

**PREPARATION OF A STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT
FRAMEWORK FOR THE
KOGELBERG BIOSPHERE RESERVE**

**INITIAL STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION:
IMPLICATIONS FOR THE STRATEGIC
MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK**

Prepared for:

KOGELBERG BIOSPHERE RESERVE COMPANY

Prepared by:

**SETPLAN/DJ ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS JOINT VENTURE
&
ENVIROCENTRIC**

March 2006

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Purpose of this Report.....	1
1.3 Contents of this Report.....	1
2. OVERVIEW OF THE INITIAL STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION PROCESS	3
3. SOCIAL STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION.....	4
3.1 Introduction	4
3.2 Awareness of the Biosphere Reserve Concept and Interest in the KBR... 4	4
3.3 Opportunities for Sustainable Natural Resource Use	5
3.4 Core Business and Key Management Programmes	5
3.5 Structure of the KBRC	6
4. ECONOMIC STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION	7
4.1 Introduction	7
4.2 Management Performance of the KBR and Key Challenges Facing the KBR 7	7
4.3 Economic Opportunities in the KBR	8
4.4 The role of the KBRC in realising the Economic Opportunities	8
4.5 Structure of the KBRC	9
5. ROLE PLAYER CONSULTATION	10
5.1 Introduction	10
5.2 Management Performance of the KBR.....	10
5.3 Core Business and Key Management Programmes	11
5.4 Structure of the KBRC	12
6. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE SMF.....	14
6.1 Key Management Challenges facing the KBRC	14
6.2 Core Business of the KBRC.....	14
6.3 KBRC Management Programmes.....	15
6.4 KBRC Structure	15

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve Company (KBRC) has appointed consultants (Setplan / DJ Environmental Consultants Joint Venture) to prepare a Strategic Management Framework (SMF) for the Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve which *inter alia* will focus on the following:

- Establishing an agreed vision, goals and objectives for the Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve;
- Identify projects the KBRC must carry out;
- Look at the structure of the KBRC and restructure if necessary;
- Identify sources for long term funding.

In accordance with the biosphere ethos the SMF is being prepared with the input from the people who live and work in the biosphere reserve, i.e. the stakeholders. The stakeholder consultation process will initially focus on soliciting inputs from stakeholders which will inform the preparation of the SMF (Initial Stakeholder Consultation). Thereafter stakeholders will be provided with opportunities to review the SMF in its various components, namely the Strategic Plan, the Management Plan and the Corporate Plan. This report presents the findings of the Initial Stakeholder Consultation Process and is used as an informant to the preparation of the various components of the SMF.

1.2 Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this report, titled Initial Stakeholder Consultation: Implications for Strategic Management Framework, is to provide a record of the initial stakeholder consultation process and to inform the preparation of the SMF, particularly the preparation of the Strategic Plan. Key informants derived from the initial stakeholder consultation process and the situational analysis form the basis for the contents of the Strategic Plan.

1.3 Contents of this Report

This report is structured as follows:

Chapter 1: Introduction – Provides a brief background to the report, describes its purpose, and provides a brief description of its contents.

Chapter 2: Overview of the Initial Stakeholder Consultation Process – Presents a description of the methodology followed and describes the stakeholder groups targeted.

Chapter 3: Social Stakeholder Consultation – Briefly describes the social stakeholder consultation process and presents the key inputs provided by this stakeholder group.

Chapter 4: Economic Stakeholder Consultation – Briefly describes the economic stakeholder consultation process and presents the key inputs provided by this stakeholder group.

Chapter 5: Role Player Consultation – Briefly describes the role player consultation process and presents the key inputs provided by this.

Chapter 6: Implications for the SMF – Based on the key findings of the initial stakeholder consultation process, the section presents key informants for the preparation of the SMF.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE INITIAL STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION PROCESS

The Initial Stakeholder Consultation Process engaged the following stakeholder groups in the following ways:

- Social stakeholders (i.e. public, community based organisations and environmental interest groups): 4 public workshops were held at different localities throughout the KBR.
- Economic stakeholders (i.e. representing the major economic sectors, viticulture, fruit, fishing and tourism and also cross-sectoral development agencies): interviews were held with representative structures.
- Role Players (statutory bodies): Two separate workshops were held with the conservation and environmental management agencies (the 'conservators') and the planning officials (the 'planners') with jurisdictions in the KBR.

The method of consultation for the various stakeholder groups was essentially the same in that questions were posed to the stakeholders and their inputs were requested. Generally stakeholders were requested to respond to the following key questions:

1. What was their understanding of the biosphere reserve concept and in particular the KBR?
2. What was their experience of the management performance of the KBR?
3. What do they believe the KBRC should be doing regarding the management of the KBR?
4. How should the KBRC be structured?

However, there was some variation in the focus of the consultation process. For example, in consulting social stakeholders there was additional focus on determining awareness of the biosphere concept and to ensure that people were clear about the concept an information sharing component was introduced. When consulting the role players there was particular focus on obtaining their views on the role of the management entity in relation to their mandates (i.e. unpacking cooperative governance) and while consulting economic stakeholders focus was on identifying the economic opportunities within the KBR, particularly those that related to the use of ecosystem services and products.

The key inputs from the stakeholders and role players consulted during the initial consultation process are summarised in the following sections and implications for the SMF are presented.

3. SOCIAL STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

3.1 Introduction

Social stakeholders were invited to attend any of four public meetings which were held at various locations within the KBR. Workshops were held at the following venues (Botrivier – 25 January 2006; Kleinmond – 26 January 2006; Grabouw – 1 February 2006; Betty’s Bay – 2 February 2006). The purpose of the workshops were as follows:

1. Determine levels of awareness of the biosphere reserve concept and improve awareness among stakeholders;
2. Determine what interests stakeholders have in the biosphere reserve (e.g. people may only be interested in the biosphere reserve because it can ensure that the place where they live remains attractive while others may be interested because it presents opportunities for business improvement);
3. Identify opportunities for projects that involve the use of the biosphere reserve’s natural resources (e.g. plants and fish) for the benefit of the poorer communities in the area.
4. Obtain perspectives on what the core business of the KBRC should be and how the KBRC should be structured.

Generally attendance was poor (primarily attributed to a lack of awareness among the general public of the biosphere reserve concept) but valuable input was nonetheless obtained.

Detailed records of the four workshops are included in [Annexure A](#). The following sections provide a summary of the inputs from the workshops with the social stakeholders.

3.2 Awareness of the Biosphere Reserve Concept and Interest in the KBR

The following key points emerged as a result of the consultation process:

- Awareness of the biosphere reserve concept is extremely limited, particularly among the historically disadvantaged communities (HDC’s) with some people having never heard of the concept before and not aware that they lived in one.
- Those stakeholders that had heard of it before were of the opinion that it was strictly a conservation model that did not recognise the importance of socio-economic development.
- A minority had a good understanding of the concept and, as they represented community based environmental interest groups within the KBR, had a vested interest in supporting the KBR.

- Awareness of the biosphere reserve concept and the KBR was greater along the coast (e.g. in places like Kleinmond and Betty's Bay) when compared to the hinterland (e.g. in places like Grabouw and Botrivier).
- When asked what their interests in the KBR were, some stakeholders were unable to respond. This is believed to be related to the limited awareness of the concept which led people to believe that there was no benefit for them in living in a biosphere reserve. Those that had views were the ones who had an understanding of the concept. They indicated that their interests were mainly conservation related and related to addressing environmental issues that affected their quality of life (e.g. curbing development, limiting in-migration, addressing service delivery).

3.3 Opportunities for Sustainable Natural Resource Use

- While some stakeholders held the opinion that the KBR presented real opportunities for sustainable natural resource use (particularly in the marine environment, other stakeholders believed that opportunities for the consumptive use of the KBR's natural resources were extremely limited and that their use would compromise the conservation goal. They believed that only through tourism the biosphere reserve could have a meaningful socio-economic development impact.
- Tourism and particularly eco-tourism is regarded by many stakeholders as the panacea that will solve all the social and economic problems faced in the KBR through providing employment and SMME opportunities.
- Regarding the use of biodiversity products there was acknowledgement, however, that through creativity and innovation new products could be developed that could improve the livelihoods of the poor.

3.4 Core Business and Key Management Programmes

The following key points emerged as a result of the consultation process:

- Stakeholders were clear about the importance of addressing the lack of awareness of the biosphere reserve concept. In this regard a core function of the KBRC should be initiating an outreach programme that targets those with the least understanding of the concept.
- Addressing awareness should be a first step as only when stakeholders have a good understanding of the concept will they begin to show an interest in the KBR.
- Some stakeholders went further to state that the KBR would need to deliver tangible benefits for the poor if greater support from HD communities was expected thereby implying that the KBRC should focus its efforts on socio-economic development.

- Recognising the threat that unscrupulous development within the KBR can have on the success of the biosphere reserve, stakeholders indicated that there was a desperate need for clear land use development and management guidelines. Allied to this was their frustration that the KBRC had no legal basis and could not force land owners to comply with the biosphere reserve's land use and management policies.
- There was a sense that the KBRC should focus its efforts on the transition and buffer areas of the biosphere reserve because these are the areas where most of the threats to biodiversity conservation arise and where the opportunities for sustainable use of the reserve's products and services lie.

3.5 Structure of the KBRC

The following key points emerged as a result of the consultation process:

- The KBRC, for those that were aware of its existence, is regarded as being poorly representative of the KBR's stakeholders. Obtaining buy-in from the HDC's living in the KBR would depend on these groups being well-represented on the management body.

4. ECONOMIC STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

4.1 Introduction

Key economic stakeholders in the KBR were consulted in the initial stakeholder engagement process. To identify the key stakeholders prominent businesses, emerging businesses, SMME support and development agencies, representative structures and tourism collectives were selected from the four main sectors of the economy, namely agriculture, forestry, fisheries and tourism.

Interviews were held with the key economic stakeholders during which responses to a series of questions asked by the consultants were requested. The questions asked were as follows:

1. What is your understanding of biosphere reserves?
2. What is your experience of the KBR to date?
3. What are the economic opportunities in the KBR?
4. What should the KBRC do to unlock these opportunities?
5. How should the KBRC be structured?

A detailed record of the interviews held with economic stakeholders is included in [Annexure B](#). The following sections provide a summary of the inputs from the interviews.

4.2 Management Performance of the KBR and Key Challenges Facing the KBR

- The dysfunctionality of the KBRC has been a source of frustration for economic stakeholders, particularly those from the private sector who are pursuing development opportunities. In the absence of a prominent representative structure, several economic stakeholders have contacted KOBIO assuming that they represent the KBR.
- There is confusion among stakeholders regarding what the KBR actually stands for. Many are aware of its socio-economic development role but vocal advocacy groups have placed emphasis on the conservation role and used this with effectively to lobby against development in the KBR.
- The KBR is regarded as a volatile environment for investment. This is largely due to the presence of obstructive forces who have been effective in lobbying against development in the KBR.
- The majority of land owners and HDC's have not bought into the KBR. Wider consultation and representation on the management structure is needed to ensure these very important stakeholders are on board.

4.3 Economic Opportunities in the KBR

- The majority of economic opportunities in the KBR are tourism-related. Initiatives are being driven effectively by the private sector but what is needed is better coordination, particularly regarding marketing strategies.
- There are also opportunities in the agricultural sector and these include:
 - a. Harvesting of timber;
 - b. Cultivation of wildflowers for the cut-flower market
 - c. Cultivation of wildflowers for the extraction of essential oils
 - d. Bee farming (using both fynbos and deciduous fruit trees as sources)
- Due to the high quality environment, particularly the high quality of the sea water, the coastal part of the KBR is regarded as an ideal place for various forms of mariculture. However obstructive forces that oppose most forms of development makes the KBR unattractive to investors and entrepreneurs.
- Provided the forestry parastatals continue with their exit strategy, the commercial forestry areas within the KBR also present a number of opportunities ranging from tourism (the sites are suitable for the construction of accommodation infrastructure), sustainable agriculture (suitable for the roll-out of land reform) and possibly agro-industry.

