<td>Social Responsibility Policy and Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDESD</td>
<td>United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WfW</td>
<td>Working for Water Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

The 4th National People and Parks Conference, organised by the Department of Environmental Affairs, was held at the University of Zululand, KwaZulu Natal Province from the 29th August to the 1st September 2010. The conference aimed to take stock of progress since the 2008 conference in Mafikeng, as well as to reconfirm the centrality of the People and Parks Programme in the national transformation and development agenda for the Biodiversity Sector. Delegates were welcomed to Richards Bay by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Zululand Prof Fikile Mazibuko and the Mayor of Umhalthuze Local Municipality: Mayor Zakhele Mngayi. Conference proceedings were opened by the honourable Minister of Water and Environmental Affairs, Ms Buyelwa Sonjica and His Majesty, King Goodwill Zwelitini.

The conference covered a broad range of issues with a view to celebrating and showcasing success stories for future replication, as well as identifying concerns in the existing programmes and sharing lessons learnt as a means for addressing the remaining challenges. Strategic partnerships were acknowledged through the signing of the Kids in Parks Memorandum of Understanding between Pick ’n Pay, the Ministry of Water and Environmental Affairs, the Ministry of Basic Education and SANParks. The conference also launched the National Co-Management Framework. Most importantly, however, the conference provided a platform for People and Parks stakeholders to engage with ongoing programme concerns.

The conference proceedings are summarized under six broad headings:

1. People and Parks Programmes in a South African context;
2. People and Parks Programmes in an International context;
3. Community concerns regarding People and Parks Programmes;
4. Five thematic areas aimed at improving People and Parks Programmes;
5. Site visits to People and Parks Programmes in KwaZulu Natal;
6. The way forward.

1. People and Parks in a South African context

The conference opened with a series of presentations outlining the context within which People and Parks Programmes take place. The Honourable Minister, Ms Buyelwa Sonjica, and the Honourable Deputy Minister, Mme Rejoice Mabudafhasi, outlined details of the governments transformation agenda on biodiversity and conservation and the history of the People and Parks Programme. Presentations were also made regarding the need for linkages between the national agenda for people and parks, and the national agenda for basic education, rural development and land reform, and fundraising. The Chief Executive Officer of SANParks provided a summary of the interrelationships between people and parks in his presentation ‘healthy people, healthy parks’.
These presentations were followed by an overview of strategic partnerships relating to the People and Parks Programme, namely a look at the role of education in conservation by an advisor to the Minister of Basic Education, Ms Linda Chisholm; and an exploration of strategic funding partners with presentations by Mr Gareth Ackerman – Chairperson of Pick n Pay, and Professor Nevhutanga – Chairperson of the National Lotteries Board.

Ms Tumi Seboka, a representative for the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform, completed the series of presentations on understanding contextual issues by outlining the Department of Rural Development and Land Reforms Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP). In doing so, Ms Seboka outlined the relationship between the CRDP and Outcome 7: ‘Vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security for all’. The presentation aimed to contextualise the People and Parks Programme in relation to rural development strategies, and in particular, in relation to two principle components of the department’s rural development strategy, namely their rural job creation model and the National Rural Youth Service Corps concept.

These presentations outlined the importance of understanding and addressing contextual issues such as poverty, food security, capacity building, traditional knowledge, scientific knowledge, climate change, governance, politics and fundraising. These issues all impact directly on the success of People and Parks Programmes as they determine the context within which the programmes are implemented. Without co-ordinated and sustainable responses to contextual issues, programmes will struggle to achieve their overarching goals for conservation, poverty relief and a vibrant and healthy rural socio-economic and ecological landscape.

2. People and Parks in an International Context

Two international guests, Mr Ashish Kothari from the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and Ms Refiloe Ntsohi from the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture in Lesotho, were invited to the conference to share learning’s from People and Parks projects around the world. These two presentations provided an international context regarding the global significance of People and Parks type programmes, and highlighted some of the challenges and successes of these programmes internationally.

Mr Kothari’s presentation outlined international trends in indigenous and community conservation areas (ICCAs). He noted the important work that has been done in South Africa with regard to developing sound People and Parks Programmes.

Mr Kothari’s opening remarks highlighted the need to add “by the people” to the People and Parks slogan “conservation for the people, with the people”. He outlined that such additional emphasis would further encourage an understanding of community based conservation as being about more than simply co-management, but also including conservation activities by communities capacitated to take responsibility for conservation on their own – within their communities as well as on claimed land.
Mr Kothari’s address focused on outlining some of the most important principles governing community conservation areas and partnerships, providing examples of successful community conservation areas from around the world, looking at the international significance of community conservation areas and assessing the status of community conservation areas internationally.

Ms Refiloe Ntsohi representing the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture, Lesotho, presented a case study outlining the history of protected areas and their management in Lesotho. The presentation looked at land use practices in Lesotho, and the extent to which traditional livelihood choices influences the interaction between people and protected areas in Lesotho. The presentation concluded with a summary of lessons learnt from efforts at developing protected areas able to respond to community concerns in Lesotho.

3. Community concerns regarding People and Parks Programmes

Community representatives from all nine provinces convened in the afternoon before the conference opened to table their concerns relating to People and Parks Programmes. Each province presented a list of concerns. The concerns varied according to regional governance and funding trends, as well as the individual experiences of different communities. Community representatives convened again on Day 2 of the conference, and took a decision to formally present their concerns to the conference.

The decision for community representatives to present their full list of concerns to the conference delegates was a solution to the growing levels of frustration amongst community representatives at the absence of the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform. The concerns were presented by the National Steering Committee Chairperson, Mr Mhlaba, during Plenary Session 3 on Day 2. The following issues emerged as being the most pressing concerns affecting all provinces:

- **Funding** – with a particular emphasis on resources to support the operation of community representative structures in each province, and resources to support community based initiatives.

- **Land Reform** - with a particular emphasis on the slow rate of land reform processes and the need to fast track title deed processes following the settlement of land claims.

- **Co-management** - with a particular emphasis on the need for equal partnerships in co-management arrangements.

- **Job creation and beneficiation** – or more specifically the lack thereof.

- **Transparency** – with a particular emphasis on the need for more regular communication from government departments outlining the details of decisions taken affecting People and Parks Programmes.
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- **Commitment** from government to follow through on promises made; and

- **Capacity Building** – with a particular emphasis on long term capacity building to support a holistic range of subjects, including financial management, legal issues and conservation science.

Representatives from each provincial management authority responded to the concerns raised by Mr Mhlaba. The responses referred to specific issues raised by each province, as well as some general remarks regarding the process of working together with communities on People and Parks Programmes. Each province expressed their concern regarding the issues raised by Mr Mhlaba on behalf of communities, and agreed that there are many problems that both communities and government structures need to address. Some examples were given of instances in which concerns have been successfully dealt with, but overall there was a commitment to continue to work towards improving the People and Parks Programmes.

The following responses emerged as being important to all protected area management authorities:

- **Dialogue** – emphasis was placed on the importance of continuing dialogue between community structures and protected area management authorities.

- **Support for community structures** – management authorities recognised the importance of supporting community structures and raised concerns about how to ensure the necessary financial resources and capacity building support are made available to communities.

- **Job creation** - it was noted that many jobs have been created through People and Parks Programmes, but it was also conceded that more jobs are needed.

- **Intergovernmental co-ordination** - management authorities recognised the need for more effective intergovernmental co-ordination, particularly with the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform.

- **Post settlement support** – it was agreed that additional resources are needed to ensure post settlement support programmes are successful.

- **Strategic interventions** – Mpumalanga Tourism and Parks Agency outlined the need for People and Parks Programmes to have a clear vision, an implementable action plan and adequate resources to be successful.

- **Leadership and accountability** – it was agreed by all management authorities that strong leadership and accountability structures in both government and community structures is important for the success of People and Parks Programmes.
4. Five Thematic Areas

Five thematic areas were identified as being critical to the success of People and Parks Programmes. These themes were expanded from the thematic areas identified in Mafikeng (2008) in an attempt to include a broader range of issues affecting the co-management of protected areas. The five areas identified were:

1. Strengthening of the protected area network.
2. Rural development in the context of protected areas.
3. Land reform and co-management of protected areas.
4. Capacity building, awareness and education for co-management.
5. Sustainable financing mechanisms and partnerships for conservation.

The thematic areas were tabled by the Department of Environmental Affairs and on Day 3 conference delegates separated into five groups to discuss them in detail. The discussion groups were representative of a range of People and Parks stakeholders, including community representatives and government officials from all provinces, members of Cabinet (Deputy Minister), members of the KwaZulu Natal Provincial Legislature and representatives from non-governmental organizations and international organizations.

These parallel sessions focused on unpacking what has worked, what has not worked, and what actions need to be taken to find a way forward for each thematic area. Discussions were wide ranging, including individual experiences and broader learning’s. These discussions were then summarized and presented to the rest of the delegates on the final day of the conference. These actions make up the beginning of the framework for a plan of action for the People and Parks Programme 2010.

5 Site Visits to People and Parks Programmes in KwaZulu Natal

Following the thematic discussion breakaway groups, delegates were given the opportunity to visit three of KwaZulu Natal’s best examples of People and Parks Programme initiatives. These included visiting iSimangaliso Wetland Park, Nselweni Bush Camp, and Somkhanda. The purpose of visiting these sites was to see successful examples of co-management agreements between communities and protected areas. The visits were intended to offer inspiration and best practice learning to the delegates. Delegates were given an opportunity to ask questions to community representatives benefiting from the agreements and to the park officials. Information sharing and a tour of each site’s tourist attractions were made allowing delegates to learn while enjoying the offerings of the protected areas.
6. **The Way Forward**

The conference was closed by a detailed response to the conference discussions by the honourable Deputy Minister of Water and Environmental Affairs, Mme Rejoice Mabudafhasi. The honourable Deputy Minister introduced her concluding remarks by noting three important achievements of the fourth people and parks conference:

1. Clear presentations of **community concerns** and frustrations regarding the slow pace of implementation of People and Parks Programmes;

2. **Site visits** to three people and parks projects in KwaZulu Natal to share learning’s with all delegates from successful People and Parks Programmes and demonstrate the value in sharing best practice learning across provinces;

3. **International best practice** presentations to assist delegates to locate their challenges and successes in relation to a broader international context.

The honourable Deputy Minister noted the importance of proactively engaging with community concerns and protected area management concerns. She also highlighted the importance of the five proposed thematic areas discussed during the conference as being crucial to the success of people and parks issues.

Based on these concerns the honourable Deputy Minister presented on behalf of the Department of Environmental Affairs a list of commitments to this conference and the communities who await its results with keen interest:

1. To work towards the promotion of **healthy and sound relations** amongst all the parties to the People and Parks Programme as in communities, the government and the agencies and individual parks.

2. The **mobilisation of resources** (including financial) to help unlock the many blockages that have frustrated the best efforts amongst the parties.

3. To build a strong and people and parks **structures** (for coordination and implementation purposes) at all levels to ensure the meaningful engagement and participation of parties in all activities based on the principles of corporate governance and respect for each other’s roles.

4. To further explore the model of **community support** that was presented by Mpumalanga during the conference as a best practice for community support and engage all other provinces with a view to sharing Mpumalanga’s best practices and adopting broad guidelines for supporting communities. Once adopted, the National Department of Environmental Affairs will be charged with the responsibility of monitoring the implementation of the guidelines.

5. To build on the successes of the **Kids and Parks** programme and mainstream it within the broader People and Parks Programme.
6. To undertake nationwide **feasibility studies** within the protected areas.

7. To use Resource Africa’s theatre team as ambassadors of the People and Park brand and for the purpose of popularising it within parks communities and nationally.

8. To convene a national **People and Parks Coordinating Forum** constituted by the National Department of Environmental Affairs, the Community Representatives Executive Steering Committee and Provincial Departments and Agencies.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The fourth People and Parks Conference convened from the 29th August to the 1st September 2010 in King Bekuzulu Hall at the University of Zululand, Richards Bay KwaZulu Natal Province. The conference follows on from the third conference held in Mafikeng, North West Province in 2008 as part of the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) programme of work on People and Parks.

The conference was convened to take stock of the progress made with the implementation of the People and Parks Programme since 2003, with a specific focus on progress made since 2008. The conference aimed to celebrate and showcase success stories from around the country for further replication in other provinces and to share lessons learnt from all projects as a means of addressing the remaining challenges. The conference also sought to acknowledge existing strategic partnerships and to develop new ones to support the People and Parks Programme.

The overarching goal of the conference was to reconfirm the centrality of the People and Parks Programme to the national transformation and development agenda for the Biodiversity Sector and provide a platform for engagement amongst People and Parks stakeholders around ongoing concerns.

In summary, the conference aimed to:

- Take stock of the progress;
- Celebrate and showcase the success stories for future replication;
- Share lessons learnt as a means to addressing remaining challenges;
- Acknowledge existing strategic partnerships and develop new ones to support the People and Parks Programme;
- Reconfirm the centrality of the People and Parks Programme in the national transformation and development agenda for the Biodiversity Sector; and
- Provide a platform for People and Parks stakeholders to engage with ongoing programme concerns.

1.1 Conference Agenda

1.1.1 Day 1
The conference was opened by a gala dinner for all delegates. The gala dinner centred on addresses by the honourable Minister of Water and Environmental Affairs, Ms Buyelwa Sonjica and His Majesty, King Goodwill Zwelitini.
Prior to the conference, representatives from all community trusts and organisations met to discuss their concerns and co-ordinate their engagement with conference proceedings. This meeting was not minuted as part of the conference, but the resolutions of the discussion were presented by the community on Day 2 in the form of a list of community concerns.

The rest of the conference was divided into three plenary sessions on day two, a plenary session and three concurrent site visits on day three, and two plenary sessions on day four. The plenary sessions covered a broad range of themes and discussions, including presentations by international guests, provincial departments and community representatives and addresses by the Honourable Minister, Ms Buyelwa Sonjica and the Honourable Deputy Minister, Mme Rejoice Mabudafhasi.

1.1.2 Day 2

Plenary Session 1: Plenary Session 1 was opened by welcome addresses by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Zululand Prof Fikile Mazibuko and the Mayor of Umhalthuze Local Municipality Mayor Zakhele Mngayi, who welcomed delegates to Richards Bay and the University. The session continued with presentations by the Honourable Minister and Deputy Minister and presentations from People and Parks strategic partners Pick ’n Pay, the National Lotteries Board and the Department of Basic Education. These presentations culminated in the re-launch of the Kids in Parks Programme and the signing of a memorandum of understanding between the Department of Environmental Affairs, the Department of Basic Education, Pick n Pay and SANParks. The People and Parks Publication was launched during this session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plenary Session 1</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address of the People and Parks Programme and launch of the People and Parks Publication</td>
<td>Ms Rejoice Mabudafhasi, Deputy Minister: Water and Environmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of education in the conservation of natural resources</td>
<td>Prof Linda Chisholm, Advisor to the Minister of Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick ’n Pay and Kids in Parks</td>
<td>Gareth Ackerman, Chairperson Pick ’n Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Lotteries Fund</td>
<td>Prof Nevhutanga, Chairperson National Lottery Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Reform and Conservation</td>
<td>Ms Tumi Seboka, Representative for the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments Transformation Agenda on Biodiversity and Conservation</td>
<td>Ms Buyelwa Sonjica, Minister Water and Environmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing of the Kids in Parks MoU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch of the National Co-Management Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy People, Healthy Parks</td>
<td>Dr David Mabunda, Chief Operations Officer South African National Parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Plenary Session 2:** Plenary Session 2 included two case study presentations by international guests, Mr Ashish Kothari from the World Conservation Union (IUCN) in India and Ms Refiloe Ntsohi from the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture in Lesotho. These presentations provided delegates with details of people and parks type programmes from around the world, giving the People and Parks Programme an international context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plenary Session 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Conserved Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons from Lesotho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plenary Session 3:** Plenary Session 3 was originally allocated to report backs from all provincial protected area management authorities on the status of People and Parks Programmes in their provinces. However, following community concerns regarding the failure of the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform to arrive to note concerns about his departments role in resolving People and Parks related concerns, it was agreed that it was more important to address community concerns directly with the honourable members present. In light of this, the National Steering Committee of Community Representatives presented a list of community concerns from each province. Following the presentation of these concerns, representatives for the provincial management authorities were invited to respond. The honourable Minister, Ms Buyelwa Sonjica then closed the session with a response from the National Department of Environmental Affairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plenary Session 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community concerns from all nine provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected area management authorities responses to concerns from all provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A response from the Department of Environmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.3 Day 3

**Plenary Session 4:** Plenary Session 4 included a series of parallel discussion by delegates on the five themes selected as being of critical importance to the success of the People and Parks Programme. Delegates divided themselves into groups and participated in discussions on strengthening the protected area network; rural development in the context of protected areas; land reform and co-management; capacity building awareness and education; and financing mechanisms and partnerships for conservation.
Field Trips: Following the parallel session, the delegates divided into groups to visit three sites near Richards Bay with successful people and parks related programmes. These included visits to iSimangaliso Wetland Park, Nselweni Bush Camp in Hluhluwe Imfolozi and Somkhanda.

