

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The South African National Parks (SANParks) accepted the challenge of a proposal put forward by Kerley & Boshoff (1997) to expand the Addo Elephant National Park to encapsulate the unique assemblage of biodiversity and tourism opportunities in the area, as well as to amalgamate the Woody Cape and Tootabie Nature Reserves to form a core conservation area of global significance.

Specialist studies were commissioned in 2001 with the financial support of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) (in the form of a PDF Block B grant), administered through the World Bank. The specialist studies focused on the scientific and socio-economic analyses that would underpin the implementation of a greater Addo Elephant National Park (gAENP) Conservation Project.

The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), commissioned as one of the specialist studies of the gAENP project, was to consolidate the biophysical and socio-economic information in a rational and logical manner to facilitate strategic planning and decision making around the project. Specific aims included:

1. The synthesis of all existing information (biophysical, socio-economic and institutional).
2. Description of the gAENP initiative.
3. Discussion of the opportunities and constraints presented by the environment for the gAENP programme.
4. Description of the socio-economic and biophysical implications of establishing the gAENP.
5. Identification of options for an acceptable way forward.
6. The presentation of this information in an acceptable format to the public, authorities and other Interested and Affected Parties (I&APS).
7. The SEA must meet World Bank Safeguard requirements. Three of the Bank's safeguard operational policies are triggered in this SEA i.e. OP 4.11 (Cultural Property); OP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement) and OP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment).

THE GREATER ADDO ELEPHANT NATIONAL PARK PROPOSAL

The Addo Elephant National Park (AENP) was proclaimed in 1931 with the express purpose of protecting the last remaining Eastern Cape elephants. Unbeknown at the time, its locality could not have been more fortunate as it was set in possibly the country's most biologically diverse area – an opportunity now attempting to be consolidated.

The proposed gAENP will include a unique combination of land and seascapes, biodiversity and socio-economic opportunities. Spanning almost 200km in length, and about 30km wide, and covering about 440 000ha, inclusive of 100 000ha marine area, would make it the third largest national park in South Africa. The creation of a conservation area of this magnitude would certainly enhance the conservation of poorly represented biodiversity in the region.

As the development and expansion of the park remains a dynamic process, incorporating many factors besides direct purchase such as contractual inclusions, delineation of its exact boundaries would remain uncertain. However, for the purpose

of this study, the 340 000ha terrestrial footprint initially proposed by Kerley and Boshoff (1997), with a 5km buffer area (needed to facilitate information gathering on the border areas), and a marine area inclusive of the Bird and St Croix island groups was used. This total area is referred to as the planning domain.

Expansion of the park would capture important biological patterns and allow the re-establishment of ecological processes essential for ensuring ecological sustainability. It would increase the country's terrestrial conservation area from 5.5% to 5.7%, as well as considerably increasing the country's few marine protected areas. Given the park's unique assemblage of biodiversity (representation of five of the country's seven biomes), and linkage with a marine protected area (MPA), the park would make a major contribution to South Africa's commitment to the international Conventions on Biological Diversity and Combating Desertification.

The proposed gAENP will be able to support almost all eco-tourism experiences sought after by tourists – local and international – therefore fulfilling the aim of enhancing the socio-economic benefits of the region. This will not only allow the park to generate income, but will have major economic spin-offs for local communities, the Eastern Cape and South Africa, as more international revenue is injected into the country, creating more employment and wealth. In addition, the park will support basic and essential life-supporting ecological services, a facet that is difficult to measure, and not often factored into analyses.

The gAENP proposal is supported by national Government and the public, and has received financial support from a number of international and national sources (e.g. GEF, Humane Society of United States, IFAW, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT), Working for Water and Poverty Relief).

THE GREATER ADDO ELEPHANT NATIONAL PARK STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (SEA)

The goals of the SEA for the gAENP are to synthesise existing socio-economic and biophysical information, to determine opportunities and constraints presented by the environment for the gAENP programme, to recommend ways to optimise opportunities and minimise constraints, and to distribute this information to I&APs. Another goal of the SEA is to highlight World Bank Safeguard Policies. Some of these policies have been triggered in this study and have required investigation to avoid, minimise and/or mitigate impacts.