4.4 The role of the KBRC in realising the Economic Opportunities

- There is strong consensus among economic stakeholders that the KBRC needs an outreach programme, mainly to increase awareness of the KBR and its potential benefits to the people that live in it. This outreach programme could also facilitate the training of guides and tour operators from HDC's.
- Another important programme should focus on socio-economic development. Economic stakeholders indicated that in delivering meaningful socio-economic benefits to KBR stakeholders the KBRC would add value by performing a coordination and facilitation role. Regarding its coordination role, as an example, value can be added through coordinating tourism marketing strategies. Regarding its role as a facilitator, the KBRC can facilitate the establishment of partnerships between the public and private sectors and assist in removing bureaucratic red-tape which stakeholders believe will unlock economic opportunities.
- Economic stakeholders also pointed out that another important focus area would be the collation and dissemination of information, promotion of scientific research and performance monitoring against the strategic plan.

- A number of stakeholders pointed out that the KBRC would have to have strong fundraising capabilities.
- A major obstacle to the promotion of sustainable socio-economic development is lack of clarity about what the KBR stands for and the need for a clear policy which indicates what types of development are suitable and where they can and cannot take place. The KBRC needs to establish itself as a 'force' within the region with a clear strategic plan and should facilitate the preparation of a Spatial Development Plan (SDP) for the KBR.

4.5 Structure of the KBRC

- Economic stakeholders are of the opinion that the current structure is not representative of the stakeholders. It needs to be balanced across the socio-economic spectrum and needs to have representation from the KBRs major stakeholders. Major stakeholders include all the major land owners which include CapeNature, the local authorities and the farmers.
- First and foremost economic stakeholders have indicated that the KBRC needs a 'home' and needs to be contactable. It also needs to make itself known to the KBR stakeholders as the structure representing the KBR.
- Economic stakeholders are indifferent about the suitability of a Section 21 Company as an appropriate legal entity for managing the KBR.
- Several stakeholders were of the opinion that the KBRC should be structured according to different portfolios.
- The KBRC needs to have a board which is representative of the KBR's stakeholders and is responsible for policy decisions. It's executive functions should be carried out by a separate structure which must have the technical capacity to do this.

5. ROLE PLAYER CONSULTATION

5.1 Introduction

Two separate role player groups were considered to perform key functions in the management of the KBR. These groups were as follows:

- The conservators: Includes all environmental management agencies ranging from environmental management officials from the various municipalities, representatives of the provincial conservation authorities (terrestrial and marine), Non-governmental Organisations (NGO's) and various other environmental interest groups active in the KBR.
- The planners: Included town and regional planning officials from the City of Cape Town, Theewaterskloof Municipality, Overstrand Municipality and the Overberg District Municipality.

To facilitate the effective consultation of these two groups of role players two separate workshops were held, one with each of the groups respectively. Both workshops followed very similar formats with discussion sessions aiming to determine the following:

- i. Role player perceptions of the past and current management performance of the KBR and its management structures;
- ii. Role player perceptions of what the core business of the KBRC should be and what key management programmes the KBRC should focus on; and
- iii. How the KBRC should be structured to effectively carry out its core business.

The only exception was that the planners workshop included an information sharing component, the purpose of which was to increase awareness among planning officials of the biosphere reserve concept. It was assumed that this would not be necessary for the conservators.

Detailed records of both workshops are included in [Annexure C](#). The following sections provide a summary of the inputs from the workshops with the conservators and the planners.

5.2 Management Performance of the KBR

- The KBRC appears to have no dedicated staff and no prominent representative who can be contacted. This is a major weakness and has led to confusion regarding who actually represents the KBR. Many role players perceive KOBIO as the 'face' of the KBR.
- Since the establishment of the Article 18 Technical Committee functionality has resumed. This should be regarded as a success.

- Representivity from HDC is poor – this is a major weakness. Poor representivity from PDCs results in poor credibility of the KBR among this sector of the community and places the KBR low on the political agenda.
- KBRC are perceived as only having conservation interests. This is a weakness and has resulted in limited buy-in from certain stakeholder groups. UNESCO’s intentions are that biosphere reserves should also give attention to socio-economic development. The lack of a clear plan indicating what the KBR is all about has allowed misinterpretation and contributed to the perception that the KBR is only concerned about conservation.
- The dysfunctionality of the KBRC can be attributed to the lack of a ‘management / business plan’. The SMF which is currently in preparation is intended to give direction to the KBRC and restore functionality.

5.3 Core Business and Key Management Programmes

- Other successful landscape-scale biodiversity conservation initiatives (e.g. ABI, Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Initiative) are based on developing and maintaining strong partnerships among stakeholders. Role players were of the opinion that a similar approach could be applied in the KBR and that the core business of the KBRC should relate to the establishment and maintenance of a successful partnership among the KBR’s key stakeholders.
- There was some disagreement among role players regarding whether the KBRC should only focus its core business only on partnership building or whether it should also be an implementing agent. The point was made that there are role players in the KBR who are mandated to perform the conservation and socio-economic development roles and that the KBRC would not add value by making its own interventions in this regard.
- Certain role players suggested that the KBRC should perform an advocacy role but others cautioned that in performing this role it could threaten the interests of certain partners and this would ultimately compromise the partnership.
- The KBRC must have an ‘outreach’ program which should focus its attention on building awareness among all stakeholders of the biosphere reserve concept. The environmental awareness program previously initiated by the KBRC was successful but needs to be sustained.
- The KBRC must perform a logistic function (i.e. have an information management program in which it would be responsible for the collation and dissemination of information regarding the status of the KBR). As part of this logistic function the KBRC must also communicate with and share knowledge with the international network of biosphere reserves and

other C.A.P.E. initiatives. A performance monitoring system must be implemented by the KBRC to determine whether it is successful in achieving its goals.

- Regarding its role in socio-economic development the KBRC should focus its efforts of building partnerships and demonstrate sustainable livelihood activities to poor communities through initiating demonstration projects within the KBR. In this regard the KBRC should be seen an instigator of progressive ways of moving forward rather than a regulating authority.
- While role players were of the opinion that a major challenge in the KBR was the poor alignment of SDFs and the lack of fine-scale plans which indicate what types of development could happen and where, the opinion was that the KBRC should not be directly involved in addressing these challenges as mandated government agencies were responsible for ensuring the alignment and preparation of these plans.

5.4 Structure of the KBRC

- First and foremost the KBRC needs to be contactable and needs a 'home' or office in the area.
- The message from role players was do not restructure the KBRC unless it is absolutely necessary to do so. Rather strengthen and provide support to the existing structure. In this regard revising the Articles of Association may contribute significantly to addressing organizational weaknesses.
- Role players were of the opinion that the Section 21 Company was the appropriate vehicle as this has both a non-executive Board and an executive Committee. The Board should be responsible for representing the interests of the stakeholders and making policy decisions and the executive Committee should have the technical capacity to implement projects.
- Recognising the importance of fundraising some role players felt that a smaller management structure with one good project developer with strong fundraising capabilities will be far more effective than the current KBRC.
- Role players stressing the importance of stakeholder representation had conflicting ideas about whether representation must be geographical (e.g. from different communities throughout the KBR) or sectoral (e.g. government, labour, private sector etc.). To address the challenge of how best to achieve representation without forming a large cumbersome

structure the suggestion was made that each director can establish a sub-committee under his / her portfolio to achieve this representation.

6. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE SMF

6.1 Key Management Challenges facing the KBRC

The initial stakeholder consultation process identified the following key management challenges facing the KBRC:

- Awareness of the biosphere reserve concept and related concepts such as sustainable development is limited, particularly among HDCs.
- Broad based community support for the KBR is lacking. This is related to the perception that exists among poorer communities that biodiversity conservation does not deliver tangible socio-economic benefits.
- Until the KBRC can demonstrate its benefit to the local authorities it will have to rely on self-raised funds.
- Poorly aligned Spatial Development Frameworks (SDFs) and ambiguity concerning what forms of development are desirable and where various forms of development should take place.
- The presence of vocal and powerful environmental interest groups.
- Collaboration from stakeholders has to depend on their voluntary support for the biosphere reserve.

6.2 Core Business of the KBRC

Initial consultation with stakeholders and role players in the KBR has indicated that the core business of the KBRC should be as follows:

- The KBRC should, as its main function, regard itself as being responsible for establishing and maintaining strong, healthy partnerships in the KBR. It should not perform the advocacy role as this often compromises partnerships.
- The KBRC should refrain from regarding itself as an implementing agent as there are mandated government agencies in place to perform this function.
- The most important technical capabilities that the KBRC will require will be fundraising and project development.
- Concerning the unlocking of socio-economic opportunities in the KBR, the KBRC should see itself as facilitating the establishment of partnerships between the public and private sector.

6.3 KBRC Management Programmes

Stakeholders and role players in the KBR are in agreement that the KBRC should execute the following management programmes:

- **Outreach Program:** Raising awareness and building broad-based understanding of the biosphere reserve concept. Under this program it will focus its attention on strengthening and fostering partnerships, opening modes of communication and marketing and promoting the KBR. Its role in achieving this will be through facilitation and mediation.
- **Development Program:** Demonstrating the socio-economic benefits of sustainable resource use to poorer communities. The KBRC will have to demonstrate the linkage between biodiversity conservation and the delivery of tangible socio-economic benefits. This can be done by giving support to demonstration projects in the KBR.
- **Research and Monitoring:** The KBRC will have to initiate baseline KBR-scale research and collate information on the state of the KBR. It will need to implement a performance monitoring system which will assess its performance in achieving the targets set in the SMF. Under this program it should facilitate the preparation of a land use planning and management system or SDP.

6.4 KBRC Structure

Inputs from stakeholders and role players have resulted in the following key recommendations regarding the restructuring of the KBRC:

- The current vehicle, namely the Section 21 Company, is appropriate. What needs to be addressed is how broad-based representation is achieved without establishing a cumbersome structure and how the appropriate technical and administrative capabilities are secured within the structure.
- The most important capability required by the KBRC is fundraising and project development (i.e. identifying key projects, raising funds for implementation and managing implementing agents). The requirement for other capabilities will be determined when the core business and management programs of the KBR are agreed to as giving effect to the core business and management programs will require certain capabilities.
- The Articles of Association require revision as these were poorly drafted. They need to reflect the key functions of biosphere reserves and be informed by the Strategic Plan which presents the core business of the KBRC.

Annexure A:
Records of the four social stakeholder workshops

RECORD OF SOCIAL STAKEHOLDER FOCUS WORKSHOP FOR THE KOGELBERG BIOSPHERE RESERVE

**KROMCO HOSTEL, BOTRIVER
19:30 – 20:30, 25 JANUARY 2006**

INTRODUCTION

A Social Stakeholder Focus Workshop was held on Wednesday, 25 January 2006 at the Kromco Hostel, Botriver. Dudley Janeke (DJ), the public participation facilitator from DJ Environmental Consultants (DJEC) undertaking the stakeholder engagement process, welcomed attendees. He explained that the stakeholder engagement process forms an essential part of preparing a Strategic Management Framework which the Setplan / DJ Environmental Consultants Joint Venture has been appointed to do. He indicated that the workshop would be conducted in English and Afrikaans.

Attendees at this workshop are listed in Annexure A.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A brief overview of the information presented to stakeholders is provided below.

