

IUCN South Africa Country Office

P.O. Box 11536
Hatfield
Pretoria
0028

3rd Floor, Hatfield Forum West
Arcadia Street
Hatfield
Pretoria

Tel: +27 12 342 8304
Fax: +27 12 342 8289
e-mail: admin@iucn.org

Branch of the Regional Office for Southern Africa, Harare

Executive Summary

acknowledge that, with hindsight, assessing impact in some projects can be seen as premature because of the issue of timing. As the IUCN-SA did not set time-based indicators, this understanding only emerged during the impact assessment.

In considering trends, similarities and differences across the programmes assessed, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The greatest strengths in the programmes and projects assessed are different. This is probably due to a combination of the following factors: the projects are different in terms of objectives, scale, scope and location; the projects have not been jointly planned; and experiences and lessons learnt have not been sufficiently shared between projects. In

- 2.3 FTTSA has made good strides in creating an enabling pro-poor environment that emerging tourism enterprise and workers within the established tourism sector can take advantage of. It is premature to assess the impact of this on livelihoods. In our opinion, FTTSA does not seek to impact directly on livelihoods but is focused on the enabling environment level and this should be made more explicit.
- 2.4 SASUSG has had no direct impact on livelihoods, but has had impact on creating an enabling environment for sustainable livelihoods and conservation. IUCN-SA's role in this has been so limited that this positive impact cannot be attributed to IUCN-SA. The challenge for IUCN-SA is deciding on its relationship to SASUSG.
- 2.5 Greening had some impacts both on the enabling environment and on directly creating livelihoods. But these were short term and they need to be built on to be sustainable. The challenge is for IUCN-SA to identify how to take forward the lessons and ideas that came out of Greening and translate these into programmes/projects, without being dependent on other partners. It has generated the concept and business plan for a national sustainable development campaign, but this needs to be driven by and is dependent on DEAT. It is acknowledged that IUCN-SA has tried to develop some concepts (e.g. the barometer), but it is worthwhile re-examining this. A design process for IUCN-SA driven programmes/projects at the level of detail as undertaken by NATPRO may be needed.
- 2.6 ABS was unable to have the degree of impact on the Biodiversity Act as they would have liked, although it was successful in affecting some changes. This was due to the difficulty of impacting on governance, a problem encountered by a number of programmes/projects. The greatest impact seems to have been on the various stakeholders for whom ABS is of concern.
3. IUCN-SA's impact on sustainable livelihoods is insignificant in terms of the scale and scope of the problem. This is the situation faced by all small NGOs and is not, in itself, a criticism of the IUCN-SA. The question is rather whether the strategies employed by IUCN-SA hold the potential to make a significant contribution in the medium to long term. It is our assessment that they do, although a number of changes are needed. Recommendations are made below.

4. The projects have had different planning models. The ability to respond quickly and constructively to opportunities that arise has been a great strength. Strengths in the initial phases of pursuing a vision with energy and then developing a tighter strategy and plan can be drawn on. Ongoing organisational support has been less uniformly successful. The FTTSA model of developing a clear, focussed tool and training others to use it is one that may be realistic for IUCN-SA in other projects where ongoing involvement is necessary but where IUCN-SA does not have the capacity to service the institutions.
5. The projects have developed different interesting models of empowerment of the previously disadvantaged. In FTTSA the model has been a rights-based one that has empowered employees at the workplace to utilise the trademark process to their benefit. The SVP model has focused on creating space in the market that community-based entrepreneurship could exploit to their benefit. The attempts at direct interventions in organisational development in the second phase of SVP were less successful. In Blyde, local level interventions have created local business opportunities despite a stalemate in the macro-political environment. In Greening, promotional communications campaigns have emerged as a new model for advocacy and lobbying work. This model of advocacy was also used in the SVP and other interventions such as the World Parks Congress, and is emerging across programmes/projects as a key area of competence within the IUCN-SA. In all cases access to accurate information and training have been important.
6. Although IUCN-SA has worked on brown issues and in an urban context, there is no longer-term programme envisaged in this area. It is a gap that may be able to be filled in taking forward Greening.
7. In South Africa there is lack of depth in policy debates about the link between poverty alleviation and environmental sustainability. IUCN-SA works within the paradigm that there is a link between improved livelihoods and improved conservation of biodiversity. This is a disputed paradigm, but not one that can be empirically proven in the medium term. IUCN-SA should engage more vigorously in this debate, sharing its experiences and generating knowledge.
8. Across most programmes/projects interviewees linked their observation that IUCN-SA's was successful to specific individuals. The IUCN-SA was seen as being these individuals. This reveals the commitment, drive and success of the

individuals. In most successful small organisations there is a high association between the organisation and the specific individual that the outsider deals with. There is a danger that the perception can be created that if these individuals are no longer with the organisation, then the organisation has little to offer. To

1(i)10.1(i)1-n8(.6(.3(n4-c.6(ia)(.)(tis di)75)vi)75s.J(85a)75tis. ermtisTo

lefic vd 3-4(en t)6.isider8(v)m.7(i)p.4(u)5.4(a)-ct.:8(e)Jm0 Tc0 Tw(or)409TJ0 -1.73 TD070026 Tc-070006 T1(cr).n(n

3.1 Intend to have an impact on creating an enabling environment for sustainable livelihoods and conservation but which are not expected to have direct impact on improving livelihoods

3.2 Intend to have an impact on directly improving livelihoods

1. Background and ToR

IUCN-SA¹ has initiated a process to develop a four-year programme and business plan. The programme will provide a technical, results-based framework for guiding IUCN-SA interventions over the four-year intercessional period from 2005-8. The programme will be informed by IUCN's mission, vision, strategy and key result areas, and be rooted in South African realities. It needs to provide leadership in defining and addressing key issues and trends in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development within a broader national context.