### Field Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iSimangaliso Wetland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nselweni Bush Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somkhanda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.4 Day 4

**Plenary Session 5**: Plenary Session 5 provided an opportunity for feedback and discussion regarding the parallel sessions on Day 3. Representatives from each group presented the overall findings of each discussion group focusing on what has worked, what has not worked, and what is the way forward for each thematic area.

### Plenary Session 5

| Feedback from Parallel Session 1: Strengthening the protected areas network |
| Feedback from Parallel Session 2: Rural development in the context of protected areas |
| Feedback from Parallel Session 3: Land reform and co-management |
| Feedback from Parallel Session 4: Capacity building, awareness and education |
| Feedback from Parallel Session 5: Financing mechanisms and partnerships for conservation |

**Plenary Session 6**: Plenary Session 6 closed the conference with an overview of conference proceedings by the Honourable Deputy Minister Mme Rejoice Mabudafhasi and a closing address by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Zululand, Prof Fikile Mazibuko.
1.2 Conference Delegates

The conference was attended by a range of delegates from government departments, community trusts, nongovernmental organisations, donor organisations and the private sector. For a full list of organisations represented see Appendix 1.
2 PEOPLE AND PARKS IN A SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

Several presentations were made on Day 2 outlining the context within which the People and Parks take place. The Honourable Minister, Ms Buyelwa Sonjica, and the Honourable Deputy Minister, Mme Rejoice Mabudafhasi, outlined details of the governments transformation agenda on biodiversity and conservation and the history of the People and Parks Programme. Presentations were also made regarding the need for linkages between the national agenda for people and parks, and the national agenda for basic education, rural development and land reform, and fundraising. The Chief Operations Officer of South African National Parks (SANParks) provided a summary of the interrelationships between people and parks in his presentation ‘healthy people, healthy parks’.

Together, these presentations outlined the contextual issues facing People and Parks Programmes in South Africa, as well as ways to move forward on creating sustainable responses to contextual concerns. The above presentations are summarized below:

1. The governments transformation agenda on biodiversity and conservation;
2. An overview of the People and Parks Programme;
3. Healthy people, healthy parks – SANParks;
4. The role of education in conservation;
5. People and Parks fundraising avenues;

These presentations outlined the importance of understanding and addressing contextual issues such as poverty, food security, capacity, traditional knowledge, scientific knowledge, climate change, governance, politics and fundraising. These issues all impact directly on the success of People and Parks Programmes as they determine the context within which the programmes are implemented. Without co-ordinated and sustainable responses to contextual issues, programmes will struggle to achieve their overarching goals for conservation, poverty relief and a vibrant and healthy rural socio-economic and ecological landscape.

The honourable Minister launched the National Co-Management Framework, and signed an MoU with the Department of Basic Education, Pick and Pay and SANParks regarding future partnerships for the Kids in Parks Programme. The Deputy Minister launched the department’s new publication outlining best practice case studies from successful People and Parks Programmes across South Africa.
2.1 People, Parks and the Minister of Water and Environmental Affairs

2.1.1 Government’s Transformation Agenda on Biodiversity and Conservation
The honourable Minister of Water and Environmental Affair’s keynote address contextualized the goals of the people and parks programme in relation to the government’s broader agenda for transformation in the biodiversity and conservation sectors. The keynote address is provided in Appendix 2. The Minister noted South Africa’s liberation history, biodiversity richness and need for a viable green economy as being central to the national and international importance of People and Parks Programmes. Within this context, the Minister launched the National Co-Management Framework and outlined issues needing to be addressed in finding a way forward.

This summary focuses on outlining the key points in the Ministers address regarding:

1. Liberation, democracy and conservation;

2. Convention on Biological Diversity;

3. The Green Economy;

5. The way forward.

2.1.1.1 Liberation, Democracy and Conservation
South Africa’s struggle for liberation and democracy was articulated in the Freedom Charter signed in 1955 in Kliptown. The slogan “the people shall govern” was a critical driving force behind the movement towards democratic governance and it remains a guiding force behind the Department of Environmental Affairs efforts to place people at the centre of all policies and programmes.

The advent of democracy in 1994 saw a shift in land ownership policies across the country as well as a recognition of the processes through which the majority of South Africans were forcibly removed from their land. The establishment of protected areas on communal rangelands and villages under Apartheid saw the removal of many people from their homes. Through the land restitution process, thousands of communities have subsequently claimed back this land.

Previously communities were excluded from playing a role in protecting the environment, and the government is now faced with the challenge of managing land reform, rural development and conservation concerns. These concerns are addressed in the Protected Areas Act (Act 57 of 2003), but a lot of progress still needs to be made to ensure that communities benefit from agreeing to leave claimed land under conservation. Without concrete benefit to claimants, conservation concerns will lose significance to rural communities and come under threat of alternate land use options.

The People and Parks Programme is a direct response to these concerns, embodying the department’s efforts to address land reform, conservation and rural development in a co-ordinated manner.

2.1.1.2 Convention on Biological Diversity
Internationally, increasing attention is being paid to the significance of biodiversity and conservation to the global community. The Convention on Biological Diversity, however, recognises more than just the ecological importance of biodiversity and specifically notes that conservation and the sustainable use of biological diversity are as important as the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the conservation and utilisation of these resources. South Africa subscribes to these objectives and the sustainable utilisation of natural resources is at the forefront of South Africa’s approach to development as articulated in the National Strategy for Sustainable Development.

South Africa’s biodiversity heritage has been internationally recognized and it is ranked the third largest home to biodiversity in the world. Without proper co-management and benefit sharing, however, the fruits of the liberation struggle and the wealth of the country will not reach the poorest of the poor.
2010 is the International Year of Biodiversity and will see the hosting of the tenth Conference of Parties (COP10) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in Nagoya, Japan. South Africa is proud to be part of a global community celebrating these events.

2.1.1.3 The Green Economy

One of the department's primary objectives is developing a sustainable interface between ecological sustainability and socio-economic development. At the heart of this is the recognition that the Green Economy is central to job creation, rural development and a green future for the country. The department is actively engaged in using international platforms to advance positions that support a move towards the implementation of economic instruments including, where appropriate, market-based mechanisms, for biodiversity conservation. New and innovative financial instruments, particularly those targeting the poor, need to be developed.

The department strongly believes that the environment portfolio has a substantial role to play in economic development, and it is actively engaged in strategies to develop sustainable economic opportunities related to biodiversity conservation. The transformation of the hunting industry is an example of ways in which income can be generated and shared by the conservation sector. In 2007, a total income of R650 million was realised by the hunting industry, demonstrating the importance of conservation related industries to the national economy.

The department is in the process of finalising Hunting Norms and Standards to ensure that hunting activities adhere to the principles of sustainable utilisation of resources, and that hunting related activities takes place lawfully and are regulated uniformly throughout the country.

2.1.1.4 National Co-Management Framework

The Biodiversity White Paper of 1997 did not address transformation issues per se, but it set out a number of goals, strategies and priorities for conservation, sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing. The Protected Area Act (Act 57 of 2003), however, consolidated these initial strategies into concrete recommendations.

The access and benefit sharing section of the Protected Areas Act (Act 57 of 2003) outlines the need for redress and the equitable access to natural resources. The Protected Areas Act (Act 57 of 2003) also makes provision for the People and Parks Programme and has made it possible for co-management agreements to be developed between claimants and protected area management authorities.

In 2007, the then respective Ministers of Environmental Affairs and Land Affairs concluded an agreement that provided a mechanism to facilitate a co-operative national approach to the resolution of land claims within protected areas, the environmental protection of protected areas under claim and the optimum participation and benefit sharing of claimants and communities.

The development of co-management agreements aimed to allow communities to play a critical role in the management of protected areas as well as take an active role in creating economic
opportunities in and around protected areas. The National Co-Management Framework has now been finalised, and will act as a guiding framework to ensure the proper implementation of these agreements.

### 2.1.1.5 The Way Forward

In conclusion, the Minister noted a few key concerns that have been flagged by the department as being key to the transformation of the biodiversity and conservation sectors. These include concerns regarding the need for urgent capacity building in communities and the exclusion of women from many community related processes. Internal departmental concerns include the ineffectiveness of having eighteen institutions dedicated to conservation concerns, resulting in a duplication of efforts as well as excessive costs. This concern is being actively addressed and solutions are being sought to improve the management effectiveness of protected area management authorities and other biodiversity related institutions.

The department is also in the process of developing a Biodiversity Charter to guide stakeholders on the appropriate way of conducting business. This is meant to support partnerships between government, communities, the private sector and NGO’s. The department is investigating a Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBBEE) scorecard specifically for the conservation sector to address transformation issues.

### 2.2 Healthy People, Healthy Parks

Dr David Mabunda, CEO of South African National Parks (SANParks), delivered a presentation titled ‘Healthy people, healthy parks’ which outlined some of the achievements of the SANParks to date. The presentation outlined achievements made in the establishment of park forums and public participation forums; environmental education; cultural heritage; the Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP); SANParks special projects; small and medium sized enterprises (SMME) and projects aimed at the sustainable utilization of resources found within National Parks.

#### 2.2.1 Park forums and public participation

New park management plans have been developed for national parks through a range of stakeholder engagement processes. Eighteen parks now have established representative forums to ensure public participation in park management. The Garden Route is currently in the process of consolidating into one forum. There are two parks with functioning joint management boards, namely the Richtersveld and the Kgalagadi National Parks.

#### 2.2.2 Environmental education

Over 300 000 learners have enjoyed free access to national parks over the past three years. The Kids in Parks programme has provided free tours and accommodation for disadvantaged
learners in various national parks and has been considered a great success. In addition to the Kids in Parks programmes, the Imbewu & Junior Rangers Programmes focuses on further increasing the participation of youth in national parks, and the Kudu Green School has been established as a new initiative for Gauteng schools.

2.2.3 Cultural heritage
In addition to participation forums and environmental education projects, SANParks have included cultural heritage repatriation and access in their programme of work relating to people and parks. The repatriation and reburial of human remains at Mapungubwe was a great success, done in collaboration with affected communities from Tshivhula, Lemma, VhaNgona, Leshiba, Machete and the San. To further access to such cultural heritage projects, interpretive facilities are being developed to facilitate access for schools and the public to such sites at Mapungubwe and Addo Elephant National Park. Heritage sites including graves are now being promoted and managed in most national parks.

2.2.4 Expanded Public Works Programme
The EPWP is a government initiative to provide poverty relief through creating temporary work opportunities to the unemployed to carry out useful activities. The main focus of the programme is on job creation and community development across a number of public works processes and there are four programmes specifically dedicated to creating employment opportunities in the environmental sector:

1. People & Parks (Infrastructure)
2. Working for Wetlands (Wetland rehabilitation)
3. Working for Water (Alien vegetation removal)
4. Working on Fire (Fire control and prevention)

The EPWP aims to create jobs through labour intensive models that transfer skills and develop contractor capacity in participating communities. The key deliverables of the environmentally oriented programmes are enhanced biodiversity through alien clearing and rehabilitation, the building of conservation related infrastructure (roads, fences, rest camps, etc) and the development of secondary industries.

In total 2,000 – 8,000 people are employed per year through conservation related EPWP’s. This translates into an average of 5,100 people per year. The EPWP has also facilitated the development of small and medium sized enterprises and local contractors able to provide services to national parks.
SANParks & EPWP Success Stories

### A labourer in an EPWP team started DTM Construction Company in Mapungubwe

He then set up his own company (DTM Construction) and tendered for his first contract in 2005 to remove a redundant structure in the park. This contract brought in R175 000. DTM Construction then tendered for a R1 million project to construct a camp site in the park, and is are now able to handle projects worth up to R4 million both inside and outside the park.

### Contractor Trevor Homu in Kruger National Park started as an alien-clearing contractor in 2000.

Trevor now owns his own company offering alien clearing and waste removal services and has entered into the property market. Trevor currently employs 46 permanent and 20 temporary employees.

The EPWP has also led to the development of several secondary industries to support park related projects. Some examples include the Knysna Furniture Factory which produces furniture for SANParks tourist units as well as school desks and benches; the Mata Mata fence contractor and stacked poles supplier who supplies poles to parks for fencing; community curio outlets around the country; several car washes in Kruger; hop-on guides in Addo Elephant National Park and the outsourcing of retail opportunities to several communities across the country.

### 2.2.5 Sustainable resource use projects

In addition to job and contractor creation activities, SANParks is engaged in sustainable resource use projects that assist communities harvest resources from national parks in sustainable, economically beneficial ways.

Successful projects include the Khomani San Cultural Heritage use project; the Struisbaai Suurv Plukkers Vereniging (Suurv harvesting at Agulhas for making e.g. jam); the KNP Sustainable Utilisation of Plant and Animal Products e.g. Traditional healers Makuya project; the KNP Grass Harvesting Project; the Mopane Worm Harvesting (Mapungubwe preparing for implementation); the Rastafari Rooiwortel (Bulbine latifolia) Nursery; the Outeniqua Eco Honey Bee Farming Project – Tsitsikama; and fern harvesting has recently been approved on the Garden Route.

Together these projects provide examples of the many ways in which healthy parks can help sustain healthy livelihoods for people living near protected areas.

### 2.3 People, Parks and Education

Environmental education strategies are central to the sustainability of People and Parks Programmes. A representative for the Minister of Basic Education, Prof Linda Chisholm
delivered a presentation on the importance of education to conservation in the broader context of basic education in South Africa. This was followed by presentations by Mr Gareth Ackerman, the chairperson of Pick ‘n Pay, and Professor Nevhutanga, the chairperson of the National Lotteries Board – both of whom spoke about the importance of sustainable financing for education initiatives and committed financial resources to supporting the Kids in Parks and People and Parks Programmes.

Within the Department of Environmental Affairs, environmental education is primarily facilitated through the Kids in Parks Programme, and following the presentations regarding education and conservation and funding for education and conservation, the Minister presented a Memorandum of Understanding for signing by the Department of Environmental Affairs, the Department of Basic Education, SANParks, and Pick n Pay.

The Memorandum of Understanding outlines the roles and responsibilities of each partner with regard to the management and funding of the Kids in Parks Programme.

2.3.1 The importance of education in the conservation of Natural Resources

Professor Linda Chisholm, an advisor to the Minister of Basic Education, spoke on the Ministers behalf about the need for education to be geared towards meeting the goals of sustainable development. Prof Chisholm reminded delegates that conservation should be seen within the broader goals of sustainable development, and that education for conservation is directly linked to education for sustainable development.

