



# Implementing bioregional plans: lessons learned from environmental management frameworks (EMFs)

June 2016  
Biodiversity Planning Forum

**Dirk Cilliers**

Department of Geography and  
Environmental Management



# 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 process.
- 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**