To ensure that IUCN-SA's interventions in conservation and sustainable development support and address a broader local agenda defined by priorities in poverty alleviation, job creation, addressing HIV/AIDs, and stimulating economic growth, four issues are being investigated:

- § An assessment of the social impact of IUCN-SA's interventions: Given that the strengths of IUCN-SA's interventions are in empowerment and livelihoods, an assessment of the social impact of interventions to date, within a broader context, is necessary. This report contains the findings and recommendations of this assessment.
- § Government priorities: As a key partner of IUCN-SA, an understanding of the national framework and its links with conservation and sustainable development is an essential element informing the development of a programme.
- § Issues and programmes within member organisations: A review of key issues and focal areas in member organisations will help to identify areas of overlap, synergy and potential partnerships.
- § Donor intelligence (ODAs, bi- and multi-lateral and corporate): An understanding of the funding landscape is an important component of programme development in order to develop an effective and realistic fundraising strategy for the programme. A review of trends and patterns in both the corporate sector and donor organisations is required.

¹ IUCN-SA refers to the IUCN South Africa Country Office, IUCN refers to the IUCN as an international organisation, and where other regions or offices of the IUCN are referred the title relevant to that office is given.

assess IUCN's social impact against criteria such as job creation. Rather the KEG strategy will form key indicators against which the impact will be assessed.

The following indicators were used:

š

interviews with individuals and groups across the chain of institutions involved in these projects/programmes.

A list of livelihoods projects/programmes was identified. These were then divided into category A, B and C priority based on the criteria below. It was agreed that all category A projects must be covered and that time would determine the approach taken to category B and C. It may be possible to pull out information of importance to the future programme on those projects from existing documents and/or a key interview. For each

Š

A number of documents, specific to the programme being reviewed, that were considered are listed in the tables below. In addition to these the following general IUCN documents were read to inform this review:

- § IUCN-International, IUCN Global Program 2001 - 4
- § IUCN-International, IUCN Programme 2005 – 8
- § IUCN-International, Guide to linking component programmes to the IUCN Programme, March 2002
- § IUCN-International, User guidelines for developing IUCN component programme plans, undated
- § Third draft of Southern Africa Situational Analysis: Synthesis Report – An Analysis of Human and Ecosystem Wellbeing for IUCN-ROSA’s Programme
- § IUCN-ROSA, Progress and Assessment Report, 2003
- § IUCN-ROSA, Achieving Environmental and Human Security – IUCN Programme

jobless growth. The official unemployment rate is 31.2%, substantially higher than the 1996 figure of 19.3%. The age distribution pyramid is typical of developing countries, with a high number of young people. However, the percentage of the population aged 0 – 14 years decreased from 34,3% in 1996 to 32.1% in 2001. More than 80% of the population lives on an income of less than 67% of the national average income per capita. Half of all South African households (or 22 million people) are "poor", earning less than R353 per adult per month, or approximately \$2/day. This poverty is concentrated among Africans (61%) and female-headed households (60%). Most of the poor live in rural areas (72%). South Africa's rural population depends on pensions, welfare payments and transfers for up to 60% of their monthly income.

Poverty leads to malnutrition that is estimated to affect 2.5 million children. Poverty also exacerbates health risks, such as malaria, tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS. An estimated 12.9% of the population is infected with HIV, with 1.500 new HIV infections each day.

- § The provision of access to quality and affordable basic services to all South Africans
- § The promotion of environmental sustainability
- § A sustained reduction in the unemployment rate
- § Attainment of sustainable high growth rates

Chapter 6 of the UN Human Development Report on environmentally sustainable development makes a number of recommendations including mainstreaming of environmental and biodiversity considerations. It suggests approaches and tools such as: promoting sustainable livelihoods and generating economic opportunities, strengthening institutions and capacity building, real cost accounting and environmental considerations to be reflected in sectoral budgets.

There is a joint sub-programme with the Department of Arts and Culture to support the generation of micro business doing craft.

The nature of poverty in South Africa makes it impossible for the IUCN-SA, as a relatively small NGO, to intervene in a way that makes a significant impact on the magnitude of the problem. There is always the option of being a service provider for government programmes but this has several limitations. It is a difficult, highly bureaucratic and often inefficient environment in which to work. The opportunities for doing things in a different way are limited and it becomes difficult to intervene meaningfully in policy debates. The IUCN-SA's endeavours could easily get lost in the morass of government activity. It seems then that the IUCN-SA should rather maximise its strengths and contribute to the creation of an enabling environment for sustainable development. At its fingertips the IUCN-SA has examples and experience of a wide variety of interventions that have supported livelihoods and environmental sustainability. The IUCN-SA's markets and biodiversity focus is appropriate because employment opportunities and livelihood options are key areas where useful intervention can be made. The variety of experience across these different areas of policy give the IUCN-SA an edge when it comes to looking at the interconnection of different government programmes and how they impact on community and private sector initiatives towards the same ends. With this base, the IUCN-SA is in a position to intervene strategically in policy debates around poverty and environmental sustainability.

