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i. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background to the project

The South African National Parks (SANParks) has applied to the GEF/World Bank for a grant of US $5.5 million to establish a megabiodiversity conservation area in and around the existing Addo Elephant National Park, located in the Eastern Cape of South Africa. The Park lies within an area of global biodiversity value and contains five out of seven plant biomes found within South Africa. The proposed adjoining marine environment is also of considerable biodiversity value. Other than along the coastal area, the area is characterised by relatively low and declining agricultural productivity with a very low population density. A significant land use trend in the Province is towards game farming and eco-tourism with over 400 farms having already converted. During project preparation, detailed specialist studies, including a strategic environmental assessment, were undertaken indicating the desirability and viability of creating an expanded conservation area. The project will support the expansion of the Addo Park from an existing 150 000 ha to 240 000 ha plus 100 000 ha of marine protected area. The project will significantly boost eco-tourism from the existing 120 000 tourists per annum. By project closure the Park is predicted to be financially self-sufficient.

Since 1997, the expansion of the Park has been proceeding with land purchase by SANParks. This will continue for at least the next 1-3 years. This has primarily taken place on a willing buyer and willing seller basis. The next phase of expansion will primarily involve land owners being incentivised to contract land into the Park. Some of this has already taken place.

Resettlement context

Since 1997, SANParks has been purchasing land with a clause requiring land to be purchased free of occupation. A survey is currently underway to identify workers and families who have been displaced from these farms in order for compensation to be provided by SANParks. Due to low population densities, few displaced workers are expected to be found. A further survey is currently being undertaken to identify all individuals who could be affected by the proposed expansion of Addo over the next 6 years. Current estimates of potentially affected individuals vary from a low of 570 inhabitants (191 workers) to a higher figure of approximately 3300 inhabitants. The variability in the figures is ascribed to the underlying assumptions which are made including: the area of land to be included into Addo, the ratio of farm workers per ha of land and the number of dependants. Further, the actual number of workers and inhabitants which might require resettlement support will also depend on the extent to which workers and inhabitants displaced since 1997 can be found. Based on current phasing for the expansion of the Park, it is anticipated that SANParks resettlement obligations in this regard will end in approximately 2010.

Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and Resettlement Action Plans (RAP’s)

SANParks has developed a RPF to comply with Bank Operational Policy 4.12 and a series of RAP’s for years 1 and 2 of implementation. The RPF includes a broad identification of the affected community, South African legal requirements,
development of guiding principles for compensation, generic income restoration plans and implementation and monitoring arrangements.

During years 1 and 2 (Phase 1), 6 farms with a total of 69 inhabitants will be affected. RAP’s have been developed for these farms. During the first 3 years of the project, a total of 13 farms and an estimated 544 inhabitants may be affected including the above.

Detailed planning for the marine component of the project will only begin in year 1 to 2 of the project. Therefore, it is premature to produce RAP’s or to develop detailed RPF proposals. The RPF is likely to need some updating in future as the marine component of the project is developed.

Disclosure

The RAP’s and the RPF have been developed with those directly affected. They have been disclosed to affected parties directly through meetings due to low levels of literacy and long travelling distances in the project area. The document has also been made available at public libraries and the Bank.

Implementation/institutional arrangements

Implementation of the RAP’s will be as follows. The lead responsibility for implementation will rest with SANParks who will provide the necessary staff and budget for implementation including the use of an agent if need be. At community level, local level fora will be convened for purposes of communication and liaison. The local level fora will nominate representatives to sit on the proposed Resettlement Working Group. The Resettlement Working Group will primarily provide an oversight function including serving as a vehicle to raise issues and concerns and monitor the implementation of the RAP’s. The Resettlement Working Group will meet every 3- 4 months and will be broadly convened to include government, key agencies, NGO’s and community representatives. The Resettlement Working Group will report to the Addo Steering Committee. SANParks will also appoint an independent team to bi-annually monitor the implementation of the RAP’s. The reports of the independent monitor will be provided to the Addo Park Manager, the Addo Steering Committee, the Resettlement Working Group and the Bank.

Bank monitoring and supervision

The Bank will be provided with copies of all RAP’s for approval. Supervision missions will, on a 6 monthly basis, pay special attention to the planning and implementation of the RAP’s. Emphasis will be placed on ensuring that corrective actions are taken where needed.
PART 1:
RESETTLEMENT POLICY FRAMEWORK (RPF)
1. BACKGROUND TO THE ADDO PROJECT AREA

The proposed Greater Addo Elephant National Park (gAENP) comprises an area of the Eastern Cape that contains an extremely high biodiversity, yet is poorly conserved. The area that has been identified as potentially forming an expanded conservation area would form a continuous, terrestrial conservation area of almost 200 km in length, about 30 km at its widest part and about 10 km at its narrowest. This is known as the planning domain. Within the planning domain, the exact boundaries of the proposed park remain uncertain although a priority area of 240 000 ha has been identified to potentially comprise the full extent of the Park. The existing Park would form the nucleus of the gAENP and priority areas would be consolidated to streamline management of the Park and to acquire areas deemed to be of critical conservation importance. In addition, an adjacent marine protected area (MPA) of about 120 000 ha is also being proposed. (For details see specialist reports as part of the gAENP conservation planning exercise at www.addoelephantpark.com).

Expansion of the gAENP would involve the incorporation of largely private farms through either direct purchase or via contractual arrangements. Since 1997, roughly 75 000 ha has been incorporated into the Park, with 51 000 ha of that through direct purchase. Expansion plans during the next 3 years include the consolidation of a further 29 000 ha (or 13 properties) of priority properties as part of Phase 1. This will increase the Park to about 154 000 ha. Although inclusion via contractual means would be pursued in some areas during the first phase, Phase 2 would predominantly focus on the contractual incorporation route, not discounting the periodic opportunistic purchase if price and availability of funds prevail.

Although most farms would be acquired through a process of willing-buyer willing-seller, concern has been expressed as to the impacts, particularly resettlement impacts, of the expansion. In particular, concern has been expressed that farm workers would be likely to lose access to employment and places of accommodation typically provided on the farms. Farm workers are regarded as among the most vulnerable members of South Africa's working class, largely as a result of the ongoing decline in the agricultural sector, as well as a result of historical conditions that have ensured that farm workers are usually poorly skilled and not well equipped to sell their labour in the wider economic market.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE POTENTIALLY AFFECTED POPULATION

2.1 Farm workers and their families
A detailed data base is currently being compiled for all inhabitants potentially falling within the ambit of the RPF. During phase 1, for 13 farms, it is estimated that 165 workers and an additional 544 dependants will fall within the ambit of the RPF. On the 6 priority farms there are currently 69 inhabitants of which 10 permanent workers and 6 dependants will become SANParks responsibility, there being no alternative livelihood options for them.

From the information provided by farmers and farm workers, there are a total of 35 farm workers + 34 dependants on the 6 priority farms that were surveyed. There is an
average of 3.3 people, and 1.7 workers, per household. From these interviews, the following population profile has been assembled.

Table 1: Selected Farm Worker Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Most workers are 18 to 49 years (84%). Only 9% are over 60 years, so only very few will be able to fall back on old age pensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>73% of the workers are male.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Workers are poorly educated. 24% have no education at all; 37% have to Std. 2 (the minimum literacy threshold); 25% have Std 3 to 5; only 13% have any secondary education, with only one having matric. Most are either Xhosa and/or Afrikaans, with only a few (18%) speaking English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>Lack of formal education and of English means that most workers have only worked or lived on farms or local small towns, with 63% having worked only on farms. Only a few (19%) have lived and/or worked in larger urban settings such as Uitenhage or Port Elizabeth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>Median income is R588 per month and average is R698 per worker per month.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lack of off farm experience means that most of these farm workers have only limited contacts and networks in urban areas. Evidence from resettlement on farms elsewhere in South Africa, such as in the former homeland of Qwaqwa, shows that ex-farm workers without such networks have serious difficulty in finding jobs in a high unemployment economy such as that of South Africa. SANParks is committed to ensuring that this does not happen in this instance and as such will ensure that the income restoration strategies as set out in this document are effectively implemented.

Farm workers in the proposed gAENP area currently receive a significant portion of their income in the form of performance bonuses as well as rations and payments in kind, including meat, staple foods, water, limited access to electricity, firewood, housing, clothing, limited transport, loans, UIF, and the right to keep livestock on the farm. This enables people to live on relatively low wages (a median household cash income of R588 per month with an average of R698), but also serves to inculcate dependence upon the farmer. These benefits are of considerable value to the workers and are regarded as part of their income stream. Furthermore, these benefits generally do not terminate with retirement. As such the elderly have a safety net provided by the farmer. Once displaced from the farm, such benefits would fall away. In order to ensure that this does not happen, SANParks will ensure that incomes are replaced via the income restoration strategy outlined in this document.