Mr Lesley Jacobs (LJ) of the Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve Company (KBRC) introduced the proposed project to the workshop. He explained that the background of the project was as follows:

- Kogelberg Biosphere (KBR) was registered in 1998 (SA's 1st biosphere reserve)
- Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve Company (KBRC) established in 2002 but become dysfunctional
- All stakeholders were not part of the process and Technical Committee (Article 18 committee) established to address organisational problems
- Commissioned Setplan / DJEC Joint Venture to prepare management plan with stakeholder involvement

He also encouraged the stakeholders to:

- Inform the rest of the community of the benefits of the project.
- Go through bid and familiarise themselves with the contents.

PURPOSE OF WORKSHOP

(DJ)

The project brief was essentially to design & carry out a participatory planning process with KBR stakeholders to produce a Strategic Management Framework which *inter alia* would focus on the following:

- Establish an agreed vision, goals and objectives

- Identify projects the managing body must carry out
- Look at the structure of the managing body and restructure if necessary
- Identify sources for long term funding

The purpose of the workshop was to:

- Inform stakeholders of the project
- Share information on what biosphere reserve's are about
- Understand what people think about living in a biosphere reserve
- Identify opportunities for sustainable use of the reserve's natural resources.

WHAT IS A BIOSPHERE RESERVE

(NS)

Nick Steytler (NS) gave an overview on what a Biosphere Reserve is.

- Biosphere Reserves: Are representatives of the world's ecosystems and are regarded as important places where a balance is achieved between the goals of conserving biodiversity, promoting economic and social development and maintaining associated cultural values. As such they are showcases for sustainable development.
- Sustainable development in the South African context can be defined as optimising user benefits, now and in the future, whilst maintaining diverse, healthy and productive ecosystems.
- UNESCO has the following requirements:
 - Conservation of landscapes, ecosystems, species and genetic variation.
 - Economic and human development that is socially, culturally and ecologically sustainable.
 - Support for:
 - Environmental education and training
 - Research and monitoring
- NS explains to the workshop what it would mean for them to live in the KBR:
 - Must look after our environment – fynbos, animals, rivers, wetlands, fish, perlemoen, etc.
 - Must address socio-economic issues (poverty, unemployment, crime) through utilising the reserve's natural resources in a sustainable manner.
 - Must educate and improve awareness of all stakeholders and participate in international research.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

(DJ)

The stakeholders are invited to give their input on the following issues:

a. What is your understanding of KBR?

- Shirley: It's the first time she's heard about KBR. She read an article about it, but understands it better now. She also sees the potential and benefits in the project for the community.
- Maureen: Has heard about the project before, but thought it was all about nature conservation.
- Marie: Had an idea what the project was, but is here to re-affirm
- Biodiversity & Wine Initiative: Will the project align itself with this successful initiative?
 - NS response:
 - KBR stakeholders must be aware of initiatives like these and in managing the KBR we must seek to enhance its benefits.
 - Farmers are very important stakeholders in the KBR and must therefore support the KBR. To do this there must be some benefit for themselves, e.g. Eco-labelling (biosphere reserve friendly labels on produce).

b. What would you like from KBR?

- Youth (students) must be educated w.r.t. conservation awareness. They must be exposed to KBR.
- To create a pride amongst community (including farmers) who live in the KBR.
- There must be more youth projects: The small vlei near Botriver must be developed for children to use and learn from.
- The roads to KBR resources need to be safe for the children to use.
- Short-term goals must be set so that changes and achievements can be seen.
- LJ asked if he can have the blessing of the attendees to add the above-mentioned ideas to the IDP. Permission was given.
- Can KBRC put pressure on Theewaterskloof Municipality to improve service delivery (particularly waste management)? Botriver currently gets dismal service.
 - LJ (TWK Mun): Botriver is new to Theewaterskloof Mun. There is an infrastructure problem. The groups in Botriver have placed pressure on Mun. Concerns have been noted by mayor and senior officials in the mun and are seen as a priority.
- KBR must be marketed as an "end-destination" and must be made visible to the public and tourist.

- Anthony: SAFCOL land in core areas is not being used. Because of its designation as Core it cannot be developed. Development has its place and surely some of this land is suitable for development. What will the project do about that?
 - NS: while it does not fall within the scope of the project to look at the boundaries and zones of the KBR, if it emerges as a result of the process that this needs to be addressed then the consultants will recommend this as key focus area of the management plan.
- KBR needs to collaborate with local businesses, e.g. Tourism. Should consider niche businesses and initiatives already in existence. (e.g. Arabella)

c. What should KBRC do?

- Must be a balance in representation on KBRC between “greenies” and CBO’s who have more of a development interest.
- Need short terms, achievable goals. Delivery is important particularly if you want the support of the local communities.
- Good planning and goal setting linked to timelines (3-5 yrs), will make goals achievable. Need to be short, medium and long-term goals.
- Get education strategy and platform right. Create awareness and encourage people to participate as a priority.
- Find new and creative ways to educate community.
- Establish a management team to facilitate these processes.
- Establish an implementation team to develop a protocol for how ideas become a reality in KBR.
- Find a way to link education programmes and ecotourism.
- NS: KBRC has in the past been active in environmental education and awareness. The initiatives must be strengthened and given continuity.
- The issue of BEE must be addressed in the Strategic Management Framework.

d. What natural resources would you like to use?

- Fynbos – aromatic oils & herbs and spices, medicinal plants.
- The Kogelberg leopards, as a symbol of conservation, provide an opportunity for instilling pride among KBR stakeholders.
- We must be creative in the way we use resources.
- Kelp harvesting for abalone farms.
- Water in the KBR is used for agriculture and has potential for aquaculture because of its high quality.

SUMMING UP

Kahmiela August (KA) gave a summary of the input of the stakeholders.

WAY FORWARD

NS outlined the way forward in the Public Participation Process:

- Consultants will be holding other focus workshops and sessions with economic stakeholders and statutory bodies.
- Following this a draft Strategic Framework will be prepared – this focuses on the core business of the KBRC by outlining the vision, mission statement and goals of the KBRC.
- Multi-stakeholder workshop will be held to determine the themes to be addressed in the Management & Corporate Plans
- Thematic workshops to develop details of Management Plan (i.e. working groups on fire management, tourism, resource use, others)
- Preparation of a draft Strategic Management Plan and wide circulation for stakeholder review.

CLOSURE

DJ indicated that the information covered during the workshop would be summarised in the record of the workshop and forwarded to all stakeholders. He invited written comment on the project from stakeholders on the comment sheet provided. DJ thanked participants for taking the time to attend and participate in the workshop, which closed at 20:43.

ANNEXURE A

LIST OF ATTENDEES

TITLE	NAME	SURNAME	ORGANISATION
Mrs	S	Andrews	Ward Committee
Mrs	M	Steyn	Resident
Mr	W	Smith	Resident
Mrs	M	Swatz	B.A.D.C
Mrs	M	Appel	B.A.D.C
Mr	L	Jacobs	KBRC
Mr	A	Appel	Kogelberg Biosfeer Aksie groep
Mr	E	Wyngaard	B.A.D.C
Mr	J	Pheiffer	B.A.D.C
Mr	G	April	Botriver Primary School
Mr	H	Gey Van Pittius	Botriver Hotel
Mr	Dudley	Janeke	DJ Environmental Consultants
Mr	Nick	Steytler	DJ Environmental Consultants
Mrs	Kahmiela	August	DJ Environmental Consultants
Miss	Letitia	Janeke	DJ Environmental Consultants
Dr	Hans	Steyn	Overberg District Municipality

RECORD OF SOCIAL STAKEHOLDER FOCUS WORKSHOP FOR THE KOGELBERG BIOSPHERE RESERVE

**GERALD WRIGHT HALL, GRABOUW
19:30 – 20:30, 01 FEBRUARY 2006**

INTRODUCTION

A Social Stakeholder Focus Workshop was held on Wednesday, 01 February 2006 at the Gerald Wright Hall, Grabouw. Dudley Janeke (DJ), the public participation facilitator from DJ Environmental Consultants (DJEC) undertaking the stakeholder engagement process, welcomed attendees. He explained that the stakeholder engagement process forms an essential part of preparing a Strategic Management Framework which Setplan/ DJ Environmental Consultants Joint Venture had been appointed to do. DJ indicated that the workshop would be conducted in English and Afrikaans.

Attendees at this workshop are listed in Annexure A.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

(DJ)

A brief overview of the information presented to stakeholders is provided below.

DJ introduced the proposed project to the workshop. He explained that the background of the project:

- Kogelberg Biosphere (KBR) was registered in 1998 (SA's 1st biosphere reserve)
- Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve Company (KBRC) established in 2000 but become dysfunctional
- All stakeholders was not part of the process and Technical Committee (Article 18 committee) established to address organisational problems
- Commissioned Setplan/DJEC Joint Venture to prepare management plan with stakeholder involvement

He also encourages the stakeholders to:

- Inform the rest of the community of the benefits of the project.
- Go through the BID and familiarise themselves with the contents.

PURPOSE OF WORKSHOP

(DJ)

The project brief was essentially to design & carry out a participatory planning process with KBR stakeholders to produce a Strategic Management Framework which *inter alia* would focus on the following:

- Establish an agreed vision, goals and objectives
- Identify projects the managing body must carry out

- Look at the structure of the managing body and restructure if necessary
- Identify sources for long term funding

The purpose of the workshop was to:

- Inform stakeholders of the project
- Share information on what biosphere reserve's are about
- Understand what people think about living in a biosphere reserve
- Identify opportunities for sustainable use of the reserve's natural resources.

WHAT IS A BIOSPHERE RESERVE

(NS)

Nick Steytler gave an overview on what a Biosphere Reserve is:

- Biosphere Reserves: Are representatives of the world's ecosystems and are regarded as important places where a balance is achieved between the goals of conserving biodiversity, promoting economic and social development and maintaining associated cultural values. As such they are showcases for sustainable development.
- Sustainable development in the South African context can also be defined as optimising user benefits, now and in the future, whilst maintaining diverse, healthy and productive ecosystems.
- UNESCO has the following requirements:
 - Conservation of landscapes, ecosystems, species and genetic variation.
 - Economic and human development that is socially, culturally and ecologically sustainable.
 - Support for:
 - Environmental education and training
 - Research and monitoring
- Nick explains to the workshop what it would mean for them to live in the KBR:
 - Must look after our environment – fynbos, animals, rivers, wetlands, fish, perlemoen, etc.
 - Must address socio-economic issues (poverty, unemployment, crime) through utilising natural resources sustainably
 - Must educate and improve awareness of all stakeholders and participate in international research.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

(DJ)

The stakeholders are invited to give their input on relating to the following questions:

a. What is your understanding of KBR?

- Some people indicated that it is the first time that they have heard about the Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve.
- Some people have heard about it, but were not clear of the extent of the reserve. They thought only certain areas (nature reserves) formed part of the KBR.

b. What would you like from KBR?

- To attract attention to the area as a tourist destination – to promote tourism.
- To stimulate socio-economic development.
- The people in the transitional area have different experiences / awareness of the KBR than those living in the core area – needs to be considered.
- Creation of job-opportunities.
- The impacts of urban settlements on the areas' tourism must be evaluated as tourism is the backbone of economy in the local area.
- To sustainably utilise a variety of natural resources.
- Very important for the people to get involved.
- Establish pride amongst locals (community + farmers) to work together for common good.

c. What should KBRC do?