Stakeholders and other Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) have been encouraged to become involved in the process from an early stage, to ensure that a transparent planning process is achieved.

Although only one overriding land use option has been considered namely conservation, various options regarding boundaries and institutional and management strategies have been considered.

The gAENP SEA process has involved interactions with specialists, the client, authorities, the World Bank and the public. The SEA and specialist studies have identified a number of information gaps, which will be dealt with during the course of implementation of the gAENP, depending upon their importance.

THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Biodiversity

As the central caveat of the gAENP remains the conservation of biodiversity of the region in perpetuity, biodiversity priority areas were determined using a strategic and dynamic GIS conservation-planning tool, called C-Plan (2001). C-Plan is used to identify conservation priority areas in a systematic and defensible manner based upon best available information. Priority areas would entail those areas that would ensure biodiversity pattern, as well as the natural processes that support and drive it. It is important to note that the C-Plan analysis indicates which areas are important, but does not make recommendations as to which management models may be appropriate for implementation.

Terrestrial environment

Biodiversity of the terrestrial environment was determined by mapping the 43 identified land classes/vegetation types scattered amongst the five biomes occurring in the planning domain. The terrestrial environment is diverse and consists of the Algoa dunefield in the southeast, adjacent the Alexandria coastal forest block. Moving northwards from the coast towards the Zuurberg Mountain range, a variety of mesic thicket types occur, and two intrusions of mesic thicket into the Indian Ocean forest reach almost to the coast. Fynbos/grassland mosaics occur on the Zuurberg in the central area. Nama Karoo intrusions occur in the north and west of the planning domain. The east-west aligned Zuurberg range dominates the central part of the area. The Alexandria forest receives the highest rainfall in the planning domain and the areas north and west of the Zuurberg the least.

The faunal species composition is well represented in the planning domain, with the notable exception of a number of the large predators such as lions, cheetah and wild dogs. The most conspicuous and well-known is the Addo elephant (*Loxodonta africana*). The elephants are of a high conservation status and are considered to be keystone species in subtropical Thicket. The endangered black rhinoceros (*Diceros bicornis bicornis*) occur and are also an important tourist attraction. The proposed park will also be important for the conservation of a broad suite of conservation worthy species, many of which have Red Data Book status but are overlooked purely because they lack charismatic appeal. These include the endemic dune grasshopper *Acrtylus hirsutus* and hairy-footed gerbil (*Gerbillurus paeba*) *exilis*, which occur in the Alexandria dunefield, the important flightless dung beetle (*Circellum bacchus*) and the butterfly (*Aloeides clarki*).

However, exotic indigenous species such as impala, lechwe and blesbok, introduced onto private land occur within the area and could become potential problems.

Freshwater environment

The Sundays River and its tributaries form the most significant river system that flows through the gAENP. The Sundays River, which is of great value for irrigation in the lower Sundays Valley, extends well beyond the boundaries of the proposed park, but significant tributaries or at least their headwaters occur within the proposed park. These include the Coerney, Krom, Wit, Kabougaand the Klein Uie rivers. Other important river systems that flow within the planning domain are the upper Bushmans River with its tributaries, the Blou and Steins rivers (northeast), and the Boknes River and its tributaries (southeast). The Sundays and Boknes rivers are the only rivers within the planning domain that flow into the sea.

The Darlington Dam (previously Lake Mentz) is a large (4 350 ha) impoundment within the proposed park that receives Orange River water through interbasin transfer. The Sundays River Irrigation Board manages the water release programme. Entire river drainage systems or catchments are recognised as ideal conservation units, as they comprise discrete ecosystems and allow management of most associated ecological processes.

Nine different types of waterbodies occur in the gAENP, each having a complement of biotopes with characteristic flora and fauna, that collectively add to the broad diversity of the park. The freshwater ecosystems include: perennial rivers; seasonal rivers; episodic rivers; ephemeral rivers; permanent and semi-permanent vleis; seasonal vleis: springs and seeps; episodic endorheic pans; forest swamps and marshes. A number of threatened faunal species rely on these waterbodies for their survival.