4. Findings of assessment

4.1 Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa (FTTSA)

4.1.1 Programme overview

Project leader	Jennifer Seif
Area of operation	SA nationally
Project team (staff or consultants)	8 staff based in Pretoria; 15 consultants who undertake certification: called assessors
Project structures (Boards, Committees,	Trademark Panel (2 external experts plus Jennifer) Trustees

Partners etc)	
Brief summary	<p>FTTSA encourages and publicises fair and responsible business practise by SA tourism establishments through the FTTSA Trademark. This is awarded to tourism establishments that meet certain criteria. Tour operators promote these establishments to increasingly fair-trade conscious tourists. In this way the market share of the establishments can grow. In addition the assessment process is an organisational development tool that assists tourism products to be sustainable.</p> <p>www.fairtourismsa.org.za</p>
Clients	<p>7 tourism businesses; 10 international tour operators who use FTTSA label; broader tourism business sector – SA Tourism, TBCSA, industry structure</p>
Who interviewed	<p>Jennifer Seif, (National Coordinator) Lee-Anne Bac (Trademark Panel Member) Heidi Newton-King, Kate Rivett-Carnac, Siphoh Mahlangu, Anna Spenceley (Assessor) Adrienne Harris (TBCSA), Dr Salifou</p>

7. FTTSA does not contribute directly to livelihood creation but it does create an environment in which space and opportunity is developed which in turn encourages local entrepreneurs to take risk and initiative. This is through insisting on both workplace empowerment and fair procurement procedures.
8. FTTSA links fair tourism as sustainable tourism. Although it was originally conceived as an environmental project, environmental issues became only one principle and the focus is not on environmental sustainability. Nevertheless, a number of the products have adopted innovative environmental management systems. This lack of an exclusive environmental focus is a supporting factor in encouraging FTTSA to move out of IUCN-SA's umbrella. This does not mean that FTTSA should not develop the environmental aspects.
9. The key challenges facing IUCN-SA are to develop and expand the business case, no matter how slowly, and also to win over the unconverted. An opportunity also exists to work with government and the Grading Council in particular, to assist in the implementation of the Responsible Tourism guidelines.

4.1.3 IUCN-SA's impact on knowledge and empowerment

FTTSA has been very successful in empowering through knowledge. Interestingly, part of the success is the clear and consistent message and its relatively narrow focus of workplace fairness. The different categories of informants had different perspectives on this matter but all agreed that this is where FTTSA adds real value. In terms of knowledge, the fact that fair trade in tourism trademark is a 'world first' is a significant

outweighed by the value of getting all the staff involved and behind the trademark process. Assessors also pointed to the SAQA accreditation that will be a likely outcome of their continuous training as beneficial. A few mentioned that not only have they learned a lot from other assessors during the training, but they have also applied their new knowledge in other aspects of their working lives. This capacitation, in a context of lack of skills, should not be ignored.

Š Networking between trademark users themselves and between them and the IUCN-

applicants is an opportunity for empowerment and building capacity in the environmental field that has yet to be exploited.

4.3.5 IUCN-SA's impact on sustainable livelihoods

FTTSA has no direct impact on sustainable livelihoods. However it creates an enabling environment through access to markets. Community-based service providers are assured of fair market opportunities, however, limited, by fair trade principles. As one trademark user put it, "The trademark keeps us accountable. The local community knows what we stand for, as does the staff. It is not a once off snap-shot; we have to be true to the principles." This shared access to the tourist market gives incentives to local entrepreneurs to break away from the intermediary establishment and attempt independent access to the tourist market.

One assessor pointed out that the fair wages and commitment to empowerment gives staff security. This is of course a crucial part of supporting the sustainability of livelihoods.

Whilst FTTSA does not directly take the risk nor create, it does incentivise tourist products to take the risk of creating local livelihoods in a creative way with the hope of extra access to the discerning tourist market. For this aspect of FTTSA to be enhanced, it is very important the trademark businesses are profitable and that the market grows.

4.1.6 Future indicators to assess impact over five years

4.2 Southern African Sustainable Use Specialist Group (SASUSG)

4.2.1 Programme overview

Project leader	Suzette de Wet provides administrative support and coordinated inputs into various events such as WSSD, WPC and AU. She spends about 2 days/month on SASUSG
Area of operation	Southern Africa
Project team (staff or consultants)	Suzette gets technical support from Saliem Fakir and financial support from Ardeel le Tang
Project structures (Boards, Committees, Partners etc)	There are about 150 members who are specialists in sustainable development issues. It is a voluntary group of professionals in the region in regular email contact with annual planning meetings in April/May
Brief summary	SASUSG me thtiprthsi S(r)-7..1(bl2)7.1()-7.b(i)7.3e 11-etrst bl2ees of conPra1SG

Chairperson (consultant, Botswana)

Hector Magome, Executive Committee (SANPARKS)

Kule Chitepo, Executive Committee (Resource Africa)

Simon Munthali, Executive CommR,tae(,)0(tae(,))ph8s8 Tcg9eta(l)-6(i)-6(9(o)-6.p6(i)-6(ut)-6.1(t)-6.6()JT0.006 T

SASUSG's strengths and impacts on enabling environment

The interviewees concurred that SASUSG has the following strengths:

- § Convening power over past nine years of cross-sectoral specialists from diverse backgrounds in Southern Africa
- § Strong technical capacity
- § Voluntary and cost efficient
- § Open, critical and rigorous debate
- § Comte6.s pec int6.sthe6.se et6.sbeause issu6.ses

6.68n le6.57 shipt

one way of doing this. Over the past three years the SASUSG website has only had 916 hits. If it were hosted on IUCN’s global website and linked to other relevant websites, hits would be likely to increase. Profiling of information available, through IUCN would also be an option.