- Include all stakeholders i.e. a balanced representation.
- Engage with local people to ensure ownership. This must be an ongoing process and not once-off.
- Educate community and create an awareness amongst the people e.g. awareness campaign.
- Develop tourism.
- Maximise opportunities to ensure sustainable job opportunities.
- There must be a compatible alignment of the Strategic Management Framework with the Spatial Development Framework of the local municipalities.
- The project must look at what type of developments are allowed and not allowed in the KBR.
- Must be a participatory process on all levels. Eg. Schools / Municipalities / farmers
- Look at establishment of conservation initiatives / fire management
- Funding is needed if the projects are to be .

- Tourism is the only real sustainable development opportunity and as such provides the greatest opportunity to help alleviate social and economic problems.
- Development Guidelines are needed which avoid compromising the beauty of nature. Tourists will only visit the area if the beauty is protected.
- While the idea of promoting community based use of the areas natural resources is worth pursuing, one must recognise that the only areas within the KBR where the use of these resources is permitted (in terms of biosphere zones) is in private ownership. These landowners are unlikely to allow people onto the land to harvest these resources.
- Use different and creative ideas to inform the community and increase awareness of biosphere reserves (e.g. community college).
- KBRC must have representation from the local municipalities.

d. What natural resources would you like to use?

- Fynbos – dried plants

SUMMING UP

DJ gives a summary of the input of the stakeholders.

WAY FORWARD

NS outlined the way forward in the Public Participation Process:

- Consultants will be holding other focus workshops and sessions with economic stakeholders and statutory bodies.
- Following this a draft Strategic Framework will be prepared – this focuses on the core business of the KBRC by outlining the vision, mission statement and goals of the KBRC.
- Multi-stakeholder workshop will be held to determine the themes to be addressed in the Management & Corporate Plans
- Thematic workshops to develop details of Management Plan (i.e. working groups on fire management, tourism, resource use, others)
- Preparation of a draft Strategic Management Plan and wide circulation for stakeholder review.

CLOSURE

Dudley indicated that the information covered during the workshop would be summarised in the record of the workshop and forwarded to all stakeholders. He invited written comment on the project from stakeholders on the comment sheet provided. Dudley thanked participants for taking the time to attend and participate in the workshop, which closed at 20:35.

ANNEXURE A

LIST OF ATTENDEES

TITLE	NAME	SURNAME	ORGANISATION
Mr	A.J	Burgler	Tri Active Events Management
Mr	C.P	Pieters	Tri Active Events Management
Mrs	A	Coughlan	Overberg Tourism
Mrs	S	Mouton	Community Ward Committee
Mr	E	Molteno	KOBIO
Mr	P	Williams	Resident
Mr	D	Williams	Resident
Mr	A	Chalama	Resident (Xola Naledi)
Ms	N	Xolani	Resident
Mr	E	Mawura	Resident
Mr	T	Mnto	Resident
Ms	W	Jacobs	Dennekruin Community
Mr	P	Jacobs	Resident
	H	Coert	Resident
Mr	Dudley	Janeke	DJ Environmental Consultants
Mr	Nick	Steytler	DJ Environmental Consultants
Ms	Letitia	Janeke	DJ Environmental Consultants

RECORD OF SOCIAL STAKEHOLDER FOCUS WORKSHOP FOR THE KOGELBERG BIOSPHERE RESERVE

**KLEINMOND COMMUNITY HALL, KLEINMOND
19:30 – 20:30, 26 JANUARY 2006**

INTRODUCTION

A Social Stakeholder Focus Workshop was held on Thursday, 26 January 2006 at the Kleinmond Community Hall, Kleinmond. Dudley Janeke (DJ), the public participation facilitator from DJ Environmental Consultants (DJEC) undertaking the stakeholder engagement process, welcomed attendees. He explained that the stakeholder engagement process forms an essential part of preparing a Strategic Management Framework which Setplan/ DJ Environmental Consultants Joint Venture had been appointed to do. DJ indicated that the workshop would be conducted in English and Afrikaans.

Attendees at this workshop are listed in Annexure A.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

(DJ)

A brief overview of the information presented to stakeholders is provided below.

DJ introduced the proposed project to the workshop. He explained that the background of the project:

- Kogelberg Biosphere (KBR) was registered in 1998 (SA's 1st biosphere reserve)
- Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve Company (KBRC) established in 2000 but become dysfunctional
- All stakeholders was not part of the process and Technical Committee (Article 18 committee) established to address organisational problems
- Commissioned Setplan/DJEC Joint Venture to prepare management plan with stakeholder involvement

He also encourages the stakeholders to:

- Inform the rest of the community of the benefits of the project.
- Go through the BID and familiarise themselves with the contents.

PURPOSE OF WORKSHOP

(DJ)

The project brief was essentially to design & carry out a participatory planning process with KBR stakeholders to produce a Strategic Management Framework which *inter alia* would focus on the following:

- Establish an agreed vision, goals and objectives
- Identify projects the managing body must carry out

- Look at the structure of the managing body and restructure if necessary
- Identify sources for long term funding

The purpose of the workshop was to:

- Inform stakeholders of the project
- Share information on what biosphere reserve's are about
- Understand what people think about living in a biosphere reserve
- Identify opportunities for sustainable use of the reserve's natural resources.

WHAT IS A BIOSPHERE RESERVE

(NS)

Nick Steytler gave an overview on what a Biosphere Reserve is:

- Biosphere Reserves: Are representatives of the world's ecosystems and are regarded as important places where a balance is achieved between the goals of conserving biodiversity, promoting economic and social development and maintaining associated cultural values. As such they are showcases for sustainable development.
- Sustainable development in the South African context can also be defined as optimising user benefits, now and in the future, whilst maintaining diverse, healthy and productive ecosystems.
- UNESCO has the following requirements:
 - Conservation of landscapes, ecosystems, species and genetic variation.
 - Economic and human development that is socially, culturally and ecologically sustainable.
 - Support for:
 - Environmental education and training
 - Research and monitoring
- Nick explains to the workshop what it would mean for them to live in the KBR:
 - Must look after our environment – fynbos, animals, rivers, wetlands, fish, perlemoen, etc.
 - Must address socio-economic issues (poverty, unemployment, crime) through utilising natural resources sustainably
 - Must educate and improve awareness of all stakeholders and participate in international research.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

(DJ)

The stakeholders are invited to give their input on the following issues:

a. What is your understanding of KBR?

- Some individuals felt that it as part of its conservation function there should be mention made of the conservation of microscopic organisms, species, invertebrates and not just the larger and more obvious animals and plants.
- For some it is all very new information. They indicated that it is not right to inflict their (human) lifestyles on the biosphere reserve. There should be harmony.
- Others thought it was all about the conservation of nature for the future generations. They were not aware that it also had a socio-economic development function.
- Some felt that the concept does not work in reality. Big businesses will always gain and small fishermen don't. They were referring to the impact of the quota systems on the livelihoods of the locals.

b. What would you like from KBR?

- Should create a beautiful environment to live in.
- To assist in finding a balance in the utilisation of the natural resources for the benefit of the broader society without negatively impacting on the sustainability of the resource.
- Enable sustainable use of land in the face of migration and influx of people to the area. They also raised a concern regarding the carrying capacity of the natural resources and felt that it is the responsibility of the KBRC to monitor this and provide some sort of guidelines.
- What are the boundaries for development within the KBR?
 - KBR must be marketed as an "end-destination" and must be made visible to the public and tourist to ensure that more people visit the area and in the process provide more economic opportunities for the locals.
- To create opportunities for local communities through education, awareness and training initiatives.
- It is important for the KBRC to have a clear understanding of the strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats of the KBR to ensure a comprehensive Strategic Management Plan. The SWOT analytical approach should be used.
- Education strategies should extend beyond the borders as the activities of people outside the KBR impact on the biodiversity within the KBR
- Education strategies need to consider the problem of a continual influx of people into the area – education strategy needs to be continuous – not just a once-off
- People are not interested in the KBR because it has no benefit for them. Only when they start seeing benefits and are given access to

the reserve's resources will the people show interest, learn about sustainability and then understand the concept.

- Towns in the transitional zone should have different criteria to towns outside the KBR.
- Local income could be increased from marine resources, but on a different basis to quota system e.g. allow sales of recreational quota to tourists or shops. Need to develop sustainable income generating strategies. (LED Strategies)
 - Protection of our resources against poachers by using resources for local community to sell and thus generating local income.

c. What should KBRC do?

- Will authorities take cognisance of the framework? Are goals achievable?
- Have a definition of core business – goals for strategy plan – structures (implemental plans) – plan of action. / To implement principles of Biosphere Reserve.(Perhaps a sentence with a vision statement)
- Promote tourism
- Focus on education and training
- Find funding to implement projects
- The management of structure must be out of the government hands.
 - Article 21 Company works easier and it also works for the stakeholders.
- Should the KNRC be guided by UNESCO?
- Job creation through the use of natural resources and services – this is the crux of the socio economic component
- How can KBR provide sustainable jobs needs to be looked at seriously
- Who are the people of the Biosphere reserve? E.g. Botriver does not fall in the Biosphere reserve. Who are the communities?
- To create an understanding of the value of conserving our resources.
- Will management plan give guidelines to regulate land use and development?
- Guidelines for sustainable tourism. Could it be facilitated by KBRC?
- No more roads through KBR – The N2 toll road will re-direct traffic and this will result in environmental impacts. How is this project going to address this issue?
 - KBRC will have to manage that once the entity is reconstituted. The Strategic Management Framework may provide guidelines for KBRC to lobby against such developments.
- To create awareness and inform communities about the KBR and nature conservation.

SUMMING UP

Kahmiela August (KA) gave a summary of the input of the stakeholders.

WAY FORWARD

NS outlined the way forward in the Public Participation Process:

- Consultants will be holding other focus workshops and sessions with economic stakeholders and statutory bodies.
- Following this a draft Strategic Framework will be prepared – this focuses on the core business of the KBRC by outlining the vision, mission statement and goals of the KBRC.
- Multi-stakeholder workshop will be held to determine the themes to be addressed in the Management & Corporate Plans
- Thematic workshops to develop details of Management Plan (i.e. working groups on fire management, tourism, resource use, others)
- Preparation of a draft Strategic Management Plan and wide circulation for stakeholder review.

CLOSURE

DJ indicated that the information covered during the workshop would be summarised in the record of the workshop and forwarded to all stakeholders. He invited written comment on the project from stakeholders on the comment sheet provided. DJ thanked participants for taking the time to attend and participate in the workshop, which closed at 20:43.

ANNEXURE A

LIST OF ATTENDEES

TITLE	NAME	SURNAME	ORGANISATION
Mrs	A	Coughlan	Overberg Tourism
Mrs	E	Bernhardt	Overberg Tourism
Mrs	E	Barry	Overstrand Town Council
Mr	P	Muller	Kleinmond Nature Conservation Society
Dr	F	V.D. Merwe	Kleinmond Natuurbewaring Vereniging
Dr	N	Fairall	KOBIO
Mr	J	Van Staden	Kleinmond Belastingbetalers Vereniging
Mr	L	Van Heerden	KOBIO
Mr	Dudley	Janeke	DJ Environmental Consultants
Mr	Nick	Steytler	DJ Environmental Consultants
Mrs	Kahmiela	August	DJ Environmental Consultants

RECORD OF SOCIAL STAKEHOLDER FOCUS WORKSHOP FOR THE KOGELBERG BIOSPHERE RESERVE

**MOOIUITSIG COMMUNITY HALL, BETTY'S BAY
19:30 – 20:30, 02 FEBRUARY 2006**

INTRODUCTION

A Social Stakeholder Focus Workshop was held on Wednesday, 02 February 2006 at the Mooiuitsig Community Hall, Betty's Bay. Dudley Janeke (DJ), the public participation facilitator from DJ Environmental Consultants (DJEC) undertaking the stakeholder engagement process, welcomed attendees. He explained that the stakeholder engagement process forms an essential part of preparing a Strategic Management Framework which the Setplan / DJ Environmental Consultants Joint Venture has been appointed to do. He indicated that the workshop would be conducted in English and Afrikaans.