Marine environment

Algoa Bay is recognised as being part of the South Coast marine biogeographical province (equivalent to the terrestrial biomes of South Africa). The potential to create a Marine Protected Area (MPA) along this stretch of the coast and to link up with the two offshore island groups and the terrestrial component of the park is of national and international significance.

Algoa Bay is at the extreme east of the Agulhas Bank and the fish fauna is made up of species found on both the east and (to a lesser extent) west coasts of South Africa and many are endemic to South Africa.

The marine mammal fauna of South Africa comprises in excess of 30 whale, dolphin and seal species. Nine species are relatively common in the area, albeit some only seasonally. These include populations of the bottle-nosed dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*), the nationally critically endangered humpback dolphin (*Sousa chinensis*), the southern right whales (*Eubalaena australis*) and Bryde's whale (*Balaenoptera edeni*). Algoa Bay alone is estimated to harbour about 10% of the South African population of humpback dolphins.

The seas around Bird Island are famous for their populations of the threatened great white shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*), with the reefs around the islands known to support populations of commercially sought after reef fish, which have been over-exploited over the last 50 years. Proclamation of the gAENP MPA would assist in rebuilding these species stocks, protect nursery areas, assist with spawning areas for chokka squid (*Loligo vulgaris reynaudii*), protect the important soft bottom areas from trawling, and act a source for surrounding areas which in turn would help the fishing industry (both commercial and recreational) industry.

The two island groups within Algoa Bay (Bird Island and St Croix Groups) are of great historical and conservation value. A number of birds of conservation significance occur on the islands e.g. the vulnerable Jackass Penguin (*Spheniscus demersus*), South African gannets (*Morus capensis*), the endangered roseate tern (*Sterna dougallii*) and the endemic African black oystercatcher (*Haemotopus moquini*). The colony of Cape fur seals (*Arctocephalus pusillus*) breeding on Black Rocks of the Bird Island group represents the easternmost breeding range for this species.

The Alexandria coastal dunefield is the largest, most impressive and least degraded coastal dunefield in South Africa, and one of the most spectacular in the world. It is a classic example of the dynamic nature of geological processes, and it also provides a unique set of habitats which are not found in other landscapes, namely open sand, bushpockets and duneslacks, all of which support a range of specialist organisms.

The proposed gAENP would include at least 2km of the Sundays River Estuary, which is relatively pristine, unlike most other large estuaries in the Eastern Cape. Its deep channel structure and associated biological processes makes it unique in the South African context.

Processes

To ensure that the biodiversity pattern in all environments persist in the long term, the gAENP conservation planning exercise included important ecological and evolutionary processes e.g. fire, migration, pollination, herbivory, nutrient cycling, water and sand transfer, to name a few. These processes were identified but more importantly given spatial parameters and targets essential in the conservation planning exercise e.g. how much river frontage is required to maintain the critical ecological processes and how much linkage between the biomes must there be. These processes were incorporated into the C-Plan (conservation planning) programme.

Limitations to biodiversity conservation

Limitations to the protection of biodiversity occur mainly in the form of land transformation whereby natural habitat is transformed into habitat that no longer supports a high biodiversity. The biophysical specialists determined the extent of the existing limitations and predicted future limitations to biodiversity. These limitations have been termed “threats” in the specialist reports and are essentially threats to the conservation of biodiversity.

Conservation targets

Conservation targets are explicit interpretations of the broad goals of a planning exercise. A 10% target (IUCN 1989) was applied in this study as a *minimum baseline target* for each vegetation land class, and was adjusted upward by a *retention target* that took into account current transformation and future limitations to the conservation of biodiversity. Explicit targets for mammal populations within the gAENP are the minimum numbers required to maintain a viable population. These targets for the medium to large mammals were set at either 50 or 200, depending on their conservation importance (Red Data status and endemism to the region) and importance of the population in a national context.

