



REPORT ON SOUTH AFRICAN WORLD HERITAGE BUFFER ZONES

EXPERT WORKSHOP

16-17 OCTOBER 2014

MALOTI DRAKENSBERG PARK WORLD HERITAGE SOUTH AFRICA

1. Background

1.1 Context of the workshop

Paragraph 99 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention and from here on referred to as the Operational Guidelines, stated that the description of boundaries is an important requirement in the establishment of effective protection of a nominated property. The boundaries should be drawn to ensure the full expression of the Outstanding Universal Value as well as the integrity and/or authenticity of the property.

Paragraph 104 of the Operational Guidelines defines a buffer zone as “*an area surrounding the nominated property which has complementary legal and/or customary restrictions placed on its use and development to give an added layer of protection to the property. This should include the immediate setting of the nominated property, important views and other areas or attributes that are functionally important as a support to the property and its protection. The area constituting the buffer zone should be determined in each case through appropriate mechanisms. Details on the size, characteristics and authorized uses of a buffer zone, as well as a map indicating the precise boundaries of the property and its buffer zone should be provided in the nomination.*”

This implies that a clear definition of a buffer zone is needed in order to ensure maximum protection of world heritage sites.

As articulated in the (2008) expert meeting on buffer zones held at the Schatzalp in Davos, Switzerland, buffer zones are undeniably essential instruments for conservation of assets inscribed on the World Heritage List. Throughout the history of implementation of the World

Heritage Convention, the protection of the “boundaries” of the inscribed properties was considered to be a key element of conservation, for cultural and natural sites. The concept of buffer zones is also valued by the World Heritage Committee and has led to its inclusion in the Operational Guidelines as one of the components to be considered in the preparation process of a nomination dossier.

1.2 Status quo of buffer zones

The assessment of reports from the World Heritage properties in the Africa region clearly shows that the status of property boundaries and buffer zones has improved since the First Cycle of Periodic Reporting, mainly for the cultural properties. It is important to note, however, that despite the improvement, inadequacies in boundaries and buffer zones are still reported and certain properties’ reports reveal that not all buffer zones have been presented to the World Heritage Committee. Africa as a developing region is currently facing developmental pressures, and the need to balance the co-existence of heritage and development is often hampered by poorly defined, not approved or non-existing boundaries and buffer zones.

Cases in South Africa illustrate that the lack of definition of activities taking place in the buffer zone may lead to uncertainties in the protection of world heritage site. The lack of legislation and regulatory measures with regards to buffer zones further exacerbates the issue and leaves heritage sites vulnerable to threats associated with undesirable development.

1.3 The South African buffer zone expert workshop

Reflecting on the recommendations from the International Expert Meeting on ‘World Heritage and Buffer Zones’ held in Davos, Switzerland from the 11 – 14 March 2008, the following issues were highlighted:

- a) The definition of a buffer zone must inherently be in a position to regulate undesired influences;
- b) Provisions that regulate the value of the World Heritage site as well as the function of the environment must be enforceable (under the law);



- c) The discussion on the purpose of a buffer zone is directly linked with site management (responsibility and information);
- d) The importance of the environment must be properly recognized to be able to define a suitable perimeter as well as the required protective measures for the buffer zone;
- e) The adoption of firm controls (no change) in a buffer zone may contribute to isolation of a heritage property from its long existing social, cultural and economic context, and may contribute to unintended and unnecessary perplexity of the heritage property by conceptually isolating the property from its surroundings.
- f) Buffer zones are not considered as part of the world heritage properties and this diminishes the protection, where in fact it is most needed;
- g) The concept of buffer zone is not very well understood at the local level therefore awareness is required.
- h) National legislation, in many cases, still focuses on individual monuments;
- i) Core zones and buffer zones tend to be managed by different authorities and this diminishes the relationship between the two and minimizes its importance.