Attendees at this workshop are listed in Annexure A.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

(DJ)

A brief overview of the information presented to stakeholders is provided below.

DJ introduced the proposed project to the workshop. He explained that the background of the project:

- Kogelberg Biosphere (KBR) was registered in 1998 (SA's 1st biosphere reserve)
- Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve Company (KBRC) established in 2000 but become dysfunctional
- All stakeholders was not part of the process and Technical Committee (Article 18 committee) established to address organisational problems
- Commissioned Setplan/DJEC Joint Venture to prepare management plan with stakeholder involvement

He also encourages the stakeholders to:

- Inform the rest of the community of the benefits of the project.
- Go through the BID and familiarise themselves with the contents.

PURPOSE OF WORKSHOP

(DJ)

The project brief was essentially to design & carry out a participatory planning process with KBR stakeholders to produce a Strategic Management Framework which *inter alia* would focus on the following:

- Establish an agreed vision, goals and objectives
- Identify projects the managing body must carry out

- Look at the structure of the managing body and restructure if necessary
- Identify sources for long term funding

The purpose of the workshop was to:

- Inform stakeholders of the project
- Share information on what biosphere reserve's are about
- Understand what people think about living in a biosphere reserve
- Identify opportunities for sustainable use of the reserve's natural resources.

WHAT IS A BIOSPHERE RESERVE

(NS)

Nick Steytler (NS) gave an overview on what a Biosphere Reserve is.

- Biosphere Reserves: Are representatives of the world's ecosystems and are regarded as important places where a balance is achieved between the goals of conserving biodiversity, promoting economic and social development and maintaining associated cultural values. As such they are showcases for sustainable development.
- Sustainable development in the South African context can be defined as optimising user benefits, now and in the future, whilst maintaining diverse, healthy and productive ecosystems.
- UNESCO has the following requirements:
 - Conservation of landscapes, ecosystems, species and genetic variation.
 - Economic and human development that is socially, culturally and ecologically sustainable.
 - Support for:
 - Environmental education and training
 - Research and monitoring
- NS explains to the workshop what it would mean for them to live in the KBR:
 - Must look after our environment – fynbos, animals, rivers, wetlands, fish, perlemoen, etc.
 - Must address socio-economic issues (poverty, unemployment, crime) through utilising the reserve's natural resources in a sustainable manner.
 - Must educate and improve awareness of all stakeholders and participate in international research.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

(DJ)

The stakeholders are invited to give their input on the following issues:

a. What is your understanding of KBR?

- Some people understood it was an enlightened way to live in harmony with nature.

- Some people understood that the transitional zone carries the core and buffer areas. They understand that finances generated in the transitional zones must be used for the conservation of biodiversity in the core and buffer areas.
- Some belief that it was only “a pie in the sky”.
- For some it was the first time that they have ever heard of the KBR.
- Some understood that it was a way to teach the world how to live. To be an example and campaign for an innovative and responsible way of living.

b. What would you like from KBR?

- To live in the heart of the fynbos.
- The KBR must be revolutionary and also provide protection to its people and nature.
- To be a place where people live in Eco-villages.
- To create a healthy environment, free of bad smells, air pollution, radiation etc..
- To create sustainable job-opportunities – i.e. opportunities for self-employment.
- To ensure sustainable use of marine resources for local people living in the KBR.
- Must bring together the people (with different cultural backgrounds) living in the KBR.
- Must maximise the opportunities for the local people.

c. What should KBRC do?

- Network with local authorities to achieve common good by utilizing the natural resources.
- Ensure education and capacity building of all stakeholders.
- Local Authorities must be part of the process. They must buy-in to the KBR and show the political will to make it happen.
- There must be sufficient representation of community and political buy-in.
- Look for funding.
- Develop mechanisms to regulate land use and development. Must discourage inappropriate developments.
- General education with regards to sustainability.
- Make sure that plans are implemented.
- Must look at the Provincial Spatial Development Framework which are more in line with the KBR principles. The Overstrand Spatial Development Framework is problematic and is not supportive of bioregional principles and does not enhance the KBR. Alignment of these overarching development frameworks is critical and should be a core focus of the KBRC.

- Promote and ensure that sustainable development guidelines are implemented e.g. when plots are cleared for houses the indigenous vegetation should be carefully removed and sold in plant nurseries rather than destroyed.
- Promote and initiate futuristic sustainable living projects.
- Organise demonstration projects within the area – particularly projects demonstrating sustainable living.

d. What natural resources would you like to use?

- Eco-tourism – this provides the best opportunities for alleviating poverty and addressing unemployment.
- Promote and be creative with regards to crafts (e.g. use seashells and alien vegetation, etc)
- Cutting of alien vegetation is an employment provider.
- Feel uncomfortable with the idea that local communities be allowed access to natural resources in sensitive areas.

SUMMING UP

DJ gave a summary of the input of the stakeholders.

WAY FORWARD

NS outlined the way forward in the Public Participation Process:

- Consultants will be holding other focus workshops and sessions with economic stakeholders and statutory bodies.
- Following this a draft Strategic Framework will be prepared – this focuses on the core business of the KBRC by outlining the vision, mission statement and goals of the KBRC.
- Multi-stakeholder workshop will be held to determine the themes to be addressed in the Management & Corporate Plans
- Thematic workshops to develop details of Management Plan (i.e. working groups on fire management, tourism, resource use, others)
- Preparation of a draft Strategic Management Plan and wide circulation for stakeholder review.

CLOSURE

DJ indicated that the information covered during the workshop would be summarised in the record of the workshop and forwarded to all stakeholders. He invited written comment on the project from stakeholders on the comment sheet provided. DJ thanked participants for taking the time to attend and participate in the workshop, which closed at 20:35.

ANNEXURE A

LIST OF ATTENDEES

TITLE	NAME	SURNAME	ORGANISATION
Mr	J	Whitehead	Pringle Bay Ratepayers Association
Ms	C	Burlock	KOBIO
Mr	J	Botha	SABC, 50/50
Ms	H	De Vos	SABC, 50/50
Mr	N	Barnsley	Betty's Bay Ratepayers Association
Mrs	S	Barnsley	Betty's Bay Ratepayers Association
Mrs	E	Van Der Horst	Hangklip Heritage Trust
Capt	M	Stakemire	Hangklip- Kleinmond Federation of Ratepayers Ass.
Mrs	A	Nunn	Botanical Society (Kogelberg Branch)
Ms	E	Le Roux	KBR Section 21, KOBIO
Mr	L	Van Heerden	KOBIO
Mr	D	De Bruyn	Resident
Mrs	A	Coughlan	Overberg Tourism
Mrs	E	Bernhardt	Overberg Tourism
Mr	R	Isaacs	Resident
Mrs	S	Arendse	Resident
	I	Arendse	Resident
	J	Adonis	Resident
	J	Smith	Resident
	P	Flemmer	Resident
	A	Smith	Resident
	M	Hartnick	Resident
Ms	S	Jacobs	Resident
Mr	A	Rabie	Resident

Annexure B:
Record of the economic stakeholder interviews

TOWARDS THE PREPARATION OF A STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE KOGELBERG BIOSPHERE RESERVE

RECORD OF THE ECONOMIC STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION PROCESS

Interviews held during the month of March 2006.

Prepared by the DJ Environmental Consultants / Setplan Joint Venture

March 2006

Introduction

Interviews were held with the key economic stakeholders during which a series of questions were asked by the consultants. The questions asked were as follows:

1. What is your understanding of biosphere reserves?
2. What is your experience of the KBR to date?
3. What are the economic opportunities in the KBR?
4. What should the KBRC do to realise these opportunities?
5. How should the KBRC be structured?

Table 1 presents the list of economic stakeholders interviewed and table 2 a summary of their inputs.

Table 1: List of Economic Stakeholders Interviewed

Acronym	Name	Organisation	Telephone & Fax	Email
AA	Anthony Appel	Kogelberg Investments	083-360 0652 (c) 028-284 9749 (f)	
BZ	Brian Zwarts	Emerging Businessman	083-360 0652 (c)	
WZ	Winston Zwart	Emerging Businessman	083-360 0652 (c)	
PC	Dr Paul Cluver (snr)	Paul Cluver Wines	021-844 0605 (t) 021-844 0150 (f)	info@cluver.com
LC	Liesl Cluver-Rust	Paul Cluver Wines	021-844 0605 (t) 021-844 0150 (f)	liesl@cluver.com
CB	Cany Bugler	TriActive	021-859 4250 (t) 021-859 4230 (f)	info@triacitive.co.za
RG	Riaan Gous	Arabella	021-412 9010 (t)	gous@arabella.co.za
SW vd M	SW van der Merwe	Dennis Moss Partnership (=Arabella)		
LM	Liesl Muller	Green Mountain Eco Route	082-450 9747 (c)	info@greenmountain.co.za
CM	Carin Malan	Elgin Grabouw Vyeboom & Villiersdorp Agricultural Association	021-859 1958 (t) 021-859 2689 (f)	egvv@mweb.co.za
TX	Toni Xaba	Harold Porter National Botanical Garden	028-272 9311 (t) 028-272 9333 (f)	
AdA	Adnaan Abrahams	CapeNature	021-659 3443 (t)	adabraha@pgwc.gov.za
KD	Keith Dampies	Elgin Community College – Agriculture	021-848 9413 (t) 021-848 9414 (f)	keith@elf1.co.za
EB	Edwin Boshoff	Elgin Community College – Agriculture and Education	021-848 9413 (t) 021-848 9414 (f)	keith@elf1.co.za
RS	Robin Stanley	Elgin Community College - Agriculture	021-848 9413 (t) 021-848 9414 (f)	keith@elf1.co.za
GM	Guy Musson	Espadon	083-658 7391 (c)	guy@espadonmarine.co.za

Table 2. Summarised Record of the Inputs from Economic Stakeholders Interviewed

Inputs	Economic Stakeholder
<i>Perceptions of KBR Management Performance</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The KBRC is perceived as being dysfunctional. It has no clear leadership or direction. There is no KBRC contact person, telephone number etc. 	AA, LM, RG, SW vd M, CM, TX, EB, KD, RS, AdA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to a lack of presence of the KBRC and limited marketing of the KBR no-one really takes notice of the KBR. 	RG, SW vd M
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The KBR has been used as a tool to stifle development. Sustainable development is a balance between biodiversity conservation and socio-economic development. The history of the KBR has been an imbalance in the favour of biodiversity conservation. There is a need to focus on socio-economic issues. 	AA, RG, SW vd M
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KBRC have been successful in achieving biodiversity conservation role. 	CM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delineation of zones was done with a strong conservation focus and without broad stakeholder participation. The boundaries are soft as they have not been adequately researched and are in need of revision. 	AA, RG, SW vd M
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People who have been involved in the KBR to date have done so because of their own interests and are indifferent to the needs of the majority. 	PC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thought there was a Fire Protection Agency in the KBR – possibly not yet formalized. 	CM
<i>Challenges Facing the Management of the KBR</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited consultation with HD communities has resulted in limited buy-in from this important stakeholder group. This has also contributed to the limited awareness of the biosphere reserve concept among this group. 	AA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landowners in KBR do not understand the concept and have not bought into the concept. 	RG, SW vd M
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the absence of an effective KBR management structure, KOBIO has become the face of the KBR. KOBIO is a lobbying / advocacy group that has not been able to assist entrepreneurs who are interested in various initiatives in KBR and in many cases has lobbied against development initiatives. 	AA, LM, AdA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The divergent interests of stakeholders and the presence of obstructive forces in the KBR is the cause of much frustration. As a result the area is regarded as volatile and agencies, entrepreneurs, etc are cautious of investing there resources there. 	TX, GM, AdA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing biosphere reserves takes a lot of work. KBRC will need resources. 	AdA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The perception exists that development cannot take place in biosphere reserves. 	AdA