These workers and their families for the most part thus come from a very small and circumscribed socio-economic universe. They overwhelmingly express the wish to remain within their immediate locality, with 45% wanting to live on farms, 44% in
local towns such as Addo, Kirkwood or Paterson, and 11% in larger towns or urban complexes, notably Port Elizabeth.

SANParks will take these limitations very seriously in its plans to provide employment and livelihoods for displaced inhabitants.

2.2 Seasonal workers
No detailed socio-economic picture of seasonal workers exists, as they were only found during the survey on one of the farms. They were shearing sheep and or picking fruit. The 6 farms surveyed employed 4 seasonal labourers from neighbouring areas, including, local townships. Piecework is without the kinds of benefits that permanent workers receive, and is without any kind of employment security. Whilst it is not intended to develop RAP’s for seasonal workers, SANParks will endeavour to find placements under the poverty relief funding program, should any positions become available.

2.3 Already displaced workers
During the last 5 years, (1997 to 2001) SANParks has bought some 36 farms for incorporation into the gAENP (28 000 ha). While some of these farms were effectively unoccupied at the time SANParks took ownership of them, it needs to be established whether the depopulation of these farms reflects wider economic trends and/or whether it reflects the fact that the farms were being purchased by SANParks in terms of a “free of third party” requirement. The only way to resolve this issue is to contact all the owners of these farms at the time of transfer as well as the displaced inhabitants. The project will attempt to locate and provide compensation to workers and their families displaced through the Addo land expansion process, post 1997. The process will entail advertising, following up on leads, public meetings, the design of a data base, assessment of resettlement needs followed by development and implementation of RAP’s.

2.4 Host communities
While ex-farm workers will have moved to a range of destinations, depending on where they have family ties, or have been able to find employment and accommodation, investigations suggest that they have mainly moved into the local townships. This could, in future, result in increased pressure on accommodation and service provision. However, in this case, all townships within the planning area of the gAENP, and from where most workers originate, can provide access to medical care (clinics), schools and other related services, such as sanitation and electricity. SANParks has received full endorsement from all these municipalities for the project as well as a pledge for full cooperation in terms of providing housing grants for these workers. It is therefore not anticipated that host communities in towns will suffer any burden through workers or families who select to move to surrounding towns. Therefore, no form of compensation is envisaged for host communities in towns. More importantly SANParks will need to monitor and ensure that in instances where farmers take workers with them to new farms that this does not result in existing workers being moved off the land to make way for those moving onto the farms.

2.5 Farmers and their families
Farmers and their families falling into the middle to upper income group, are clearly much better off than workers on their farms in terms of education, disposable capital
and alternative livelihood options. Further, SANParks pays above average prices for farms. For these reasons, landowners/farmers whose farms are purchased or expropriated are therefore not expected to fall under the ambit of the RAP’s.

2.6 Indirectly affected population
A number of people in the local towns such as Addo, Jansenville, Kirkwood and Patterson are dependent upon the agricultural economy. These include people that service life and work on the farms, such as business people, agricultural service providers, teachers and state officials, etc. They are not expected to be negatively affected by the switch from an agrarian to a conservation economy in this portion of the Province. Therefore, no compensation is envisaged.

3. ADDO OPPORTUNITIES

In the current South African socio-political context, the *raison d'etre* for the coming into being of the gAENP is driven as much by a conservation ethos as by a desire to expand economic opportunities and, in particular, to open these opportunities up for those that have been historically disadvantaged. For the most part, economic opportunities should accrue within the context of eco-tourism or nature based activities. In this regard the *Strategic Environmental Assessment Specialist Study No 11: Eco-tourism Opportunities* (see [www.addoelephantpark.co.za](http://www.addoelephantpark.co.za)) deals with the broad diversity of tourism related opportunities in the terrestrial and marine environments.

The challenge will be to ensure that the opportunities that arise, and the employment that these opportunities create, are accessible to marginal groupings and, in particular, those losing farm based employment. The above-mentioned specialist report (No. 11) estimates that between 40 and 42 eco-tourism jobs will be created per 15 000 ha developed (about 1 person for every 350 ha). The estimate is that of these, 25% could be of an unskilled nature, 50% could be semi-skilled and the remaining 25% could be skilled and managerial posts (pers comm with R. Davies author of the report).

The number of jobs calculated to result from a consolidated 154 000 ha park (i.e. the inclusion of 13 additional farms within 3 years) are as follows:

- 98 permanent jobs (increase of 28) in conservation (25 for unskilled 49 semi-skilled and 24 skilled workers.)
- 260 permanent jobs (increase of 170) in eco-tourism (66 for unskilled 129 semi-skilled and 65 skilled workers).
- 24 permanent (increase of 15) technical and administrative jobs (these would be skilled jobs).
- 71 contract jobs in fencing maintenance (the bulk of these would be unskilled). This equates to about one permanent or fencing contractual job per 337 ha.
- 421 temporary poverty relief jobs for a 4 year period (the bulk of these would be unskilled).
A total of 453 permanent jobs and 421 temporary jobs are predicted to be created or an increase of 214 permanent jobs against the current employment of the Park. During this period, approximately 165 agricultural jobs are calculated to be shed from the 13 farms through incorporation into Addo. This figure excludes seasonal employment. Some of these job losses will be replaced on new farms to be purchased by farmers. The remainder will be catered for through the RAP’s/income restoration plans. Therefore, the net job gain is calculated to be 49 permanent jobs plus approximately 421 temporary jobs through the Poverty Relief/Working for Water Program (seasonal employment figures are unknown). A significant but more difficult impact to measure is the net benefit to the overall economy of the conversion from a low intensity agricultural economy to a nature based economy. Specialist reports indicate a significant gain.

4. SANPARKS CONSERVATION MANDATE

SANParks, as the country’s premier conservation organisation, has been mandated by the national government to contribute to the expansion of South Africa’s biodiversity conservation areas from the present 6% to 8% of the country’s surface area by 2010, excluding marine areas. Inclusive of the need to expand the protected areas, there has been a shift from a preservationist philosophy to an ecosystem conservation approach in an attempt to encapsulate ecological patterns and processes. However, the general lack of understanding and appreciation by the general public and government of the essential role of ecosystems as the back-bone of our very existence has often led to conflicts around the setting aside of land for conservation, as opposed to alternative land-uses. National parks, as megabiodiversity repositories, primarily serve conservation purposes, but also have an enormous potential for economic development, so much so that when fully developed they should be viewed as an asset and not a liability to South African society. The booming eco-tourism industry in Kruger, Cape Peninsula, Tsitsikama, Kgalgadi Transfrontier and Addo Elephant National Parks reflects this.

In meeting both conservation and socio-economic obligations, SANParks is attempting to address the issue of conserving a healthy environment, thus combining the objectives of restitution with conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity. This is in accordance with the National Constitution, National Environmental Management Act (NEMA), the governments macro-economic GEAR initiative and social justice initiatives as advocated through the Land Restitution, and Reconstruction and Development Programme.

The general requirement of setting aside large conservation areas is primarily designed to meet the essential ecological patterns and processes associated with preserving sustainable functioning examples of the country’s different biomes, for which Africa is so renown. Large size also enhances the aesthetic appeal of an area, especially their recreational and spiritual values. Furthermore, expansion of national parks remains necessary in the face of the consequence of climate change and the habitat needs of threatened and endangered species.

Thus, for national parks to meet their essential requirement of conserving biodiversity, whilst also meeting human needs, they must:
- Be large enough to support representative examples of one or more natural ecosystems.
- Contribute to biodiversity and ecological processes and preserve special cultural features.
- Provide spiritual, scientific, educational and recreational opportunities.
- Incorporate the needs and aspirations of local, national and international communities.
- Reduce occupation and exploitation that are largely in direct threat to its main purpose.

Furthermore, if parks are to continue to grow to meet their objectives in an ever-increasingly cluttered and competitive world, political forces need be nurtured and funding sourced. In this regard, the national government has played a pivotal role of late towards land purchases, consolidating 40% of the 20,000 ha in the Addo Elephant National Park alone in 2001-2 but also in other parks such as Vembe-Dongola National Park. Private investors have also facilitated the expansion of a suite of national parks. However, alternative forms of incorporation into national parks through contractual arrangements with private land-owners and community land are also being actively pursued by SANParks, thus furthering state-private/community partnerships – a central theme in the up-coming World Parks Congress in 2003. In this regard the incentives basis for incorporating private or communal land need to be further developed to enhance conservation on a wider front.

