Summary of *WET-ManagementReview*

Although there are several Natural Resource Management Programmes (NRMPs) in South Africa that deal with wetland issues, there has been little evaluation of the impacts of these programmes on the management and rehabilitation of wetlands. There has also been little attention given to how effectively individual wetlands are being managed, and how effectively the various organizations involved collaborate at these sites. To address this, an investigation was undertaken consisting of four main parts. Part 1 broadly examines the impact of the NRMPs which promote the conservation and rehabilitation of wetlands. Part 2 presents the framework that was used for assessing management effectiveness and applies this framework to 21 individual wetlands. Part 3 examines in further detail six of the 21 wetlands, and focuses on the relationship between participation in rehabilitation and the long-term sustainability of natural resource management. Finally, Part 4 presents a framework for assessing how effectively various organizations and programmes collaborate, and applies this framework to one of the 21 sites. Thus, in progressing from Part 1 to Part 4, the selection of issues and individual sites becomes increasingly focused.

Part 1 begins with an overview on the principal land uses affecting the health status of wetlands in South Africa in order to provide the context of the remaining assessment. Next, an assessment is provided of the impact of NRMPs on the status of South African wetlands and how this impact differs across various land-use and tenure sectors and the potential key factors that determine the impact of these programmes in the various sectors. Three government-led programmes, Working for Wetlands (WfWetlands), Working for Water (WfWater) and LandCare, SouthAfrica, and two NGO-led programmes, Mondi Wetlands Project (MWP) and the Crane Conservation Programme of the Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT) and its crane conservation partners are examined. Forestry stands out as the sector that has demonstrated the most marked improvement with regard to its management of wetlands, and this is largely as a result of the extensive withdrawal of plantations from wetlands. It is anticipated that it is going to be more difficult to effect widespread change in some of the other sectors (e.g. sugarcane and subsistence farming) because of there being more actors who are less connected, and there is also less external pressure for change. In Part 2 of the investigation, a management effectiveness framework, called *WET-EffectiveManage*, is described. *WET-EffectiveManage* consists of 15 questions each addressing an important element of management effectiveness (e.g. mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land-uses). For each of the questions, the respondents assign a score of 0, 1, 2 or 3 based on which of the criteria descriptions best fits the situation at the site being assessed. In addition, for each of the questions the respondent is invited to provide additional comment. The questionnaire, which includes an explanation of each question and its underlying assumptions, aims to be as transparent as possible and to promote learning by both the researcher and the respondents as they work through the questionnaire together. *WET-EffectiveManage* was applied to 21 wetland sites in South Africa. A stratified sampling approach was used so as to include a diversity of land tenure contexts (private, communal tribal land and formally protected government land) and was drawn from 10 different provinces. A common feature of all the sites was that there had been some form of intervention by an NRMP to improve the state of the wetland, and most of the sites had undergone some form of rehabilitation to improve their physical state. Respondents who had a good knowledge of the site were requested to complete two questionnaires, one for the situation prior to the intervention and one for the situation after the intervention. In general, an improvement in the management effectiveness of the sites was observed, although this was less apparent in communal-use contexts where natural resource governance structures were weakened, and pressure on natural resources and complex social dynamics constrained the management effectiveness. Across all contexts there were some elements that consistently scored relatively low, and these included protection of the site, an actively-used management plan, allocation of resources for management, and monitoring.

The results of the investigation highlight areas where NRMPs need to improve their specific interventions (such as providing greater facilitation to local landholders for developing an easily accessible and frequently reviewed management plan). Thus the investigation concludes with providing recommendations for enhancingthe impact of NRMPs, particularly in relation to the wetland rehabilitation currently being undertaken in South Africa. Part 3 of the document takes six of the 21 wetlands included in Part 2, and examines specifically the element of participation of the different parties involved in the rehabilitation, with a particular focus on the long-term sustainability of the rehabilitated wetland. The participation of each of the involved parties is examined for each phase of the project (initiation, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation). Based on interviews with participants, the nature of their participation was characterized according to the following types: (1)

passive participation, (2) participation in information giving, (3) participation by consultation, (4) participation for material incentives, and (5) participation as a partner. The key assumption underlying this study is that the greater the level of participation, particularly through active participation of the landholders as partners, the greater is the likelihood of the long-term sustainable management of the wetland. The six different projects examined vary considerably in this regard, ranging from those where the landholders are actively involved as partners in all of the phases of the project to those where the involvement of landholders is primarily passive or achieved through consultation. However, even in those projects where the active involvement is generally strong, landholders have limited involvement in the evaluation of the projects. Part 4 of the document presents a framework for assessing the effectiveness with which various organizations collaborate. The framework starts with three underpinning principles, namely the presence of an explicit shared purpose, reciprocity (i.e. give and take) and effective, open communication. Criteria are then given for assessing whether each of these principles is being attained. For example, the two criteria for assessing explicit shared purpose are (1) the collaborative purpose is explicitly stated and (2) the collaborative purpose should be attained by consensus. The criteria provide a reference point against which the principles can be evaluated or judged. Each criterion is further disaggregated into indicators. A scoring system is used to assess the level of achievement of each principle. Part 4 points out that although it is recognized that a collaborative approach is generally required, collaboration often involves a lot of resources. Therefore, where resources are limited, collaboration should be 'directed' to those situations most requiring it. To assist in this, Part 4 presents the conceptual model of Kinnaman and Bleich (2004), which indicates that where the level of certainty that specified actions will produce certain outcomes, and the decision-makers' level of agreement regarding the appropriate course of action for the situation are typically high, then a 'command and control' type of behaviour is generally appropriate. However, where the level of certainty or agreement is low, then generally collaborative behaviour will be most appropriate. To illustrate the application of the framework presented in Part 4, a case study of the Rietvlei wetland is described. This wetland has been impacted upon by a variety of land-use activities in its catchment and on-site. There was a clear shared purpose for the rehabilitation initiative and a good spirit of give-and take existed in the initiative. However, some organizations indicated that the rehabilitation plan focused too much on problems within the wetland and did not address wider wetland issues (e.g. pollutant inputs from the upstream catchment). Overall, communication was not good, and the most important factor affecting the quality of communication was that it was often not clear to those involved in the initiative what information was needed and by whom. The greatest need for collaboration was probably in the phase that addressed the question of how to sustain the outcomes of the rehabilitation in the long term (and was associated with high levels of uncertainty). However, the behaviour exhibited in this phase of the project was mainly coordination, with one organization playing a much more prominent role than any of the others. This is probably the area that would have most benefited from a greater investment in joint problemsolving and decision-making, particularly involving the landowner.