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The challenge is to make conservation important for those who live outside the conservation areas. 	PC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to demonstrate benefits of stakeholders and role players becoming involved and supporting the KBR. CapeNature has invested large amounts of financial resources in the KBR and has not yet seen a return on this investment. 	AdA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need a strategy to deliver (biodiversity conservation) benefits to people. The people cannot do this but role players can. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CapeNature: perform a management and monitoring role but must not get involved in entrepreneurial role – need others to look at the potential for economic development, e.g. game reserve, golf course (need to look across sectors) ○ Need to create an environment where private sector can create a mix of products. Authorities may need to open-up the regulatory environment to allow this to happen. ○ Need to develop a plan which indicates how and what is sustainable in KBR – where should things happen (e.g. trails) and where no development should take place. 	PC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KBR is rich in marine resources but due to restrictive quota allocations, recreational bag limits and prohibition of selling of recreational catches people are forced to poach. 	AA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land reform – DAC Committees lack teeth. LED officers have not taken BEE seriously. 	AA, BZ
<i>Economic opportunities in the KBR</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are areas within KBR which are disturbed and mostly former forestry areas that are suitable for development. Problem is that current delineation and ambiguous development guidelines for the zones present an obstacle to realizing these development opportunities. 	AA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is timber in places near the core areas which if access was opened then SMME's could harvest the timber. The delineation of the zones and the nature reserve management policies closes access to these areas. 	BZ
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The coastal part of the KBR has excellent potential for mariculture. The seawater quality is exceptionally high and there are good resources of kelp which is used as a food for growing out abalone. Mariculture entrepreneurs are, however, not encouraged to invest because of the obstacle presented by influential environmental interest groups. 	GM, AA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bees and fynbos honey already has a good market (overseas) but access to fynbos and fruit growing areas present an obstacle and as a result this opportunity is not realized. 	BZ

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land reform – once trees felled in forestry areas then opportunities arise for new emerging farmers. 	AA, BZ
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wildflower harvesting opportunities do exist but existing farmers in co-hoots with CapeNature and keep emerging competitors out. There are opportunities for extracting essential oils from the abundant and diverse fynbos. 	AA, BZ
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bottling of Spring Water – Appletiser is prepared to go into a JV with an empowerment partner. 	AA, BZ
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agriculture is struggling in the KBR. Agro-tourism (e.g. biodiversity wine route) presents an alternative viable economic activity that KBR farmers can get involved in. 	LM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The KBR offers leverage for fund raising. All that is required is open channels of communication between KBRC and those wanting to raise funds. 	EB, KD, RS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Money is made in downstream value-adding activities and not by the primary producers. Best opportunities lie in extracting value out of diversity (e.g. essential oils). 	PC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tourism opportunities exist for emerging businesses but newcomer must partner with existing viable tourism businesses to be successful. 	AA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arabella brings in tourists to the KBR. These tourists exist as a market waiting to be tapped by local entrepreneurs who could offer, for example, guided trails in the surrounding areas). 	AA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a dirt road through the Highlands area which connects the N2 and the R44 which if upgraded can open many tourism opportunities as the road is very scenic. 	AA, BZ
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overberg Tourism should look at creating a KBR tourism route which could include the Elgin Valley and other areas. 	LC, CB
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KBR is both a tourism destination within the Overberg as well as a gateway into the region and to Cape Town depending on which way you travel. 	LC, CB
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CapeNature is planning upmarket lodges in some of the Core and Buffer areas. These will be run as a partnership between the public and private sector where the community will have a major stake. Areas being looked at are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Buffelstal area where there is a need to rehabilitate the area as a result of heavy metal contamination from military weapons testing. ○ CapeNature rondavels in Kogelberg Nature Reserve. ○ Palmiet Campsite. ▪ Current thinking is to integrate the three sites as a hiking experience from the mountains to the sea. 	AdA

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CapeNature is developing new policy on consumptive use of natural resources. KBR is however not considered a suitable location to implement this because of its status as a biodiversity hotspot. 	AdA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CapeNature is interested in developing mountain bike trails and will be contacting adjacent landowners to come on board. 	AdA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are a number of sporting events which are hosted in the KBR. CapeNature sees potential for developing these further, particularly in the line of adventure tourism. It has offered a concession for river rafting to a local operator. 	AdA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is envisaged that the Highlands area will be converted to conservation land (if MTO / SAFCOL continue with their exit strategy. This area has good tourism potential. 	AdA
Other Opportunities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many farmers are not aware of the CAPE Stewardship Programme but would welcome it. Also agriculture students at Elgin Community College need to be exposed to the Stewardship Programme and would welcome environmental education and training. 	CM, EB, KD, RS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Harold Porter National Botanical Gardens is being developed along the lines of the Kirstenbosch National Botanical Gardens and has great potential to become a window into the KBR for tourists and be a place where information can be displayed to raise awareness. It also has potential to become a research hub although this is not currently planned for. 	TX
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SANBI is interested in supporting the KBRC by performing an educational role , particularly through the interpretation of biodiversity 	TX
The Role of the KBRC in Realizing these Opportunities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KBRC needs to clarify what the KBR is all about (i.e. its vision, goals and objectives) and then disseminate this information to all stakeholders. 	EB, KD, RS, CM, LM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As the Kogelberg area was identified through the CAPE project as being a biodiversity hotspot there is a need to synergise with the CAPE objectives with those of the KBR. 	AdA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KBRC should focus on increasing awareness of the KBR / have an outreach programme. Should produce pamphlets, brands, signage, information and routes. Could target farm stalls and the top of Sir Lowry's Pass. Regarding tourism the outreach programme should focus on training and education of guides. 	LM, CM, LC, CB, TX
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The KBRC should act as a coordinator ("mothership") of conservation, socio-economic and logistic initiatives in the KBR. 	LM, CM, TX, CM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KBRC should bring potential partners together around sustainable economic development 	LM, TX, AA, PC

opportunities, i.e. perform a facilitatory role.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regarding this facilitatory role, the KBRC can assist with removing red tape within organizations like CapeNature, MTO, MCM which prevents access to resources within the KBR. 	AA, BZ
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The KBRC should perform a 'watchdog' role. It should sensitize different governmental departments about socio-economic challenges in KBR, i.e. perform an advocacy role. 	AA, CM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KBRC must direct research in KBR and identify opportunities to demonstrate sustainable projects, i.e. perform a logistic role. 	LM, LC, CB
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KBRC should not only focus on the marginalized communities but also the mainstream (e.g. target estate agents and developers to encourage them to introduce sustainable / indigenous water wise gardening). 	TX
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KBRC must introduce a performance monitoring system (i.e. needs to set real measurable goals with timelines and then measure performance against these). 	AA, LC, CB, AA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KBRC can direct communication with BEE structures and KBR coordinator. 	AA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KBRC needs to be able to leverage funding. 	LC, CB, CM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KBRC needs to define what appropriate development is, i.e. it needs a local land use planning and management system. This could be done through preparing Spatial Development Plan (SDP) for the KBR. 	RG, SW vd M
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Must look at poverty alleviation locally if biodiversity conservation is to be sustainable i.e. how can the biosphere reserve concept be used to address socio-economic problems. 	RG, SW vd M
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are unique land resources in the KBR. Strategically need to unlock value of land based on sustainability principles. 	RG, SW vd M
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The KBRC should be responsible for coordinating fire management within the KBR. 	CM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To obtain the support of the farming community the KBRC will have to be action orientated not just talk and theory. 	CM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The KBRC must promote voluntarism. 	EB, KD, RS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KBRC should consolidate its activities according to the following programmes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outreach Programme ○ Development Programme ○ Monitoring and Research Programme 	TX
The Structure of the KBRC	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current management structure is unrepresentative. Needs balanced representation. 	AA, PC, EB, KD, RS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bottom-up structures, as are common in Europe, are not necessarily appropriate for 	PC

<p>biosphere reserves in SA. People have less money and less time to provide voluntary services. Those that do have different agendas (e.g. NIMBY syndrome). Because biosphere reserves have national and international importance it is appropriate that government takes responsibility – bottom-up approach not appropriate. This however is complicated by fact that local authorities have weak capacity.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need simple structure with representation from people with the biggest stake in the area. Biggest stakeholder is CapeNature – perhaps they should run the KBR and then establish a committee representative of community and land owners. Advisory Committee must be as small as possible but must achieve a balance representivity (from Local Authorities, community and major land owners) and functionality 	PC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do not try to create artificial constituencies but rather use legitimate structures (i.e. representatives of properly constituted bodies) 	PC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In a successful biosphere reserve compliance and buy-in is required from land owners. Most land is state-owned so state is a big stakeholder. Stewardship Programme is effective in getting private land owners on board. So the state must take responsibility and use the Stewardship Programme as a mechanism to get private land owners on board. Together these groups decide on how to manage the biosphere reserve. However, they must consider the needs of the people living in the biosphere reserve and ensure that they benefit from management. For this reason structures are needed to engage the broader stakeholders. 	PC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The KBRC should be structured according to portfolios. Key portfolios of the KBR could be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tourism ○ Conservation ○ Social Development ○ Economic Sectors ○ Land and Infrastructural Development <p>See example of Richards Bay.</p>	RG, SW vd M, CM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 21 Company is the appropriate vehicle. Must be properly constituted and must have socio-economic strategy. Then land owners will buy-in into strategy. 	RG, SW vd M
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Board must be representative of the different sectors but must be limited in number otherwise it will be too cumbersome. 	LM, RG, SW vd M

▪ KBRC Board should set policy.	CM
▪ KBRC needs a project manager / coordinator with specialist support teams which are set up around special interests / projects.	LM, CM
▪ KBRC must be able to negotiate with municipality	CM
▪ Incorporate socio-economic element within KBRC management structure – must have a BEE focus.	AA
▪ If local authority has too much power then KBRC will be dysfunctional. Need to avoid political infighting and needs continuity in representation.	AA

Annexure C:

Records of the 'conservators' and 'planners' workshops

RECORD OF CONSERVATORS WORKSHOP FOR THE KOGELBERG BIOSPHERE RESERVE

**JONKERSHOEK CONFERENCE HALL, JONKERSHOEK
09:30 – 15:30, 14 MARCH 2006**

INTRODUCTION

A Conservators' Focus Workshop was held on Tuesday, 14 March 2006 at the Jonkershoek Conference Hall, Jonkershoek. James Jackelman (JJ), from Envirocentric and part of the consultant team, welcomed attendees and introduced himself as the workshop facilitator.

Attendees at this workshop are listed in Annexure A.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

(RC)

A brief overview of the information presented to stakeholders is provided below.