In meeting this conservation mandate SANParks:
- Has added over 130,000 ha to nine national parks in six of the country’s seven biomes in 2001-2 alone, thereby addressing some of the conservation priorities of SANParks and the National Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT).
- Is in the process of proclaiming a marine protected area around the Cape Peninsula National Park.
- Accepts that setting aside large areas for conservation is a justifiable land use.
- Accepts that occupation of such ground by people, other than in controlled circumstances such as park staff villages/developments, is largely in direct conflict with SANParks conservation ethos and in certain parks unacceptable given its broad spectrum of indigenous and in some cases dangerous fauna.
- Recognises the challenge of making conservation appropriate to the people and circumstances of South Africa and, by experimenting boldly, innovatively and sensibly, hopes to contribute leadership to the international challenge of making conservation appropriate to poor, previously disadvantaged peoples. Examples include the San - Mier community venture with SANParks in the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park and the Makuleke community park in Kruger National Park.
- Recognises the fact that its system of national parks contribute economically at both the national and Provincial/Regional scales. In this regard SANParks has been successful in accessing R280m from Poverty Relief and Work for Water project funds from national government for 2002-2004, and creating over one million man-days of work in the unemployed sector throughout the country.
• Recognises that in meeting its conservation mandate that people, and particularly poorly educated farm labour force and fishing communities, may be initially negatively affected through park expansion programmes. Therefore, in the case of Addo, SANParks will, where possible, avoid the need for resettlement and where required ensure that RAP’s are developed and fully implemented in order to compensate inhabitants.

• Is also aware that the burgeoning conservation industry potentially offers greater socio-economic opportunities for the above disadvantaged groups than current land uses.

• Recognising that there is often a time lag between proclamation, consolidation and development of a park and an overall increase in employment, will in the case of Addo, ensure implementation of RAP’s.

• Shall use this framework to enhance the opportunities available to those groups most affected by park expansion programmes and, ultimately, to improve the ecological, economic and social sustainability of conservation and protected areas.

• Also recognises that resettlement cannot occur in isolation but, rather, through a joint effort by various responsible government departments tasked with social issues such as the Departments of Land Affairs, Housing, Local Government, Environment & Tourism.

• Acknowledges that it normally takes vacant occupation of purchased land given the conservation ethos and product that SANParks is identified with which includes dangerous game, and the fact that the parks are not developed for the exclusive right of a specific group but for the general public of South Africa.

• Acknowledges the domestic legal obligations and responsibilities associated with park expansion as well as the requirements of funders and donors where applicable.

5. SOUTH AFRICAN LEGAL REQUIREMENTS IMPACTING RESETTLEMENT/ LAND TENURE

As part of South Africa’s democratisation process since the early 1990’s, the country has developed possibly the most progressive National Constitution and supporting social legislation. A great deal of emphasis has been placed upon legally supporting the poorest and most vulnerable sectors of South African society. In this regard, the following legislation applies. Table 2 applies to resettlement and land-right issues which are addressed in the SANParks RPF.

Table 2. Legislation affecting the land/sea incorporation programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Legal Issues (Land/Sea/Labour)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Parks Act 57 of 1976</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>This Act makes provision for the establishment and extension of parks and for the exclusion of certain land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental management must place people and their needs at the forefront of its concern, and serve their physical, psychological, developmental, cultural and social interest equitably. Actions and activities undertaken in carrying out expansion plans should thus be socially, environmentally and economically sustainable.

Where SANParks wishes to incorporate (purchase) privately owned land, the act makes provision for this, where the owner has agreed. In the event of no agreement, the act makes provision for expropriation by the Minister of Public Works or by the Board.

The Act provides for measures with state assistance to facilitate long-term security of land tenure; regulates the conditions of residence on certain land; and the conditions on, and circumstances in, which the right of persons residing on land may be terminated and under what conditions and in what circumstances they may be evicted.

“No one may be deprived of property except in terms of law of general application, and no law may permit arbitrary deprivation of property.”

This Act provides for the protection of the security of tenure of labour tenants and those persons occupying or using land as a result of their association with labour tenants. It also provides for the acquisition of land and rights in land by labour tenants.

This Act provides for the restitution of rights in land in respect of which persons or communities were dispossessed under, or for the purposes of furthering the object of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>National Environment and Management Act 107 of 1998 (NEMA)</strong></th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Environmental management must place people and their needs at the forefront of its concern, and serve their physical, psychological, developmental, cultural and social interest equitably. Actions and activities undertaken in carrying out expansion plans should thus be socially, environmentally and economically sustainable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expropriation Act 63 of 1975</strong></td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Where SANParks wishes to incorporate (purchase) privately owned land, the act makes provision for this, where the owner has agreed. In the event of no agreement, the act makes provision for expropriation by the Minister of Public Works or by the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension of Security of Tenure Act 62 of 1997 (ESTA)</strong></td>
<td>Land &amp; Labour</td>
<td>The Act provides for measures with state assistance to facilitate long-term security of land tenure; regulates the conditions of residence on certain land; and the conditions on, and circumstances in, which the right of persons residing on land may be terminated and under what conditions and in what circumstances they may be evicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Constitution 108 of 1996</strong></td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>“No one may be deprived of property except in terms of law of general application, and no law may permit arbitrary deprivation of property.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour Tenants Act 30 of 1996</strong></td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>This Act provides for the protection of the security of tenure of labour tenants and those persons occupying or using land as a result of their association with labour tenants. It also provides for the acquisition of land and rights in land by labour tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restitution of Land Rights Act 22 of 1994</strong></td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>This Act provides for the restitution of rights in land in respect of which persons or communities were dispossessed under, or for the purposes of furthering the object of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention of Illegal Eviction From and Unlawful Occupation of Land Act 19 of 1998</strong></td>
<td><strong>Labour</strong></td>
<td>This Act provides for the prohibition on unlawful evictions and lays down procedures for eviction of unlawful occupiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marine Living Resources Act 18 of 1998</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sea</strong></td>
<td>The marine protected areas of the MLRA are essentially a carry-over of the marine reserves of the Sea Fishery Act. Protection is now granted to these areas in terms of section 43 of the MLRA which provides that the Minister may, by notice published in the Gazette, declare an area to be a marine protected area for the protection of fauna and flora or a particular species of fauna or flora and the physical features on which they depend; to facilitate fishery management by protecting spawning stock, allowing stock recovery, enhancing stock abundance in adjacent areas, and providing pristine communities for research; or to diminish any conflict that may arise from competing uses in that area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sea Shore Act 21 of 1935</strong></td>
<td><strong>Land/Sea</strong></td>
<td>This Act declares the State President to be the owner of the seashore and the sea within the territorial waters of the Republic and the alienation of these areas are prohibited. The Sea-shore Act is administered by DEAT. Although the alienation of the area is prohibited, the Act does make provision for the ‘Premier’ to lease the area for a number of uses, provided that such letting is in the interest of the general public. The ‘Premier’ is also required to issue permits for the removal of any material from the sea and seashore, except precious stones, natural oil, precious metals or any base metals, or any aquatic plant, shell or salt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Sea Birds and Seals Protection Act 46 of 1973

The enumerated objectives of the Act are to provide for control over certain islands and rocks, the capture and killing of sea birds and seals and for the disposal of the products of sea birds and seals.

6. ADDO LAND ACQUISITION FRAMEWORK

The proposed land acquisition framework seeks to:

- Establish the principles and criteria to inform land incorporation into the gAENP.
- Prioritise areas based upon national conservation priorities.
- Prioritise areas for incorporation according to their contribution to the goals and objectives of this specific park.
- Provide a fair and equitable framework by which to include areas.
- Show flexibility with regard to different means of incorporation.
- Establish legally binding institutions whereby contractual landowners can collectively contract with SANParks.

6.1 Principles

Further expansion of the gAENP or proclamation and inclusion of newly identified areas remains justified on ecological and economic grounds provided that the following five basic principles are met:

- *Maintenance of ecological integrity:* It is critically important that the biological viability of this park (and its species) is enhanced through the consolidation of missing components of existing ecosystems or the inclusion of unconserved ecosystems within a conservation area that adds general strength to the system in question.
- *Representativeness:* Inclusion of unique (or endemic) elements of biodiversity associated with biomes or hotspots becomes a priority for acquisition.
- *Enhancing biological diversity:* Inclusion of unique biodiversity assets adds general conservation value to the park.
- *Enhancing economic viability:* Inclusion of specific pieces of land to either reduce management costs or enhance the economic potential of the park; essential for sustainability, job creation, political support and poverty alleviation. Economic factors alone might justify an acquisition.
- *Minimising threats:* Specific acquisitions could reduce threats to the biological integrity of the park from land transformation (through habitat loss, increased erosion of biodiversity, introduction of alien species, and general loss of ecological services), and economic and social threats from inappropriate developments on park boundaries.
Thus, the importance placed upon any particular tract of land or expanse of sea for incorporation into the gAENP depends on its contribution to the goals and objectives of the park and the threat of these not being achieved in the long-term because of irreversible actions or activities. This therefore requires the weighing up of a suite of criteria:

- conservation value (primarily its biodiversity contribution) is of central importance;
- location;
- size;
- cultural value;
- economic contribution;
- financials associated with costs; and
- aesthetic value and social constraints; and resettlement requirements/impact.