Prof Chisholm outlined the need for education for sustainable development and the new national curriculum to be draw on existing environmental legislation in South Africa and on international agreements for content and guidance. She also outlined that integrating these principles into the national education strategy, together with facilitating a multi-sectoral approach to People and Parks Programmes will ensure that education priorities are aligned with the needs of capacity building for conservation. Prof Chisholm outlined the following as being crucial to education for conservation:

1. Education informed by national and international conservation policy;
2. Multi-sectoral approach and the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU);
3. National curriculum development in line with education for sustainable development;

2.3.2 Education and Policy

Education for conservation extends beyond issues regarding protected areas to include all issues relevant to the sustainable development of South Africa. It is only through a holistic
approach to environmental education that the value of conservation can properly be recognized and located within a broad range of environmental issues. The Department of Basic Education is guided in this thinking by institutions such as the South African National Parks, who have clearly outlined their mission to “develop and manage a system of national parks that represents the biodiversity, landscapes and associated heritage assets of South Africa for the sustainable use and benefit of all”.

The department is also guided by international agreements on the implementation of sustainable development principles and practices, such as those signed at the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 and the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002. Other relevant international agreements include regional declarations, such as those made by African Ministers of Education in 2006 to implement the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (UNDESD) in the context of the Second Decade on Education in Africa.

The African ministers statement of commitment emphasises the need to situate UNDESD activities within key policy initiatives such as the Millennium Development Goals, the African Union’s Second Decade on Education Plan of Action and the Dakar Framework for Action aimed at achieving the Education for All goals.

### 2.3.3 Multi-sectoral approach

The Department of Basic Education’s approach to education for conservation is further underpinned by embracing a multi-sectoral approach to education. This includes working closely with SANParks, the Ministry of Water and Environmental Affairs and the private sector.

The Kids in Parks programme is an example of such multi-sectoral collaboration, and the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding provides a platform for the Department of Basic Education to support broader efforts in environmental education through the conceptualisation, planning and support of initiatives to contribute to the long-term sustainability of the Kids in Parks programme. The department’s support is particularly useful in relation to the curriculum dimensions, the choice of participants and monitoring and evaluating of the Kids in Parks programme.

### 2.3.4 National Curriculum Development

The Kids in Parks programme is “a stepping stone towards making the learners environmentally responsible citizens”. This is achieved through the National Curriculum Statements for Grades R-12 that incorporate the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development within a human rights and social justice framework. The National Curriculum Statements were completed in 2002 and implemented from 2003. In 2009 implementation was reviewed and recommendations made for the improvement of implementation. Education for sustainable development remains firmly embedded in the curriculum – through the geography, science and tourism curricula in particular but also in other subjects.
2.3.5 Kids in Parks

The Kids in Parks programme seeks to sensitise young people living in the vicinity of the parks to understand why it is important to conserve the surroundings of the parks.

When the Kids in Parks programme was launched, excitement about it was derived from the possibility it provided for bringing the environmental learning component of the national curriculum to life. What was and remains valuable about the programme is that learning about the environment is not restricted to theory; it brings it to life in an active way. It is through active and real engagement in and with the environment that children can deepen their understanding of the relationships between poverty and sustainable development and need to conserve our national heritage.

Prof Chisholm was extremely gratified to note that the extension of the programme from 2008-2010 substantially augmented the 11610 learners and 707 teachers who had participated in the programme by the end of 2007. The extension of the programme for five years and to all national parks was welcomed as it invites expansion of the reach of the programme to another 5000 learners and 200 teachers annually, i.e. 25,000 learners and 100 teachers over the five year period.

The department is pleased that teachers are also participating in the programme and are confident that they too acquire experiences whose value will go beyond the programme itself. The Kids in Parks programme is as much about the continuing professional development of teachers as the creation of environmental ambassadors who will work side by side with government inculcating caring and responsible values and attitudes towards our environment, our common heritage.

2.4 People and Parks Funding

2.4.1 National Lotteries Board

Professor Nevhutanga, Chairperson of the National Lottery Board presented an outline of the work of the Distributing Agency for Arts, Culture and National Heritage in providing financial support for non-governmental work in these sectors in South Africa. Prof Nevhutanga focused his presentation on the agencies legacy of funding to date, with a particular emphasis on the contribution made to environment and wildlife related projects.

In order to make the funds more accessible to a broader range of projects, particularly communities participating in People and Parks Programmes, Prof Nevhutanga then outlined the procedures and regulations governing funding applications, as well as some of the obstacles faced by applicants and the central applications office.
This summary focuses on the following elements of Prof Nevhutanga’s presentation:

1. **Legacy**;
2. Application **procedures**;
3. **Obstacles**.

### 2.4.2 Legacy

In the past financial year (ended 31 March 2010) the Distributing Agency for Arts, Culture and National Heritage, Charities and Sport and Recreations allocated R3,4 billion to 2 316 beneficiary groups with a payout of R1,9 billion to the beneficiary groups. The remaining funds have been set aside and will be paid out according to the allocation schedule agreed on with each project.

In the Arts, Culture and National Heritage sector, R1,2 billion was allocated to 188 beneficiary groups and R0,5 billion was paid out.

Of these allocations, R288 million was allocated to projects directly related to People and Parks related programmes, with the following organizations having received financial support:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation to People and Parks related organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Park Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4.3 Application Procedures

Grants made by the Distributing Agency for Arts, Culture and National Heritage are made by an application process adjudicated by a committee of experts in each respective sector. The application process is strictly limited to organizations that meet the advertised requirements and submit their applications according to the advertised time frames.

The Government initiated the National Lottery in order to have an outside source of funding for non-profit organisations. These sectors, however, operate independently and have their own operational requirements in addition to those stipulated by the distributing agencies.
In order to be considered for funding applicants must submit the following:

1. Proof of registration as a non-profit organisation (NGO, Section 21 company or non-profit trust).

2. A constitution in which your key activities are outlined. This will help clarify whether your activities are in line with the mandate of the sector.

3. For new and first time applicants, two years financial statements prepared by an independent accounting officer. For organizations that have been previously funded, we require the most recent years’ audited financial statements. This will give an indication of your organisation’s ability to manage funds.

4. A project implementation plan.

5. A carefully costed budget.

### National Lotteries Application Requirements

- Proof of registration as non-profit
- Constitution outlining key activities
- Financial statements
- Project implementation plan
- Costed budget

2.4.4 Obstacles

Several factors prevent the National Lotteries Board from successfully supporting those organisations most in need of financial support. Applicants whose first language is not English have noted that they struggle to understand the call for applications and the application form. In response to these concerns the board has set up an Information Centre to provide guidance to applicants. The Board is in the process of setting up more offices around the country.

Incomplete and late applications are another factor preventing organisations from receiving funds. It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that applications are submitted on time and completely. Furthermore, on the last day for applications the board receives a flood of applications. Applications are approved chronologically, according to the date on which they are submitted, so submitting applications early increases the chance of being successful.
The Board has some internal obstacles regarding making payments to grantees on time. The Board is making every effort to pay out grants as soon after approval as possible, but this is not always possible.

The National Lotteries Board wants to facilitate more partnerships with People and Parks related programmes, and the Department of Water and Environmental Affairs in general.

To apply phone 012 432 1300, or go to www.nlb.org.za to download forms.

2.5 “Doing Good is Good Business” Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainability Projects by Pick ‘n Pay

Mr Gareth Ackerman, the chairperson of Pick ‘n Pay made a detailed presentation showcasing the company’s corporate responsibility and sustainability projects in South Africa. Today, the Pick ‘n Pay Group has a total of 775 stores, made up of Hypermarts, Supermarkets and Family Stores (which are franchise stores). Pick ‘n Pay employs over 38 000 people, and generates an annual turnover of USD6.76-billion. As such, Pick ‘n Pay is an important force in South Africa’s economy.

Pick ‘n Pay believes that sustainability businesses have an important role to play in the building of sustainable communities – a responsibility Pick ‘n Pay embraces wholeheartedly. They state “It is not simply a philanthropic way of thinking; it is an act of enlightened self-interest. In our case, the more economic freedom that exists within South African society, the more scope there will be for growth in the retail market.”

Pick ‘n Pay believes that big business must work together towards securing the economic security and social wellbeing of generations to come. As such, they provide an important example of how corporate sustainability projects can drive poverty alleviation strategies and economic development.
Mr Ackerman provided short summaries of a number of Pick ‘n Pay projects, outlining the diverse range of projects they support. These included projects related to supporting climate change education and environmental education through the Kids in Parks programme, to running a green business through recycling, waste management, the use of organic produce and supporting sustainable fisheries. Mr Ackerman also listed some of the business development initiatives they support, including the sale of eco-shopping bags, the small business initiative, the Flower Valley Trust, and the Daily Bread Bakery. These initiatives are all community-based businesses that support communities to develop and grow sustainable businesses.

The presentation by Mr Ackerman set the scene for the potential scope of involvement of the private sector in supporting People and Parks Programmes. Pick ‘n Pay’s involvement in education, business development, green business practices and fairtrade sets the standard for collaboration between big business and community initiatives. Mr Ackerman encouraged government, communities and business sectors to pursue opportunities to work together.

2.6 Land Reform and Conservation

The honourable Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform was unfortunately unable to attend the conference. He passed on his regrets to the delegates and sent a senior representative from the Gauteng and North West Land Claims Commission, Ms Tumi Seboka to speak on his behalf.

Ms Seboka presented a detailed outline of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reforms Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP). In doing so, she outlined the relationship between the CRDP and Outcome 7: ‘Vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security for all’. Ms Seboka’s presentation addressed issues of rurality, and the challenges facing rural areas. Ms Seboka also addressed two principle components of the departments rural development strategy, namely the departments job creation model and the National Rural Youth Service Corps concept. In conclusion, Ms Seboka outlined some of the challenges and opportunities to be addressed in finding a way forward.

This summary focuses on the following elements of Ms Seboka’s presentation:

1. Outcome 7 and the CRDP strategic planning framework;
2. Rurality and the challenges facing rural areas;
3. Job creation through CRDP;
4. The National Rural Youth Service Corps;
5. CRDP in conservation areas;
6. The way forward.
2.6.1 Outcome 7 and the CRDP strategic planning framework

Outcome 7 of President Jacob Zuma’s National Development Goals presents the creation of ‘vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security for all’ as an issue of national importance. Outcome 7 outlines the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform’s approach to implementing a Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) and identifies and discusses key outputs and actions towards achieving vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security for all.

The outcome provides a sample of contributions of other cluster outcomes and programmes in promoting objectives of Outcome 7 and provides the framework for the implementation of the CRDP within the conservation context.

The CRDP’s vision is directly aligned with Outcome 7 and seeks to create vibrant, sustainable and equitable rural communities. The strategy aims to create an agrarian transformation, meaning the rapid and fundamental change in systems and patterns of ownership and control of land, livestock, cropping and community. The objective of the CRDP is to promote social cohesion and sustainable development in rural areas.

Four strategies have been identified to achieve Outcome 7 as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four strategies to achieve Outcome 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social mobilization of rural communities to take initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strategic investments in economic and social infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increased economic activity and rural livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sustainable land and agrarian transformation through the sustainable conservation and use of natural resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.2 Rurality and the challenges facing rural areas

The Rural Development Framework, adopted by the Government in 1997, defined rural areas as:

“Sparsely populated areas in which people farm or depend on natural resources, including villages and small towns that are dispersed throughout these areas. This includes large settlements in the former homelands, created by apartheid removals, which depend on migratory labour and remittances for their survival.” As such, the department uses the notion of “rurality” to understand socio-economic processes in a diverse landscape. “Rurality” refers to a way of life, a state of mind and a culture which revolves around land, livestock, cropping and community.”
Lessons from the CRDP sites indicate that there are many challenges facing rural areas. Under utilisation and/or unsustainable use of natural resources coupled with a lack of access to socio-economic infrastructure and services, public amenities and government services leaves rural residents with few resources from which to generate sustainable livelihoods. Lack of access to water sources for both household and agricultural development further exacerbates this problem, as do low levels of literacy and skills.

Migratory labour practices and lack of socio-economic opportunities has facilitated the decay of the social fabric of many households and villages (child-headed households, crime, family disputes and lack of Ubuntu). Unresolved restitution and land tenure issues further complicate these issues and the formation of townships not formally established thus hindering service provision and development.

In such circumstances dependence on social grants and other forms of social security and unexploited opportunities in agriculture, tourism, mining and manufacturing are crippling the rural economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges Facing Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Under utilisation and/or unsustainable use of natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Poor access to socio-economic infrastructure and services, public amenities and government services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of access to water or lack of water sources for both household and agricultural development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low literacy, skills levels and migratory labour practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decay of the social fabric (child-headed households, crime, family disputes and lack of Ubuntu).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unresolved restitution and land tenure issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Townships not formally established thus hindering service provision and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dependence on social grants and other forms of social security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unexploited opportunities in agriculture, tourism, mining and manufacturing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6.3 Job creation through CRDP

Job creation through CRDP initiatives is central to achieving vibrant rural communities and food security for all. In order to achieve this, the department has identified several key activities to facilitate the development and success of a comprehensive job creation programme.

These activities include the profiling of households to determine their needs, skills and employability through the National Integrated Social Information System (NISIS). Once households have been profiled, employment creation opportunities can be identified in line with planned interventions (e.g. rural infrastructure projects) and opportunities in neighbouring areas. Targeted training and development in line with identified job creation opportunities will then be necessary, particularly training in basic technical skills.

The aim of the department is to place one member of each household in a job on a two-year contract in line with the Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) and contribute 50% of income to household development priorities.

In order to achieve these goals, communities will need to be organized and proactively participate in cooperative development initiatives and local opportunities. Once programmes are operational, their impact will need to be evaluated to determine their impact, particularly with regard to issues such as teenage pregnancy, HIV/AIDS, reduced dependence on social grants and increased productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job creation through CRDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Profiling households to determine their needs, skills and employability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identification of employment creation opportunities in line with planned interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Targeted training and development in line with identified job creation opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Place one member of household per job on a two-year contract in line with the EPWP and contribute 50% of income to households’ development priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mobilize communities to participate in cooperative development initiatives and local opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate impact (e.g. delayed teenage pregnancy, HIV/AIDS, reduced dependence on social grants, increased productivity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6.4 National Rural Youth Service Corps

The vision for the National Rural Youth Service Corps (NARYSEC) is “Stretching the Horizons of Rural Young People”. The programmes objectives are to facilitate nation building through the construction of district youth life skills hubs that serve as rural youth empowerment centres. These centres will enable rural youth to play a strategic and significant role in the transformation of rural communities by participating in the roll out implementation of the CRDP. The intention is that such activities will create a major countryside revolution for socio-economic freedom and promote a result oriented national rural youth service thus building patriotism and social cohesion.

The strategy includes a six point plan for rural youth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six point plan for rural youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Civic education and training;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Household and community profiling;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Youth employment programme;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Young farmer programme;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rural arts and culture programme;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rural youth services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.5 CRDP in protected areas

The Comprehensive Rural Development Programme is a holistic strategy to meet the needs of all rural communities, including those living in the vicinity of protected areas. Within this strategy is an awareness of the importance of the implementation of the co-management framework for meeting the basic human needs, conservation sustainability and transformation of the rural economy. Critical to achieving this is aligning the rural development strategy with the objectives of the people and parks principles and objectives.

2.6.6 The way forward

The department outlined the need for further work in several areas of CRDP policy and implementation to be informed by lessons learned in existing CRDP sites. Finalising the policy on comprehensive rural development is an important starting point for ensuring the programmes are successful.
In relation to People and Parks Programmes, it is important that national and provincial rural development plans are aligned with relevant park management plans. It is also important that the department participate in the implementation and monitoring of co-management arrangements in protected areas. In this regard, implementation protocols are needed to ensure the integrated implementation of CRDP. In particular, timeframes and indicators are needed for the remaining land claims in conservation areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The way forward for comprehensive rural development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Refine lessons from the CRDP sites to inform policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finalise the policy on the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Align national and provincial rural development plans with relevant park management plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement and monitor the implementation of co-management and other institutional arrangements in protected areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement protocols to ensure integrated implementation of the CRDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agree on timeframes and indicators for the remaining land claims in conservation areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, Ms Seboka outlined the department’s intention to roll out the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme to 160 wards across the country - with conservation areas in these wards forming part of the programme. Job creation models are to be implemented in all wards.