Mr Rod Cronwright (RC) of Setplan provided a background to the project which was as follows:

- *Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve (KBR) was registered with UNESCO's MAB Program in 1998*
- *A 35-member management committee was established to manage the KBR*
- *In 2002 the management committee was dissolved and replaced by a Section 21 Company, the Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve Company (KBRC), with 8 directors*
- *A business plan for the KBR was developed in 2004 but not implemented*
- *An Article 18 KBRC Technical Committee was established in 2004 to manage the affairs of the KBRC*
- *The Setplan/DJ Environmental Joint Venture appointed by the KBRC and Overberg DM in 2005 to develop a Strategic Management Framework for the KBR*

He also outlined the project brief as follows:

- *Using a participatory planning process with KBR role players and stakeholders, develop a "Strategic Management Framework" for the KBR*
- *The Strategic Management Framework will comprise the following:*
 - *A medium-term Strategic Plan (values, vision, goals, objectives)*
 - *A medium-term Management Plan (themes, strategies, projects, activities)*
 - *An Institutional Development/ Corporate (Restructuring) Plan (Institutional development, co-operative governance, operating procedures)*

- *A performance monitoring system (performance measurement, review and reporting)*

PURPOSE OF WORKSHOP

(JJ)

The purpose of the workshop was to:

- *Inform stakeholders of the project and its objectives*
- *Collectively assess the performance of the KBR and the KBRC to date*
- *Collectively determine where the KBRC should be focusing its future efforts to complement existing management initiatives*
- *Obtain input on the key management activities and projects that could/ should be developed and implemented by the KBRC*
- *Obtain input on how the KBRC could/ should be institutionally structured to achieve its objectives and implement the management activities and projects*

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

(JJ)

The stakeholders are invited to give their input on the following issues:

a. The performance of the KBR and the KBRC to date

Prior to opening the discussion to the floor NS presented the consultants understanding of the performance to date. This was presented as follows:

- *Established Section 21 Company and Article 18 Technical Committee*
- *Coordinated an environmental education and awareness program that targeted scholars, teachers and farmers*
- *To date have not been responsible for any other biosphere-scale projects*
- *Individuals 'representing' KBR have lobbied against developments in the KBR (e.g. Pringle Bay Abalone Farm and Arabella Phase II)*

Thereafter NS presented a shortlist of the key challenges and issues facing the KBR / KBRC as determined through the situational analysis: These were as follows:

- *No legal status of biosphere reserves in SA*
- *Efficacy of KBRC*
- *What is the KBRC core business?*
- *Mainstreaming the KBR among role players*
- *An imbalance in awareness of the biosphere reserve concept among KBR stakeholders*
- *Perceived non-delivery of tangible socio-economic benefits*
- *Lack of political will*
- *Poor waste management in parts of KBR*

- *Lack of coordinated fire management plan*
- *Ambiguity regarding permissible activities in zones*
- *Need for a KBR-scale performance monitoring system*
- *Limited funding (self-generated and external)*

The discussion was opened to the floor and the following inputs were received:

- Funding is the most important support system.
 - Directors did not know how to source funding.
- KBRC needs administrative / bureaucratic capacity.
- There is no direction and lack of a plan. Original Articles of Association not drawn up with any vision or direction.
- Voluntary basis is a weakness.
- Political will (lack of) and political infighting is a major obstacle.
 - This raises the question: Whose responsibility is the management of the KBR? Is it the responsibility of the local authorities or stakeholders?
 - Provision is made for ensuring political involvement / buy-in through the representation of the Article 18 Technical Committee
- Is lack of legal basis a problem?
 - SA has a plethora of legislation and mandated role-players, but what is missing is a co-ordinator (partnership builder)
 - As there is no legal basis KBRC should not be trying to 'do' things but rather it should focus on building partnerships, perform a coordination function and initiate some demonstration projects.
 - Functionality will come from statutory bodies.
- KBRC has no dedicated staff / representative and lacks a home.
- Technical Committee is holding it all together – this can be regarded as a success.
- We need to know what you want today before you can determine the correct structure.
- Need grassroots successes.
 - It all depends on what our view is of what KBRC should do (i.e. expectations)
- The expectation exists that the KBRC should be a lobbying group
 - If their role is to build and maintain partnerships, then lobbying can be counter productive.
 - Lobbying may have caused fractures in KBRC in the past.
- Representivity from historically disadvantaged community is poor – this is a major weakness.
- Confusion as to who represents the KBR – KOBIO is currently perceived to be the 'face' of the KBR.
- Poor representivity from PDCs results in poor credibility.
- KBRC are perceived as only having conservation interests – this is a weakness.

b. Strategic Priority Areas that the KBRC should focus on

Prior to opening the discussion to the floor JJ presented a number of suggestions regarding possible strategic priority areas for the KBRC. These were as follows:

- *Coordination of cross-institutional and regional initiatives in KBR*
- *Implementation of regional information, education and awareness initiatives in KBR*
- *Monitoring of performance in KBR*
- *Fund raising for KBR initiatives and programs*
- *Strategic and operations planning for KBR functions*
- *Advocacy – reactive and proactive responses to opportunities and threats*
- *Information management support to KBR*

The discussion was opened to the floor and the following inputs were received:

- Address perceived lack of delivery on socio-economic benefits.
 - This will generate the political will and broad stakeholder buy-in.
- Operationalise PSDF in KBR or only certain aspects of it. Need to ensure that all SDFs affecting KBR are aligned with the PSDF.
- Marine environment / component and its managers need to be involved. (MCM is an important partner)
- KBRC interventions should target buffer areas and transition areas through developing the following:
 - Guidelines for land use which are unambiguous
 - Opportunities for socio-economic development
- Extension of World Heritage Site to include KBR's marine resources and the active management of these resources.
- We need to preserve the integrity of the landscape through minimising human footprint.
- KBR must be a showcase for sustainable development.
 - KBRC needs to identify demonstration projects.
 - Be a place where local authorities demonstrate their capacity to manage sustainable development.
- The KBR must be a place of ever improving biodiversity conservation, i.e. we must try to increase the core over time.
- Generic approach not appropriate, need local knowledge of the landscapes.
- Who are we is an important question that needs to be answered?
 - Complex stakeholder community in KBR?
- A major challenge is addressing lost momentum
- The KBRC must be a physical entity that can be seen and be contacted, that can build awareness and capacity and demonstrate sustainable livelihood activities to poor communities.
- The KBRC should be an instigator of progressive ways of moving forward – more an innovator than a regulator.

- The structure of the managing body needs to ensure that the following is addressed:
 - Must have administrative capacity
 - Needs to establish a functional working relationship between role players/ NGO's/ CBO's

c. Key Management Activities and Projects

Prior to opening the discussion to the floor JJ presented a number of suggestions regarding possible strategic priority areas for the KBRC. These were as follows:

- *Coordination of Fire Protection Agency*
- *Bi-annual State of KBReserve report*
- *SDF for the KBR*
- *Funding application to NLDF*
- *Co-ordination of CMA*
- *Development of marketing materials*

The discussion was opened to the floor and the following inputs were received:

- Facilitate access to areas in KBR, particularly the attractive core areas
 - Will raise awareness of the value of the KBR.
- Co-ordination is a key function of the KBRC
 - The KBRC should establish roles & responsibilities, mandates, interests of the KBR community
- Functioning partnership is an indication of successful partnership.
- KBRC needs to capacitate local authorities to integrate environmental principles into management and development of KBR's human settlements.
- KBRC should be responsible for collation and dissemination of information.
- KBRC should monitor Biodiversity Conservation in KBR or alternatively whether the KBR vision / goals are being achieved (i.e. monitor implementation of SMF)
- Is KBRC supposed to be an expert group advises role players?
 - KBRC cannot force a role player to do anything.
 - It has no mandate to do this.
 - It is not a 'legitimate' organisation.
 - KBRC is not going to be an implementing agent.
- Can the KBRC perform an independent auditing / monitoring role player performance role?
- KBRC should be responsible for awareness raising at grassroots.
 - To do this effectively it needs a local champion.
- KBRC should safeguard livelihoods of its people through e.g. identifying alternatives to poaching (i.e. perform advocacy role).
- KBRC needs project development/ fund raising capacity.
- Tourism co-ordination and marketing.
 - KBR can unify operators and improve regional marketing.

- Market KBR with historically disadvantaged communities e.g. Working for Water targeted KBR.
- KBRC must communicate with and contribute knowledge to international network of biosphere reserves and other C.A.P.E. initiatives.
- Land Care can provide opportunities for co-operation from the agricultural sector. KBRC should facilitate introduction of Land Care and Stewardship Programme into farming community.
- KBRC should co-ordinate the establishment of a Fire Protection Agency and the establishment of Ward Committees.

d. What is the appropriate structure for the management entity

Prior to opening the discussion to the floor RC presented background to the current structure of the KBRC which was as follows:

- *1998 - Management Committee was KBR's original management entity. Included approximately 35 members, was regarded as representative but cumbersome management structure*
- *2002 - KBRC Section 21 (not for profit) company founded, influenced by Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve*
- *KBRC Articles prescribe min. 3 max. 8 directors.*
- *WWF, CapeNature Board & BotSoc special members*
- *Article 18 provides for technical support to directors by Standing Committee (WCPA, Local Authorities, representatives from core, buffer & transition areas)*

Thereafter RC presented a slide showing a number of options for improving the efficacy of the KBRC:

- *Amendment of Articles of Association & review of governance structures*
- *Establish voluntary association*
- *Establishment of Trust*
- *Other*

The inputs from the floor regarding the structuring of the management entity were as follows:

- Don't restructure unless necessary. Rather strengthen and provide support to existing structure.
- The question that needs to be asked is: Is the current structure unattractive to potential partners?
- Current structure has a Board, which makes policy decisions. The Technical Committee then takes these forward, i.e. is the implementing agent. The Technical Committee should therefore assume more responsibility.
- Board Members need to have a number of capabilities including:
 - Financial management.
 - Policy awareness.

- Or should they just representative of stakeholders?
- Smaller structure with one good project developer with fundraising capabilities will be far more effective. Representation can be achieved through external forums.
- Whatever the structure is, it needs a home!
- Identify operational skills required then develop structure around that, but also needs an overarching stakeholder representative body that approves its actions.
- Representivity can be at an entirely different level or achieved through other mechanism/s.
- Operational basis is most important.
- Could be useful to have a political appointment on board
 - This runs the risk of poor continuity – politicians may change alliance
- Section 21 Company can accept funding and can make policy.
- Branding and legitimacy of logos needs to be regulated / co-ordinated

SUMMING UP

RC gave a summary of the input of the conservators.

WAY FORWARD

NS outlined the way forward in the Stakeholder Consultation Process:

- Currently engaging stakeholders (social and economic) and role players (conservators and planners)
- Information to inform preparation of Strategic Plan (i.e. vision, mission statement etc)
- Thematic focus group sessions to develop action plans for key strategic priorities (April)
- Draft Strategic Management Framework for public review (mid-June)

CLOSURE

JJ thanked participants for taking the time to attend and participate in the workshop, which closed at 15h00.

ANNEXURE A

LIST OF ATTENDEES

TITLE	NAME	SURNAME	ORGANISATION
Dr	Mandy	Barnett	C.A.P.E
Dr	Nicolette	Louw	Pringle Bay Conservancy
Mr	Francois	Kotze	Overberg District Municipality
Mr	Clive	May	CoCT
Mr	Steve	Gildenhuys	CapeNature
Mrs	Ingrid	Horwood	Friends of the Botriver Estuary
Mr	Gonald	Present	CapeNature
Mr	Rob	Fryer	Overstrand Conservation Foundation
Ms	Chris	Burlock	Biosphere Reserve Action Group, Rooi Els Conservancy , KOBIO
Dr	Neil	Fairall	Groenland Water Users Association
Mr	Arne	Slingers	CoCT
Mr	Guy	Palmer	CapeNature
Ms	Barbara	Jenman	Betty's Bay Conservancy
Mr	Leon	Steyn	Overstrand Municipality
Mr	Nick	Steytler	DJEC
Mr	Rod	Cronwright	Setplan
Mr	James	Jackelman	Envirocentric

RECORD OF PLANNERS FOCUS WORKSHOP FOR THE KOGELBERG BIOSPHERE RESERVE

**OVERSTRAND MUNICIPALITY, HERMANUS
9:00 – 14:00, 14 MARCH 2006**

INTRODUCTION

A Planners Focus Workshop was held on Thursday, 16 March 2006 at the offices of the Overstrand Municipality, Hermanus. Rod Cronwright (RC), the project leader from Setplan, welcomed attendees. He explained that the stakeholder engagement process forms an essential part of preparing a Strategic Management Framework which the Setplan / DJ Environmental Consultants Joint Venture has been appointed to do.