6.2 Land incorporation options
The most difficult component of this strategy of incorporating private/communal lands remains determining the areas importance and how much it is worth ‘paying for’ through either direct purchase, incentives (via contractual/management arrangements) to private land-owners, or expropriation. These different incorporation options would be exercised under the following conditions:

- **Purchasing** will be entertained when the property is considered to be of biological importance within the identified core area of the park, adjoining or surrounded by current SANParks property, of cultural or aesthetic value, managerial importance (straightening boundaries etc), at a reasonable price.
- **Contractual arrangements** would be entertained when the property is situated on the periphery of the gAENP area, preferably outside the core conservation area, of biological merit on its own account, of such a size that it would be able to support a sustainable conservation-based enterprise, or is part of a larger cluster of smaller properties making up an economic unit. These areas would be proclaimed as Schedule 1b (2b) park and protected by the National Parks Act.
- **Management agreement** would apply to areas on the periphery of the park, of limited biological value but with managerial importance and importantly can be fenced into the park. These areas would not be proclaimed as contractual National Park land, thus not protected by the National Parks Act.
- **Buffer arrangements as a type of weaker agreement** would be encouraged with surrounding land-owners largely outside the desired park boundary but whereby park integrity would be enhanced if their land use conforms with that of the park.
- **Expropriation** will only be considered when the purchase route can not be exercised on a willing-buyer willing-seller basis for key properties identified for purchase, and all other avenues had been exhausted.

The extent to which SANParks implements any of the above alternatives will depend upon the resources which they have at their disposal when considering the options as illustrated in the following matrix (Table 3):
Table 3: Prioritised incorporation matrix with importance scale in *bold italics* and preference indicated as A,B,C,D and incentives offered to private landowners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High value and high threat areas</th>
<th>High value and low threat areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Private land</td>
<td>1. Private land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inside park</em> (undertaken to bring them into the park)</td>
<td><em>Inside park</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Purchase, <em>very high</em></td>
<td>A. Purchase, <em>high</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Expropriate, <em>very high</em></td>
<td>B. Contract incentive, <em>high</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Contract incentive, <em>moderate</em></td>
<td>C. Management agreement, <em>low</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Management agreement, <em>no</em></td>
<td>D. Expropriate, <em>low</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside Park</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outside Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Services, <em>very high</em></td>
<td>Extension services, <em>high</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incentives offered to private land-owners
Legal recognition, traversing rights, management input, tax exemption, fencing support, consumption of game, extension service.

2. Government land/sea
Negotiation priority – *very high*

2. Government land/sea
Negotiation priority – *high*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low value and high threat</th>
<th>Low value and low threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Private land</td>
<td>1. Private land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inside park</em></td>
<td><em>Inside park</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Management agreement, <em>high</em></td>
<td>A. Management agreement, <em>moderate</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Contract incentive, <em>low</em></td>
<td>B. Contract incentives, <em>low</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Purchase, <em>low</em></td>
<td>C. Purchase, <em>low</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Expropriate, <em>no</em></td>
<td>D. Expropriate, <em>no</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside park</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outside park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension service, <em>moderate</em></td>
<td>Extension service, <em>low</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incentives offered to private land-owners
No legal recognition, no tax exemption. Reduced or no management input, fencing support, consumption of game, extension service.

2. Government land/sea
Negotiation priority – *high*

2. Government land/sea
Negotiation priority – *moderate*
The incorporation of government land (either terrestrial or marine) for conservation purposes would also be governed by the conservation value and risk matrix above.

6.3 Incentives for private/communal land incorporation
Incentives to encourage private/communal land-owners incorporation into the gAENP will be pursued. Possible incentives will include provision of extension services, fencing, traversing rights, use of wildlife, management costs, tax exemption, and access to funding to name but some. The package of incentives would vary depending upon the perceived conservation value and threat (Table 2). They must be assessed to give greater biological value to the park and towards the State’s attainment of its biodiversity goals.

7. RESETTLEMENT POLICY FRAMEWORK (RPF) FOR THE GAENP

7.1 Guiding principles
SANParks will implement the following guiding principles for the resettlement process in keeping with World Bank safeguard policies, international best practice domestic legislation and SANParks corporate ethos.

Principle 1: Avoid and or minimise resettlement
SANParks will demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the members of the proposed Resettlement Working Group (see below), the merits of the proposed purchase and incorporation of farms concerned. The long term conservation and strategic planning objectives for the gAENP are clearly stated and available through the Strategic Environmental assessment on www.addoelephantpark.co.za. This, at the minimum, states the ecological goals (core business) of the gAENP in clearly quantifiable and measurable terms. These principles and criteria are outlined in section 6 above.

SANParks will demonstrate that the acquisition of any farms that have particularly high numbers of employees is critical to the long term ecological goals of the expansion programme. The final shape and size of the gAENP should thus be a matter of negotiation and deliberation.

Principle 2: Genuine consultation and participation must take place
Genuine consultation and negotiation will take place with interested and affected parties. This means that the final outcome of proposed land incorporation and resettlement options is not clear at the outset and that all interests will be taken seriously. Local level consultative fora will therefore be formed (see below). Consultation and participation will take place during project planning and implementation and as a part of project monitoring.

Fora will be given official recognition within the gAENP institutional framework, as part of the proposed Resettlement Working Group.

Principle 3: Establish a pre-resettlement baseline
A comprehensive baseline survey is in the process of being established as part of the RAP process. It will include a detailed register of the farm employees, their dependants, income and associated benefits, housing details and employment route.
This database will be drawn-up and maintained for all properties purchased and incorporated into the gAENP.

**Principle 4: Support relocation**

All aspects of resettlement including relocation destinations, housing designs, income restoration strategies, garden sites and, where applicable, agricultural sites etc. will be planned and completed prior to inhabitants either moving and/or losing out on any benefits in terms of their current situation. Financial and technical support, staff and vehicles will be allocated to ensure that inhabitants are able to move all their goods, settle onto new properties and, where necessary, initiate new livelihoods with minimal disruption by agreed dates.

**Principle 5: Negotiate and provide fair and equitable compensation options**

Individuals and households who are resettled shall be no worse off than prior to resettlement. A number of possible income restoration/compensation options will be made available and explained and negotiated to the satisfaction of the affected parties. (see annex 2). Private properties to be purchased will be done so on a willing buyer willing seller basis. Alternatively, and where appropriate, contractual/management arrangements will be entered into. In instances where all other negotiations fail, and as a last resort, such land will be purchased via expropriation. Prices will be based upon a valuation undertaken by an independent state-approved assessor. Normally above average prices will be paid to the seller meeting his legal and financial responsibilities towards his farm employees.

SANParks will through negotiation and written agreement with land owners stress their legal and financial obligations to employees. SANParks will monitor and ensure that existing host community workers on farms purchased by farmers incorporated into the gAENP do not lose any benefits from the arrival of new farmers and their workers from the said properties. In the event that a seller reneges on his legal responsibility towards his employees or inhabitants are found to be worse off through land incorporation than prior to incorporation, SANParks will take on the relevant portion of the resettlement liability. This may include the employment and accommodation responsibilities of the employees and dependants. Employment may include no less than placement in the 4 year Poverty Relief programme, currently operating in the gAENP area. If permanent employment through SANParks becomes available, these workers will receive first preference. Workers may remain living in their current accommodation while SANParks negotiates with Local Government and the Department of Housing to obtain the R15 000 per household Government Grant to build a house in the town of the worker’s choice. SANParks shall also seek legal recourse to the seller where they renegade on their commitments or disadvantage workers on newly acquired farms through bringing workers and inhabitants with them.

In the event that a property is expropriated, SANParks will take on all responsibilities including the employment and accommodation responsibilities of these affected farm employees. Resettled workers discussed above will be included in capacity building programmes to enhance their prospects of advancement and further employment.

Any appropriate temporary and permanent employment positions within SANParks will be initially offered to these affected farm employees (depending upon their
SANParks will also actively engage with local governments and other responsible government departments to incorporate farm employees directly affected by the park expansion programmes into their housing and employment programmes.

**Principle 6: Ensure that directly affected communities benefit from resettlement**

Replacing housing or arable land at the level enjoyed before resettlement amounts in theory to the restoration of the status quo. In practice, such 'mathematical' restoration can leave people worse-off if they are cut off from their resource base. For there to be development, people must be actively better off than before, and in a manner, which is sustainable. Resettled people are entitled to development, as they sacrifice economic, social, and territorial ties and resources for the benefit of others. The SANParks Conservation-Social Ecology Policy states its intention to 'give support to, and open up opportunities for, those communities that were dislocated and marginalised when national parks were originally set up' ([http://www.parks-sa.co.za/conservation/social_ecology.html](http://www.parks-sa.co.za/conservation/social_ecology.html)). In the gAENP context this means providing access to jobs arising out of gAENP or by providing productive farms/land to resettle farm workers.