Opportunities and constraints presented by the natural environment

Opportunities		Constraints
?? Biodiversity conservation	?? Climate change protection	?? Environmental fragmentation
?? Meeting conservation responsibilities	?? Conservation of the threatened Nama Karoo	?? Tourism visibility constraints in thicket vegetation
?? Existing conservation areas	?? Research opportunities	?? Sundays River
?? Underdevelopment within the planning domain	?? Species conservation	?? Fishing
?? Minimal alien vegetation	?? Opportunity to replenish fish stocks	?? Existing agricultural potential
?? Limited human populations	?? Preservation of the islands	?? Competing land use
?? Low agricultural potential	?? Ecological importance of Sunday's River and estuary	?? Industrial development
	?? Eco-tourism opportunities	?? Presence of alien floral and faunal species
	?? Sustainability of project	
	?? Important fossil deposits	

Conservation planning outputs

The conservation planning process through the C-Plan conservation tool identifies the most optimum selection of cadastral units for biodiversity conservation. Yet the challenge remains to optimally exploit the eco-tourism opportunities of these biologically important areas in synergy with the conservation planning exercise. Providing sufficient opportunities for eco-tourism is essential for gAENP, as income from eco-tourism will contribute greatly to gAENP being financially self-sustainable. Enhancing eco-tourism opportunities will also allow for sufficient economic spin-offs for the surrounding communities and regional economy.

Results from the various biophysical specialist studies were used to feed a conservation planning process (C-Plan). Broad areas were categorised based on the possible role that these areas could play in the development of the gAENP. It is important to note at the outset that all of the areas identified have been highlighted as being of critical importance to the gAENP development in terms of meeting conservation targets set by the consultants for the conservation of biodiversity patterns and processes. Yet for simplicity eight broad conservation important areas were identified in the planning domain.

THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

The Eastern Cape is the second largest of South Africa's nine provinces with the third largest population (6.7 million according to the 1996 census). It is growing at a rate higher than the national average, with a large proportion of the population being under the age of 15 years. Despite the size and potential of the province, it remains the poorest, partly due to historical and political reasons.

The Eastern Cape has a relatively high proportion of low paid workers and high levels of poverty. The average Gross Geographic Product (GGP) per capita is less than half that of South African average. With approximately 710 000 poor households in the province (4.1 million people), 57% of households and 64% of individuals in the Eastern Cape live in poverty. Poverty is found particularly in the rural areas and in the eastern half of the province.

Local communities

The broad planning domain area, inclusive of the towns, has an estimated population of 27 000 people, but the people (i.e. farm workers and their families) directly affected by land purchases has been estimated to be 3 267 (Resettlement Policy

Framework – available on www.addoelephantpark.com). The local communities in the planning domain are typical of the under-developed rural areas of South Africa. Both farmers and workers appear to have a long history of residency on the parcel of land on which they currently reside (on average, 33 years per farmer and 22 years per worker). Mean household size for workers is 4.02 and for farmers 3.4.

Studies have indicated that dairy farms, on average, employ about 15 labourers (i.e. 1 per 50 ha) while small stock pastoralism normally employs about half as many labourers on six times as large a property (about 1 per 555ha). Dairy farms generally appear to employ their workers at marginally higher wages of R392 – R673/month in comparison to the R359 – R561/month on small stock farms, both of which fall short of the SANParks average monthly wage of about R1 301 – R2 805/month for equivalent labourers. Moreover, dairy farmers on average appeared to have a further 1.5 farms under their management, while the pastoral farmers had marginally fewer with on average of 0.8 further farms. This indicates that on average about 50% of the farms in the domain are unoccupied by the land owners. This concurs with the fact of steady depopulation of the rural areas over the last decade, which would account for the high formal urbanisation level of 89% for the Port Elizabeth/Uitenhage metropole. Furthermore, only about 25% of the 36 farms purchased by SANParks in the last five years were occupied by the land owner, tenants or a labourer.

The majority of farm labourers live in settlements that occur in clusters on demarcated sites. Dairy farms employ more labourers per hectare than small stock farms. Most workers live in brick houses, very few of them have electricity, some have vegetable gardens and/or limited stock, with few having extra facilities (e.g. farm schools, soccer fields).

Mainly male farm labourers receive wages and food rations, whilst the majority of women depend on natural resources to supplement the household heads income and, together with children, are the most vulnerable social group.

In terms of the Interim Protection of Informal Land Rights Act (109 of 1996) and other legislation, tenants are protected when evicted without adequate provisions. The Extension of Security of Tenure Act (62 of 1997) gives special rights to occupiers who are 60 years or older and who have lived on the land for 10 years or longer. Family graves that have been established play a very important role in the spiritual well-being of many of the local people, with access to such sites within National Parks having never been denied.