Ms Seboka emphasized that the roll out would include the prioritization of youth development through a special programme currently being refined as well as by focusing on youth participation in conservation.

“Working together we can do more by improving the quality of life for all our people living in rural areas”
3 People and Parks in an International Context

Two international guests were invited to the conference to share learning’s from people and parks projects around the world. These two presentations provided an international context regarding the global significance of people and parks type programmes, and highlighted some of the challenges and successes of these programmes internationally.

3.1 Community Conserved Areas in International Perspective

Mr Ashish Kothari from the World Conservation Union (IUCN) delivered an address outlining international trends in indigenous and community conservation areas (ICCAs). Mr Kothari noted the important work that has been done in South Africa with regard to developing sound People and Parks Programmes, and commended everyone’s efforts. He noted South Africa has having many success stories worthy of international recognition and was pleased to return to South Africa to continue to learn and share experiences with us.

Mr Kothari’s opening remarks highlighted the need to add “by the people” to the People and Parks slogan “conservation for the people, with the people”. He outlined that such additional emphasis would further encourage an understanding of community based conservation as being about more than simply co-management, but also including conservation activities by communities capacitated to take responsibility for conservation on their own – within their communities as well as on claimed land.

Mr Kothari’s address focused on outlining some of the most important principles governing community conservation areas and partnerships, providing examples of successful community conservation areas from around the world, looking at the international significance of community conservation areas and assessing the status of community conservation areas internationally.

This summary of Mr Kothari’s presentation highlights some of the key learning’s he presented focusing on the following key areas:

1. Principles governing community conservation areas and partnerships;
2. International examples of successful community conservation areas;
3. International significance of community conservation areas.

3.1.1 Principles governing community conservation areas and partnerships

The Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) outlined in the international Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) commits countries to engage with conservation activities within formal protected areas, as well as within indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs).
ICCAs include natural and modified ecosystems with significant biodiversity, ecological services and cultural values that are voluntarily conserved by indigenous and local communities through customary laws or other effective means.

Within these areas, it is important to understand what the term governance means? Who decides what is done, and who decides how it is done? In other words, who holds power, authority and responsibility with regard to indigenous/community conservation areas?

Governance of protected areas is distinct from management and in recent times, more attention has been paid to governance issues in conservation. The 5th World Parks Congress held in Durban, South Africa in 2003, the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia in 2004, the World Conservation Congresses 3 and 4, and the Marine Parks Congress 1 all addressed issues of governance as being central to conservation.

An important realization to emerge from the increased focus on governance is that governments are not the only managers of protected areas. There are currently four types of organizations / collectives responsible for the management of protected areas, namely:

1. **Government** (at various levels);
2. **Indigenous peoples and local communities**;
3. **Private owners** of land and natural resources (individuals, corporate actors…);
4. **Various** parties (together).

In an attempt to accommodate these previously unrecognized modes of conservation governance the IUCN has developed a **matrix** of protected areas categories and governance types (new IUCN Guidelines). They are now promoting the **legal recognition** of all governance types as well as national **protected area system reviews** to include innovative governance types: including indigenous/community conserved areas (ICCAs).

---

**Governance of Indigenous / Community Conserved Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who holds power, responsibility &amp; authority</th>
<th>Governments not only managers of protected areas</th>
<th>Matrix of protected area governance types</th>
<th>Legal recognition of all governance types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
3.1.2 International Examples

There are numerous international examples of indigenous/community conserved areas across a wide range of different landscapes and land types. ICCAs include a diverse range of sites including sacred lakes and hill tops; nesting roosting and feeding habitats of endangered wildlife; indigenous territories and cultural landscapes/seascapes; territories and migration routes of nomadic herders and mobile indigenous populations; sustainably managed wetlands, fishing grounds and water bodies; temporary and permanently forbidden sites; biosphere reserves; community forests and lakes; and sustainably managed resource reserves.

Some examples of these sites include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacred lakes and hill tops.</td>
<td>Indian Himalaya Chizire sacred forest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe Sacred crocodile pond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tibet, China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesting roosting and feeding habitats of endangered wildlife.</td>
<td>Rushikulya turtle conservation, Orissa, India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous territories and cultural landscapes/seascapes.</td>
<td>Paruku Indigenous PA, Western Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alto Fragua Indi-wasi National Park, Colombia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territories and migration routes of nomadic herders and mobile</td>
<td>Wetlands in Qashqai mobile peoples' territory, Iran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indigenous populations.</td>
<td>Sustainably managed wetlands, fishing grounds and water bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lubuk Larangan river, Mandailing, Sumatra Coron Island, Philippines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary and permanently forbidden sites.</td>
<td>Bijagos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosphere reserves.</td>
<td>Guinea Bissau Rekawa lagoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community forests and lakes.</td>
<td>Rupataal, Nepal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parc Jurassien Vaudois, Switzerland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qanats, Central Asia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainably managed resource reserves.</td>
<td>Jardhargaon forest, Indian Himalaya Global diversity of ICCAs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.3 International significance of ICCAs

The diversity of sites that could be managed through indigenous/community conservation areas could double the earth’s protected area coverage! This would be a remarkable achievement for the conservation community as well as local communities as it would ensure key ecological and social processes are sustainably managed. ICCAs have the potential to maintain critical ecosystems services and provide ecological connectivity impossible to achieve through formal...
protected areas. These ecosystem services are the basis of livelihoods and cultural identity for millions of people and protecting them would assist in maintaining these communities. ICCAs are site specific and built on sophisticated ecological knowledge systems, yet most are still unrecognized.

Formal recognition of such areas would expand the total coverage of protected areas, address gaps in the system and improve connectivity in the landscape, enhance public support for conservation and increase the flexibility and resilience of ecosystems, assisting in their ability to adapt to climate change.

Formal recognition of such areas would require combing a variety of categories and governance types in a national system of protected areas, which could help create linkages between wild and domesticated biodiversity, and associated cultures. This would provide resilience, adaptation, food security for all ecosystems, including human systems.

3.1.4 Status of ICCAs internationally

The IUCN conducted a survey of how countries are faring in recognizing and supporting ICCAs in thirty countries across the world. The survey noted that there are three ways to legally recognize ICCAs:

1. Through protected area systems (e.g. Protected Areas Act 57 of 2003);
2. As part of more general conservation measures (e.g. People and Parks Programme);
3. Embedded in a recognition of indigenous peoples, decentralized governance, etc (e.g. Communal Land Rights Act 11 of 2004).

The study found that there has been good progress in some countries, but halting progress in others. Key issues identified related to the still unidentified and documented nature of most ICCAs; the increasing threat to ICCAs by forces of development, commercialization and cultural change; the slow pace of change in conservation legislation; inappropriate, top-down recognition forcing uniform approaches to a diverse set of ICCA institutions. It was also found that uncritical funding allocations often created more problems than solutions.
Key Learning’s from the IUCN

- Most ICCAs are not yet identified or documented!
- Forces of development, commercialisation and cultural change threaten many ICCAs.
- Conservation legislation has been slow to adapt to ICCAs.
- Inappropriate top-down recognition leads to uniform approaches that undermine diverse ICCA institutions.
- Throwing money at ICCAs creates more problems.

For more information regarding the IUCN and international case studies:

www.tilcepa.org  www.iccaforum.org  ashishkothari@vsnl.com

3.2 Lessons from Lesotho

Ms Refiloe Ntsohi representing the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture, Lesotho, presented a case study outlining the history of protected areas and their management in Lesotho. The presentation looked at land use practices in Lesotho, and the extent to which traditional livelihood choices influence the interaction between people and protected areas in Lesotho. The presentation concluded with a summary of lessons learnt from efforts at developing protected areas able to respond to community concerns in Lesotho.

3.2.1 Background

Lesotho is a relatively small country covering 30,355 km². With a population of only 1.8 Million people (2006 census) and a landscape dominated by mountains (75%), land use practices in Lesotho are important for livelihood and ecosystem services within and beyond the borders of the country. Lesotho is landlocked by three provinces of South Africa, namely the Free State, KwaZulu Natal and the Eastern Cape.

A democratic system of governance and the traditional laws of Lerotholi govern Lesotho. Traditionally these laws dictate that the land belongs to the Basotho people and is held in trust by the King. The power to allocate land was traditionally delegated to Chiefs.

Land reform started in Lesotho in 1979 and continues to date. The Land Act of 1979 determined that land allocation be delegated to Land Committees elected by the Minister rather than through to Chiefs elected by the King. The Local Government Act of 1997 and the Land Act of 2009 further democratized land allocation by assigning land allocation powers to democratically elected Community Councils.
3.2.2 Land Use Practices

Land use in Lesotho is divided between residential areas, development areas, agricultural areas, rangelands, mountain rangelands and protected areas. The Basotho are traditionally a nation of livestock keepers, with the majority of the country’s land being allocated to rangelands and mountain rangelands. Herds are predominantly sheep, goat, cattle, horses and donkeys. The focus of Basotho livestock herding is on herd size maximization and not turnover, with emphasis being on large herds representing social power and wealth rather than commercial activity.

Rangelands provide a critical food source for livestock and rangeland and grazing rights are communal. As a result, overgrazing is the most important environmental challenge in Lesotho.

Rangelands often contain key resources like wetlands and host most of the country’s biodiversity, including 2,961 plants species, of which 19 are endemic, as well as 63 species of mammals, 318 species of birds, 40 species of reptiles, and 14 species of fish.

3.2.3 Establishment of Protected Areas

The first protected area in Lesotho was established in 1970 (Sehlabathebe National Park). The area was traditionally used for summer grazing and a conventional park establishment process led to the evacuation of cattle post owners and fencing of the site. Another two national parks were established in 2000 (Tsehlanyane National Park and Bokong Nature Reserve) and a fourth in 2008 (Letsa La Letsie).

These protected areas were established through more in depth community consultations and no periphery fencing was put up.

In the establishment of the Tsehlanyane and Bokong National Parks, a co-management model was used. The Lesotho Highlands Water Project (LHWP) conducted consultations. The model included the establishment of community representative CCFs under a legally registered constitution. The co-management agreement includes an arrangement through which a percentage of the total revenue goes to neighbouring communities for development projects. The agreement also allows for the regulated utilization of natural resources such as medicinal plants and firewood. The parks also provide a source of water for communities during droughts.

3.2.4 Lessons Learned

The establishment of protected areas through community consultation has proven to be successful in Lesotho. It was learned through the process that the government is committed to the process, and intensive consultation with communities ensured a smooth process. Real benefits for communities through the beneficiation agreement have provided incentives for community buy in. On-going park-community projects are also important, as is on-going community empowerment.
Lessons Learned in Lesotho

- Government commitment is essential;
- Intensive consultations with communities ensures collaboration and success;
- Real benefits are important to facilitate community buy-in;
- On-going Park-Community projects are important to the growth of the sector;
- On-going community empowerment is a key outcome for the Ministry.

There are currently proposals underway to develop another three protected areas at Senqu Sources, Liqobong and Qeme Plateau.
4 COMMUNITY CONCERNS

Since the 2008 People and Parks Conference in Mafikeng, community representatives have utilised the development of a National Steering Committee to discuss community concerns relating to people and parks projects around the country. In preparation for the fourth People and Parks Conference, each province compiled a list of community concerns to be presented to the conference.

In the absence of the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform, communities felt the need to raise their concerns formally. There was an overwhelming concern that the Ministers absence indicated a lack of concern for community interests and the proceedings of the conference were interrupted to present community concerns to the Minister and Deputy Minister of Water and Environmental Affairs on Day 2. This platform allowed communities to clearly outline their concerns to those officials present, including their unhappiness at the absence of the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform. The communities resolved to present the list of persistent problems and challenges they faced throughout the country, province by province, before the Minister’s presentation and seek answers and concrete proposal on the way forward.

Following a detailed presentation by the National Steering Committee Chairperson, Mr Mhlaba, representatives from provincial protected area management authorities provided responses to the concerns raised.

This section summarises the points raised by community representatives and the responses offered by provincial management authorities. Detailed notes regarding the concerns raised by each province can be found in Appendix 3.

4.1 Overarching Community Concerns

Mr Mhlaba presented concerns specific to the People and Parks Programmes in each province. The concerns varied according to regional governance and funding trends, as well as the individual experiences of different communities. The following, however, emerged as being the most pressing concerns affecting all provinces:

- **Funding:** There is an overall lack of funding to support People and Parks Programmes, economic development initiatives, settlement grants and leases. This is affecting the ability of communities to participate meaningfully in People and Parks Programmes and the ability of government agencies to uphold land reform agreements.

- **Land Reform:** Land reform processes, including the settlement of claims, the transfer of title deeds and the handing over of land are very slow. Such delays are making it difficult for communities to understand and assert their rights. They are also leading to increasing frustrations and are seen as a lack of commitment by the government to keep their promises.
4 Community Concerns

- **Co-management:** Co-management arrangements are not being implemented in a way that allows communities to participate as much as they would like to in local, regional and national decision making processes. Co-management arrangements have been further delayed in some areas by land reform failures. Most communities feel that the government is failing to involve them adequately in the management of protected areas.

- **Job Creation:** Not enough employment or economic development opportunities are being created in the current People and Parks Programmes.

- **Beneficiation:** Communities were also concerned about protected areas continuing to utilise service providers from outside local communities, despite available skills in areas such as security and maintenance. More opportunities are needed for communities to develop small businesses able to benefit from the eco-tourism economy.

- **Transparency:** Communities expressed concern over the degree of transparency from government, particular with regard to the allocation of resources and decisions regarding protected area management. Communities would like to be more informed about government processes, and receive clear feedback on issues relating to People and Parks Programmes.

- **Commitment:** Communities are concerned that delays in all areas of People and Parks Programmes indicate a lack of commitment from the Government to the success of People and Parks Programmes. Communities expressed their ongoing commitment to the programmes, but also their increasing frustration.

- **Capacity Building:** Communities expressed frustration at a lack of capacity building to support their engagement in People and Parks Programmes. This concern was raised in relation to co-management arrangements, business development initiatives, environmental education, financial management and engagement with legislation.

4.2 **Provincial Management Authority Responses**

Representatives from each provincial management authority responded to the concerns raised in the community presentations. These responses referred to specific issues raised by each province, as well as some general remarks regarding the process of working together with communities on People and Parks Programmes. Each province expressed their concern regarding the issues raised by the communities, and agreed that there are many problems that both communities and government structures need to address. Some examples were given of instances in which concerns have been successfully dealt with, but overall there was a commitment to continue to work towards improving the People and Parks Programmes.
The following areas of work emerged as being of general concern:

- **Dialogue:** Provincial representatives noted the importance of good communication between management authorities and communities. The need for continued dialogue was recognised by management authorities.

- **Support for community structures:** Provincial representatives agreed with communities that additional support is needed for community co-management structures, volunteers and the national steering committee. It was noted that provincial financial resources are inadequate to address all of the needs of community structures, and it was agreed that collaboration with the national department is needed to ensure sufficient resources are made available to support communities. The need for resources to ensure communities are able to pursue funding opportunities outside of government was also noted.

- **Job creation:** It was noted that more economic opportunities are needed in People and Parks Programmes. However, it was also noted that many jobs have already been created (e.g. 1000 in the Western Cape, 600 in Mpumalanga), and this achievement must not be undervalued.

- **Intergovernmental co-ordination:** In response to issues regarding land reform processes and a lack of transparency, provincial authorities noted the need for more effective inter-government co-ordination. Several examples were given of areas in which provincial management authorities are not able to finalise agreements with communities when they are waiting for processes to be completed in other departments.