The SANParks will draw up a specific list of jobs arising out of gAENP, together with the training needs and related budgetary and staff requirements. This amounts to the principle of benefit sharing, promoted by the World Bank, whereby the affected people are entitled to share in the benefits of an overall project. This will include their having first claim upon benefits such as jobs as they become available as a result of the gAENP initiative.

**Principle 7: Cater for vulnerable population**

Vulnerable groups merit particular support in a number of ways. Members of vulnerable groups are often not able to make their voice heard effectively and account should be taken of this in the consultation and planning processes, as well as in establishing grievance procedures. They are often physically weaker and may need special help in the relocation phase, as well as additional rations, assistance and medical attention in settling onto new properties. Physically or socially weaker people are often short on strength and skills. They tend to get sidelined in the competition for jobs or benefits. Their special needs will thereby be identified and catered for.

**Principle 8: Budget for resettlement as an upfront project cost**

Experience across the world shows that unless resettlement is built in as an upfront project cost, it tends to be under budgeted, that money gets whittled away from the resettlement budget to ‘more pressing’ project needs, and that it tends to be seen as peripheral to the overall project. SANParks will, in conjunction with other relevant government departments, ensure that resettlement costs, including providing for those workers already displaced from farms as a result of the gAENP initiative, are built into the overall gAENP project budget.

**Principle 9: Establish an independent monitoring and grievance procedure**

Monitoring of the resettlement aspect of the gAENP project will be undertaken by an independent Monitoring Team appointed by SANParks. Grievance procedures will be
organised in such a way that they are accessible to all affected parties, with particular concern for the situation of vulnerable groupings. Since resettlement should inevitably be a phased activity, with some groups and families moving after others, care will be taken to ensure ongoing lines of communication and feedback between processes of monitoring and complaint on the one hand, and of planning and implementation on the other.

Principle 10: SANParks accepts responsibility for ensuring proper resettlement planning and implementation

Ultimate responsibility for protecting those displaced by the purchase and/or expropriation of land will rest with SANParks. SANParks, as an organ of state, has the added responsibility to ensure that the constitutional objective of securing “ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development” is adhered to. This includes ensuring that landowners fully replace all benefits, which workers enjoyed on previous farms, on new farms. Specifically, the development of the gAENP as an alternative resource management programme should not be prejudicial to the objective of ensuring that the livelihoods of some of the country’s most marginal employees (farm workers) are maintained or that viable alternatives are provided.

The onus therefore rests with SANParks to ensure that those displaced by the incorporation of land are adequately cared for and that host communities on farms are not disadvantaged.

Principle 11: Comply to legislation

SANParks will comply with all legal requirements as regards resettlement, including OP/BP 4.12. Workers/households displaced from farms from 1997 onwards will fall within the requirements of this framework and, by the end of the first year of implementation, all reasonable efforts will have been made to trace previously displaced occupants of farms and to ensure that RAP’s are developed with and for them.

Principle 12: Adhere to eligibility criteria for resettlement

The following members of the community will qualify for resettlement compensation:

- Farm workers and their families on farms yet to be acquired.
- Those workers and their families who have already been displaced.

Categories of population potentially affected but not specifically eligible for compensation:

- Seasonal workers are not specifically eligible as they are only partially affected, being mobile and selling labour in an area wider than gAENP. Furthermore, it is almost impossible to accurately trace seasonal workers and to measure their losses with any degree of confidence.
- People living in the gAENP and environs that rely on the current socio-economic configuration around agriculture for their livelihood. It is not possible to quantify potential losses and it is anticipated that the conversion from farming to agriculture will create substitutional advantages.
- Host towns which may receive ex-farm workers e.g. the residents of Paterson Township.
Categories of population which could become eligible for compensation / monitoring

- Host communities on farms acquired by ex-Addo farmers. SANParks will need to monitor to ensure that existing farm workers are not removed to make way for ex-Addo farm workers. In instances where this happens the RPF may be applicable.
- Ex-Addo workers who move with farmers to new farms and whose resettlement expectations are not met.
Figure 1: Resettlement flow diagram

Are farm workers present on farm or have any been dismissed in anticipation of sale

Yes

Can all workers be accommodated by farmer on another farm at equivalent terms

No

Can workers be satisfactorily employed by SANParks or concession at equivalent rates and packages

No

Are suitable SANParks or concession employment opportunities likely to become available in short-term (2 years)?

No

Workers must be accommodated in another income restoration strategy and monitored

No

No further requirement for resettlement action

Yes

No further requirement for resettlement action, other than monitoring

Yes

Workers inducted into new employment and appropriate training provided. Form part of group to be monitored

No

Workers receive transitional support until employment is available. First call on Poverty Relief jobs

Yes
7.2 Generic income restoration options
Based on the above information and the RPF, a series of 6 RAP options were then developed as follows:

Following a consultative process with the Department of Land Affairs, farmers and farm workers, SANParks agreed to the following RAPs options. By designing these options SANParks has endeavoured to implement the RPF.

Option 1.
The farmer offered the workers a similar job, with a similar salary and housing and other benefits at another farm. The workers are happy with this and have agreed to move with the farmer.

Option 2.
As a result of having made been destitute by the sale of the property, the workers who had been working as permanent employees¹, agree to be employed in the SANParks - Poverty Relief Programme, until the discontinuation of the said programme in 4 years time. In terms of this option the workers understand the following:
- that the worker’s dependants and himself/herself may continue to live in their current accommodation until the discontinuation of the programme, after which alternative arrangements will be made. In the meantime SANParks will continue to negotiate with the Department of Local Government and Housing to obtain the R15 000 grant per household, so that the worker will have housing to the same or better standard in the town of his choice.
- that the Poverty Relief Programme pays R35 per day and will provide transport to and from the jobsite.
- that alternative arrangements for accommodation will be made should the jobsite be too far to travel to on a daily basis.
- that the worker will be included in a capacity building programme through the Poverty Relief Programme and SANParks to increase his/her opportunities in the greater job market.
- SANParks will be liable for providing all other benefits enjoyed by the worker and his dependants.

Option 3.
The farmer has offered the worker a job at another farm but, because it is not in an area that he/she is familiar with, the farmer has ‘assisted/will assist’ the worker in finding another job at a farm or in a town nearby, with access to housing and similar benefits. Until such time, the farmer assumes responsibility for providing benefits to the worker.

Option 4.
The farmer will offer the worker another job when he moves (location still unknown). However, until such time that he knows where he will settle next, the worker is not ready to make a decision to move. In the meantime the worker will continue to work

¹ It is agreed that the SANParks – Poverty Relief Programme will employ all permanent workers. Casual workers who have been working and living on the farm for a number of years will receive second priority for upcoming jobs. If and when permanent jobs within the gAENP arise, these jobs will be offered to the affected workers as a first port of call.
on the current farm, with the same benefits such as salary and housing. The worker is aware that SANParks now has all his/her details on record and will monitor his/her future movements.

Option 5.
This option is still in negotiation and planning stages and has therefore not been offered to workers as yet. SANParks in conjunction with the Department of Land Affairs (DLA) can apply on behalf of workers who choose to remain within the agricultural sector for a Land Reform Grant. This grants each household about R20000 to assist in starting up an agricultural related activity. Workers will be accommodated on productive land and undergo extensive capacity building/training exercises to assist them to build up their activities into profitable businesses, related to the conservation and tourism activities of the gAENP. The DLA has already indicated that they would also contribute towards an agricultural – resource economist to assist in identifying possible activities.

Option 6.
The worker becomes employed by SANParks in a permanent position with full employment benefits. e.g. as a field ranger.

Figure 2: Interviewing members of the community

Jill Gordon obtaining endorsement from a worker.
8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

8.1 Process for developing future RAP’s for currently displaced workers
The RAP’s address the six farms proposed for purchase in year 1 of the Addo expansion. The process for developing RAP’s for subsequent phases will be an iterative process, in the sense that the RPF and the RAP for Phase I resettlement will serve as the model for subsequent phases. The experience gained from Phase I will thus feed into subsequent phases in a cumulative fashion, correcting any mistakes and allowing for any significant differences in the nature of resettlement issues in subsequent phases. The following process will be used to determine eligibility.

Table 4. Eligibility process for currently displaced workers and dependants (change layout)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising:</td>
<td>SANParks will place an advert that states that people who were displaced by the purchase of land for the gAENP between February 1997 and March 2003 must make themselves known. Advertisements will be placed in Afrikaans, English and Xhosa in local newspapers and on radio stations, as well as in areas likely to be populated by those displaced e.g. the towns of Addo, Jansenville, Kirkwood and Paterson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Campaign</td>
<td>Posters should be distributed in areas likely to be populated by those displaced e.g. the towns of Addo, Jansenville, Kirkwood and Paterson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct contact and interviews</td>
<td>Contact and interview community organisations, such as Advice Offices and Farmer’s Associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
<td>Coordinate and facilitate all public meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Registration:**
Claimants must register (name, identity number and contact details) with agents to be appointed by SANParks.