Most households have intact family units. The bulk of the farm workforce is unskilled and barely literate (around 24% of workers have no schooling), thereby reducing the chances of employment other than manual labour.

Along with general productivity, the farm survey indicates that the profitability, land value per hectare and number of workers per farm are substantially higher in the coastal dairy farms than mixed stock farms further inland. This has implications for the number of people affected and the value of land.

The mohair producers in the Somerset East, Jansenville and Uitenhage areas produce at least one third of South Africa's mohair. The southeastern corner of this region, within a 250km radius of Port Elizabeth, is an important bastion of Angora

goat farming. The loss of certain farming areas is likely to cause the production of mohair to decline.

Demographics

The demographics of the planning domain were taken from enumerator areas (EAs) falling within the planning domain and the results of a limited farm survey undertaken as part of this project are presented in the table below.

Race/Group		Education	
Black	64.5%	No schooling	24%
Coloured	25.5%	Some 1 ^o education	44%
Asian	0.4%	Some 2 ^o /matric	24%
White	9.6%	Post 2 ^o education	8%
Home Language		Gender	
Xhosa	65%	Male	49.3%
Afrikaans	33%	Female	50.7%
English	2%	Monthly Income (farm workers)	
Employment		Lowest	R325.00
Working Age	58%	Highest	R560.00
Employed (% of working age)	39%	Age profile/dependency	
		1 adult:0.54 children	
		1 worker:3.34 dependents	

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The planning domain is relatively rich in rock art and artefacts, and SANParks has a policy for the protection of cultural resources. In order to conform to the policy, SANParks has commissioned a more detailed study, which has produced a draft framework, that will ensure that the resources will be protected within the gAENP.

Therefore, whilst World Bank Safeguard Policies for Cultural Resources, OPN 11.03 and OP 4.11, are triggered by virtue of the presence of cultural property in the area, the beneficial land use impact of the gAENP proposal, South African heritage legislation, SANParks CRM Policy, the gAENP Cultural Resources Framework discussed below, together with the compilation of a cultural resources inventory, result in compliance with OPN 11.03.

Major economic activities in the Eastern Cape and planning domain

Economic activities were assessed at the provincial and district levels for the Eastern Cape Province.

Eastern Cape

The Eastern Cape had the 5th highest GGP (R19 574m) in 1991, but the average annual growth in GGP from 1991 to 1996 was 1.5%, less than the total average for South Africa. The high Tress Index indicates a dependency on a few economic activities, namely manufacturing (25.8%), commerce (16.3%) and services (27.3%). At 0.603, the Human Development Index (HDI) of the Eastern Cape is lower than the country as a whole (0.672). The HDI for certain population groups in the rural districts is comparable to the worst in the world.

The country's economic sectors fall into nine categories, with the tourism industry not a recognised defined sector. Economic benefits are hidden in the commerce and agricultural sectors, making the contribution of tourism industries to national GDP and provincial GGP difficult to quantify. The tourism industry is, however, expected

to be a major growth industry in the province, attracting 12% of the South Africa's visitors.

The economic sectors most important from an employment point of view in the Eastern Cape are services (29.8%), manufacturing (18.1%), commerce and accommodation (15.7%), agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing (13.2%).

The proposed planning domain of the gAENP falls within four municipal areas, namely Nelson Mandela Metropole, Sundays River Valley, Ndlambe and Blue Crane Route.

Planning domain

In the planning domain, the agricultural sector is most important sector in rural areas in terms of labour (contributing 32%) and in providing inputs to the manufacturing sector, in particular industries such as meat processing, dairy products, fruit canning, bakery and confectionary. Absolute numbers of people employed in the agricultural sector are comparable across all districts except the Nelson Mandela Metropole. The greatest contributor to the GGP in the area is manufacturing.