1.4 The workshop had the following objectives:

- a) Improve the management of buffer zones, by setting guidelines for the identification and regulation of activities in buffer zones;
- b) To determine more refined methodologies by reflecting on a framework for an inclusive definition of 'buffer zone; and

To determine the activities that can be undertaken in the buffer

14.1 The workshop also reviewed the following items:

- a) The activities that may take place in the buffer zone and actions that need to be implemented in order to prevent and regulate new developments within the buffer zones;
- b) The functional, visual and structural relationship of the buffer zone; and
- c) The demarcation and protected mechanisms and legislations

1.5 The expected Outcomes of the workshop:

- a) To improve knowledge and skills of participants on management and protection of buffer zones;



- b) To illustrate case studies and guidelines provided for improved management and protection of buffer zones of World Heritage sites in South Africa;
- c) The state of buffer zone demarcation for World Heritage sites in South Africa to be assessed; and
- d) To come up with recommendation for the future of buffer zone management in South Africa, compiled and disseminated.

1.6 Methodology of the workshop

The workshop consisted of plenary sessions and group work. The methodology of the workshop built on various case studies from World Heritage sites in South Africa. The participants presented the status of buffer zones in their respective sites and shared experiences about the demarcation, management and protection mechanisms during the plenary sessions. Also a number of reflections on buffer zones at global, regional and national levels were made. The plenary sessions were followed by group work to further articulate the issues and develop recommendations.

1.6.1 Guidelines for presentations

Each participating site manager or representative was expected to present a 15 minute case study on the buffer zone situation concerning their site.

The presentations were structured in the following way:

- Delimitation of the site and its buffer zone (using maps);
- Legal provision in place for the buffer zone;
- Description of activities implemented or envisioned in the buffer zone, (using map if possible);
- Impact of activities of buffer zone on the integrity of the site
- Analysis and suggestion for improved management and protection of the buffer zone.

1.7 Workshop Participants

The workshop was attended by 27 participants from various World Heritage Sites in South Africa and Lesotho, the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Ezemvelo KZN wildlife,

ICOMOS-SA, IUCN and the African World Heritage Fund. (*See Appendix 2 for the list of participants*)

1.8 Partners of the workshop

The workshop was convened by the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) in partnership with the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF).

1.9 Workshop programme

(See appendix 1 for programme)

2. PROCEEDINGS

2.1 Opening Ceremony

The opening ceremony was chaired by Mr Thabo Kgomommu as program director. He greeted everyone with remarks from the Department of Environmental Affairs and asked for a brief introduction of all participants. The Manager of the Didima Lodge, Mr Bheki Khoza made a brief welcoming of the participants and wished everyone a fruitful stay. The ceremony was officially opened by Ms Thumeka Ntloko, acting Chief Director: Protected Areas System Management at the Department of Environmental Affairs.

The speech highlighted that the issues of buffer zones are of national priority and that there is still more work to be done regarding world heritage and buffer zones, especially in community beneficiation. The speech articulated that there have been cases of people being moved from their respective land in order to protect the area and this has resulted in a loss of interest from community involvement in the protection of world heritage sites. It was also stated that these types of workshops should assist in adopting a more inclusive approach, whereby the communities are consulted. It was also encouraged that world heritage status should be associated with the surrounding communities to enhance sustainable development and not limited it. It was stated that the most reported factors contributing to the lack of balanced conservation and sustainable development in South African world heritage sites include mining, interpretation of sites and legislative tools in the buffer zones.

2.2 BUFFER ZONES AT WORLD HERITAGE SITES: CONCEPT AND CASE STUDIES IN THE GLOBAL CONTEXT

A presentation on concept and case studies on buffer zones in the global context stated that according to operational guidelines an adequate buffer zone should be provided, wherever necessary for the proper protection of the property. Although not mandatory, the buffer zone is an essential element for the protection and strongly recommended for inscribed properties. Mr Varissou presented case studies from different parts of the world and illustrated with maps their different protection mechanisms and techniques.

Based on the presentation, it is evident that the delineation and physical indication of buffer zones are not clear and understood by all stakeholders. Also, the protection and monitoring of a WHS legal status, dissemination and enforcement of legal or custodian mechanisms is lacking. The lack of definition for activities that are recommended, tolerated and forbidden on the property hinders socioeconomic development for surrounding communities and also the plurality of decision makers and of national/local stakeholders involved and also the divergences of views and practices for example, in mining, serves as constraints in the safeguarding of World Heritage.