**Details of Claim:**
The agents must interview claimants and document the nature and detail of the claim. This should include as much information as possible on family members and neighbours who were displaced from the same or neighbouring farms.

**Investigation:**
The agents must then investigate the claim by cross-referencing information obtained from the claimant with the SANParks database.

**Reporting:**
The agents must submit written reports to the Resettlement Working Group (which includes SANPark representation).

**Decision:**
Based on the findings of the written report, the RWG must decide at its next meeting on the legitimacy of a claim and communicate this back to the agent.

**Appeal:**
The agent must inform the claimant of the decision as well as of the claimant’s right to appeal (in writing), should the claim be unsuccessful.

The process requires that the following mechanisms to be developed:
Consultative Mechanisms, including the proposed Resettlement Working Group (see below);
Grievance Redress Mechanisms (see below); and
Monitoring Mechanisms (see below).

It is essential that there is ongoing communication between these three mechanisms. It is perceived that there will be some continuity in membership of these three bodies across the various phases of the gAENP project, to enable a transfer of experience to take place.

### 8.2 RAP process for workers and inhabitants who may be displaced in future

- The data base under development will be used to identify affected members as farms are about to be purchased.
- Consultations and negotiations will then be held and draft RAP’s developed prior to any negative impacts.
- Once negotiated the RAP’s will then be implemented and monitored.

The organisational chart for the implementation of resettlement is outlined in Fig. 3. below.
8.3 Consultative mechanisms

Provision will be made for all people affected by resettlement, and the associated processes to which it gives rise, to be represented in consultative mechanisms. This will enable parties to make their voices heard and to make meaningful input into the design of the RAP’s. Consultative mechanisms will be structured at two levels:

8.3.1 Local level fora

Local level consultative fora will be elected, convened and run by the affected parties themselves and recognised by SANParks for purposes of liaison and communication, as well as for the election of representatives to the proposed Resettlement Working Group (RWG). Such local level fora will each have a constitution and keep regular minutes. If needed, they will be provided with training and seed money to be able to become functional. The local level fora are designed to empower resettlement-affected constituencies. To this end, they will be entitled to take grievances and appeals to the appropriate channels but will be encouraged to first channel these to the RWG. (see below). The proposed independent Monitoring Group will monitor the activities and minutes of the RWG. Secondly, the local level fora will elect representatives to the RWG (see below) in such a way as to allow for representation of the main categories of affected parties.

8.3.2 Resettlement Working Group (RWG)

The RWG will act as the primary advisory body to SANParks in all matters relating to resettlement. It will be constituted to be the primary representative voice of those
affected by resettlement. It will report to the gAENP Steering Committee. It will have the following functions:

- To act as the primary higher level channel of communication between the various interest groups/organisations involved in the planning and implementation of the RAP’s. In particular, it will serve to facilitate communication between SANParks and the affected populace.
- To serve as the court of first appeal to solve any problems including grievances.
- Assist the SANParks in overseeing the resettlement processes in all its phases.
- Monitoring the implementation of the RAP’s.

The composition of the RWG will be as follows:

- A representative of each of the following four affected constituencies
  - Farm workers who have previously been displaced and may be displaced by Phase I of gAENP.
  - Farmers who have been or are to be bought out by Phase I of gAENP.
  - Host communities, such as the townships of towns such as Addo, Jansenville, Kirkwood and Patterson, which have been, and could be, receiving farm workers moving off designated farms since 1 January 1997. Host community representative from farms.
  - Representatives of Addo Elephant National Park, responsible for resettlement as well as a senior SANParks official as chair.
- A representative of each of the following departments of the Government of the Eastern Cape.
  - Land Affairs
  - Agriculture
  - Tourism
- A representative of the Resettlement Monitoring Team, when it is on site (only to be co-opted if and when necessary).
- A representative from surrounding farms/agriculture. This representative would help to identify employment opportunities on neighbouring farms.
- An outside member with the necessary resettlement expertise.

The RWG will meet at least once every three to four months, following standard accepted practise. The chair will report to the AENP Park Steering Committee and the independent Monitoring Team. Meetings will be advertised beforehand and will be open to members of the public for information. Provision for translation between Afrikaans, English and Xhosa will be made at RWG meetings.

Claims are unlikely to be approved without referral to the RWG for information and comment unless exceptional circumstances prevail.

8.4 SANParks role
The ultimate responsibility for delivery and implementation of the RAP’s rests with SANParks. SANParks will ensure staff support for the planning and implementation of the RAP’s. It may, in addition, source consultants to support the resettlement officer. Independent consultants will be contracted to produce independent monitoring reports twice per annum.
SANParks role will include:

- Planning and managing implementation of all approved RAP’s in accordance with the RPF.
- Ensuring the maximum participation of the affected parties in the planning of the RAP’s.
- Obtaining/accessing and coordinating funding for the implementation of the RAP’s.
- Overseeing the training necessary for the ex-farmworkers to be inducted into new employment opportunities.
- Ensuring the monitoring and evaluation of the RAPs and the undertaking of appropriate remedial action so as to deal with grievances and to ensure that income restoration is satisfactorily implemented.
- Chairing the RWG.

In the spirit of co-operative governance, SANParks will engage the assistance of relevant government departments such as the Department of Agriculture, Land Affairs, Local Government and Housing.

8.5 Grievance redress mechanisms

Grievance redress mechanisms are essential tools for allowing affected people to voice concerns about the resettlement and compensation process as they arise and for corrective action to be taken timeously. Such mechanisms are fundamental to achieving transparency in the resettlement process. The proposed dispute or grievance mechanisms are as follows:

- **Disputes over value of compensation for land to be incorporated into the gAENP.** Disputes over the value of compensation will be referred to the RWG. If deemed necessary by the RWG, the case should be re-investigated. If the dispute cannot be resolved in this manner, the complainant has the right to seek legal redress, with the loser, as per norm, paying the court costs of the winner.

- **All other disputes and grievances** should be referred to the Resettlement Grievance Officer and follow the process as set out in Figure 4 below i.e. grievances and disputes can ultimately be lodged with the SANParks Board for a decision. A written record of all disputes/grievances raised and dealt with during the resettlement and compensation process should be kept by the RGO. The record of grievances lodged with the RGO will be monitored by the RWG and by the independent Monitoring Team. This should be undertaken as part of the on-going monitoring and evaluation process.
Figure 4: Grievance procedure

1. Affected party declares a grievance
2. Grievance sent to RGO and Resettlement
3. Grievance resolved
4. No Further action
5. Grievance sent to RWG
6. Grievance resolved
7. No Further action
8. Grievance sent to AENP Steering
9. Grievance resolved
10. No Further action
11. Grievance sent to SANParks Board
12. Grievance resolved
13. No Further action
8.6 Monitoring
SANParks will appoint an independent Monitoring Team to monitor the implementation of the RAP’s and the resettlement process. The Monitoring Team will be contracted to visit the gAENP twice per year. It will draft its reports before the end of each visit for submission to the Park Manager, the AENP Steering Committee and the RWG. The Monitoring Team’s costs will be funded out of the SANPark’s resettlement budget.

A database of all affected workers on both priority farms and all farms incorporated since 1997, is in the process of being compiled. This includes a photographic record of the workers and their housing. This information will also be provided to the RWG. The Social Ecologist, based in the gAENP, will in future supervise the resettlement planning process on each farm.
PART 2:
RESETTLEMENT ACTION PLANS (RAP’s) PLUS
INCOME RESTORATION STRATEGIES

Developed by Jill Gordon of SANPark’s
1. PURPOSE

This section of the report presents the proposed RAP’s for the six priority farms proposed for inclusion into the gAENP during year 1 of project implementation.

The priority farms have been purchased by SANParks for inclusion into the gAENP, over the last year (2002-2003), but are all at different stages of completion. The purchase priorities have been set in terms of the previously described land incorporation framework.

2. METHODOLOGY

Based on the RPF and a survey of the 6 farms, a data base was developed and interviews conducted ultimately resulting in the design and negotiation of the RAP’s including the preferred income restoration strategies. Access to farms was negotiated with the relevant landowners and where farmers were no longer on the farms they were interviewed, where possible, at their place of residence.

In addition to interviews undertaken on the identified farms, some ex-farmworkers were interviewed in the towns of Addo and Paterson to develop an overview of the socio-economic situation of those displaced from previously acquired farms. They were identified by using a “snowballing technique”, following up leads from interviews with current farmworkers. All interviews were conducted in the mother tongue of interviewees.

The RPF as an essential part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment, has been widely distributed for comment. The SANParks also received comment on the RPF and RAPs from the Department of Land Affairs (DLA). This letter is included as Annex 1.