The most important contributors to GGP in the planning domain are Alexandria (field crops (R25m) and animal products (R90m)), Kirkwood (horticultural crops (R38m)), Port Elizabeth and Somerset East (animal products (R48m and R28m respectively)) and Uitenhage (animal products (R23m)). Although not reflected in the contribution to GGP, in 1995 the AENP was estimated to generate about R300-400 million into the national economy by tourists travelling to the park. The knock-on of this industry is seen in the burgeoning of the bed & breakfast industry in the Addo area from 2 to 19 in a few years. Furthermore, the AENP and other eco-tourism/conservation operations appear to employ twice the labour force at four times the salary of comparable pastoral operations.

Opportunities and constraints presented by the socio-economic environment

<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Low population density ?? Benefits to neighbouring communities ?? Unstable agricultural sector ?? Availability of donor money ?? Poverty alleviating potential ?? Growing wildlife industry ?? Cross-subsidisation between National Parks <p>Optimise opportunities by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Using land reform grants (SLAGs) ?? Government assistance in poverty alleviation ?? Ensuring neighbouring communities benefit from the economic spin-offs from ecotourism and possibly also from natural resources in the park 	<p>Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Resettlement issue of farm labourers ?? Negative perceptions of people ?? Park establishment costs ?? Equitable benefits ?? . <p>Mitigate constraints by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Developing a Resettlement Policy Framework ?? Developing a communication strategy ?? Resolving neighbour issues ?? Minimising establishment costs ?? Creating employment options
--	--

THE FINANCIAL VIABILITY OF gAENP

Financial pressures resulting from a reduction in government subsidy has resulted in SANParks placing greater focus on business efficiency within parks. Each park has

become a “business unit”, where they endeavour to fund their own operations and become financially sustainable.

Total Gross Income (TGI) from small-stock pastoralism (a land use covering approximately 60% of the planning domain) is estimated to be about R80/ha in comparison to the R103/ha from game farming (not including income from ecotourism) and R157/ha from eco-tourism. These figures were calculated using an area of approximately 135 000ha of similar vegetation type and grazing carrying capacities. Areas under intensive dairy farming are estimated to have a TGI of about R177/ha, against which conservation would struggle to compete on purely financial grounds, yet provides unmeasurable ecological services not provided by the cleared agricultural land.

Establishment costs for gAENP are considerable, and to determine the financial viability of the proposed park, financial requirements were determined by one of the specialists. Results showed that for the park to be financially viable, additional capital funding of about R170 million would be required to fund mainly land acquisition and game introductions. However, to a large degree the former is to be achieved via large donor and government support, and the latter by translocations of game from other parks. GEF and other multi-donor support is being sought to provide funding for the establishment of the Park. Financial viability is expected in the sixth year after project implementation. The projected income from eco-tourism and game sales will cover the operational costs of this development. The economic benefits from job creation (over 500 directly from the operations) and other benefits such as biodiversity conservation and ecological services (clean water, carbon sinks etc) yield huge unaccountable benefits. The spin-off effects in the area are potentially high as it gives landowners another option for their land beyond normal agriculture. If the project does attract the tourist numbers expected, a larger region will benefit significantly.

Opportunities and constraints presented by tourism

<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Existing tourism market ?? Eco-tourism opportunities ?? Heritage attractions ?? Ease of access (proximity of airport and good roads) ?? Established tourist accommodation ?? Lack of unsightly developments ?? Safety ?? Private sector and community involvement ?? Greater opportunities for agricultural labour force <p>Optimise opportunities by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Ensuring all ecotourism opportunities are captured ?? Ensure involvement of the private sector and local communities 	<p>Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Limited perceptions of the Eastern Cape ?? Coega development <p>Mitigate constraints by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Tasking tourism organisations with promoting the Eastern Cape as a suitable tourist destination ?? Sensitive development of Coega
--	--

THE LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

The proposed gAENP programme and the SEA take into account the opportunity for gAENP to alleviate poverty in the region, improve living standards of disadvantaged

communities, satisfactory resettlement where applicable, Black Economic Empowerment (BEE), sustainable tourism, local employment and outsourcing strategies while preserving the biodiversity of the area, thus meeting national and international conservation requirements.

Current institutional framework for conservation management

With many aspects of conservation management shared between national and provincial competencies, confusion amongst the general public often arises. In most cases the activities of national institutions are geared towards the development and implementation of a national framework conservation policy and overseeing the provisions of a number of international conservation conventions. Provincial departments, in particular the provincial conservation authority, by contrast, have been devolved certain powers to implement national policy provisions. The involvement of a single agency in the gAENP streamlines responsibilities and implementation. Yet active involvement of provincial authorities in surrounding park buffer areas remains essential to coordinate legislation and governance.