2.3 REFLECTIONS ON THE USE OF BUFFER ZONES IN THE AFRICAN CONTEXT

The case studies from the African context reveal that development has not stopped because of world heritage status being bestowed upon a property. The urban setup has difficulties in having a buffer zone since it is the space where development is priority.

The presentation illustrated that a long history exists of habitation in most World heritage sites by indigenous people, hunter-gatherers and other different groups adapting their cultural identity and lifestyle in the exploitation of particular resources such as fishing or hunting and subsistence farming in the buffer zone area and in some cases this has become part of the outstanding universal value. Like any other development, the exploration and mining including concessions in and outside the buffer zone need to be carefully monitored.

The corrective measures to be considered would be to improve the state of conservation at World Heritage properties, by effective risk management and increased community involvement

and direct economic benefits to local communities. Also, to develop and implement strategies to enable States Parties to effectively address the challenge of balancing heritage conservation and development needs.

2.4 REFLECTIONS ON THE USE OF BUFFER ZONES IN THE MANAGEMENT OF WORLD HERITAGE SITES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SUSTAINABILITY

In the presentation on case studies that depicted sustainable buffer zone management, it was stated that the buffer zone was introduced as part of an ecological networks or heritage system that functions to protect from potentially damaging external influences and which are essentially transitional areas characterized by compatible land uses. It was also stated that buffer zone places a focus on conserving biodiversity at the landscape, ecosystem or regional scale. The emphasis should be noted based on maintaining or strengthening ecological coherence, primarily through providing for connectivity maintaining the integrity and authenticity of the property. The conservation planners stress the importance of connecting protected areas through biological corridors and steppingstones and insulating them with buffer zones. Unfortunately competition for land, population pressure and poor governance mean that many protected areas remain in isolation.

It should be noted that buffer zone management cannot be uniform across the globe, therefore other effective management and protection frameworks should also be considered as buffering mechanisms.

2.5 REFLECTION ON THE DAVOS EXPERT WORKSHOP

Drawing from the expert meeting that was held in Davos, the concept of a World Heritage buffer zone should be regarded as a summary term used by the World Heritage Committee for a diverse range of buffer zone typologies that are used to provide additional protection to an inscribed World Heritage. The State Parties should use terminology for buffer zones that meet their own management requirements and reflect cultural or linguistic situations and the need to clearly communicate buffer zone concepts to local stakeholders in a nominated or inscribed World Heritage property.

Sometimes more than one buffer zone could be created for a single property to enhance integrity and management. For instance the boundaries of an area to preserve important views and settings of an urban area might be different to that required to manage traffic impacts or visitor pressure. It was highlighted that buffer zones should be clearly linked to the appropriate level of legal and management frameworks in order to provide protection; and the need for a holistic (integrated) approach that encompasses management of a wider area including the designated buffer zone(s).

This encourages the State Parties to develop legal frameworks and regulatory instruments that will ensure buffer zones can function in relation to the protection of the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage property. It was articulated that the different zoning provisions may be considered to effectively protect the outstanding universal value, including the visual corridors and influence zones such as watershed.

There should be a support for the principle of empowering of communities within the governance structures for World Heritage properties and their buffer zones, and the participatory planning processes that can be considered as good practice. However, further reflection on this area of discussion was required as it was beyond the core tasks of the workshop.

2.6 CASE STUDY: FOSSIL HOMINID SITES OF SOUTH AFRICA

The Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai and Environs, known as the Cradle of Humankind, were inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1999. The site covers the area of over 47 000 hectares of privately owned land in the north west of Johannesburg and is home to over 17 000 residents. In 2005, two other highly significant sites, Makapan and Taung were listed as serial sites together with the Cradle of Humankind World Heritage Site. Together, these are the Fossil Hominid sites of South Africa. The Fossil Hominid Site was gazetted without a buffer zone and there have been Boundary iterations over time and attempts to establish a buffer.

