

- **OVERSTRAND MUNICIPALITY (OM)**

Municipal Offices

- **Hermanus**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
FERNKLOOF NATURE RESERVE (FNR) ADVISORY BOARD (FAB)
HELD AT FERNKLOOF HALL ON
FRIDAY, 12 March 2021 at 09:00**

Sive Mzananda

Duncan Heard

Secretary

Chairperson

- **Please refer to the last page for acronyms used in the Minutes*

- **Welcome, Attendance and Apologies**

The chairperson welcomed everyone who attended.

Present:

Duncan Heard (DH) [FAB Chairperson]

Tarron Dry (TD) [Biodiversity Conservation Manager: OM]

Nicolette Lloyd (NL)

Siviwe Nondobo (SN) [Reserve Manager: OM]

Kari Brice (KB) [Ward 13 Councillor: OM]

Sive Mzananda (SM) [FAB Secretary: EMS]

Glynis van Rooyen (GvR)

Anthony van Hoogstraten (AvH)

Johan Montgomery (JM)

Johan Burger (JB)

Apologies :

Muthama Muasya (MM)

Bongani Sithole (BS) [Cape Nature]

Liezl de Villiers (LdV) [Environmental Manager: OM]

Sean Privett (SP)

Pat Miller (PM)

Willemien Burger (WB) [Botsoc Exco – Observer]

No Apologies

Grant Gillion (GG) [Law Enforcement: OM]

- **Minutes of the previous meeting**

2.1 Acceptance of Minutes from the previous FAB meeting on 5 February 2021.

These Minutes have been circulated and placed on the Overstrand website.

Amendment recommendation received

Pat Redford, spokesperson for the Hermanus Baboon Action Group (HBAG) commented in writing as follows: *“Please refer to the point no. 9 of the FAB minutes of the February 2021 meeting. HWS have been managing baboons in Overstrand since November 2019. You indicate 3 or 4 months; however, the period is currently in its 16th month.”*

DH corrected the quote to read as follows:

“HWS has been managing the Baboons in the Overstrand Area over the past 16 months. They use many methods for keeping the baboons out of the urban areas and have employed monitors to undertake this task. Monitoring by HWS [Human Wildlife Solutions] over the past 3-4 months indicate that they have been achieving notable successes in reducing urban incursions during this period.”

2.2 Matters arising from Previous Meeting

KB, JB and NL had to be excused during the meeting since they had other commitments.

As many of the members could not attend this meeting, it was decided that Matters Arising and the Agenda points would be discussed at the next meeting.

It was then decided that the meeting would be used to undertake the Protected Area Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) workshop exercise (See 2.5 below). The information document that explains this exercise had been circulated to all FAB members.

2.3 Proposed Hermanus Bypass Road

AvH noted the recent letter from DEADP to the DTPW rejecting the amended Final EIR. This letter, however, gave DTPW yet another opportunity to amend the document. It is of concern that despite massive opposition to this proposal, it is still clearly still on the table while a vast amount of public money is still being spent on consulting fees to further this project.

2.4 Hermanus Botanical Society

AvH noted that there had been no representatives from the EMS attending BOTSOC meetings for a while now. He asked whether the EMS were no longer interested in participating? TD stated that they do still have an interest and will participate. He

nominated SN to be part of those BOTSOC meetings too.

Action: TD & SN

2.5 METT Workshop

- The meeting then continued to workshop the METT exercise which was aimed at indicating how effectively the FNR is being managed. The scoring is expressed as a final percentage based on the workshopped consensus scores attributed to each of the 33 applicable management sphere questions.
- The information document that explains this exercise was circulated to all FAB members previously. This 2007 document was internationally researched and verified through a project facilitated and sponsored by the World Wildlife Fund and the World Bank. *It is entitled Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT): Reporting Progress at Protected Areas (second edition)*. It was developed by a team consisting of Sue Stolton, Marc Hockings, Nigel Dudley, Kathy MacKinnon, Tony Whitten, and Fiona Leverington.
- DH facilitated the workshop. The results can be seen on the **Fernkloof Nature Reserve 2021 METT data analysis sheet on Page 6 below**.
- The 2021 result is also compared with that achieved in 2011 when this exercise was last done with the FAB of that time. A short explanatory note has been added next to each management sphere question to provide the reader with some context of the question that was scored.
- An acceptable overall score should be from 68% upwards. In 2011 the assigned score was 56,57% as opposed to 59.6% in 2021. This reflects an improvement of just over 3% which is not a significant or satisfactory improvement over a 10-year period. The improvement can mainly be attributed to the higher scores achieved that are related to recent progress made with planning aspects.
- The management spheres as highlighted with red comment require urgent and sustained attention to improve management effectiveness going forward. They are broadly:
 - The improvement of effective measures to improve FNR security and ensure legal compliance so as to effectively protect/conservate the integrity of its biodiversity, habitats, and ecological processes as well as the safety of its

recreational users.

- The improvement of an adequate and dedicated staff component that have an adequate operational budget, work facilities and resources to achieve the stated FNR Management Plan goals and objectives.
- The draft management plan for FNR contains action projects that, if implemented, will significantly contribute to improving the weak management spheres highlighted by the METT.