It is recommended that IUCN-SA build better linkages with the content work of SASUSG so as to learn from their knowledge and experience and to share IUCN-SA’s expertise. This can be done, for example, through broader dissemination and use of SASUSG information/knowledge through IUCN-SA projects/constituents. Many of IUCN-SA’s experiences are relevant to the present parks focus of SASUSG. Initially a few simple connections could be made, and over time IUCN-SA can develop the relationship if this is beneficial. The institution of a Policy and Research Unit within the IUCN-SA should facilitate a closer integration of the work within IUCN-SA. The following ideas could be pursued:

- § An IUCN-SA staff member could interrogate the content available on SASUSG’s website and in its publications of relevance to IUCN-SA’s future programmes
- § IUCN-SA staff could attend the August indicators workshop and assess whether engagement in this process could generate useful impact indicators for IUCN-SA
- § Staff could attend and present experiences (maybe on the empowerment models discussed elsewhere in this report) at SASUSG working sessions.

4.3 Sustainable Ventures programme (SVP)

4.3.1 Programme overview

Project leader	Anthea Stephens
Area of operation	Southern Africa
Project team (staff or consultants)	

	<p>Two intentions – a) showcase enterprises to highlight that policy decisions have local livelihoods impacts: project made waves in IUCN in shifting IUCN conservation mindset. b) use summit and international audience at summit to promote the enterprises as business</p> <p>Website gets many hits</p> <p>www.thatworks.org</p>
Clients	Public, enterprise, intermediaries
Who interviewed	<p>Anthea Stephens, (Project leader), Maxwell Gomera in ROSA , Miguel Araujo - Head of Corp. Strategy in HQ , Xenya Cherny (HQ media) Fiona Macleod (Mail and Guardian) Grace Masuku, Joseph Diliza, Bob Malichi , Tanya Mcgregor (IUCN-SA intern), Beauty Jiji (SAFIRE), Niseth v/d Meulen (NACOBTA)</p>

Documents

on being questioned about internal community conflict following the summit, declared that nothing had changed in the way they worked. In the next breath they explained that after the summit they were careful not to work with individuals only but with the whole group.8.983h.4(o)5ommu.4but with the

The media material produced for the summit was excellent. Xenya Cherny summarised it as “Positive and fresh – not jargoned. It was exceptionally well written.” She circulated it to 200 global media contacts prior to the summit.

Not enough is made of IUCN-SA’s own knowledge base. One of the effects of the squeeze on academic institutions is that it makes them re-use their data sets for an increasing number of publications. IUCN-SA could learn from this! IUCN-SA has information throughout its projects and it would be worthwhile to share the experience around the ongoing development of these enterprises.

4.3.4 IUCN-SA’s impact on governance for sustainable livelihoods and environmental management

The impact of “Another way that works” on IUCN-SA’s thinking around environmental interventions has been significant.

IUCN-ROSA pointed out that the environmental agenda is changing and that people are being encouraged to look after their natural resources because of the value they can get from them. Creative ways of getting value contribute much to this thinking and to its potential success in managing the environment. High value from natural products places the debate at a different level. The showcasing succeeded in exposing the conservation community to a new business area to which it was not accustomed. In doing so a number of questions were raised. Is this area feasible, viable, should IUCN-SA be doing this and what environmental safeguards need to be put in place, were some of the questions mentioned. The subsequent renewed interest in commercialisation of natural products in IUCN-SA global was a direct impact of the “There’s another way that works” campaign.

Whether the campaign initiated this new way of thinking or whether it confirmed an already emerging philosophy is unclear. Either way the optimism it created catalysed a broader approach in IUCN. The SEED project is a direct result and it is expanding rapidly in terms of partner countries. Space has been created for IUCN-SA to do a more detailed and thorough investigation of enterprise development since the summit so that the learning can be shared internationally. There may also be support for exchanges

and certainly the Seed award process could be very motivating for enterprises wishing to compete.

In phase two the support that was required from the different enterprises differed one from the other. Given the vast geographical distances between the projects, the range and disparity of support needed, it was not possible for IUCN-SA to meet these needs adequately. This lesson for IUCN-SA poses an interesting challenge as to whether or not such ongoing organisational development and support is a realistic role for IUCN-SA.

have figures for the other enterprises, - Baobab juice in Malawi, Marula Oil in Limpopo, wood-carving in Mozambique – but they are still operational.

What is tricky is how to determine significance. If a project of 2 full-time workers doubles its staff component, is that significant? If a person's wages increase, temporarily, by 20% is that significant? If 400 additional producers are required to satisfy a demand, is that significant? In our view value has to be attributed to the ongoing viability and sustainability of the enterprise irrespective of the actual numbers of people or figures. It is a challenge for small enterprises to survive.