- **Post settlement support:** Provincial management authorities acknowledge the problems associated with post settlement support and raised concerns regarding where to find the necessary resources to ensure post settlement agreements are implemented.

- **Strategic interventions:** It was noted that strategic interventions are needed to ensure success of People and Parks Programmes. In particular, the need for programmes to be driven by a clear vision, accompanied by an action plan and sufficient resource allocation was noted.

- **Leadership and accountability:** It was agreed that more leadership and accountability is needed, both within government structures and within community structures. In this regard, management authorities felt that cohesion within community structures was very important.
5 THEMATIC DISCUSSIONS

Five thematic areas were identified as being critical to the success of People and Parks Programmes. These themes were expanded from the thematic areas identified in Mafikeng (2008) in an attempt to include a broader range of issues affecting the future co-management of protected areas.

1. Strengthening the protected area network.
2. Rural development in the context of protected areas.
3. Land reform and co-management of protected areas.
4. Capacity building, awareness and education for co-management.
5. Sustainable financing mechanisms and partnerships for conservation.

Conference delegates separated into groups to discuss these thematic areas in more detail. The discussion groups were representative of a range of People and Parks stakeholders, including community representatives and government officials from all provinces, members of Cabinet (Deputy Minister), members of the KZN Provincial Legislature and representatives from non-governmental organizations and international organizations.
These parallel sessions focused on unpacking what has worked, what has not worked, and what actions need to be taken to find a way forward for each thematic area. Discussions were wide ranging, including individual experiences and broader learning’s. These discussions were then summarized and presented to the rest of the delegates on the final day of the conference. These actions make up the beginning of the framework for a plan of action for the People and Parks Programme 2010.

5.1 Strengthening the protected area network

The protected area estate includes all areas recognized by the National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act (Act 57 of 2003). The management of this estate by government agencies and communities is critical to the health of South Africa’s biodiversity heritage and natural resource wealth, and thus forms the context for all People and Parks Programmes. Strengthening the protected area network is crucial to strengthening People and Parks Programmes.

The Protected Areas Act (Act 57 of 2003) recognises a wide range of land use areas as ‘protected areas’, including special nature reserves; national parks; nature reserves; World Heritage Sites; marine protected areas; specially protected forest areas, forest nature reserves and forest wilderness areas (declared under the National Forest Act); and mountain catchment areas (Mountain Catchment Areas Act).

Strengthening the protected area network means both improving the management effectiveness of protected area management authorities, and expanding the protected area estate. The recent Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) indicates that South African management authorities have an overall management effective score of only 49%. This is below international and continental standards, and indicates that there is room for growth and improvement within the existing system.

With regard to expanding the protected area estate a National Protected Areas Expansion Strategy (NPAES) was developed in 2008. South Africa currently in the NPAES has 6.2% of our land area under conservation. However, this target has been expanded to 12% of land to adequately cover a representative sample of its biodiversity. This target will cover the 10% international target for terrestrial biodiversity cover.

Climate Change has also introduced important dynamics into the protected area estate that need attention. Other protection mechanisms are being encouraged i.e. stewardship programme.

5.1.1 What has worked

Several initiatives have been underway to strengthen the protected areas network, many of which have had positive outcomes. In particular, recognising the need to empower and capacitate communities around protected areas and ensure that they benefit from them has had far reaching positive effects. The current protected areas audit to update the protected areas register and ensure that all protected areas are properly declared and claimed has also been very important
for strengthening the protected area estate. The formalisation of the management effectiveness tracking tool is assisting with improving the management of protected areas. These processes are helping communities see the value in protected areas and have led to community assistance with border identification.

### Strengthening the protected area network – What has worked?

- Empowering and capacitating communities.
- Expanding community benefits from protected areas.
- Protected areas audit.
- Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)
- Community participation in protected area border identification

### 5.1.2 What has not worked

The lack of information and understanding of the details of the protected area estate and its management at all levels is hampering the implementation of efforts to strengthen the protected area estate. Information sharing mechanisms are inadequate and the information that is available is not filtering down to communities. A lot of progress has been made in developing frameworks and plans for expanding and strengthening the estate, but little implementation can be seen. Communities and government departments are frustrated with the lack of progress and what seems like too much focus on problems and plans, and not enough focus on practical solutions. Progress has been further hampered by lack of support from under resourced municipalities who are not enthusiastic about nationally driven programmes. The slow pace of land settlement is also contributing to problems in expanding and strengthening the estate, and multiple issues around land tenure continue to cause problems. Due to broad ranging problems within rural communities and protected area management authorities, bread and butter issues dominate with little time, resources or attention for structural issues such as strengthening the protected area estate.

### Strengthening the Protected Area Network - What has not worked?

- Inadequate understanding (at all levels) of the existing protected area estate.
- Weak community capacity.
- Inadequate information sharing mechanisms for communities.
- Lack of understanding of the provisions in the Protected Areas Act (Act 57 of 2003).
- Lack of support from weak municipalities.
- Lack of buy in from municipalities.
- Insufficient implementation of programmes to strengthen the protected areas estate.
- Too much focus on plans, strategies, models and tools and not enough on
implementation.

- Multiple issues around land tenure continue to cause problems.
- There are competing priorities within management and community structures. Most of the pressure is to focus on ‘bread and butter issues’ and not strengthening the protected area estate.

5.1.3 The Way Forward
Reflecting on things that have worked, and things that have not, the group decided to focus on three key areas that emerged as being important to finding a way forward:

1. Improved knowledge and understanding at all levels;
2. Improved management effectiveness in all protected areas;
3. Increased community participation and partnerships.

5.1.3.1 Improved knowledge and understanding
Improving knowledge and understanding of the protected area estate is needed across all levels of government and community structures. A lot of information is available that needs to be passed on to communities and government officials in a way that they can understand and use. More information is still needed on many protected areas, and the protected areas audit must continue to fill the gaps in existing information.

The Protected Areas Act (Act 57 of 2003) holds a lot of important information and guidelines. Communities and government officials need to be capacitated to engage with the act and use it more effectively. Strengthening information sharing and communication strategies will empower communities to understand more about protected areas, and enable government officials to better manage their estates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved Knowledge and Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand existing PA estate better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.3.2 Improved management effectiveness in all protected areas
The development of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) has been a very positive step towards improving the management of protected areas. The tool needs to be
reviewed now that it has been piloted. Protected area management authorities need to be careful not to blame the tool for management shortcomings and must ensure that they use it to improve. The tool is helpful in measuring overall effectiveness, but now indicators must be developed and these must include community engagement. The IUCN has launched a governance effectiveness tool in Nagoya, Japan and this needs to be looked at across all provinces as well.

5.1.3.3 Improved community participation and partnerships

Communities would like to be more involved in the planning and implementation of programmes to strengthen the protected area network. Success stories have shown that broader community participation in these processes assists with their implementation. Plans and models need to be translated into action plans that can be implemented at local, provincial and national levels to stop the loss of protected areas and assist with the expansion of the protected area estate. Lessons must be learnt from land settlement processes to avoid the same frustrations and delays.

Communities need to participate more actively in all processes regarding strengthening the protected area estate, but this participation needs to be driven by BOTH communities and government officials. Closer collaboration between communities and protected area management authorities should assist communities to decrease their dependence on management authorities and empower them to do some things on their own. There are nationwide consultations on important issues such as legislation, and communities need to be empowered to participate in these consultations. More policies and legislation is needed to support community engagement in all processes.

Activities aimed at improved community participation and partnerships will assist communities to take ownership of the resources and empower them to be more proactive in the management of resources. The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform needs to come on board with this process and legal instruments need to be provided to support the settlement of land claims.
5.2 Rural development in the context of protected areas

Rural development within and beyond People and Parks Programmes is crucial to the development of vibrant rural economies able to sustain local communities and protected areas. There are existing comprehensive rural development programmes across the country and making linkages to these programmes is very important for both communities and protected area management authorities. In this regard, intergovernmental relations and co-governance between the various departments involved in rural development is crucial.

Coordination and facilitation of all relevant government departments is a serious challenge to consolidating rural development initiatives, as is developing programmes that are responsive to, and inclusive of, all aspects of the rural community.

Creating sustainable linkages between protected area related economic development initiatives and existing rural development strategies is the best way to ensure the resources allocated to rural development are fully utilized.

Within this context, issues of entitlement versus ownership were discussed, with an emphasis on communities needing to find ways to shift from a sense of entitlement regarding rural development initiatives, to a sense of ownership and participation in these initiatives to ensure they are successful.

5.2.1 What has worked

It was broadly agreed that individual efforts by project champions drive positive outcomes in rural development programmes. It was also agreed that in general all aspects of rural development are very challenged. The focus of the discussion was on finding solutions to the seemingly overwhelming problems associated with rural development.

**Rural Development – What has worked?**

- Individual champions to drive projects.
- Few successes.
5.2.2 What has not worked

Rural development initiatives are championed by MEC’s and community representatives expressed frustration at not having the necessary knowledge or power to influence provincial, district or municipal processes. As such, there is little involvement of the relevant communities in local Integrated Development Planning (IDP) processes.

There is also a lack of integration between local and national government planning and implementation strategies, leading to a lack of coordination that negatively affects the success of rural development programmes. There is a further lack of integration between government, business, NGO and community based initiatives.

Due to these and other failures, communities have little interest in formal rural development projects and they do not participate in monitoring or managing what is happening to try and affect more positive outcomes. There is a lack of proper reporting processes and significant funds are wasted on unsuccessful initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Development – What has not worked?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Efforts championed by MEC’s and communities not properly involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of knowledge and influence within communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of involvement in IDP processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of integration between local and national government planning and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of integration between government, business, NGO and community initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of community interest in formal rural development processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of accountability and reporting within existing programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 The way forward

Reflecting on things that have worked, and things that have not, the group focused on three key areas that emerged as being important to finding a way forward:

1. **Capacity** building for communities;

2. **Integration** with local, district and national processes;

3. Communities need to take **ownership** of rural development.

5.2.3.1 Capacity building

In order for communities to meaningfully participate in rural development processes local structures need to be strengthened and capacitated to drive involvement. In particular, communities need to be capacitated to understand how IDP and municipal planning cycles work so that they can participate in them as active and informed stakeholders.
Long-term capacity building is also crucial and communities would like grant funding to be used to raise capacity from local youth through university educations. Long-term capacity building was noted as being important for building true capacity for ownership and participation in rural development processes.

### 5.2.3.2 Integration
Integration needs to take place on several levels. Firstly, between national, district and local planning and implementation processes. Secondly, between local municipalities and local communities, and thirdly between protected area management authorities and local municipalities.

If integration, co-operative governance and participation are improved between these three sectors then rural development strategies will be more successful. In particular, communities and protected areas need to be able to access municipal budgets to ensure sustainable support for their projects.

Strategies need to be developed to bring local government on board with People and Parks Programmes. Starting with the Mayor, municipalities should facilitate broader integration.

### 5.2.3.3 Ownership
Through capacity building and integration communities can start to take ownership of rural development processes. As beneficiaries, communities should be able to leverage the development value of projects and participate more meaningfully. This will assist them to bring focus to areas where conservation is happening. If communities understand and participate in
IDP processes, they will be able to take ownership of local economic development processes. If municipalities understand and participate in People and Parks Programmes they will be able to support them through municipal processes.

Communities, protected area management authorities and municipalities need to take ownership of rural development.

### 5.3 Land reform and co-management in protected areas

Issues surrounding co-management and land reform determine the institutional and land ownership arrangements through which People and Parks Programmes operate. A focus on these two issues is critical to the development of sound institutions and relationships through which programmes can be implemented.

A broad ranging discussion was held outlining local, provincial and national issues relating to land reform and co-management. The discussion included individual and group concerns, and focused on trying to understand how to move forward effectively around issues of land reform and co-management.

#### 5.3.1 What has worked?

The development of a national co-management framework is set to provide the kind of guiding principles needed to ensure that individual co-management agreements include all the necessary details. Many provinces have delayed finalizing their co-management agreements so as to ensure that they are in line with the national framework, and it’s completion will assist in ensuring these arrangements are finalized.

It was widely agreed that implementation of land reform and co-management arrangements is the most successful in areas where there are dedicated staff able to provide the necessary support and drive to guide implementation. Intergovernmental collaboration between the Department of Environmental Affairs and the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform is particularly important at a local and provincial level to ensure that processes receive the necessary support.
Communities that have been able to present a united approach to their land reform and co-management concerns have been more successful than ones with internal political struggles. The need for sound legal advice for communities was noted, although communities with united approaches were reported as being less dependent on external advice and more proactive in their engagements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has worked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Development of a national co-management framework;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff dedicated to resolving land reform and co-management issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intergovernmental collaboration in certain areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• United communities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legal support for communities (where available);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 What has not worked

Despite some successes, the number of provinces in which there is dedicated capacity to deal with land reform and co-management issues are very low. Most provinces do not have dedicated staff to deal with the complex processes around land reform and co-management, and must do it over and above their regular responsibilities. Most provinces are also experiencing a lack of intergovernmental co-ordination, making it difficult to settle issues that involve both protected area and land reform issues.

Both land reform and co-management are highly emotive issues with a lot at stake for both communities and government departments. Much conflict arises during settlement negotiations and there is no dedicated capacity to facilitate independent conflict resolution and interdepartmental co-ordination. Arbitration is a lengthy and expensive process that further delays negotiations and must be avoided if other conflict resolution methods can be found.

Several issues arose regarding co-management on land surrounding protected areas. Communities would like clarity on how to engage with government on land that falls under their claim, but outside of protected area boundaries.

Communities are required to participate in complex co-management negotiations without the necessary legal and financial support to ensure they are always properly informed of the issues at hand. This is a critical issue as it leads to dissatisfaction with co-management agreements at a later stage, once the issues become clearer. It also leads to frustration during the negotiation process as communities do not feel they are equal partners in the negotiation when they do not understand all the implications of the legislation and settlement provisions.

Financial support is needed to sustain lease agreements with government departments when these form part of land claim settlements. This, together with the lack of concrete timeframes for
5.3.3 The Way Forward

Issues surrounding co-management and land reform are interdependent, but recommendations regarding the way forward can be outlined separately to assist with clarity. Some of the issues raised fall within the mandate of the Department of Environmental Affairs and its provincial authorities, while others will need to be resolved by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. All issues will be noted and efforts made by the Department of Environmental Affairs to ensure they are addressed.

5.3.3.1 Land Reform

Ownership is an essential feature of co-management and co-management arrangements cannot be finalized in the absence of title deeds and finalized land reform processes. In this regard, communities would like to see title deed processes fast tracked. Lease agreements are often the product of land reform and co-management negotiations, and unless sustainable funds are made available by government, they will no longer be a viable alternative for resolving land reform and co-management issues.

There are many outstanding land reform issues, such as the recent decision by cabinet regarding the claimants in the Kruger National Park, which need to be clarified and clearly communicated to the relevant communities.

Inter-governmental cooperation must be improved, so that land reform and co-management issues can be resolved.
5.3.3.2 Co-management

The national co-management framework can now be used as a ‘menu’ of options to inform co-management negotiations between communities. Co-management arrangements must be site specific, tailor made to each individual community and protected area. Equal partnerships are essential to successful co-management arrangements and communities need to be capacitated around all aspects of protected area management to ensure that they can participate as equals. Communities with title deeds are more able to assert their rights, and this also allows more equality in co-management relationships. Capacity building around co-management is needed at all levels, within community and government structures.

A critical element of such capacity building is to ensure that all communities are properly capacitated to understand and proactively engage with three critical pieces of legislation governing land reform and co-management activities, namely, the Protected Areas Act; the Land Restitution Act; and the Public Financial Management Act.