The case study on the Fossil Hominid Sites focused on the Cradle of Humankind and the newly proposed extension. The challenges faced on the site are the need for a proclaimed boundary and a Gazetted management authority. It was stated that regarding the appointment of management

authorities, relevant stakeholders were not engaged; hence there is not proper management structure for the site at the moment. This has made things difficult in controlling activities within the buffer zone, as the two departments, namely GDARD and DED have complementary but yet contradicting mandates in the protection of protected areas. There are also issues of land ownership and developments within the buffer zone. It was stated that the problem is not defining the boundary or what should happen within it but it is more a matter of how one can control and manage what has been decided on.

2.7 CASE STUDY: MAPUNGUBWE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE

The Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape's buffer zone was 237 100 ha and proclaimed formally gazette in 2009. Following the request from Unesco for the State Party to submit the State of Conservation reports, subsequently leading to an reactive monitoring mission in 2010 and 2012, there was a need to modify and redefine the buffer zone. This was as a result of Coal of Africa mining which was based 7km away from the core area of the World Heritage site. The 35th Session of the World Heritage Committee (Paris 2011) examined the state of conservation of Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape and among other things requested the State Party to secure the buffer zone and to have a HIA produced. New buffer is 104 800 ha and has been submitted to Unesco and approved. In addressing any future problems which may arise as part of developmental influences in the buffer zone, the management authority has sort out the need to improve the condition at Mapungubwe by Consultations with stakeholder and to close liaison with DMR as 423 mining applications have been submitted and also to attempt to mitigate the impact of mining through offsets.

2.8 CASE STUDY: VREDEFORT DOME

The Site was nominated and inscribed with a 5km Buffer zone, however the Buffer zone as it stands is not practical and has huge implications with regards to the management of the Site. The boundary cuts farms into two portions. It did not consider farm boundaries, or at least parent farms. It was visible that the inscribed buffer zone is not practical as it did not follow the cadastral boundaries and also the inscription did not include the activities that are allowed in the

Buffer zone. The WHS is more than 90% privately owned by farmers. It was stated that the practical boundary elaboration was still to be created.

There are five general land use zones identified as: Mixed farming, Livestock farming, Conservation, Mixed livestock conservation and irrigation farming. The challenges identified presently in the management of Vredefort Dome as the Limited intergovernmental coordination in relation to management of the site, protected areas regulations and their practicality towards the WH properties. The site was declared a World Heritage property but has not been proclaimed nationally. The issues of ownership and rights in relation to economic advancement versus conservation are still a bone of contention. The Land is changing hands so often that it is posing risk to the authenticity and value of the site. Regular review of the regulations and standards are becoming a risk to the full protection of WH property and also the proclamation and absence of Management Authority

In the South African context, the delineation of buffer zones should be compulsory, and sites should use natural cadastral where possible and to improve enforcement mechanisms, especially in the private farms also to give sites National status before they can be elevated to World Heritage Status. It also reasonable to List and gazette the activities compatible with the objectives and values of the WH properties and also to identify grey areas and limitations and to ensure participation in the coming review of the current EIA and EMF regulations to secure the interests of the WH Property.

2.9 CASE STUDY: CAPE FLORAL REGION PROTECTED AREAS

The current size of the Cape Flora region is 557 584 ha with 14 Clusters and 194 land parcels. The total area of the property is 1 135 486 ha with the Buffer Zones of 810 697. The challenges currently facing the site are fires and invasive alien species. At the end of the presentation the mitigation measures used to remedy the challenges was articulated as being Fire monitoring, AIS monitoring, Integrated Catchment Management, priority species monitoring, data collection Conversion to knowledge to inform planning and Implementation Stewardship as well as mainstreaming.

2.10 CASE STUDY: ROBBEN ISLAND

The presentation presented most of the activities that are happening on the buffer zone since Robben Island is naturally buffered by the ocean. It was highlighted that the Robben island buffer is also a Pathway for boats in and out of Port of Cape Town and for access to the Island. The Robben island buffer is also a habitat for marine living resources and forage grounds for endangered African penguins. It was highlighted that the dominant activities on the buffer are commercial fishing and recreational fishing activities since space for sea recreational activities are permitted by the Port Authority. The presentation also mentioned some of the constraining factors on the management of the site, some of which are the lack of synergies in legislation and also a lack of well-defined response mechanism and not well defined stakeholders from the time the island was decommissioned as a maximum security prison. It was expressed that Stakeholder management is a strategic goal for the RIM with well-defined stakeholders and clear responsibilities.