4.3.6 Future indicators to assess impact over five years

The following possible indicators serve as a starting point for discussion:

- § Numbers of full-time and part-time workers employed in enterprises
- § Numbers of producers required
- § Annual orders per producer (this is to ensure that there is some equity in allocating production quotas)
- § Annual orders
- § Annual sales (sales and orders should be broken down by categories such as local, export, and export should be broken down into specific countries)
- § Nature of interventions required annually from other institutions

4.4 Blyde River Canyon National Park (Blyde)

4.4.1 Programme Overview

Programme leader	Chris Clarke 084-5103251
Area of operation	Mpumalanga
Project team (staff or consultants)	Official Park Development Team – Danie Pienaar (SANParks Kruger); Elvis Myapele (Commission, Mp); Garth Batchelor (Mp Provincial Environ Planning); Abe Sibiye (Commercialisation MPB); Mfele Mhlangu (DWAF forestry restructuring), Themba Mgwaba (DWAF's eastern cluster KZN/Mp); Marius Brandyn (DWAF Nelspruit, indigenous forest management); Busani Selabe (acting community

	<p>liaison person on behalf of DEAT).</p> <p>Only Chris Clarke is an employee of IUCN-SA. He is presently seconded to DEAT to coordinate this programme.</p>
<p>Project structures (Boards, Committees, Partners etc)</p>	<p>Implementing Authority – political level, MoU still to be signed</p> <p>Park Development Steering Committee – consists of senior officials of all three tiers of government</p> <p>Park Development Team – officials mandated to coordinate and manage the planning and development of the park.</p> <p>Local Community Project Steering Committee - 22 reps (4 tribal authorities, 11 ward councillors from Bushbuckridge, land claims rep, existing community structures).</p> <p>IUCN-SA's role is to facilitate and convene the planning and establishment of the Park and provide technical capacity to DEAT. It is a pilot and this is part of a broader approach with DEAT called Bioregional Approach to SA's protected areas. The DEAT/IUCN-SA technical assistance agreement is the mechanism.</p>

	<p>Mayor Mushe Mashego - Thaba Chweu Municipality Vincent Malatjie - Chair of Local Community Project Steering Committee Busani Selabe - Consultant to DEAT, community liaison Forest Winners Mashego - DWAF Conservation Forester: Mariepskop Marius Brundyn – DWAF Nelspruit, Integrated Forest Management</p>
<p>Documents read/reviewed</p>	<p>Business Plan April 2004 – March 2006, Consolidation of the Lowveld State Forests with Blyde River Canyon Nature reserve for incorporation into the South African National Parks System, October 2003 Draft Concept proposal, Blyde River Canyon National Park, February 2004 RESTORE GEF, Proposal for Project Development Fund (PDF) Block B Grant, May 2004 Proposal for the Consolidation of the Blyde River Canyon nature reserve and select portions of the Lowveld state forests into a National Park, November 2003</p>

4.4.2 Summary of findings

All people interviewed were open and willing to give their opinions. A sufficient cross section of people from various institutions was interviewed for conclusions to be drawn about the project’s impact to date. Findings can be summarised as follows:

1. All institutions interviewed expressed appreciation for the role that IUCN-SA has

3. There is concern about governance issues. The following concrete examples were raised: impasse when spheres of government cannot agree and nothing happens for lengthy periods of time (such as the issue of who should be the conservation authority: MPB or SANParks); lack of commitment/champion within one of the key government institutions; government staff not given enough time to focus on Blyde; lack of resource allocation to meet needs of programme by various government departments

4. To date, although the project holds out this promise, it has not been in a position to deliver tangible direct benefits to improve livelihoods. Those closest to "the people" point this out, as a concern although they acknowledge that the program is still in planning phase.

Interim monitoring and evaluation reports have been submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs and Forestry (DEAF) and the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (DWAF). The reports indicate that the project is still in the planning phase and that the implementation of the project is still in the early stages. The reports also indicate that the project is still in the planning phase and that the implementation of the project is still in the early stages.

The project is still in the planning phase and that the implementation of the project is still in the early stages. The reports also indicate that the project is still in the planning phase and that the implementation of the project is still in the early stages.

forestry to conservation. It was noted that IUCN-SA should take this further through engaging with DWAF at a policy level to enhance Participatory Forestry Management (PFM) so that knowledge generated can impact on other forests.

An example of where knowledge has been used to empower an institution to act has to do with *land claims*. The project, supported by GTZ, commissioned a study into the status of land claims on the Blyde park domain. This investigation identified that there are about 26 claims to the Blyde domain and that they are complex because they overlap and the necessary research has not been done by the Commission to verify exactly which land is claimed by whom and how overlapping claims could be addressed. It recommended that a workable approach would be to negotiate a framework agreement that applies to all claims. This could set out the principles and options for resolution of claims to Blyde and could be signed by all parties. Then the claims could be clustered in some logical manner and negotiated block by block. The Commission has agreed to adopt this approach and ring-fence the park domain as one claim process that it will handle holistically. The Blyde project was able to use the information it gathered to get the responsible institution to take some action. However, the lack of progress on land claims remains a problem area and this is picked up again below.