Prior to these interviews the farmers were interviewed to ascertain whether they were aware of their responsibilities in terms of the Extension of Security and Tenure Act (ESTA), especially in terms of their responsibilities towards their farm workers. All farm owners were aware of ESTA and its implications and in most cases were able to offer workers alternative work on another farm. In the cases where the farmer had either reneged on his responsibilities or could not reach an agreement with the affected worker/s, SANParks offered the workers the option of working for the SANParks – Poverty Relief Programme. It is however a concern to SANParks that ESTA is not properly enforced, which results in a lot of farmers “dumping” their workers in nearby towns without any compensation. The SANParks purchase contract clearly stipulates that it is the owner’s responsibility to compensate or find alternative work for resident workers. If landowners refuse to compensate workers/families appropriately, SANParks will have to resort to legal action. In the interim where SANParks becomes aware that landowners have reneged on their responsibilities it will develop and implement RAP’s as outlined above to compensate ex-workers and their dependants.

---

2 Contract has been signed, but terms are different in terms of dates when farmers should leave the farm. Thus some farmers are still currently residing on the farms, while others have moved to another location.
3. MAIN FINDINGS

There are 69 dependants plus workers on the six farms. This comprises 26 main bread winners, another 9 income earners and 34 dependants. SANParks is currently responsible for ensuring that no less than 10 permanent workers (8 main bread winners + 2 additional workers) plus 10 dependants are compensated by it. This number could decrease if placements are found on farms as discussed with farmers and farm workers.

Figure 5: The six (6) priority farms are indicated on a Map 1, below:
4. INCOME RESTORATION STRATEGIES

Table 5: The following income restoration strategies have been agreed with each household:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Affected household</th>
<th>Income Restoration Strategy</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altever – Lefras</td>
<td>Breadwinner A (3 dependants</td>
<td>Option 1. Mr. A will be moving to another farm as a permanent employee with a brick house,</td>
<td>Mr A worked for Mr. Kruger as temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruger</td>
<td>wife and 2 daughters)</td>
<td>sink roof and 4 rooms. He will be taking his wife and daughters with him. His wife will work</td>
<td>employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breadwinner B (1 dependant –</td>
<td>Option 2. Mr. B has agreed to move back onto the farm into the house he has lived in for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wife)</td>
<td>34 years and therefore has tenure, according to ESTA. He has agreed to become employed in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the SANParks – Poverty Relief Programme, with a salary of three times as much as he used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to earn as a farm worker, work clothing, 1 main meal per day and transport to and from the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>worksite. His wife also has the option to work for the Poverty Relief Programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Option 2. Mr. B has agreed to move back onto the farm into the house he has lived in for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 years and therefore has tenure, according to ESTA. He has agreed to become employed in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the SANParks – Poverty Relief Programme, with a salary of three times as much as he used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to earn as a farm worker, work clothing, 1 main meal per day and transport to and from the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>worksite. His wife also has the option to work for the Poverty Relief Programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. B was born on the farm and has worked for the farmer’s family for about 34 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When SANParks purchased the farm, the farmer reportedly “dumped” him and his Wife in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Somerset East, with a small unemployment benefit, which was consequently stolen, as Mr. B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is totally illiterate and did not know the correct procedures to draw on this unemployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>benefit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>Affected household</td>
<td>Income Restoration Strategy</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grobblerskraal – Dave Hendersen</td>
<td>Worker C (no dependants)</td>
<td>Option 1. Mr. C has already moved with the farmer to another farm and is now a permanent employee with an increased salary.</td>
<td>Mr. D's salary has improved to 5 times more than what he earned as a farm worker. He now also receives pension benefits as a SANParks' employee. He continues to live in his farmhouse (brick house, sink roof, 4 rooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breadwinner D (wife and daughter)</td>
<td>Option 6. Mr. D was a general worker on the farm, but is now permanently employed as a Field ranger for SANParks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breadwinner E (wife and daughter)</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middelfontein – Machiel (Gielie) van Tonder</td>
<td>Worker F (no dependants)</td>
<td>Option 2/ unresolved. SANParks management agreed to try and integrate Mr. F into the Poverty Relief Programme, while he remains in his current accommodation.</td>
<td>Mr. F is apparently mentally challenged and would not allow himself to be interviewed. The farmer and his sister, who also works for the same farm, answered on his behalf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breadwinner G (1 dependant – daughter)</td>
<td>Option 2/Unresolved. Although SANParks offered Saariel a job in the Poverty Relief Programme, she declined this position,</td>
<td>As the farmer will be discontinuing all his farming operations and will be moving to a town, he has</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Affected household</th>
<th>Income Restoration Strategy</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kruidfontein -</td>
<td>Breadwinner H (1 dependant - grandchild)</td>
<td>as she prefers to move back to the town of Somerset East. She has however agreed to reconsider working in the programme should the programme wish to employ people from Somerset East and she would be able to work from home. SANParks will hand her name to the programme and monitor all possibilities.</td>
<td>endeavoured to pay out the worker’s unemployment + a six month salary. In addition he will be building onto the worker’s father’s house in Somerset East, in order to provide extra space for the worker and her daughter. The farmer also endeavours to find another job the breadwinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christo Lombard</td>
<td>Breadwinner I (4 dependants – mother and sisters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breadwinner J (2 dependants – common law wife and 1 child)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. H is retired and receiving a state pension but will go with farmer to other farm. He will live in a similar house (3 bedrooms, brick, sink roof, bathroom).

Option 1. Moving with farmer with same responsibilities and same housing.

Option 2. Will become part of SANParks Poverty Relief Programme

The farmer cannot accommodate Mr J on the other farm and worker has no other options.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Affected household</th>
<th>Income Restoration Strategy</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worker K (no dependants)</td>
<td>Option 2. Will become part of SANParks Poverty Relief Programme</td>
<td>The farmer cannot accommodate worker K on the other farm and worker has no other options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker L (no dependants)</td>
<td>Option 1. Moving with farmer with same responsibilities and same housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker M</td>
<td>Option 1. Moving with farmer with same responsibilities and same housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadwinner N (3 children – 1 also employed by farmer)</td>
<td>Option 1. Moving with farmer with same responsibilities and same housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadwinner O (no dependants)</td>
<td>Option 2/unresolved. SANParks has Mr. O's details on record and will monitor what will happen to him</td>
<td>The farmer has offered Mr O another job at the next farm, but he has not decided as yet to go with.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker P (no dependants)</td>
<td>Option 1. Moving with farmer with same responsibilities and same housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>Affected household</td>
<td>Income Restoration Strategy</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadwinner Q (wife – works as domestic for farmer, 1 – 17 year old son, daughter 34, sometimes casual on farm.)</td>
<td>Option 2. Although SANParks is concerned about the problem cases of the children, a job has been offered to the couple in the Poverty Relief Programme. They will continue to live in the current house.</td>
<td>The farmer has offered Mr and Mrs Q a job on the other farm but does not want the children to go along, as they have apparently been problem cases as in drunken sprawls and stock theft. The workers have therefore opted to not go with the farmer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadwinner R (3 dependants, wife also works for farmer + 2 sons)</td>
<td>Option 1. Moving with farmer with same responsibilities and same housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker S (no dependants)</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Casual worker and will not be moving with the farmer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker T (no dependants)</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Casual worker and will not be moving with the farmer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoemanskroon – Cornelius (Neels) Lombard</td>
<td>Worker U (no dependants)</td>
<td>Option 1. The farmer offered this worker a similar job, with a similar salary and housing at another farm. Mr. U is happy with this and has agreed to move with the farmer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>Affected household</td>
<td>Income restoration strategy</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr V (2 other workers in his house, who also works for the farmer – his son, and nephew, and 2 dependants, his daughter and granddaughter)</td>
<td>Option 1. The farmer offered these workers a similar job, with a similar salary and housing at another farm. The workers are happy with this and have agreed to move with the farmer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms W (1 daughter who also works for the farmer and 2 dependants – daughter and niece)</td>
<td>Option 1. Same as above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkesrivier – Jakobus (Kobus) Lombard</td>
<td>Breadwinner X (wife, who also works for the farmer and 3 dependants -2 daughters and 1 son.</td>
<td>Option 4. The farmer had offered the worker another job when he moves, however until such time that he knows where he will settle next, the worker is not ready to make a decision to go along to the other farm. In the meantime the worker will continue to work on the current farm, with the same benefits such as salary and housing. The worker is aware that SANParks now has all his/her details on record and will monitor his/her future movements</td>
<td>This couple has worked on this farm for 9 years and is happy with life on the farm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. MONITORING PROCESS

A database of all affected workers on both priority farms, ie the remaining 7 farms proposed for phase 1 inclusion and on all other farms proposed for inclusion into the gAENP is in the process of being compiled. This includes a photographic record of the workers and their housing. This information will be provided to the RWG and used by SANParks to develop and monitor implementation of the RAP's as well as the socio-economic situation of workers and dependants moving out of Addo to other farms with farmers. At some point SANParks will need to introduce monitoring of host farm communities to ensure that they are not disadvantaged. An independent bi-annual review will be put into place to monitor the implementation of the RAP's.