2.11 CASE STUDY: UKHAHLAMBA / DRAKENSBERG PARK

The Special Case Area Plan (SCAP) identified a buffer zone as a way to establish a protective strip or shield of land between the core and neighboring areas and protects the aggregation of various environmental characteristics such as biodiversity resources, sensitive environments as well as scenic qualities of the foothills peripheral to the Park.

The Buffer zone for Maloti Drakensberg Park is divided into two layers; Layer One is proximate and is regarded as being highly sensitive. Layer Two is more distant and is regarded as being less sensitive. It was stated that it is not the intention of the WHS to implement specific activities within the buffer zone, however ownership and control of land within the buffer vests with private bodies or (indirectly) local user communities or (local) government thus co-operative inclusive decision making is required. In terms of the buffer zone policy, it was stated that any person wishing to conduct an activity within the buffer zone will need to assess the likely negative consequences of such proposed activity. It was outlined that the park has developed a buffer zone policy that seeks to guide land use activities, by promoting what is seen to be

“compatible” land use activities and discouraging non-preferred or undesirable development activities.

In the buffer zone of the park land use change or development is regarded as the biggest threat. The MDP WHS needs a revised buffer zone to better protect the OUV of the WHS. In the interim, all land use change applications within the buffer zone are referred to the Buffer Technical Committee for consideration. The SCAP is used as a guideline. The formal adoption of the Draft Buffer Zone Policy and the synchronisation of the BZP with the law are overdue and considered a priority, as is the need to extend the buffer to the Free State and Lesotho sections of the WHS.

It was articulated that Ezemvelo aims to commence with an extensive Public Participation Process for the KZN section of the Buffer Zone in January 2015. While Municipalities do sit on the Buffer Technical Committee - Stakeholder engagement with the public was not undertaken at the inception of the revised Buffer Zone Process. The anticipated challenge will be to “sell” the buffer as an ‘opportunity zone’ to various stakeholder groups, while at the same time managing stakeholder expectations.

3. DEFINITION OF BUFFER ZONE

The Operational Guidelines define a buffer zone as *an area surrounding the nominated property which has complementary legal and or customary restrictions placed on its use and development to give an added layer of protection to the property*. The South African buffer zone expert workshop produced a set of aspects that should be added to the definition.

Additional aspects:

- It protects the WHS from Negative Impacts from outside and contiguous areas from impacts from inside the WHS.
- Enables benefits to be brought to broader stakeholders with emphasis to those adjacent
- Enhances the OUV and integrity
- may be a single or multiple enabling mechanism(s)
- A transitional area compatible with WHS

- It is 3 dimensional
- Maintains sense of place through appropriate best practices
- It is not an extension of the core area

4. BUFFERING MECHANISMS

The workshop also produced a set of spatial and non-spatial aspects that define the protective mechanisms

Spatial aspects:

- Biosphere reserves
- Stewardship sites
- Formal protected areas
- Conservancies
- Declared Private Mountain
- Catchment Areas
- Other Protected Areas
- Landscape Initiatives
- Traditional management systems
- Geographical features or elements

Non-spatial

- relevant legislations
- various formal planning tools regulating land use
- Mainstreaming

5. THREATS TO Outstanding Universal Value

5.1 Common and Unique threats to World Heritage Buffer Zone Management

- Mining: Extractive activities (fracking, gas extraction)
- Poaching and trafficking of cultural resources and vandalism



- Illegal developments (environmental, town planning)
- Unplanned developments such as land invasion
- Inappropriate development such as informal settlements
- Pollution : Acid Mine drainage, bird droppings on rock art sites)
- Fragmented legal framework (implementation at the three tier levels)
- Conflicting values: natural sites being threatened by cultural values for example Robben Island on culling of rabbits, West Coast alien plants clearing.
- Lack of knowledge of the purpose of the buffer especially from the Lobby Groups
- Inability to see value in the buffer zone: Seeing buffer as a burden not a benefit to the community.
- Poverty around most of our WH properties which needs investment in the buffer zone by all stakeholders. Benefits must be seen at that level.
- Lacks of social cohesion – communities adjacent to the WHS are not involved in the operations of the WHS.
- Inability of Site Managers to explain the meaning and purpose of the buffer zone to communities.
- Land ownership with owners who are not willing to participate in Conservation measures
- Delays or inappropriate resolution of land claims
- Intergovernmental Coordination or Lack of Corporative Governance

6. LAND USE ACTIVITIES THAT ARE PERMITTED IN THE BUFFER ZONE

6.1 Land use activities:

- This must be dictated by the OUV and the Criteria of inscription.