Another example of knowledge being used to empower people is to do with training and awareness. Some youth have received tourism training and the project has made it possible for community members to understand the value of nature conservation linked to tourism. Initial work on traditional history and dance has had positive impacts on cultural perceptions. This awareness has helped improve the relationship between the MPB and communities adjacent to Blyde. In the future more awareness, more community involvement and strengthened relations with the MPB are needed. Community involvement in main decision-making was emphasised.

4.4.4. IUCN-SA's impact on governance for sustainable livelihoods and environmental management

IUCN-SA has both been instrumental in shifting the governance terrain, but has also been unable to unlock certain logjams that have negatively impacted on Blyde's progress.

Due to the fragmented nature of conservation governance in SA, an institution outside of government is seen as essential to facilitative cooperative governance needed for the implementation of the bioregional approach based on systematic conservation planning. The IUCN-SA is seen as having successfully played this facilitative role and impacted positively on better cooperative governance between the three spheres of government. It was noted that the IUCN-SA pulled the project together during a time when the MPB was inward focused due to internal re-structuring. Other large-scale biodiversity programmes, such as CAPE and SKEP, were also facilitated by NGOs and have a permanent coordination capacity outside and in addition to existing staff structures.

when this decision was reversed and it was agreed that the MPB should manage the park. This will be the first national park managed by a provincial parastatal in terms of the new Protected Areas Act. IUCN-SA's interventions to attempt to unlock this logjam at a political and senior government level were not successful. Due to this logjam the project was delayed for about a year. But instead of standing back and putting everything on hold IUCN-SA adopted a position of working at local level initiatives that could proceed despite the political battle. This resulted in the dog school community enterprise project, which is presently held in high regard by all roleplayers spoken to.

because the project is only now entering the implementation phase. Despite this reality, all interviewees closest to the local affected communities expressed the same view that short term benefits must occur now. They say that people are scared of losing forest jobs, claimants are wary of the park and people ask why they can't start something now. Some projects that were mentioned could possibly get off the ground quickly were the chalets, beekeeping and a medicinal plant nursery. The Blyde project's objectives, premise and planning are all solid and hold the promise that benefits will be delivered over the medium to long term. The details of this are set in various park documents and are not repeated here.

The most positive development regarding livelihoods improvement that interviewees spoke of is the dog school project. The Blyde project, with support from institutions such as GTZ/Transform, the Wits Facility and the DBSA, has resulted in this mixed development centre including a 110 bed hotel and restaurant, that will see some 250 permanent jobs created and many related business opportunities such as catering etc. The planning is complete, a lease agreement is presently being negotiated with the

Jobs at risk post 2007 are those associated with the two private logging mills whose contracts have been cancelled (about 500 jobs). Exactly how alternative jobs will be created, and what the respective responsibilities of the state and the private owners are is unclear. As the owners are being paid out as if they have continued their mills in perpetuity the view is that they have an obligation to put money into trust for their

4.4.6 Future indicators to assess impact over five years

The following possible indicators serve as a starting point for discussion:

1. Economic benefits for the local communities
 - 1.1 Significant black economic empowerment of local community members in businesses established to service the Park with lodges on the edge in areas such as a) fencing; b) construction; c) catering; d) waste management; e) management of projects etc
 - 1.2 Significant jobs created for local community members
 - 1.3 Local people empowered through accredited certificates to access work elsewhere
 - 1.4 Poor utilising indigenous forest resources
2. Social benefits for the local communities
 - 2.1 Local community members have advanced sense of ownership of Blyde
 - 2.2 Community involvement in management processes
 - 2.3 Community members initiate own involvement
 - 2.4 Minimal investment of government time in dispute resolution and facilitation
3. Biodiversity increased
 - 3.1 Areas reclaimed through felling of exotic forests noting that soil rehabilitation takes more than 5 years
 - 3.2 In core area all invasive alien species should be removed with weed control being ongoing
 - 3.3 Active planting in indigenous areas
 - 3.4 Indigenous forest resources sustainably harvested
4. Institutions strengthened
 - 4.1 MPB – elevated posts for Blyde Park due to elevation as competent authority and increased funding from successful commercialisation and increased profile for Blyde
 - 4.2 Local level institutions

4.5 Greening the WSSD (Greening)

4.5.1 Programme overview

Project leader	Saliem Fakir (2002) and Tzila Katzel (2003)
Area of operation	WSSD reaching Gauteng, SA and internationally
Project team (staff or consultants)	Large number – see project documentation
Project structures (Boards, Committees, Partners etc)	External Steering Committee and PMT were the main structures of importance
Brief summary	<p>The Summit provided an ideal opportunity to demonstrate sustainable development in action. The South African Government, represented by the Gauteng Department responsible for the Environment (GDACEL), partnered with the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the World Conservation Union (IUCN-SA) to green the Summit. The objective was to minimise the negative environmental impact of the Summit on South Africa and maximise its positive sustainable development legacy. The aim was to promote sustainable development through the implementation of environmental best practice in the way the Summit was hosted and to raise public awareness about environmental best practice in South Africa. The Greening initiative was planned and executed between January 2001 and December 2003 using a budget of approximately \$3.7 million, much of which funded public awareness activities.</p> <p>IUCN-SA is not directly involved presently in taking forward this campaign, but the proposal for a national sustainable development awareness campaign developed by the project is being taken forward by DEAT, and this is an important legacy</p>
Clients	Summit delegates, Gauteng public
Who interviewed	Thandi Davids and Moss Mashishi
Documents read/reviewed	Greening the World Summit on Sustainable Development Lessons Learnt. A gap in the Lessons Learnt document was that the impact of the communications and awareness campaign was not addressed Leaving a Greening Legacy: Guidelines for event greening