Existing institutional stakeholders that play a role in tourism

Similarly, many aspects of tourism are shared competencies, leading to very little co-ordinated tourism support. The provincial and local government institutions in the Addo area are currently not fulfilling their mandate in terms of stimulating and supporting tourism businesses in disadvantaged communities. This is largely due to financial and human resources constraints, while SANParks is attempting to encourage such developments through the outsourcing process (day/night drives, concessionaires).

Several sectors, including business, disadvantaged communities and farmers, argue that the current AENP is not reaching out to people enough, and linking with other local and regional tourism initiatives. The gAENP will be an international drawcard to the area, and thus it is recommended that SANParks takes a proactive lead in all tourism initiatives in the region, and integrate within the tourism sector and across sectors.

Opportunities and constraints presented by the institutional environment

<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? High institutional capacity within SANParks ?? Institutional and government support ?? Conservation management of park under one authority (i.e. SANParks) ?? Possibility of building partnerships <p>Optimise opportunities by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Coordination with other Government Departments involved with land and resource management, particularly in the buffer zone ?? Ensure satisfactory neighbour relations ?? Diversity in land ownership models in park 	<p>Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Government incapacity ?? SANParks policy ?? Other tourism organisations <p>Mitigate constraints by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Coordination of tourism efforts instigated by SANParks
---	--

Proposed institutional structures

The gAENP programme is to be developed and implemented primarily by SANParks, but in coordination with the provincial Department of Economic Affairs, Environment

and Tourism (DEAET), national government departments (Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Land Affairs, Labour), various non-government organisations (NGOs), community-based organisations (CBOs), the farming community, academic institutions, private landowners and private enterprise.

Co-operation and integration of the various institutions will be facilitated via the Addo Planning Forum (APF) and the to-be-established Park Committee (PC).

ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY I&APS

The following key issues emerged during the public participation process of the SEA. Most have already been addressed in the SEA and by SANParks:

- ?? Displacement and relocation of farm workers.
- ?? Ongoing uncertainty as to land purchases.
- ?? Impact on farming related industries and activities.
- ?? Lack of communication with affected parties.
- ?? Impact on unemployment and economic opportunities.
- ?? Impact on dairy, beef, mohair and chicory production.
- ?? Land purchase process.
- ?? Emotive attachment to land.

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS

The conservation planning process identified areas of importance to conserve and focused on implementation scenarios. Some of the areas identified as conservation worthy may not necessarily be bought by SANParks, but certain management options could be entered into between SANParks and the landowner. This opens an array of opportunities for landowners who not only wish to conserve their land, but also to be associated with the gAENP and its eco-tourism attraction.

Management options

Whether the SANParks follows the route of purchasing all land (and proclaiming as Schedule 1 Park) needed to conserve biodiversity versus purchasing a portion and entering arrangements with private enterprises for the rest, will be largely moulded by a need to weigh ecological advantages against the financial, managerial and social costs.

Including the private sector into the park via contractual park arrangements reduces costs of land, game purchases and infrastructural development, while harvesting individual ingenuity. Local communal land (which remains very limited – Enon Estate) could also be incorporated into the park on such contractual agreements, if they so desired.

Suggested management scenarios

Two contrasting management scenarios, out of innumerable possibilities, were examined:

- ?? 70% Schedule 1: 30% Contractual
- ?? 30% Schedule 1: 70% Contractual

The first scenario, with the preponderance of land under Schedule 1 ownership and management, would appear to present the most favourable option in terms management. The benefits of a national park in the international sense are great and management therefore needs to reside largely with SANParks for its long-term

security and international acceptance. The principles driving private enterprise are largely financial, and are thus very often in conflict with basic conservation principles. Thus, ideally the bulk of the area or key conservation and attraction areas need to be under SANParks' control, around which contractual areas can hinge.