6.2. Historical use:

- Historical uses, current and future(If historical use is not posing any threat they should not be stopped)
- Historical use that is sustainable should be considered but if detrimental to the site, then it should be stopped.

- There is a need to consider what is inappropriate development
- Assess if the historical use is sustainable or not, then decide
- Historical use can be a reason for the proclamation of the site e.g. Matopos

7. WORKSHOP CHALLENGES

Two of our South African World Heritage sites (ISimangaliso and Richtersveld Botanical and Cultural Landscape) were not represented at the workshop due to certain constraining factors and thus the proceedings were affected since they do not reflect cases from all the South African sites.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is important to note that there is no uniform way to neither delineate Buffer Zone boundaries nor address issues arising from its management. These are the recommendations that emerged from the South African buffer zone expert workshop:

8.1 General

- It was recommended that a Framework be developed to manage different types of land: Communal, Private etc.
- The Inability to package and sell the concept “buffer “appropriately, led to a Proposal to consider calling it a zone of influence or “areas of sustainable use”
- Buffer zone should be seen as sustainable use areas
- Buffer zone development should be integrated with local planning
- The current Legislation is too generic, there is a need to tailor make regulations for specific sites to ensure maximum protection of the OUV
- Site authorities should consider other Buffering mechanisms for example Traditional/custodian management systems
- Encourage harmonization with Unesco programmes such as MAB, CBD, etc. to consolidate the concept of the buffer zone
- Work Towards enhancing the capacity of management to deal with wider stakeholder consultation in the development/establishment of a buffer zone

- Ensure to incentivize the management of land in a sustainable way.

8.2 Legal

- There is a need of a Legal framework for Buffering, bearing in mind that there is a multiple role players and competent authorities
- Buffering mechanisms must translate to policy
- Look at the Constitution especially on the issue of property rights.
- Increase the Use of sustainable development frame work which are within the mandate of the Municipalities and they can override provincial legislation
- Applications for rezoning should be approved by the Municipalities
- World Heritage site should not be treated as a uniform concept
- Address the fragmentation of legislation (e.g. NEMA and NHRA)

9. WAY FORWARD/FOLLOW-UP

The follow up phase is extremely essential as it is required to ensure that the work done during the workshop will be implemented and utilized.

- The state party will engage on initiatives to call for the Revision of the definition of a buffer zone in the operational guidelines
- The African World heritage fund will facilitate a regional expert workshop on buffer zones.
- The EIA guidelines will be amended to incorporate the IUCN and ICOMOS practices notes on any proposed development in the buffer zone on the WHS
- Fast tracking development of EMFs
- The Department of Environmental Affairs will oversee and facilitate a specialized EMF process for all WH Sites
- The Department of Environmental Affairs will provide a consultant to develop guidelines for South African world heritage buffer zone management.



Appendix 1

Day 1: Thursday 16th October 2014		
Time	Item	Responsible/Speaker/Moderator
Plenary Session 1	Welcome Session <i>Programme Director: Thabo Kgomommu</i> <i>Rapporteur:</i>	
	Arrival of Delegates	
08:30 – 09:00	Registration of Delegates	Workshop Secretariat
09.00 – 09:15	Welcome /Participants introduction/ Background to the Workshop	Thabo Kgomommu
09.15 – 09:30	Remarks from African World Heritage Fund	Souayibou Varissou
09.30 – 09:45	Presentation: Maloti Drakensberg Park	Ntate Dhamane(from Lesotho)Oscar Mthimkhulu
09:45 – 10.00	Key note address	Thumeka Ntloko
10:00 – 10:30 Tea/Coffee Break		
Plenary Session 2	Presentations: Reflections on the use of buffer zones in the International, regional and national Context [VENUE: MALOTI DRAKENSBERG PARK]	