4.5.2 Impact and suggestions for future

Due to time constraints, only two people were interviewed and thus only suggestions are made, as the assessment was not rigorous enough to make findings. In addition to the

their participation in the Summit or to show their support for climate change mitigation. The funds raised were invested in greenhouse gas-reducing sustainable development projects in South Africa. About \$325 000 was raised and invested in two projects, namely, the Photovoltaic System for the Greenhouse People's Environment Centre and the first phase of the Oude Molen Village Solar Water Heating Project.

- § Greening and the Federated Hospitality Association of South Africa (FEDHASA) partnered to launch a Responsible Tourism Campaign to promote long-term best practice in the hospitality industry in terms of environmental, social, and economic endeavours. They delivered the information pack, the Imvelo Responsible Tourism Awards, the Responsible Tourism Guidelines and the Statement of Intent signed by 76 hospitality players. These interventions have been taken forward with the Imvelo awards being an annual event.
- § Emphasis was placed on public awareness activities that encouraged behavioural change and partnerships with relevant institutions were made to strengthen the long-term legacy of Greening interventions. Activities included an advertising campaign, showcasing environmental best practice projects and exhibitions. It is estimated that 5 million people in the Gauteng area were reached through Greening advertising. Sustainable development tours were provided free for delegates and were run twice a day during the 10 days of the Summit. Sixty-eight tours were run involving approximately 900 delegates from over 27 nations. The response from delegates who went on the tours as well as the projects visited was overwhelmingly positive. The showcasing initiative generated media interest in the best practice projects and exposed them to potential donors and sponsors. The contracting of the three small tour operators strengthened their enterprises, creating jobs for eight guides, and nine drivers

§ The Gauteng Provincial Government initiated a number of community based projects in association with the Greening initiative that were designed to leave a legacy of environmental best practice in Gauteng. The Bontle ke Bonto clean schools and ward competition resulted in 868 Environmental Management Plans being submitted by 267 wards and 601 schools, 80% of which were of high quality. Cash prizes amounting to R3.2 million (USD 320 000) were given out by

at DEAT and the media's relationship with environmental journalism. The aim of

itself. Developing relationships with DEAT officials was difficult due to the high turnover of staff at DEAT. As other programmes also experience this difficulty, IUCN-SA should discuss lobbying strategies. One possibility could be to develop a multi-pronged approach where one focuses both on influencing the regulation and implementation thereof, but also at a practical level. This could involve encouraging the establishment of partnerships between appropriate commercial bio-prospecting partners and primary producers through the sharing of appropriate contracts, material transfer and benefit sharing agreements.

- § A suggestion made was that IUCN-SA should develop expertise on ABS/IPR in-house. This could involve having such a position that is funded as part of the core centre. It was felt that it was a mistake to utilise consultants for

is the media effectiveness and community networking for enterprise benefit, while in SASUSG IUCN-SA's greatest contribution has been in administration and financial support to enable this knowledge network. Greening exploited a significant networking opportunity in responding in a short period of time to the challenge of greening the WSSD.

2. Impacts of the projects on livelihoods have been different, and to date limited.

2.1 The SVP has to date had the most direct impact on livelihoods, but its scale and scope was narrow, focusing on eight enterprises. The challenge, being taken forward in NATRO, is increasing the scope and scale of impact.

2.2 In Blyde, due to the fact that the project is still in the planning phase, and it is a large-scale long-term programme, it is premature to expect livelihoods impacts but the potential for these to be realised at a significant scale is in place. The challenge is realising some in the short term, and being innovative about the potential job loss issue, so as to create a climate of hope for future longer-term impacts. This has to be done within a context where impacting on governance is difficult.

2.3 FTTSA has made good strides in creating an enabling pro-poor environment that emerging tourism enterprise and workers within the established tourism sector can take advantage of. It is premature to assess the impact of this on livelihoods. In our opinion, FTTSA does not seek to impact directly on livelihoods but is focused on the enabling environment level and this should be made more explicit.

2.4 SASUSG has had no direct impact on livelihoods, but has had impact on creating an enabling environment for sustainable livelihoods and conservation. IUCN-SA's role in this has been so limited that this positive impact cannot be attributed to IUCN-SA. The challenge for IUCN-SA is deciding on its relationship to SASUSG.

2.5 Greening had some impacts both on the enabling environment and on directly creating livelihoods. But these were short term and they need to be built on to be sustainable. The challenge is for IUCN-SA to identify how to take forward the lessons and ideas that came out of Greening and translate these into programmes/projects, without being dependent on other partners. It has generated the concept and business plan for a national sustainable development

acknowledged that IUCN-SA has tried to develop some concepts (e.g. the barometer), but it is worthwhile re-examining this. A design process for IUCN-SA driven programmes/projects at the level of detail as undertaken by NATPRO may be needed.