These steps will aid in the implementation of co-management agreements, but will not preclude conflict between communities and management authorities during and after negotiation processes. In this regard an independent dispute resolution mechanism has been recommended that can specifically support the resolution of land claim and co-management conflicts. In some cases, political intervention is need to help resolve conflict, particularly in relation to conflicts where traditional leaders are land holders from who land is being claimed or attempting to be co-managed.

Lastly, further clarity was requested regarding the decision by cabinet not to provide ownership to claimants in Kruger, but rather settle claims through alternative means. Further information was also requested regarding the co-management of land adjacent to protected areas.
5.4 Capacity Building, Awareness and Education

Capacity building, awareness and education about all aspects of co-management and protected areas are crucial to the success of People and Parks Programmes and the ability of communities to benefit from them. This issue was raised in all five thematic discussions, all of which made recommendations regarding the specific capacity building concerns for their thematic area.

The national community representative’s steering committee outlined the scope of capacity building, awareness and education as needing to include the following key areas:

- **Environmental education** and awareness raising for children and adults;
- Protected area **management** capacity building for communities;
- Involvement in broader conservation and tourism related **programmes** and activities - e.g. Working for Water, Social Responsibility Policy and Projects (SRPP);
- **Skills profiling** for communities neighbouring protected areas;
- A review of the capacity building **roles, activities and responsibilities** of all protected area management authorities.

The discussion group on capacity building, awareness and education discussed examples from across the country and world in search of key learning’s around what works and what doesn’t work with regard to education and capacity building. The report back, however, focused on drawing lessons from successful case studies such as the education programme in iSimangaliso so as to provide concrete recommendations.
5.4.1 Approach:

It was agreed that education, awareness and capacity building needs are not the same in all communities, and it is important to assess the needs of each situation through consultation before deciding on a programme of action. In this regard, it is important to set goals and objectives in order to meet the specific needs of each community. These goals and objectives must be translated into activities that involve local school educators, community facilitators and experts. For each area, a list is needed detailing what needs to be done, by whom, when, and what resources and support are available.

Assess needs of each area through consultations
Set capacity building goals and objectives
Develop a programme of action
Involerate local facilitators and educators
Who?
What?
Where?
When?
How?

5.4.2 What has worked

Drawing on lessons from iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority it was agreed that having a clear goal and objective is very important to any education or capacity building process, as is having enough resources. iSimangaliso has a dedicated fund that ensures it keeps running.

Their goal is to ensure that each child in the region is exposed to environmental education and that local educators and facilitators are involved in the programme. This ensures the sustainability of the programme. Their objective is to provide actual experience of the natural coastal and ocean environment (touch, look, learn), and to communicate lessons on the interdependence of biodiversity and food webs.

There is also an adult environmental education programme that focuses on resource users such as divers, dive operators, subsistence fishers and other natural resource harvester’s. The focus of the work is on supporting education materials on conservation and tourism. There has also been marine protected area management training in the area. Working with NGOs such as CBD, IUCN and regional initiatives such as WIOMSA and BCC has helped ensure the success of the programme.
5.4.3 What has not worked

Despite many successes, a key concern with regard to capacity building is that there is not enough focus on adults. Many of the environmental education programmes focus predominantly on children and while this is useful for the future, it does not assist with building the community capacity needed to engage meaningfully in People and Parks Programmes.

There is also concern regarding the focus of capacity building programmes on tourism and co-management, rather than the full range of subjects related to protected area management, including legal, financial and conservation issues. It was noted that a distinction should be drawn between short-term capacity building in the form of training and workshops, and long-term capacity building involving study. More investment is needed in long term capacity building initiatives.

5.4.4 The way forward

Discussion group four agreed that capacity building, awareness and education needs to be prioritized to ensure that People and Parks Programmes are successful. There are three streams within which capacity building, awareness and education need to be considered:

1. **Children** in communities neighbouring parks;
2. Adults in communities neighbouring parks;

3. The broader community.

5.4.4.1 Children
There are many successful environmental education programmes for children, but more are needed. Environmental education should be included in local school curriculums and local educators should play an active role in including conservation matters in their learning programmes. Many schools already visit reserves for field trips, but more school visits are needed, especially in areas where the children seldom visit protected areas.

5.4.4.2 Adults
There are more environmental education programmes for children than adults, and this needs to be addressed urgently. Communities need to be made aware of, and be involved in, planning for capacity building programmes. It is very important that conservation authorities do not make assumptions on behalf of communities regarding what capacity building and training is needed.
The Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) workshops that were held were very successful and communities would like these to continue and to be expanded to all areas. Expanding adult education must include collaboration with local experts in traditional knowledge such as traditional healers. Adult capacity building initiatives must be linked to skills transfers and broader development objectives.

5.4.4.3 The broader community

Capacity building and education initiatives need to be developed in conjunction to the work happening in protected areas. Cooperative governance agreements between the Department of Environmental Affairs and the Department of Basic Education can assist with the delivery of capacity building and education programmes. Subjects like tourism, population dynamics and the food chain need to be collaborated on by both departments.

Stewardship programmes should be introduced to increase the conservation landscape and expand the scope of involvement of communities in conservation. Other initiatives that facilitate training and business linkages between the broader community and protected areas will help to raise awareness and capacity. Theatre and creative projects are also needed to raise public awareness about people and Parks issues.

5.5 Financing mechanisms and partnerships for conservation

Sustainable financing for conservation and rural development related initiatives is a concern across the conservation sector. Without sustainable financing mechanisms, government agencies are unable to fulfil their contractual obligations to communities, and communities are unable to access the necessary capacity building and infrastructural support needed to ensure they participate meaningfully in co-management and rural development initiatives.

Finding a balance between funding for conservation and funding for business related initiatives was of particular concern to the group, as these two sectors should develop supportive relationships to assist each other grow but often compete for funding and human resources.
There are many financing mechanisms such as concessionaries, grants and mandatory partners available to projects, but ensuring these sources are accessible and sustainable is difficult. Organizations such as the National Lotteries Board, the European Union, the Global Environment Facility as well as government programmes such as the Expanded Public Works Programme and private business and donors have funds available for people and parks related financing. These funds have, however, only been accessed by a few projects and provinces and efforts are needed to assist all stakeholders to access funding.

In trying to achieve sustainable financing, tension arises between a focus on conservation, and a focus on business. Finding the right balance between these two areas is critical to developing sustainable projects able to generate income and properly meet their conservation mandate.

5.5.1 What has worked
Addo Elephant National Park was given as an example of a programme that has successfully been able to generate funds to support community related projects. The claimant communities neighbouring Addo Elephant National Park formed a trust, providing them with the legal and institutional structures necessary to apply for funding. They then drafted a business plan and applied to several sources for funding. Several of their applications, including to the European Union, were successful, and the People and Parks Programmes in Addo Elephant National Park have enjoyed the benefits of having a significant amount of funding available from a diverse range of sources. This has enabled them to invest in business, capacity building and conservation related activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing Mechanisms and Partnerships for Conservation – What has worked?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The formation of a community trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The development of a business plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formal applications for funding through the trust to a range of funders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding from multiple sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.2 What has not worked
Protected areas vary in their size, location and financial needs, and few outside of the popular national parks are financially self-sustainable. As such, protected areas require additional funding for their operation and management, as well as to support People and Parks Programmes.

Different size protected areas require different types of funding, but there is no baseline inventory of up to date information regarding the budget and overall resourcing or expenditure for protected areas. Without this information, it is difficult to anticipate exactly how much support protected areas need.
Communities raised concerns regarding their participation in identifying what funds are needed for, and accessing funds in general. Many communities feel that they do not have the capacity to access funding in isolation of protected area management authorities. They outlined the need for funding to address the needs of both People and Parks Programmes and the constituent communities participating in these programmes, and want more input into the sourcing and allocation of funds.

In addition to funding for people and parks related programmes, funds are needed to mitigate external risks associated with climate change, disease, invasive species and fire. These kinds of events threaten both conservation and development initiatives and must be budgeted for.

**Financing Mechanisms and Partnerships for Conservation – What has not worked?**

- Insufficient funding for park management.
- Inability to access funds despite availability.
- Lack of up to date information about park budgets and resources.
- Lack of community participation in funding initiatives.
- Lack of focus on programme and community needs, usually either or scenario.
- Lack of funds to mitigate against external risks.

**5.5.3 Way forward**

Several steps were discussed to facilitate resolving some of the concerns regarding sustainable financing. These steps can broadly be categorized into four areas of concern:

1. **Proper planning, budgeting and accountability** processes for community and conservation authorities.
2. **Financial management capacity building** for community and conservation authorities.
3. **Legal structures** for communities to access funding opportunities.
4. **Partnerships and linkages** to support community and conservation authorities.

**5.5.3.1 Planning, budgeting and accountability**

It was agreed that zero budgeting and planning / baseline information is needed for all protected areas so that proper financial planning can inform fundraising efforts. Communities also need to collect zero budgeting and planning / baseline information for their organizational and co-management activities for the same reason.
Communities need to develop business plans for their activities and outline clear areas in which financial support is needed. To ensure these business plans are properly implemented, communities need to develop accountability procedures that ensure the integrity of their financial activities.

Business plans must be based on developing financial activities through traditional economic as well as eco-system services so that protected areas are able to use their inherent resources to secure sustainable financing.

**5.5.3.2 Capacity building**

In order for communities to take responsibility for proper financial planning and management within their organizations and within co-management frameworks, they need extensive capacity building. The communities involved with Addo Elephant National Park have good financial management skills within them, which has enabled them to access funding and managed it sustainably.

Capacity building initiatives should be aimed at using best case lessons from successful initiatives around the country as well as bringing in learning’s from broader local economic development. Skills development is essential to community participation in co-management arrangements and other People and Parks Programmes.
5.5.3.3 Legal structures

In order for communities to access funding opportunities and take responsibility for their financial management they need to develop the appropriate legal and organizational structures. Only registered community trusts, NGO’s and Community Based Organizations (CBO) can apply for grants and funding, so all communities must be supported to establish the necessary structures.

Those communities that have already established legal entities can provide learning’s and support to other communities, but support is also needed from protected area management authorities and government departments.

5.5.3.4 Partnerships and linkages

Partnerships between communities and government departments, NGO’s, funding organizations, international donors, development agencies and financial institutions are essential to sustainable financing strategies. Such partnerships can be developed at different stages, and can be geared towards support in developing formal financial management procedures, capacity building, the formation of legal entities and for funding to support projects.
These partnerships can include traditional fundraising partnerships, as well as broader economic development partnerships and linkages, black economic empowerment partnerships and business relationships. Localised community based BBBEE procurement in particular will support the development of sustainable financing mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships and Linkages for Sustainable Financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner with NGO's, Government, Donors, Business</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop partnerships at all stages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include fundraising and business partnerships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local community based BBBEE procurement strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 SITE VISITS

Following the thematic discussion breakaway groups, delegates were given the opportunity to visit three of KwaZulu Natal’s most successful People and Parks Programme initiatives. These included visiting iSimangaliso Wetland Park, Nselweni Bush Camp, and Somkhanda Game Reserve.

The purpose of these visits was to see examples of successful co-management agreements between communities and parks. The visits were intended to offer inspiration and best practice learning to the delegates. Delegates were given an opportunity to ask questions to community representatives benefiting from the agreements and to the park officials. Information sharing and a tour of each site’s tourist attractions were made, allowing delegates to learn and enjoy the offerings of the protected areas.

6.1 iSimangaliso Wetland Park

The iSimangaliso Wetland Park was listed as South Africa’s first UNESCO World Heritage Site in December 1999 for recognition of its natural beauty and unique biodiversity. The 332 000 hectare Park contains three lake systems, eight interlinking ecosystems, 700 year old fishing traditions, most of South Africa’s remaining swamp forests, Africa’s largest estuarine system, 526 bird species and 25 000 year-old coastal dunes – among the highest in the world. The name iSimangaliso means miracle and wonder.

The iSimangaliso Authority was set up to manage the Park, created from 16 different parcels of land – a patchwork of state-owned land, commercial forests and former military sites. These sites have exceptional biodiversity, ecological processes and scenic beauty. iSimangaliso also contains four wetlands of international importance under the Ramsar Convention.

iSimangaliso has 220 kms of coastline, bringing together five ecosystems and ten unique destinations: Maphelane, Lake St Lucia, Cape Vidal and the Eastern Shores, Charters Creek and the Western Shores, False Bay, Sodwana Bay, uMkhuze, Lake Sibaya, Coastal Forest and Kosi Bay.

Park establishment programs have seen the removal of some 12 000 ha of alien plants and commercial forests. Wetland and dune rehabilitation programs, the introduction of game, runway upgrades, the building of new roads, game fences, new water supply and bulk electricity supply systems and substations have all contributed to building the new Park.

During the People and Parks Conference 2010 there was a signing of agreements between land claimants and iSimangaliso which took place on the banks of Lake St Lucia estuary on 30 August 2010. After extensive negotiations, two co-management agreements with community land claimants were signed and eight land-owning communities received their revenue-sharing cheques valued between R40 000 and R299 388. The event was broadcast live on SABC 2’s Morning Live show on the Day 2 of the conference.
At the time of the establishment of the Park, it was 100% under claim but 75% of claims have now been settled. Title deeds have passed from the State to these new land-owners with restrictions in title including that the land remains under formal conservation and part of the Park forever. Principles of economic viability, financial sustainability and holistic management are incorporated in the settlement agreements.

6.2 Nselweni Bush Camp

The Nselweni Bush Camp was officially handed over to the communities surrounding Hluhluwe Imfolozi Park on the 10th of December 2009. Nselweni bush camp is situated in the Umfolozi sector of the Park. The camp was built as a joint venture with members of the surrounding community and funded in part by the Conservation Levy one pays when visiting the Hluhluwe Imfolozi Park. Ten communities benefit from the building of the bush camp through a beneficiary trust fund set up so that communities bordering the park benefit directly from the bush camp.

The communities chose to save the money earned from the Conservation Levy in order to accumulate enough funds to develop an entrepreneurial project that could create jobs for the community members. Three million rand earned from this revenue and an additional R 4 million rand provided by the Department of Environment provided seed funding to develop the bush lodge. Nselweni is the first community-funded bush lodge in the park.

The Nselweni Bush Camp is one of the most sophisticated examples of good governance in the People and Parks Programme. The Amakhosi, who own and manage the project, admitted that they had to learn to “operate above politics” in order to progress.

6.3 Somkhanda Game Reserve

Somkhanda Game Reserve is the fruit of a successful land claim made by the Gumbi community for 20 000 hectares bordering the Pongola Biosphere Reserve. The Somkhanda Game Reserve is located between Mkuze and Pongola towns in KwaZulu-Natal. Somkhanda is a Community Conservation Area born from a community decision to develop a game reserve because the habitat and low rainfall is not good for livestock or agriculture. Some land was also set aside for housing and subsistence farming for the community and they have a partnership in place with the eLan property group, who plan to develop an estate on 200 hectares of land. Money from the estate will go into the management of the reserve.

Advising the Gumbi community (which comprises about 650 families) is the former regional land claims commissioner, Thabi Shange, who is now consulting to communities. The Somkanda community conservation area is working well because the traditional leaders have come together and are co-operating with one another. They have also put all the financial checks and balances in place, and opened themselves to partnerships that are helping to make a success of their claim.

In partnership with The Green Trust, WWF and The Wildlands Conservation Trust (which specialises in community-based conservation and tourism development), Somkhanda Game
Reserve is now open for tourism. In addition to the employment opportunities offered by the reserve, the community is employed in bush clearing and alien plant control initiatives inside and outside the reserve. A major boost to the reserve was the introduction of Black Rhino through WWF’s Black Rhino Range Expansion Project. Through support from the WWF the Somkhanda Game Reserve protects 11 Black Rhino.
7 TAKING THE PEOPLE AND PARKS PROGRAMME FORWARD

The fourth people and parks conference was closed on Day 4 with a detailed response to the conference discussions by the honourable Deputy Minister of Water and Environmental Affairs, Mme Rejoice Mabudafhasi. The honourable Deputy Minister introduced her concluding remarks by noting three important achievements of the fourth people and parks conference:

1. Clear presentations of community concerns and frustrations regarding the slow pace of implementation of People and Parks Programmes;

2. Site visits to three people and parks projects in KZN to share learning’s with all delegates from successful People and Parks Programmes and demonstrate the value in sharing best practice learning across provinces;

3. International best practice presentations to assist delegates to locate their challenges and successes in relation to a broader international context.