<i>Programme Director: Oscar Mthimkhulu</i>		
<i>Rapporteurs: Guy Palmer</i>		
10:30 – 10.45	Buffer Zones at World Heritage Sites: concept and case studies in the global context	Souayibou Varissou
10:45-11:00	Reflections on the use of buffer zones in the African context	Sabelo Madlala
11:00 – 11:15	Reflections on the use of buffer zones in the management of World Heritage sites with special reference to sustainability	Mr. Kagosi Mwamulowe
11: 15- 11:30	Reflection on the Davos expert workshop	Guy Palmer
11:30- 12:00	Plenary Discussion	Programme Director
12:00-12:15	Case study: Fossil Hominid Sites of South Africa	Peter Mills/Moses Ngobeni/Lebo Diale
12:15-12:30	Case study: Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape	SANParks Fhatuwane Mugwabana/Chrispen Chauke
12:30-13:00	Plenary discussion	
13:00 – 14:00 Lunch Break		
Plenary Session 3	Presentation: national Case Studies(positive and negative) on World Heritage and Buffer zones	



	[VENUE: MALOTI DRAKENSBERG PARK]	
	<i>Programme Director: Mr. Kagosi Mwamulowe</i>	
	<i>Rapporteurs: Chrispen Chauke</i>	
14:00 – 14:15	Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape	Site manager or representative
14:15-14:30	Case study: Vredefort Dome	Lebo Diale/Maputle/Coenie Erusmus
14:30 – 14.45	Case study: Cape Floral Region Protected Areas	Guy Palmer
14:45-15:30	Plenary discussion	
15:30 - 15:45-TEA BREAK		
15:45 – 16.00	Case study: iSimangaliso Wetland Park	Site manager or representative
16:00-16:15	Case study: Robben Island	Sabelo Madlala
16:15 – 16:30	Case study: uKhahlamba / Drakensberg Park	Site manager or representative
16:30 – 17.00	Plenary discussion	Programme Director
17:00-17:15	Constitution and ToR of Working Groups	Programme Director
	END OF DAY 1	END OF DAY 1



Day 2: Friday 16th October 2014

Time	Item	Responsible/Speaker/Moderator
------	------	-------------------------------

--	--	--

<p>Parallel Session 4</p>	<p>BREAK AWAY SESSIONS:</p> <p>World Heritage and buffer zones</p> <p>[VENUE: MALOTI DRAKENSBERG PARK]</p> <p><i>Programme Director: Lebo Diale</i></p> <p><i>Rapporteur: DEA</i></p>	
----------------------------------	--	--

<p>Parallel sessions: analysis and recommendations</p> <p>Chairperson/Group rapporteurs</p>		
---	--	--

<p>07:30 – 09:00</p>	<p>Group 1: Definition and purpose and stakeholders of a buffer zone</p>	<p>Group 2: Which activities can be undertaken or not in the buffer zones?</p>	<p>Group 3: Mitigation and sustainable management strategies in buffer zones</p>
-----------------------------	---	---	---

<p>09:00 – 09:15</p> <p>TEA BREAK</p>		
---	--	--

<p>Parallel sessions continue: analysis and recommendations</p>		
--	--	--

<p>09:15 – 10:15</p>	<p>Group 1: Definition and purpose and stakeholders of a buffer zone</p>	<p>Group 2: Which activities can be undertaken or not in the buffer zones?</p>	<p>Group 3: Mitigation and sustainable management strategies in buffer zones</p>
-----------------------------	---	---	---



10:15 – 11:00	Group 1: Presentation of group work	Chairpersons/Rapporteurs
11:00-11:30	Plenary discussion on Group 1 report	
11:30 – 12:30	LUNCH BREAK	
	Presentation and Adoption of Recommendations <i>Programme Director: Sabelo Madlala</i> <i>Rapporteur: DEA</i>	
12:30 – 12:45	Group 2: Presentation of group work	Chairpersons/Rapporteurs
12:45-13:15	Plenary discussion on Group 2 report	
13:15 – 13:30	Group 3: Presentation of group work	Chairpersons/Rapporteurs
13:30-14:00	Plenary discussion on Group 3 report	
14:00 – 14:45	Workshop Resolutions	
14:45 – 15:00	Closing Remarks	Department of Environmental Affairs Vote of thanks: Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife



Departure

Appendix 2

NUMB ER	TIT LE	DELEGATE NAME	ORGANISATION	CONTACTS
Site Managers/ representatives				
1	Mr	Fhatuwani Mugwabana	Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape	Phone:082 885 4336 Email: fhatu.mugwabana@sanparks.org
2	Mr	Guy Palmer	Cape Floral Region Protected Areas	Phone:082 415 1884 Email: gpalmer@capenature.co.za
3	Mr	MagsPillay	Cradle of Humankind	Phone:083 647 5088 Email: mags@gauteng.net
4	Mr	Moses Ngobeni	Makapan Valley	Phone:082 800 2666 Email: ngobenim@ledet.gov.za
5	Mr	Oscar Mthimkhulu	uKhahlamba-Drakensberg Park	Phone:082 457 7174 Email: Oscar.Mthimkhulu@kznwildlife.com
6	Mr	Pascall Taruvinga	Robben Island Museum	Phone:060 503 1503 Email: pascallt@robben-



				island.org.za
7	Mr	Shane Christians	Richtersveld Botanical and Cultural Landscape	Phone:082 320 2618 Email: mgaven@nwpg.gov.za
8	Mr	Wayne Erlank	Cape Floral Region Protected Areas	Phone:072 430 6423 Email: Wayne.Erlank@ecpta.co.za
9	Ms	Lebohang Diale	Taung Skull and Vredefort Dome	Phone:082 697 9433 Email: ldiale@nwpg.gov.za
10	Mr	Peter Mills	COHWHS	Email: peter@qauteng.net Phone:0825557972
State party				
11	Mr	Thabo Kgomommu	DEA	Phone:082 929 4335 Email: TKgomommu@environment.gov.za
12	Ms	Ms P Mohafa	DEA	Phone:072 573 1922/076 976 7716 Email: PMohafa@environment.gov.za
13	Ms	Ramatsimele Mengwai	DEA	Phone: 078 192 7512 Email: rmengwai@environment.gov.za
14	Ms	Thumeka Ntloko	DEA	Phone:084 581 6175 Email:



				TNtloko@environment.gov.za
15	Mr	Amos Zukwa	DEA	Phone: 0735121187 Email: Azukwa@environment.gov.za
Partners				
16	Mr	Souayibou Varissou	AWHF	Phone:082 804 4569 Email: SouayibouV@awhf.net
17	Mr	Khanyisani Dladla	AWHF	Phone:0732682993 Email: KhayisaniD@dbsa.org
International Expects				
18	Mr	Kagosi Mwamulowe	International Union for Conservation of Nature	Phone:+260 977500243 Email: mwamsprog@gmail.com
Relevant Stakeholder				
19		Sonja Kreger	EZKZNW	Phone:0828774122 Email: Sonja.kreger@kznwildlife.com
20		Stue Mukan	EZKZNW	Phone:0827221193 Email: stue.mukan@kznwildlife.com
21	Mr	John Crowson	EKZNW	Phone:0827894029 Email: john@kznwildlif.com
22	Mr	Bheki Khoza		Phone:0827826652 Email: khoza@kznwildlife.com
23	Mr	Sizwe Mkhulise	ECPTA	Phone:0794967883



				Email: Sizwe.Mkhulise@ecpta.co.za
24	Mr	Sabelo Madlala	RIM	Phone:0734421092 Email: Sabelom@robben-island.org.za
25	Mr	Andy Blackmane	KZNW	Phone: 0829085888 Email: Andy.Blackmane@kznwildlife.com
26	Ms	Joyce Loza	MDTP	Phone: 0720161196 Email: Joyce.Loza@kznwildlife.com
27	Mr	Andrew Muir	Austen Smith	Phone: 0837831873 Email: Muir.ar@gmail.com