UPDATE!
MAINSTREAMING BIODIVERSITY INTO SDF’S.

How well has the Western Cape done?

11th Biodiversity Planning Forum, Eastern Cape

Mellisa Naiker and Kerry Maree
How well has the Western Cape done?
Biodiversity Conservation for Sustainable Development project:

- Always envisaged to act as a baseline of state of Biodiversity mainstreaming in W.C. Note: it does not check for conservation gains but focuses on the process.
- Aim was to improve the integration of biodiversity information into land use planning
- Partnership
- Review of available SDF’s in the CAPE domain (25 municipalities) based on criteria

Conclusions / Results

- Inconsistencies of information
- Lack of understanding on part of officials
- General lack of integration
- Recommendations
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Investments cont.

Developments over the last 6 yrs.
Capacity building and hands-on training

Development of GIS viewer
## Methodology

- Review was done for all existing SDF's that were produced post 2010 (this eliminated 8 municipalities and totalled 21).
- Documentation that was available to DEADP at the time, even if it was the draft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Score: 1-3-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there a general description of the biophysical conditions (topography, climate, ecosystems, vegetation, natural habitats, corridors, etc) of the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the SDF (including maps) refer to latest conservation programmes and plans (Western Cape Biodiversity Framework, Critical Biodiversity maps, Biodiversity Assessments) with spatial outputs / implications that are relevant to the municipality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are the municipal vegetation types and their accompanying ecosystems status distinctly defined and spatially represented in terms of the latest, relevant vegetation map of South Africa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are identified priority conservation actions reflected in the latest version of each municipal and district SDF, both spatially and reported on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Have the appropriate spatial planning categories been assigned to CBA’s?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Have the appropriate spatial planning categories been assigned to ESA’s?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have CBA’s informed the proposed spatial form and medium term urban edge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are there composite maps integrating / overlaying mapped biodiversity features and other spatial planning elements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall, is biodiversity appropriately integrated throughout the SDF, particularly with regards to other spatial priorities expressed in the SDF? Is integration meaningful, appropriate and feasible?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is there a description of the envisaged climate change and the possible implications of climate change for the municipality considered in the SDF?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Have the appropriate spatial planning categories been assigned to CBA's?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No apparent alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Some CBA's have not been assigned core 1 status but have been justified as to why not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>All CBA's have been assigned core 1 status. (*not all have been assigned core 1 status but change in status has been motivated by specialist and accepted by CapeNature)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend used to reflect the average scoring of biodiversity components of municipal SDF's to criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5-5</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5-4.4</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-3.4</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5-2.4</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1.4</td>
<td>Entirely deficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Subset of questions

Post 2010 SDF's comparable questions for 2014 review

Legend
- Green: Excellent
- Light Green: Good
- Yellow: Adequate
- Orange: Poor
- White: Poor

Map showing regions with marked levels of performance.
## Results: CBA= Core 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA Map Category</th>
<th>Formally Protected Areas (includes CBA Terrestrial and CBA Aquatic and their buffers)</th>
<th>Critical Biodiversity Areas</th>
<th>Ecological Support Areas (includes Critical ESA and their buffers and Other ESA and their buffers)</th>
<th>Other Natural Areas <em>(large intact remnants, especially adjacent to CBA/ESA)</em></th>
<th>Other Natural Areas <em>(located in an agricultural/transformed matrix)</em></th>
<th>No Natural Remaining Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORE 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUFFER 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUFFER 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETTLEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Good**: 11
- **To some degree**: 5
- **Poor**: 5

![Pie chart](chart.png)
Results: Threatened Ecosystems

- Different methodology was able to review all SDFs as ecosystem status has existed since pre 2010
- Identification of vegetation types and special habitats has improved
  - However only 6 of the total of 29 SDF’s speak to ecosystem status.

National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment (SANBI, 2004)

20% mention

62%
Discussion:

General

- Lag period
- Biodiversity information applicable to area has improved
- Improved integration of biodiversity within the SDF
- Still little evidence of practical implementable actions related to conservation and environmental protection
- Few SDF’s provide a link between its status quo to biodiversity/environmental issues and the implications thereof for forward planning
- Most SDF’s still only provide guidelines with general principles
- Attitude and mindset of most planners have been swayed towards the benefits and link between biodiversity and ecosystem services
- Willing BUT under-capacitated officials
- Blank stares
- Investing lots of time
Conclusions

Municipalities who say all the right things BUT make decisions against their own SDF

- Success
- Will the state of SDFs get any better than this? WC Systematic Biodiversity Plan!!!
- Do we need to keep this mainstreaming programme “alive” in order to maintain the success or what next? SPLUMA / LUPA?
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