- 2.6 ABS was unable to have the degree of impact on the Biodiversity Act as they would have liked, although it was successful in affecting some changes. This was due to the difficulty of impacting on governance, a problem encountered by a number of programmes/projects. The greatest impact seems to have been on the various stakeholders for whom ABS is of concern.
3. IUCN-SA's impact on sustainable livelihoods is insignificant in terms of the scale and scope of the problem. This is the situation faced by all small NGOs and is not, in itself, a criticism of the IUCN-SA. The question is rather whether the strategies employed by IUCN-SA hold the potential to make a significant contribution in the medium to long term. It is our assessment that they do, although a number of changes are needed. Recommendations are made below.
4. The projects have had different planning models. The ability to respond quickly and constructively to opportunities that arise has been a great strength. Strengths in the initial phases of pursuing a vision with energy and then developing a tighter strategy and plan can be drawn on. Ongoing organisational support has been less uniformly successful. The FTSA model of developing a clear, focussed tool and training others to use it is one that may be realistic for IUCN-SA in other projects where ongoing involvement is necessary but where IUCN-SA does not have the capacity to service the institutions.
5. The projects have developed different interesting models of empowerment of the previously disadvantaged. In FTSA the model has been a rights-based one that has empowered employees at the workplace to utilise the trademark process to their benefit. The SVP model has focused on creating space in the market that community-based entrepreneurship could exploit to their benefit. The attempts at direct interventions in organisational development in the second phase of SVP were less successful. In Blyde, local level interventions have created local business opportunities despite a stalemate in the macro-political environment. In Greening, promotional communications campaigns have emerged as a new model for advocacy and lobbying work. This model of advocacy was also used in the SVP and other interventions such as the World Parks Congress, and is

those outside the ABS programme perceived IUCN-SA's role to assist with developing lobbying strategies in a context where government is closed.

5. The knowledge and empowerment models developed within the various programmes and projects should be both shared within IUCN-SA, but also with others. Some kind of publication that shares these innovations should be developed and distributed. IUCN-SA should increase leverage of its own resources, practice, networks and partners. This could include closer interaction with SASUSG.
6. The campaign model of advocacy that has emerged as a key and unique area of competency within IUCN-SA should be strengthened and developed. Presently this holds more promise than emphasising IUCN-SA as a “think-tank” or expert on certain conceptual policy matters. Links with the Millennium Development Goal campaign could prove fruitful.
7. Interaction with government poverty relief programmes at a policy level could be mutually beneficial. There is room for getting a better understanding of how IUCN-SA could position its intervention in poverty relief strategies. Certainly IUCN-SA has worked in nearly all the sectors that are to be prioritised for targeted financial support in terms of the Expanded Public Works Programme.
8. As IUCN-SA's ability to impact on governance, has emerged as difficult (this is not unique to IUCN-SA) a four-pronged approach may be useful:
 - 8.1 Firstly, programmes should contain elements where emphasis is placed on impacting on markets for the benefit of the poor (e.g. SVP and FTTSA), even where the whole programme is focused on impacting on governance (e.g. Blyde). Within its basket of programmes/projects, some should be about impacting on markets.
 - 8.2 Secondly, local level engagements where tangible results at a small scale can be achieved should be pursued. Within the basket of IUCN-SA programmes/projects, there should be a mix of localised and smaller scale interventions.

- 8.3 Thirdly, programmes should contain elements where IUCN-SA is not dependent on others but can drive the process forward itself. Within its basket of programmes/projects, some should be under the control of the IUCN-SA. An exclusive focus on partnerships would be unwise.
- 8.4 Fourthly, a learning approach should be adopted. Lessons must be sought elsewhere and shared about how one impacts on weak institutions, as this is a critical issue throughout Africa.
9. For the future programme, crosscutting mechanisms emerging from this assessment for achieving programme/project objectives are: a) empowerment mechanisms (e.g. FTTSA support and training to enterprises); and b) advocacy through communication campaigns. Possible clusters for the basket of programmes/projects could be:
- 9.1 People and Parks: e.g. Blyde, RVM, Restitution
- 9.2 Markets and Biodiversity: e.g. FTTSA, NATPRO
- 9.3 Urban and Brown: GAP
10. One stakeholder suggested that IUCN-SA should consider building it independence through becoming a National Chapter as in Pakistan. We are not aware what this entails, and are just conveying this suggestion to the IUCN-SA.
11. To make future impact assessments and evaluations more useful, IUCN-SA should ensure that all projects have detailed plans and indicators against which they can be assessed.

6. Measuring social impact in future

This section contains initial recommendations on an approach and indicators to measure social impact in future. The following approach is proposed:

The value of experimentation and production should not be reduced by an overdeveloped assessment and evaluation system. The approach therefore should be to identify the key indicators to be tracked and set in place as part of normal reporting procedures and record-keeping that will enable IUCN-SA to build up an evolving picture

Advocacy through campaigns

- § Effect on shifting people's general perceptions: who one reaches (e.g. piggyback on Markinor general surveys)
- § Product perspective: number of people signing up for specific products; number of new orders; increase in size of business in response to increased demand – e.g. turnover, employees/outsourcing, profit
- § Track changes in media attitudes: increase in issues covered, no. of editorials etc
- § Track changes in attitudes of decision-makers in particular corporates, departments, conservation bodies (IUCN etc)

Empowerment mechanisms

- § Changes within certain organisations that show empowerment of previously disadvantaged
- § Extent to which key institutions

- § Local level institutions functioning
- § Environmental governance improved