The honourable Deputy Minister outlined the five proposed thematic areas discussed during the conference as being crucial to the success of people and parks issues and commended delegates on preparing practical recommendations to address these thematic areas during the parallel discussions on Day 2 of the conference.

The honourable Deputy Minister also noted the importance of engaging with communities concerns. She noted that although ground has been covered since the 2008 conference in Mafikeng, North-West, the challenges remains daunting. In this regard, the honourable Deputy Minister sympathized with community frustration and even the loss of patience demonstrated by communities. The slow pace of implementation of the programme remains a challenge to all concerned and the department committed to finding ways to improve the benefits to communities.

Based on these concerns the honourable Deputy Minister presented on behalf of the Department of Environmental Affairs a list of commitments to this conference and the communities who await its results with keen interest back home:

The department committed to:

9. To work towards the promotion of healthy and sound relations amongst all the parties to the People and Parks Programme as in communities, the government and the agencies and individual parks, by working towards the following goals:

9.1. Promoting the equal status of all the parties. This will ensure that communities are not treated as mere subject in the tripartite relationship but are recognised as partners deserving respect and full participations in all matter that affect their interest as per the program,
9.2. To position the Department of Environmental Affairs, as an institution, to take full responsibility for the coordination, policy development and support that is bestowed on it by the laws of the country and relevant international treaties. As such we recognise the urgent need to beef up the organisational capacity of the department in this regard,

9.3. To facilitating the capacity building efforts that will ensure that each party plays its role to the best of its ability. Notably, such efforts must be biased towards affirming community structures, leaders and key personnel at all levels and ensuring that they play their full role in the matters affecting their interests across the country,

10. The mobilisation of resources (including financial) to help unlock the many blockages that have frustrated the best efforts amongst the parties. Our efforts will be aimed at achieving the following:

10.1. Engaging the SRPP component of the Department in streamlining and leveraging dedicated funding for the People and Parks Programme,

10.2. Mobilising additional funding from the private sector and possible sources of funding through partnerships,

10.3. To engage Parks Agencies in creative ways of leveraging existing funding and business models (including procurement policies and practices) for the greater good of the programme,

11. To build a strong and people and parks structures (for coordination and implementation purposes) at all levels to ensure the meaningful engagement and participation of parties in all activities based on the principles of corporate governance and respect for each other’s role,

12. To further explore the model of community support that was presented by Mpumalanga during the conference as a best practice for community support and engage all other provinces with a view to sharing Mpumalanga’s best practices and adopting broad guidelines for supporting communities. Once adopted, the National Department of Environmental Affairs will be charged with the responsibility of monitoring the implementation of the guidelines,

13. To build on the successes of the Kids and Parks programme and mainstream it within the broader People and Parks Programme. This will be achieved by:

13.1. Rolling out the project nationally beyond the national parks,

13.2. Implementing capacity building programmes that will ensure that all agencies are well prepared to play their full roles and to draw the attendant benefits from the programme,

13.3. To extend the programme to address other special groups such as youth, women, disabled people, etc
14. To undertake nationwide **feasibility studies** within the protected areas sector by focusing on the following critical operational areas:

14.1. Detailed assessment of the protected areas **budgetary issues**,

14.2. **Human resources** capacity,

14.3. **Management effectiveness**

15. To use **Resource Africa’s** theatre team as ambassadors of the people and Park brand and for the purpose of popularising it within parks communities and nationally,

16. To convene a national **People and Parks Coordinating Forum** constituted by the National Department of Environmental Affairs, the Community Representatives Executive Committee, Provincial Departments and Agencies to achieve the following broad objectives:

16.1. To **review the resolutions** of the previous people and parks conference with a view to highlighting critical and strategic decisions whose implementation is still outstanding or remains incomplete,

16.2. To find creative ways of **enforcing the implementation** of the previous conferences resolutions,

16.3. To facilitate the **development** of the People and Parks brand and its **marketing** strategy,

16.4. To place the People and Parks Programme firmly on the **higher level of governance** including cabinet,

16.5. To draw up and adopt a People and **Parks Programme of Action** based on the outcomes of this conference and previous ones (where implementation is incomplete or outstanding)

The honourable Deputy Minister closed the conference with these commitments and encouraged everyone, including communities and government departments, to work together to achieve more!
Appendix 1: Delegate Participants

The conference was attended by representatives from the following list of organisations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Departments and Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Water and Environmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Water Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Rural Development and Land Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Land Claims Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African National Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African National Biodiversity Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Protected Area Management Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CapeNature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State Provincial Department of Economic Development, Tourism and Environmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng Provincial Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo Provincial Department of Economic Development, Environment and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga Tourism and Parks Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape Provincial Department of Environmental Affairs and Nature Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Parks and Tourism Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North West</th>
<th>Limpopo</th>
<th>Mpumalanga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakgatla Ba Kgafela CPA</td>
<td>Kondowe Conservancy</td>
<td>Somakhala CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matlwang Barolong CPA</td>
<td>Modjadji Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Songimvelo CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klipgoostad CPA</td>
<td>Wonderkop Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Moutse CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balete Ba Lekgophung Development Trust</td>
<td>Makuya Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Moletelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebolao Development Trust</td>
<td>Rust De Winter Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Rampholodi CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngaka Modiri Molema District Municipality BBK CPA</td>
<td>Mantrombi Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Moremopuso CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leswena Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Pilgrims Rest Development Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maleboho Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Mamaesee Magweri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turfloop Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Sehlare CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madimbo-Matshakatini Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Mnisi Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Communities Represented Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Cape</th>
<th>Free State</th>
<th>KZN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communities of the Sanparks arid Region</td>
<td>Selosesha Thaba Nchu</td>
<td>Gm-Ukhahlamba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Makambini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voolsdrift Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hlabisa Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witsand Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tembe/Ndumo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Usuthu Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathenjwa T/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ntsikeni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Claimant Leadership

- Kwansinde
- Kwajobe
- Mabaso
- Sokhulu
- Emdletsheni
- Bhangazi
- Makhsa
- Emandleni
- Mnqobokazi

### Other

- Umhlathuze Municipality
- Umkhanyakude Municipality
- Conservation KZN Legislation
- KZN Department of Agriculture, Environmental Affairs and Rural Development
- Institute Of Marine & Environmental University Of Cape Town
- Hand In Hand SA
- Resource Africa
- IUCN
- DBSA
- WESSA
- The Guild
- Linkd Environmental Services
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Ladies and gentleman

I have been asked to address the issue of transformation in the biodiversity and conservation within the environment portfolio of our country.

Transformation in our country is central to the attainment of an inclusive economic development that takes into cognisance the role of ordinary South Africans and that benefits of such transformation are realised by all.

The political liberation we realised in 1994 would amount to nothing unless we address the issue of economic development and participation of all our people in the biodiversity and conservation sector, which to us is integral to ensuring that the Green Economy remains central to job-creation and to propel the country into a green future.

A bit of background and history would come in handy to understand the context of our debate and relevance to this august gathering.

"In 1955 various liberation movements gathered in Kliptown to craft the way forward in the midst of apartheid system that had rendered the indigenous people of this country as mere labourers.

It was this same gathering that saw the emergence of the Freedom Charter as but one of many key decisions.

It contained an important decision which articulated the following; “The people shall govern”. It is in this context that I would like us to always place our people at the centre of all the policies and programmes of government for them to have relevance and be responsive to our people's needs and plight.

Hence this programme People and Parks!
We host this Conference as we ready ourselves for the 10th meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP10) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) that will be held in Nagoya, Japan.

Among some of the areas of focus for this gathering is the adoption of an international regime on access and benefits sharing whose negotiations are at a critical stage.

Biodiversity and conservation will play a crucial role in the development of a green economy. Informed by government's commitment to a new growth path in the form of a green economy, we will use this international platform to advance positions that support a move towards implementation of economic instruments, including where appropriate, market-based mechanisms for biodiversity conservation. New and innovative financial instruments, particularly those targeted at the poor, need to be developed.

We will advocate that recommendation that entail new financial incentive mechanisms that mobilise both public and private investment in biodiversity conservation and restoration will be supported.

The Convention on Biological Diversity is anchored on three key objectives namely the conservation, sustainable use of biological diversity, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilisation of these resources. South Africa subscribes to these three key objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Sustainable utilisation of natural resources is at the forefront of South Africa’s approach to development as articulated in the National Strategy Sustainable Development.

South Africa is proud to be part of the world community that celebrates 2010 as the International Year of Biodiversity. The celebration should be more relevant to us as a country that is ranked the fifth largest home to biodiversity in the whole world and is well endowed with natural wealth resources which include a vast array of plants, animals, scenic rivers and mountains unspoiled forests, parks and ecosystems amongst others. However, unless these majestic beauties of our land are shared with all our people our fruits of liberation will not reach the poorest of the poor.

One of our primary objectives is ecological sustainability; protected areas play a significant role in socio-economic development especially in rural areas, while also contributing to South Africa's overall development goals.

With the dawn of democracy in 1994, "and the' passing of new laws, our government has introduced the economic system of shareholding which allows rural people to play a critical role. This is integral towards ensuring that governments priority of rural development is also attained.

Gone are the days when the environmentalist were viewed as obstructing development, for we believe strongly that the environment portfolio has a substantial role to play in economic development and ensuring that as we grow our economy we do so in a manner that is sustainable and pro-green.
Although the Biodiversity White Paper of 1997 did not necessarily address transformation issues per se, it set out a number of goals, strategies and priorities for conservation, sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing.

For instance, Goal 4 identified the lack of capacity in the sector and proposed that this be addressed to enhance biodiversity conservation and to manage its use and to address factors threatening it. It was further acknowledged that women, and rural women in particular, play a vital role in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and should be involved in all decision-making processes.

The institution of land restitution process saw thousands of black people claiming ownership of land, with much of that land falling within protected areas.

Previously communities were excluded from playing a role in protecting the environment. Successful land claims presented new economic opportunities for the claimants who had been moved away from their land. The government is now faced with the challenge of seeing that previously disadvantaged people are supported and advised to ensure that they get the benefits they deserve whilst upholding their conservation mandates.

Access and benefit sharing (ASS) in the Protected Areas Act emphasises the need for redress and the importance of equitable access to natural resources, protected areas, information, support for the purposes of enhancing the livelihoods of rural communities. Rural communities and holders of traditional knowledge are often key stakeholders in these agreements and initiatives.

Today our people are becoming shareholders and new practices for Protected Areas are being created which are allowing rural people to play a critical role. The Protected Areas Act makes provision for the People and Parks Programme and makes it possible for co-management agreements to be forged between claimant and authorities.

Claimants that are now land owners are enjoying shared rights with park authorities. The formation of these agreements is proving to be a challenge and attention needs to be paid to providing support and increasing resources to facilitate this.

In 2007 the then Ministers of Environmental Affairs and Land Affairs concluded an agreement that provides a mechanism to facilitate amongst others:

- A co-operative approach to resolution of land claims within Protected Areas
- Environmental protection of Protected Areas under claim
- Optimum participation and benefit sharing of claimants and communities

We are immensely proud of some of the successes we have been able to record which have resulted in among others, the National Co-Management Framework. The Program of Work on Protected Areas under the Convention on Biological Diversity encourages state parties to
recognize and develop a broad range of protected area governance to reduce biodiversity loss and attainment of Millennium Development Goals.

It further advocates for legislating participation of local communities to promote equitable sharing of benefits. The overall objective is to ensure effective redress of land rights, integrated development and long lasting economic opportunities and a better quality of life.

It also provides a harmonized uniform guideline for conservation authorities and successful restitution claimants who want to enter a structured co-operation arrangement for the management of protected areas.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am happy to announce that we approved the national co-management framework in March this year and we will be launching it here in partnership with Department of Rural Development and Land Reform.

The co-management framework articulates a number of important principles which must be observed if the parties want to reap a mutually beneficial partnership.

It is also encouraging to note that processes are underway in the hunting industry to transform without too much pressure from the government. It is clear that the industry is aware of the need for transformation and they are willing to make it happen.

The professional hunting industry on its own is responsible for the generation of substantial income in foreign revenue. For the 2007 hunting season, a total income of approximately R650 million was realized. This industry, which is based on the country's rich fauna, has therefore been identified as providing a potential platform for broadening the participation of local communities in economic activities.

We will be publishing Hunting Norms and Standards soon to ensure that hunting adheres to the principles of sustainable utilisation of resources, takes place lawfully and is regulated uniformly throughout the country, among others.

As government, we will provide guidance and the focus of the transformation efforts should be expanded beyond male domination and training, to include Previously Disadvantaged Individuals to establish and own shares in the current industry and women in particular.

The Protected Areas Act provisions oblige us to establish the People and Parks Programme which further compelled our department to introduce co-management agreements in parks to be forged between claimants and authorities. This is evidence of local economic development which is rooted in the communities with the dividends accrued shared with the affected communities.

Although we have already begun the process, we are still not satisfied with the number of communities benefiting. With our biodiversity richness ranked fifth in the world, I'm disappointed that we have such a small number of beneficiaries.

Mother Nature has given us these resources to counter the onslaught of poverty. It is up to us to use these natural resources sustainably whilst ensuring the benefits trickle down to communities,
especially rural communities. As a department, we need to double our efforts to ensure that in the next conference in 2012 the number of benefitting communities should have increased, at least ten times.

To achieve this, we need to resolve the challenges experienced today by studying the best practices in order to find effective ways to provide support.

We also noted the lack of capacity in the sector is an impediment that should be addressed as a matter of urgency. We further acknowledge the absence of women in the sector and we need them to play a vital role in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and their involvement in all decision-making processes.

We have identified the biggest problem in the management of biodiversity as the plethora of institutions dealing with conservation and the department may consider reviewing the roles of the entities and rationalize them to bring about effective management.

In our country about eighteen institutions are managing biodiversity with five national based and thirteen being provincial. This has led to gross ineffectiveness and excessive costs. In the meantime, the department will engender uniform approach by encouraging streamlined reporting to MECs in provinces and the Minister for national institutions.

A Biodiversity Charter will be required to guide stakeholders on the appropriate way of conducting business. This means that as partners with private sector and NGOs we should develop and implement a Biodiversity Charter, or Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBEE) scorecard to address transformation and BBEE in the sector.

Provision was made in the Biodiversity Act to develop a National Biodiversity Framework (NBF) which provides for an integrated, coordinated and uniform approach to biodiversity management. The NBF is in the process of identifying activities to be implemented in the next five years to address transformation in the biodiversity sector.

Needless to say, we have challenging assignments ahead of us to ensure that all problems identified in this conference are addressed and that we should deal with completely new challenges in two years time.

After this conference I know that we must be better informed as a country for coming Nagoya Conference.

I express appreciation to the Director General and all of the departmental officials for their leadership.
Appendix 3: Detailed Community Concerns and Responses from Provincial Protected Area Management Authorities

Each province provided a detailed list of their most pressing concerns regarding People and Parks Programmes in their provinces. Following the presentations by community representatives from each province, CEO’s of provincial protected area management authorities responded to the communities. Below is a detailed summary of the concerns and responses presented by each province.