Tourism options

The gAENP offers a wide range of eco-tourism opportunities due to its geographic location, its associated landscapes, wildlife and biological importance and uniqueness. The tourism opportunities are differentiated into different products catering for different markets. For example, it will be the only park in Africa to offer a truly Big 7 experience in addition to biodiversity *par excellence*. Tourism options include:

- ?? *Coastal Areas* where open water activities e.g. boat trips, whale and shark watching, fishing and diving are possibilities, and along the coastline, for whale watching, hiking, fishing and general recreation. Unique island experiences (birds, penguins, seals) would be exclusive experiences. Walking, nature based activities and overnight accommodation are suitable for the neighbouring forests. Exposure to the world's largest coastal dunefield is another unique tourist experience.
- ?? The *Thicket Areas* are ideal for Big Five tourism, with hunting in some areas. The Zuurberg Mountains offer excellent opportunities for hiking, 4x4 trails and possibly some fishing, game viewing and hunting.
- ?? The *Savanna Areas*, especially behind the dune system, offer a wide range of opportunities. The most important of these will probably include Big Five eco-tourism and possibly hunting. Activities of a lesser importance include hiking, walking and 4x4 trails in the less accessible areas, while there are limited opportunities for fishing along certain sections of the river.
- ?? The *Karoo Area* has a good potential for Big Five game viewing and associated hunting, while Darlington Dam offers opportunities for water-based activities that includes some of the best fresh water fishing available. Hiking and 4x4 trails may be possible, especially in the mountains.

CONCLUSIONS

Information from the current studies indicate that the gAENP conservation option as proposed offers a more sustainable and economically viable form of land use for most of the planning domain, than the current agricultural option. It would provide greater long term security to the globally important mix of biodiversity and underpinning ecological processes, as well as providing increasing economic opportunities for the region. There is strong support for the project from national and provincial authorities, NGOs, financial sectors and general public. Yet the studies have elucidated genuine and legitimate concerns from certain sectors of the regional economy (notably the agricultural sector, in particular the dairy industry) and the social plight of certain sectors of the labour market, notably the farm workers. Above all it was felt that the project offers an exciting alternative land use option that could both enhance biodiversity conservation, while increasing the economic growth and well-being of the region. It was felt that it could also, through strong SANParks-private enterprise-community partnerships, produce world leading models in supporting sustainable development. In addition, the SEA also meets World Bank triggered safeguard requirements for OP 4.1, OP 4.12 and OP 4.01.

Protecting the unique biodiversity of the area holds numerous opportunities e.g.:

- ?? Meeting international and national conservation responsibilities and obligations
- ?? Eco-tourism opportunities and eco-tourism spin-offs serving as an economic generator for SANParks, Eastern Cape and South Africa.
- ?? Eco-tourism has limited costs to the environment compared with intensive farming.
- ?? Preservation of Red Data Species.
- ?? Research opportunities.
- ?? Protection of unknown medicinal plants.
- ?? Opportunities for social and financial upliftment of the local communities.
- ?? Ecological services.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Adopted recommendations

SANParks has already accepted a number of recommendations resulting from the initial specialist studies and public participation process. These recommendations have either already been implemented or are in the process of being implemented:

- ?? Restructuring of the Addo Planning Forum (APF) to include a wider representation and to diversify duties within the APF.
- ?? A Resettlement Policy Framework Document has been completed.
- ?? SANParks has agreed to ensure that the Department of Land Affairs is to be present at land acquisition negotiations with farmers to inform farm workers of their rights.
- ?? The boundary of the gAENP will remain dynamic, with land purchases guided via the C-Plan tool and completion of a land acquisition policy.
- ?? The gAENP Cultural Resources Management Framework has been adopted by SANParks. The compilation of the cultural resources inventory will be completed to inform implementation of the policy and the gAENP.
- ?? In terms of OP 4.01, the SEA has been adopted by SANParks and indicates the beneficial impact of the project on the environment.
- ?? An effective communication strategy has been designed where regular two-way communication links are set up to inform stakeholders of programmes and progress, and enable them to communicate concerns and issues.

Additional recommendations

- ?? A tourism survey to investigate the existing as well as the potential tourism opportunities of the proposed planning domain, as well as the Eastern Cape.
- ?? Financial assessment of the existing financially viable farming areas i.e. the mohair producing area.