TD was impressed with the METT management tool and stressed that they would also use it internally to continuously gauge progress and to motivate and focus management staff to achieve more effective management levels for the FNR.

- **FAB next 2021 meeting**

Date will be confirmed. {has now been set as 28/05.2021.

- **Closure**

The Chairperson thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting at 13:05.

Acronyms:

AVM – Alien Vegetation Management

BLG – Baboon Liaison Group

BAR – Basic Assessment Report in terms of the national Environmental Management Act Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (2014 – as amended)

BOTSOC – Hermanus Botanical Society

CPMG – Cliff Path Management Group

DEA&DP – Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning
EA – Environmental Authorisation
EIA – Environmental Impact Assessment
ECO – Environmental Control Officer
EMS – OSM Environmental Management Section
EPWP – Expanded Public Works Programme
FAB – Fernkloof Advisory Board
FNR – Fernkloof Nature Reserve
HBAG – Hermanus Baboon Action Group
HWS – Hermanus Wildlife Solutions
HOF – Hands off Fernkloof
IMP – Integrated Management Plan
IAV – Invasive Alien Vegetation
MFMA – Municipal Financial Management Act
MTB – Mountain Biking
NEMA – National Environmental Management Act
NEMPAA – National Environmental Management Protected Areas Act
OSM – Overstrand Municipality
PAMP – Protected Area Management Plan
PPP – Public Participation Process
SCM – OSM Supply Chain Management
SOP – Standard Operating Procedure
WCC – Whale Coast Conservation

(METT assessments aligned to Stolton et al, 2007)

| Fernkloof NR METT 13 May 2011 | | | Fernkloof NR METT 12 March 2021 | | | |
|----------------------------------------|-----------|--|------------------------------------------|-----------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ques. | | | Ques. | | | |
| 1 | 2 | | 1 | 3 | → | Legal status recognised at Provincial and National level |
| 2 | 1 | | 2 | 2 | → | Protected Area (PA) regulations require updating & improvement |
| 3 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | → | * Law enforcement effectiveness is not adequate |
| 4 | 2 | | 4 | 2 | → | PA has management objectives & is managed to meet these objectives |
| 5 | 2 | | 5 | 1 | → | * PA design (shape) makes it difficult to achieve objectives |
| 6 | 1 | | 6 | 1 | → | * PA boundary mostly not demarcated effectively |
| 7 | 1 | | 7 | 2 | → | Draft Management Plan exists but must still be approved |
| 7 a,b,c | 2 | | 7 a,b,c | 3 | → | Critical planning process aspects are in place |
| 8 | 2 | | 8 | 3 | → | Regular work plan exists and many activities are implemented |
| 9 | 2 | | 9 | 2 | → | Resource inventory: Information is sufficient for most key areas of planning and |
| 10 | 1 | | 10 | 1 | → | * Protection systems partially effective in controlling access/resource use |
| 11 | 1 | | 11 | 2 | → | More research directed at the needs of PA management required |
| 12 | 2 | | 12 | 2 | → | Resource management undertaken but some key issues are not being addressed |
| 13 | 1 | | 13 | 1 | → | * Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities |
| 14 | 2 | | 14 | 2 | → | Staff training and skills could be further improved |
| 15 | 1 | | 15 | 1 | → | * Available budget must be further improved to fully achieve effective management |
| 16 | 2 | | 16 | 2 | → | There is a reasonably secure core budget but many innovations and initiatives |
| 17 | 2 | | 17 | 2 | → | Budget management could be improved |
| 18 | 2 | | 18 | 1 | → | * There are equipment and facilities, but but these are inadequate for management |
| 19 | 2 | | 19 | 2 | → | There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities |
| 20 | 2 | | 20 | 1 | → | * There is a limited and ad hoc education and awareness programme |
| 21 | 2 | | 21 | 2 | → | Adjacent land and water use planning partially takes into account long term needs |
| 21 a,b,c | 2 | | 21 a,b,c | 3 | → | Planning is in place for habitat conservation, connectivity, ecosystem services, etc. |
| 22 | 2 | | 22 | 2 | → | There is some co-operation with adjacent landowners |
| 23 | n/a | | 23 | n/a | | |
| 24 | 2 | | 24 | 2 | → | Local communities directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to PA |
| 24 a,b, c | 3 | | 24 a,b,c | 2 | → | Impact on local communities to their trust and support for the PA as well as the |
| 25 | 3 | | 25 | 3 | → | There is a major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities |
| 26 | 1 | | 26 | 1 | → | * There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and |
| 27 | 2 | | 27 | 2 | → | Visitor facilities and services are provided for current levels of visitation but co |
| 28 | 0 | | 28 | 1 | → | * There is contact between PA managers and tourism operators but this is largely |
| 29 | 0 | | 29 | 0 | → | * Limited fees are applied to PA use, but even these do not make any contribution |
| 30 | 2 | | 30 | 2 | → | Some biodiversity, ecological & cultural values are being partially degraded but |
| 30 a,b, c | 3 | | 30 a,b,c | 2 | → | Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological & cultural values are implemented |
| TOTAL | 56 | | TOTAL | 59 | | |
| 56,57 | % | | 59,60 | % | | |