1. Western Cape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There is no track record of what is happening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communities project initiatives often remain ideas because of lack of funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The land reform process is very slow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job creation projects are needed for communities to sustain themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communities are losing faith and hope in Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no stipend for volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic development is poor with no reality and not practical to the PD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All government departments must show commitment to community development especially SALGA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Little progress has been made with people and parks programme nationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communities are not yet involved in the management committees of the nature reserves. These committee are largely white dominated, e.g. Protected Areas Advisory Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a lack of feedback from the Government to the communities regarding people and parks issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEO Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucille Meyer, CEO CapeNature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CEO of CapeNature noted the concerns raised by the communities. She raised her concern regarding the seriousness of the issues, and committed to continue to work towards addressing such concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In particular, Ms Meyer noted the importance of keeping the steering committee active in the province, and providing support for this process. She noted that the province is currently unable to afford stipends for volunteers, but raised it as an issue she wishes to pursue nationally, in hope that the broader conservation community can find support for all community volunteers.

Ms Meyer also noted the following: over 1000 jobs have already been created by Cape Nature, which is good progress. She noted that further employment opportunities were needed, but that progress already made must be acknowledged.

“I have listened very carefully, and some of the issues are real issues. I think we have done well in the province to set up an active steering committee. One elected after Mafikeng, and another is elected. There is a lot more support that we can offer to the steering committee.”

In closing, Ms Meyer called for protected area management authorities and communities to sit together and talk openly about concerns.

2. KwaZulu Natal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families were to received R10 000 compensation as part of a land settlement agreement. This is issue has not been resolved and people need answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities with claims are still waiting for title deeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-management arrangements must be communicated to all provinces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need the report of the Mafikeng Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are failing to respect the People and Parks Programmes because empty promises are being made by Honourable members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umfolozi Hluthuwe Park wrote a letter to the Minister of Rural Development but he has not ever responded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement development grants are not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminder: we met the Deputy Minister at Mafikeng!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEO Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bandile Mkhize, CEO Ezemvelo KZN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CEO of Ezemvelo KZN noted the concerns raised by the community and outlined that EKZN has worked hand in hand with communities in attempting to resolve these problems. Mr Mkhize noted that EKZN was involved in writing to the Minister of Land Affairs (now Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform) and that they have done everything they can to support the communities in their engagements with land reform concerns.

Dr Mkhize expressed that EKZN is satisfied that they have resolved everything that is within their scope and that they will continue to assist communities in their activities with other relevant departments.

3. Mpumalanga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land transfers are taking a long time to be implemented, particularly on state owned land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No land hand over has taken place since the incoming of the new Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing of the title deeds does not happen at all after the signing of the transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement grants are non-existent, years after transfers have been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These delays in completing the restitution process have resulted in the mushrooming of concerned groups within communities because they become impatient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These delays in transferring land to new owners results in game killing and selling of game by fraudulent conservation officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current tenants of transferred lands become problematic to the new land owner. Why is the state reluctant to resolve these issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New developments are coming up on the transferred lands without the knowledge and participation by the new land owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTPA is continuing to utilize private security companies on transferred land without any consultation and participation with the new land owners who are willing to offer such services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CEO Response

Charles Ndabeni, CEO MTPA
CEO of Mpumalanga Parks and Tourism Agency (MPTA), Charles Ndabeni, provided a detailed response including an outline of his vision for People and Parks Programmes in his province.

In particular, Mr Ndabeni referred to three key intervention areas, namely the creation of a holistic vision, the development of a plan and the allocation of sufficient resources. Mr Ndabeni noted the vision for conservation in Mpumalanga as being driven by the need to located their existing conservation mandate within the context of rural development. Mr Ndabeni noted that while land reform issues are not within the scope of conservation authorities, they are directly relevant to people and parks and rural development concerns and thus must be engaged with proactively. Mr Ndabeni noted the development of a land resolution strategy within their social ecology team to enable them to engage further with these issues.

Mr Ndabeni further noted that MTPA prioritized five land claims for resolution in 2009-2010, four of which have settled. He noted an additional five claims have been prioritized for 2010-2011, and another seven for 2011-2012.

Mr Ndabeni emphasized the importance of their a joint engagement with the regional land claims commissioner as being central to their strategy and their success and has enabled them to resolve 4 very difficult issues.

Mr Ndabeni also outlined the importance of ensuring communities are properly resourced to participate in co-management arrangements, and noted the provision of an office, employment opportunities and a Community Property Association (CPA) budget at Somgimvelo nature reserve as an example of the kinds of resources needed to support community initiatives. He also noted the need to compile a database of local service providers around each protected area to ensure the parks become an active part of local economic development.

Mr Ndabeni noted five agreements made with the CPA to ensure success:
1) They must support co-management arrangements,
2) There must be management protocols (cannot order reserve manager around),
3) There must be a leadership protocol – too many workshops and too little leadership – people must perform, people must account, or they are out.
4) Issues of SRPP – there must be co-ordination amongst communities, helped by
MTPA to set up community advisory committee in each park.

5) No CPA member will mobilize investors. Creative investors can manipulate CPA structures to skew investment to suite them. All investment must come through formal structures.

Mr Ndabeni noted the successes at Mangyeleti Reserve, where a R4million agreement has been signed creating 600 permanent jobs. In this instance, the management authority is only responsible for park planning, administration and management with co-management structures taking responsibility for tourism procurement and other hospitality related services.

Mr Ndabeni concluded by noting that the CMC process is very critical. He noted that all issues are land related issues and a joint process with the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform is essential. He also noted that skills development needs to be pre-empted so that skilled staff are ready when you need them and training does not only start once projects are ready to operate.

4. Limpopo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communities not involved in decision-making processes – locally to nationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land claims processes are very slow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities are given the lands do not yet have title deeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post settlement grants are not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lack of transparency on the part of the government is a concern, especially in terms of the details financial settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game management in the reserves does not involve communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community beneficiation in tourism is not meeting expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants questions after land claim won by the displaced communities staying elsewhere without including current occupants/tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspected nepotism /interest commissioner in terms of prioritising land claims for finalisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CEO Response

Karambe Matibe, LEDET

Mr Matibe noted he was responding on behalf of the Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment and Tourism as well as the Limpopo Parks Board and the Limpopo regional land claims commission.

Regarding the lack of community participation in decision making processes, Mr Matibe explained that the province sat with their communities and tried their best to move forward in term of inclusive decision making processes. He noted the development of local forums, district forums, provincial forums in an attempt to facilitate the meaningful participation of land owners in decision making.

Mr Matibe agreed with communities that the land restitution process is slow, but noted this is because the process requires research and financial investigation which take time. He also noted the effects of community dynamics and conflicting land claims on slowing down processes.

With regard to title deeds, Mr Matibe announced that the province have now resolved 98% of vesting gaps in the province, with 98% of the land now being vested. He urged other provinces to follow suite.

With regard to post settlement grants Mr Matibe agreed that they are not available, ad noted it was due to lack of budget within the department to meet demands. He noted, however, that they will continue to look for funds to solve this problem.

Mr Matibe noted that despite these successes there are still capacity concerns within government structures, largely related to changes in staff. He committed to address this concern. He did not agree with communities that there is no transparency on behalf of the government, and noted that claimants are made aware of settlement processes.

With regard to co-management, Mr Matibe noted that there was room to do more, but also noted programmes to introduce game hunting in community reserves as an attempt to expand community involvement in game management.

In conclusion Mr Matibe noted the 50-50% profit share arrangement now in place in the province to improve community beneficiation from tourism activities. He also noted the introduction of tourism levies to park fees. He noted the province is doing
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their best to resolve issues and work with communities.

5. Northern Cape

Witsand Community Concerns

- Land restitution at Witsand has not been resolved.
- The commission promised that MEC of Conservation and Land Reform would visit us in order to resolve the Witsand issue but he has not.
- The people of Witsand (Claimants) want to be part of the forum of the management and also staff of Witsand and also seek for royalties.
- We are ready to engage government if they allow us to.
- The commission also promised that claimed land where there is no dispute government will solve those claims and then engage with disputes claims on a later stadium, but nothing came from that.
- The claimants of Witsand are willing to go into partnership with conservation on a percentage basis but cannot unfortunately wait forever for this to happen.
- The claimants are now considering occupying the land, even if it is a protection area. They expressed willingness to serve some jail term if government cannot come with a solution.
- Our patience is really at breaking point. 5 years ago we threatened to occupy this land but government is not taking us seriously.
- In order for government to work together with us they should really try and solve this matter now.
- We want to be involved in game harvesting and game that were there historically must be given back.
- We as the claimants of Witsand really want to have a say in the daily activities and management of this Witsand Conservation Area.

Vioolsdrift Grondies Community Concerns

- The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform must resolve the claims issues as soon as possible. The department must come to the communities inform and explain to them how far the land claims processes are.
- The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform is hampering economic development. The community has already enrolled land for conservation purposes.
- Currently the Steikoft communal is managing the land. The community wants to register their own communal land in order to manage land themselves. The land claim must be resolved and speeded up because the unrest is getting too much.

### CEO Response

Northern Cape representative was not mandated to provide an official response on any of the issues raised. The CEO was not present.

### 6. Free State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Title deeds delays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Land disposal delays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Registration of CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resources to hold meeting to hold meetings and attend national committee meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CEO Response

**Mr Mathabula**

“We have heard our communities and we need to communicate that as a department we are in continuous meetings with the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform to engage with issues from the communities. We wrote a memo through the cluster so that both departments are working from the same framework. It has been adopted by Exco.

On the issue of resources to attend meetings, etc. We will explore this issue within our department. But we request that the lack of resources in the province to address the concerns raised be tabled at MINTEC to explore funding for a national level.
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Ladies and Gentlemen

Ndimatsheloni, Sanibonani!

I am excited to be standing here in front of you today as we conclude the 4th People and Parks conference - "conservation for the people with the people." As the Department of Environmental Affairs we reiterate our commitment to extend benefits beyond the boundaries of protected areas in line with the World Parks Congress' Durban Accord.

I returned to the podium after three days of speeches and deliberations on the many challenges facing us as partners in the People and Parks Programme journey. Most importantly, I return against the background of three important developments that took place in the conference over the last two days.

Firstly, the concerns and frustrations of the communities with regard the slow pace of the implementation of the people and parks programme and all its related challenges.

Secondly, this year’s conference programme saw the introduction of an innovative item where delegates visited three projects that epitomize some of the key critical elements of the people and parks concept. I visited one of the projects and I can begin to explain my excitement at the lessons provided by the KZN province, the energy, enthusiasm and the depth of the partnership between the authorities and communities in making the people and parks concept a resounding success we all striving for.
I hope you are as inspired as I am with the benchmarking exercises demonstrated by our gracious hosts. I am sure we can all look forward to the exchange of best practices from other provinces during and in between people and parks conferences in future.

Thirdly, it is the inclusion of international best practices to inform a comparative analysis our progress and challenges as well as inspire us to draw lessons from those who are undertaking journeys similar to ours. I have truly enjoyed the experience of other countries and I would like to thank the delegates from IUCN and Lesotho for sharing their experience so generously with us.

Regarding the concerns and challenges facing us all, and especially communities, during my opening address on Monday I alluded to five challenges that coincide with those tabled by the community representatives to this conference and also outlined the way forward as I saw it and proceeded to challenge conference in coming up with practical ways of tackling the following pertinent issues:

- The strengthening of the protected areas network,
- The challenge of rural development in the context of protected areas,
- Land reform and co-management,
- Capacity building, awareness and education,
- Financing mechanisms and partnerships.

I am glad that conference, through the parallel sessions that took place yesterday morning, has come up with practical recommendations in respect of advancing the people and parks programme for the next two years.

It became evident through the communities concerns that although we have covered some ground since the 2008 conference in Mafikeng, North-West, our challenges remains daunting.

In this regard, I can relate with the frustration and even the loss of patience demonstrated by communities. It is justified.

It is no secret that the pace of implementation of the programme remains painstakingly slow and frustrating to all concerned. After three people and parks conferences (before this one) communities have in general very little to show.

This situation is both unacceptable and requires urgent remedies. As a department we accept the challenge to act now in order to avert a looming crisis in the future. The stakes are high. The development and even the future of many communities lie in our action. Now is the time to act.

It is for this reason at the 4'h people and parks conference and on behalf of the Department of Environmental Affairs that I wish to make the following commitments to this conference and the communities who await its results with keen interest back home:
We commit ourselves:

1. To work towards the promotion of healthy and sound relations amongst all the parties to the people and parks programme as in communities, the government and the agencies and individual parks, by working towards the following goals:

   1.1. Promoting the equal status of all the parties. This will ensure that communities are not treated as mere subject in the tripartite relationship but are recognised as partners deserving respect and full participations in all matters that affect their interests as per the programme,

   1.2. To position the Department of Environmental Affairs, as an institution, to take full responsibility for the coordination, policy development and support that is bestowed on it by the laws of our country and relevant international treaties. As such we recognise the urgent need to beef up the organisational capacity of the department in this regard

   1.3. To facilitating the capacity building efforts that will ensure that each party plays its role to the best of its ability. Notably, such efforts must be biased towards affirming community structures, leaders and key personnel at all levels and ensuring that they play their full role in the matters affecting their interests across the country,

2. The mobilisation of resources (including financial) to help unlock the many blockage that has frustrated the best efforts amongst the parties. Our efforts will be aimed at achieving the following:

   2.1. Engaging the SRPP component of the Department in streamlining and leveraging dedicated funding for the people and parks programme,

   2.2. Mobilising additional funding from the private sector and possible sources of funding through partnerships,

   2.3. To engage Parks Agencies in creative ways of leveraging existing funding and business models (including procurement policies and practices) for the greater good of the programme,

3. To build a strong and people and parks structures (for coordination and implementation purposes) at all levels to ensure the meaningful engagement and participation of parties in all activities based on the principles of corporate governance and respect for each other’s role,

4. To further explore the model of community support that was presented by Mpumalanga during the conference as a best practice for community support and engage all other provinces with a view to sharing their best practices and adopting broad guidelines for supporting communities. Once adopted, the National Department of Environmental Affairs will be charged with the responsibility of monitoring the implementation of the guidelines,
5. To build on the successes of the Kids and Parks programme and mainstream it within the broader people and parks programme. This will be achieved by:

5.1. Rolling out the project nationally beyond the national parks,

5.2. Implementing capacity building programmes that will ensure that all agencies are well prepared to play their full roles and to draw the attendant benefits from the programme,

5.3. To extent the programme to address other special groups such as youth, women, disabled people, etc.

6. To undertake nationwide feasibility studies within the protected areas sector by focusing on the following critical operational areas:

6.1. Detailed assessment of the protected areas budgetary issues,

6.2. Human resources capacity

6.3. Management effectiveness

7. To use Resource Africa's theatre team as ambassadors of the People and Park brand and for the purpose of popularising it within parks communities and nationally,

8. To convene a national People and Parks Coordinating Forum constituted by the National Department of Environmental Affairs, the Community Representatives Executive Committee, Provincial Departments and Agencies to achieve the following broad objectives:

8.1. To review the resolutions of the previous people and parks conference with a view to highlighting critical and strategic decisions whose implementation is still outstanding or remains incomplete,

8.2. To find create ways of enforcing the implementation of the previous conferences resolutions,

8.3. To facilitate the development of the people and parks brand and its marketing strategy,

8.4. To place the people and park programme firmly on the higher level of governance including cabinet

8.5. To draw up and adopt a People and Parks Programme of Action based on the outcomes of this conference and previous ones (where implementation is incomplete or outstanding).

It must be the central responsibility of the National Department of Environmental Affairs to assume a vital role in the coordination and driving of all the people and park activities.
During the next coming two years, we have every intention of taking the people and parks programme to new heights.

In conclusion, I want to wish all participants a safe journey back to your respective provinces.

I also want to assure you that as government we will not rest until we ensure equitable Access and Benefit Sharing.

Lastly, I thank you all for making the 2010 People and Parks Programme conference a resounding success it is.

We look forward to your support and collaboration.

WORKING TOGETHER WE CAN DO MORE!

Thank you