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The EMF study

• **Case study review approach:**
  – **43** Key performance areas (**KPA's**)
  – **100** Key performance indicators (**KPI's**) related to EMF quality and effectiveness.

• **Mixed-method approach** - main methods:
  – Documentation analysis;
  – Analysis of spatial data; and
  – Interviews with different role players:
    • Consultants;
    • Implementing authorities; and
    • Secondary users.
Lesson #1 – Stakeholder involvement

• In most cases there was an adequate (in legal terms) public participation process but in some cases it was found that important stakeholders did not participate.

• In some cases the officials responsible for the eventual implementation (or part thereof) were not involved in the processes.

• Strong feeling of stakeholder 'buy-in' associated with involvement in the process (not just commenting phase but as part of PSC or PMT)
Lesson #1 – Stakeholder involvement

# 1

Ensure that all stakeholders that will be involved in the implementation of the tool are adequately involved in the process.
Lesson #2 – The spatial products

• **Data management** was an issue in most EMFs:
  – In most cases **metadata was lacking**;
  – In most cases the **suitable scale for use** not disclosed.

• In the same way **clarity** on the spatial analysis **techniques** was often lacking:
  – In **most cases** the **methodological approaches** was not discussed or only vaguely discussed;
  – Lack of clarity on the methodological approach used could lead to a situation where questions were raised pertaining to the **reliability** of the **spatial analysis results**.
Lesson #2 – The spatial products

#2

Ensure that the data management and the methodological processes are clear and transparent.
Lesson #3 – The management guidelines

• There was a link between the quality (and clarity) of the management guidelines and the extent to which an EMF influenced decision making.

“...the management guidelines were not discussed in adequate detail and not clearly linked to geographical areas.”

• Users were often unsure how they should apply/interpret the guidelines.
Lesson #3 – The management guidelines

#3

Ensure that management guidelines are clear.
Lesson #4 – Planning for implementation

• General lack of planning for implementation:
  – In many EMFs the key role-players responsible for the implementation were not clearly identified.
  – The roles and responsibilities was further not always clearly identified:
    • Use of EMFs at local municipal level struggled;
    • As a result there was (in some cases) a view that the EMF was not 'legally binding' on them – not their tool.

• Lack of EMF adoption and Gazetting (42% of post 2006 EMFs neither adopted nor Gazetted).
  – On average it took between 6 and 22 months to Gazette (after average 18 - 20 Months of development).
Lesson #4 – Planning for implementation

#4

Draft an implementation plan that clearly defines both roles and responsibilities and timeframes.
Lesson #5 – Capacity building and accessibility

• Some **relationship** between level of **training** and **use** of tool.

• **Very few EMFs** offered **extensive training** and user guidelines (especially technical guidance).

• Users 'scared' of the GIS systems:

  “...if the EMF tools were set-up more efficiently they would be used more.”

• **Accessibility = extent of use** (especially secondary users)
  – Not just spatial component but management guidelines as well.
Lesson #5 – Capacity building and accessibility

#5

Ensure accessibility and build capacity amongst users/implementers.
To conclude

- These **lessons learned** from EMF might be useful for the implementation of Bioregional Plans.

- The development of a **review protocol** for Bioregional Plans may assist in the **monitoring** of implementation and their effect on decision making.

**Thank you**