Attendees at this workshop are listed in Annexure A.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

(NS)

A brief overview of the information presented to the planners is provided below.

Mr Nick Steytler (NS) of DJ Environmental Consultants (DJEC) provided a background to the project and gave a concise explanation of the biosphere reserve concept and what biosphere reserves were intended to achieve. He explained that the background of the project was as follows:

- Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve (KBR) was registered with UNESCO's MAB Program in 1998
- A 35-member management committee was established to manage the KBR
- In 2002 the management committee was dissolved and replaced by a Section 21 Company, the Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve Company (KBRC), with 8 directors
- A business plan for the KBR was developed in 2004 but not implemented
- An Article 18 KBRC Technical Committee was established in 2004 to manage the affairs of the KBRC
- The Setplan/DJ Environmental Joint Venture appointed by the KBRC and Overberg DM in 2005 to develop a Strategic Management Framework for the KBR

He also outlined the project brief as follows:

- Using a participatory planning process with KBR role players and stakeholders, develop a "Strategic Management Framework" for the KBR
- The Strategic Management Framework will comprise the following:
 - A medium-term Strategic Plan (values, vision, goals, objectives)

- A medium-term Management Plan (themes, strategies, projects, activities)
- An Institutional Development/ Corporate (Restructuring) Plan (Institutional development, co-operative governance, operating procedures)
- A performance monitoring system (performance measurement, review and reporting)

In explaining the purpose of biosphere reserves NS indicated that in terms of UNESCO's requirements biosphere reserves should carry out the following functions:

- i. **Conservation** of landscapes, ecosystems, species and genetic variation.
- ii. **Economic and human development** that is socially, culturally and ecologically sustainable.
- iii. Support for:
 - a. demonstration of projects
 - b. environmental education and training
 - c. research and monitoring
 - i.e. a **logistic** function

NS also presented part of the Seville Strategy which was of relevance to the planning domain. The underlying message was that the intention has always been that biosphere reserves should achieve their goals based on the voluntary participation of the stakeholders and role players. NS also explained that there were a number of similar initiatives in the Cape Floristic Kingdom which are running successfully and have as their basis voluntarism (e.g. Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor, Gourits Initiative, Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative and Garden Route Initiative and the CAPE Stewardship Programme).

PURPOSE OF WORKSHOP

(RC)

The purpose of the workshop was to:

- Inform stakeholders of the project and its objectives
- Collectively assess the performance of the KBR and the KBRC to date
- Collectively determine where the KBRC should be focusing its future efforts to complement existing management initiatives
- Obtain input on the key management activities and projects that could/ should be developed and implemented by the KBRC
- Obtain input on how the KBRC could/ should be institutionally structured to achieve its objectives and implement the management activities and projects
- Capacity building – increase awareness of the BR concept

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

(RC)

The stakeholders are invited to give their input on the following issues:

a. The performance of the KBR and the KBRC to date

Prior to opening the discussion to the floor NS presented the consultants understanding of the performance to date. This was presented as follows:

- *Established Section 21 Company and Article 18 Technical Committee*
- *Coordinated an environmental education and awareness program that targeted scholars, teachers and farmers*
- *To date have not been responsible for any other biosphere-scale projects*
- *Individuals 'representing' KBR have lobbied against developments in the KBR (e.g. Pringle Bay Abalone Farm and Arabella Phase II)*

Thereafter NS presented a shortlist of the key challenges and issues facing the KBR / KBRC as determined through the situational analysis: These were as follows:

- *No legal status of biosphere reserves in SA*
- *Efficacy of KBRC*
- *What is the KBRC core business?*
- *Mainstreaming the KBR among role players*
- *An imbalance in awareness of the biosphere reserve concept among KBR stakeholders*
- *Perceived non-delivery of tangible socio-economic benefits*
- *Lack of political will*
- *Poor waste management in parts of KBR*
- *Lack of coordinated fire management plan*
- *Ambiguity regarding permissible activities in zones*
- *Need for a KBR-scale performance monitoring system*
- *Limited funding (self-generated and external)*

The discussion was opened to the floor and the following inputs were received:

- *CoCT officials are not very aware of the KBR – needs to be more visible / be a force to be recognised due to inactivity*
- *Kogelbaai resort is an opportunity*
- *Misaligned planning documents and complex planning jurisdictions contribute to issues in KBR*
- *By playing a coordination role may just duplicate roles of overarching structures (e.g. ODM)*
- *Need to have powers to implement its own projects*
- *Disagreement – should only facilitate – executive powers remain with mandated authorities*

- Previous chair ran KBRC like a business – met only with directors and cut out technical support
- Directors were non-executive – problem
- KOBIO regarded as the face of the KBR by planners
- UNESCO’s intentions good but open to interpretations and led to problems
- Zones need specific guidelines so ambiguity is reduced
- Needs ‘management / business plan’
- Nothing in it for certain stakeholders because of green focus
- Too many pro-green policy documents which lobby groups use as ammunition – policies too generic and not representative of what’s on the ground
- There are people with sensitive land in KBR who are willing to cooperate but green perception and experiences to date have alienated willing supporters
- PGWC recognises the KBR and supports financially
- Individuals make a difference – positive and negative
- Need greater clarity regarding what can and cannot be done in the various zones
- PGWC is confident that the concept is workable and desirable. The KBRC however does not register
- Biosphere’s are there in the 1st place because of their extraordinary natural environment – this is a weakness because interest groups, while lobbying against development, can always fall back on the principle that their interests lie in preserving this environment and therefore align with the BR concept.

b. Strategic Priority Areas that the KBRC should focus on

Prior to opening the discussion to the floor RC presented a number of suggestions regarding possible strategic priority areas for the KBRC. These were as follows:

- *Coordination of cross-institutional and regional initiatives in KBR*
- *Implementation of regional information, education and awareness initiatives in KBR*
- *Monitoring of performance in KBR*
- *Fund raising for KBR initiatives and programs*
- *Strategic and operations planning for KBR functions*
- *Advocacy – reactive and proactive responses to opportunities and threats*
- *Information management support to KBR*

The discussion was opened to the floor and the following inputs were received:

- There are Internal and external focuses
- External – education, training etc is the most important, then advocacy
- Internal e.g. monitoring, fund raising

- Important to focus on inter-biosphere functions e.g. share lessons learnt
- Clarification of planning implications of biosphere zones and coordination
- Coordination – particularly in terms of aligning spatial planning policy
- Needs to facilitate the preparation of spatial development plans
- Due to diverse stakeholder interests and because KBRC must be representative need to develop incentives for active participation – greenies have a clear incentive – how to we get others on board?
- Community representation is crucial in Sect. 21 Co. – representatives must have geographic representation not just racial or sectoral
- KBRC must establish itself has a force that can demonstrate incentives for cooperation
- Where does the socio-economic function fit in – should KBRC direct research / identify opportunities?
- Caution when coordinating as ODM also has this function – perhaps rather initiating role - coordinate own project OK
- Fund raising – funds can then be directed towards other statutory bodies better achieving their mandated functions
- Need to direct budget towards KBR management – first need to be recognised as a valued partner
- Why must there be a greater investment in KBR when municipality has other priorities – need to show how KBR contributes to municipal functions – payment for ecosystem services
- Urgent need for fine scale planning to ID suitable sites for development which overarching plans miss

c. How to align land use planning and management in the KBR and what role should KBRC play in this?

RC presented a slide showing an important part of the Seville Strategy which was of relevance to the discussion topic. He then presented some key planning issues which stimulated the discussion session. The key issues were as follows:

- *External & internal boundaries of KBR questioned*
- *Ambiguity over do's & dont's in core, buffer & transition*
- *Need to incorporate land reform targets*
- *Special conservation status for human settlements in KBR? Limits to their growth?*
- *PSDF & local SDFs not aligned:*
 - *different interpretations of what is appropriate rural development*
- *Synchronisation of ECA, HRA, LUPO & Building Reg statutory approval processes*
- *Second dwellings*
- *Architectural guidelines*
- *Sustainable building & engineering technologies*

The discussion was opened to the floor and the following inputs were received:

- KBR should focus on KBR boundaries, addressing ambiguity regarding zones but not alignment of SDFs – these will take place with or without the KBR
- All local SDFs will be forced to align with PSDF
- Who has an interest in the KBR – it may be wider than just the people who live there
- How to accommodate local conditions – broad scale plans often miss opportunities on the ground
- To develop consistency across a number of scales one must engage stakeholders - can't just distribute reports
- Through a KBR SDP on the ground / finer scale planning and management will be appropriated directed
- Additional dwellings is something that a KBR SDP should address – how many, where, should not impact on rural character
- Special status of towns needs to be resident driven – e.g. Yzerfontein, Rooi Els – authorities can support
- KBRC can promote, facilitate, generating local interest etc the designation of towns, adoption of architectural guidelines
- Environmental economy can play an important role in the land reform process - e.g. flower valley
- Intention is that people make an income from the land in question – don't have to necessarily move onto the land
- High potential agricultural land will be targeted for land reform
- KBRC should facilitate the mapping of the KBR's high potential agricultural land in SDP
- SAFCOL is interested in reinvesting in the higher productive forestry areas – not necessarily pulling out totally
- KBR because of its small scale is a good place where land use planning and management can be guided in terms of the envisaged hierarchy of plans PSDF – SDF – SDP because at the end of the day the successful implementation of these plans will depend on the support and buy-in of land owners (e.g. ABI)

d. How should the KBRC be structured?

The question was posed to the floor who had the following inputs:

- To ensure representation – ID sectors (e.g. government, labour, etc) & reps of zones (UNESCO) rather than groups from geographic areas
- Note: stakes are very high – not just like any company which can collapse and re-emerge
- Each director can establish a sub-committee under his / her portfolio to achieve representation
- Cannot be a 35 member committee

- Section 21 basis – has a Board and an Executive Committee
- Try to get disabled / women / marginalised individuals not just white successful people on board – but this has risks – people may be justifiably needy and then pursue hidden agenda
- Place the onus on the constituency to come forward and be represented
- Target the youth!!!
- Cannot depend on donated funding – need to be effective in fundraising – need certain skills i.r.o. of preparing proposals
- Ideally other partners (e.g. municipalities) should also provide funds

SUMMING UP

Nick Steytler (NS) gave a summary of the input of the planners.

WAY FORWARD

RC outlined the way forward in the Stakeholder Consultation Process:

- Currently engaging stakeholders (social and economic) and role players (conservators and planners)
- Information to inform preparation of Strategic Plan (i.e. vision, mission statement etc)
- Thematic focus group sessions to develop action plans for key strategic priorities (April)
- Draft Strategic Management Framework for public review (mid-June)

CLOSURE

RC thanked participants for taking the time to attend and participate in the workshop, which closed at 13:30.

ANNEXURE A

LIST OF ATTENDEES

TITLE	NAME	SURNAME	ORGANISATION
Mr	Shaun	October	Overberg PIMMS
Mr	Willie	Hattingh	Overberg PIMMS
Mr	Francois	Kotze	Overberg District Municipality
Mr	Charl	Marais	PGWC
Mr	Marek	Kedzieja	PGWC
Mr	Willem	Smith	PGWC
Mr	Kier	Hennessy	CoCT
Mr	Riaan	Kuchar	Overstrand Municipality
Mr	Rod	Cronwright	Setplan
Mr	Nick	Steytler	DJ Environmental Consultants