Figure 6: Consultant interviewing farm workers for resettlement data base.

Figure 7: Ronnie Gcageciso, who now works as a SANParks field officer – former farm worker in Addo area.
6. CONCLUSION

Having followed the recommendations made in the RPF for +, SANParks is confident that the process for drawing up RAPs is thorough, participative and consultative. SANParks is committed to implement this process with each and every piece of land to be included (whether by direct purchase or by contractual means) into the gAENP. In doing so SANParks will ensure:

- Maximum participation by the affected people in the entire resettlement process through setting up of the Resettlement Working Group and drawing up RAPs.
- Proper identification of those already displaced from farms that have been bought up for the gAENP, through a database, currently being collated.
- That appropriate jobs are identified for those who have been displaced, and who continue to be displaced, and reserving these employment opportunities for them, either through the Poverty Relief Programme or as permanent employees as jobs become available.
- Training for the displaced workers in order to ensure that they will be able to perform satisfactorily in their new jobs, as part of the identified capacity building programme.
- Providing alternative accommodation and facilities for those losing access to benefits on the farms acquired/to be acquired, by allowing workers to continue to live in their current accommodation while working for the Poverty Relief programme, while SANParks negotiates with the Department of Housing to obtain the R15 000 grant per household to build a house in the town of their own choice.
- Investigation of the viability of alternative income generating strategies and management of the implementation of these strategies, particularly through negotiations with the Department of Land Affairs in terms of the Land Reform Grants, which afford each household a grant of R20 000, through which profitable agricultural activities may result.
APPENDIXES
Dear Ms Gordon

Re: DEPARTMENTS INVOLVEMENT AND OPINION ON gAENP PROGRAMME AND RESETTLEMENT POLICY

I refer to your e-mail dated 27 January 2003 and addressed to my colleague Mr Mxolisi Ngangani.

The writer and Mr Ngangani have perused the draft documentation dealing with Land Incorporation Framework and Resettlement Management Framework as presented by your institution. You have requested feedback on these documents and in particular requested an endorsement by this Department of the gAENP Programme initiatives.

As previously stated in various communication and platforms, this Department fully supports the broader initiative if this would mean the improvement of socio-economic conditions of the area as a whole and the marginalised communities in particular.

As roleplayers may have noted from our interaction, this Department, notwithstanding its support for the broader initiative, has a responsibility in ensuring that the rights of farm dwellers and/or occupiers are not compromised in the process. The Department has set out to further assess how it could optimally use its resources in partnership with the other roleplayers to ensure that agricultural initiatives could be embarked
upon to ensure that the communities who previously relied on employment on the acquired farms could be catered for.

This Department acknowledges your recognition in fulfilling your mandate that “resettlement cannot occur in isolation, but rather through a joint effort by various responsible government departments” and also that SANP “acknowledges the legal obligation and responsibilities associated with park expansion services”.

As a Department therefore and in the light of the afore-mentioned, there are a few issues that relate to the tenure security of the farm occupiers that need further redress. It is however fair to mention that these are continuously being addressed by all roleplayers.

It is expected that many of these concerns will be further addressed in future meetings and with the release of the Resettlement Action Plans for each property acquired.

This Department is however encouraged by the input of roleplayers thus far, as well as the efforts of the SANP in ensuring that such inputs are taken note of. It is anticipated the further communication with the relevant roleplayers would seriously address the findings and the recommendations in the Resettlement Framework and Action Plan Summary for the gAENP.

This Department looks forward to further engaging with yourself and other roleplayers on this initiative.

With kind regards.

Signature

for DLA PROVINCIAL DIRECTOR: EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE
DATE: 26 February 2003
Annexure 2:
Pro forma: Relocation Plans for below-mentioned farm workers: (signed endorsements in hard copy)

Farm name: .......................................

Farm owner: ......................................

SANParks staff member: .................................. Title: ........................................

Independent person: .................................. Title: ........................................

Farm worker/s + dependants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm workers’ names</th>
<th>Dependant’s names</th>
<th>Option decided on (indicate number)</th>
<th>Worker’s signatures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I/we, ........................................................................................................................................

...................................................................................................................................................

I/we, ........................................................................................................................................

...................................................................................................................................................

I/we, ........................................................................................................................................

...................................................................................................................................................

I/we, ........................................................................................................................................

...................................................................................................................................................

agree that the Greater Addo Elephant National Park project has been explained to me/us, in my/our own language. I/we understand the implications of the Extension and Security Act (ESTA), explained to me/us by a staff member of SANParks and an independent consultant. I/we understand that due to this process the following options
are available to me. I have chosen the option that suits me the best and am happy with my choice.

1. The farmer has offered me a similar job, with a similar salary and housing at another farm. I am happy to move to this other farm under the same conditions.

2. Employed in the SANParks - Poverty Relief Programme for no more than 4 years, until the discontinuation of said programme:

   In terms of this option I/we understand the following:

   • that my dependants and I may continue to live in my/our current accommodation, until the discontinuation of the programme, after which alternative arrangements will be made.
   • that the Poverty Relief Programme pays R35 per day and will provide transport to and from the jobsite.
   • that alternative arrangements for accommodation will be made should the jobsite be too far to travel to on a daily basis.
   • that I will be included in a capacity building programme through the Poverty Relief Programme and SANParks to increase my opportunities in the greater job market.

3. That the farmer has offered me another job at another farm but, because it is not in an area that I am familiar with, the farmer has assisted me in finding another job at a farm or in town nearby.

4. The farmer had offered me another job when he moves however, until such time that he knows where he will settle next, I am not ready to make a decision to go along to the other farm. I am aware that SANParks now has all my details on record and will monitor my future movements.

Signed on this day ........................................ at ..................................................
Annexure 3:
TASK ONE QUESTIONNAIRE

PRIORITY FARMS RESETTLEMENT DATABASE OF AFFECTED FARM WORKERS

MARCH 2003

Questionnaire Background
SANParks has appointed Sandy & Mazizi Consulting cc to develop a comprehensive database of affected farm workers on farms they have purchased for incorporation into the Greater Addo Elephant National Park. These farms are also referred to as priority farms. The role of Sandy & Mazizi Consulting cc is to provide SANParks with a detailed database for use in future discussions and negotiations with affected farm workers.

The database should include a digital record of the affected worker and their abode. This record will be used by SANParks to track the impacts of the relocation process. It is not the role of Sandy & Mazizi Consulting cc to discuss or negotiate with farm workers around the relocation process. Any queries on the relocation process will be noted as part of the process and included in the final report to SANParks.

Individual surveys are being conducted on every affected household. It is important that the survey is conducted with the head of the household. The assistance of other members of the household will be encouraged to ensure that the information gathered in this process is as comprehensive as possible. All the information gathered through this process will be verified with the farmer owner. Any discrepancies in information will be referred back to the affected farm worker.

In order to ensure that a fair, equitable and sustainable process is implemented accurate and comprehensive information is required. Your participation in this process forms an important component of ensuring that a sustainable process is implemented and is highly appreciated.

Section 1: Introduction and Contact Details of Farm Owner and Farm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer’s Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique ID No for Photograph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Owners Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address of Farm Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephonic Contact Details of Farm Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Permanent Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Temporary/Seasonal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2: Introduction and Contact Details of Affected Farm Worker and Household

Q1. Farm Worker's First Name .................................................................

Q2. Farm Worker's Surname .................................................................

Q3. ID No ............................................................................................

Q4. Farm Worker's Postal Address ......................................................
........................................................................................................

Q5. Farm Worker's Contact Phone Number ........................................

Q6. Contact Phone Number and Name of a relative or friend that has regular contact with you but does not stay on this farm?
........................................................................................................

Q7. Gender (tick appropriate box)

Male ........................................... Female .................................

Q8. Age .................................................. (provide year e.g. 1956)

Q9. Educational Level .................................................................

Q10. Occupation on the farm, what is the main job that you do?
........................................................................................................

Q11. How long have you been employed/ working on this farm (where possible obtain a date)?
........................................................................................................
Q12. What is your monthly income/salary/wage? (Check it is the monthly wage and not weekly)

Q12.1. Do you receive an annual bonus or other bonuses? Y/N

Q12.2. If yes, how much and how often? ...................................................

Q12.3. Are you the only provider? Y/N

Q12.4. If no, please tell us about ALL other household providers and their relation to the household head?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Relation to Household Head</th>
<th>Full Time or Part Time</th>
<th>Monthly Salary or Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section C. Spouse and Dependant Details

Q13. Spouses First Name and Surname (if applicable)

First Name: ............................................. Surname: .................................

Q14. What is her/his position on the farm, nature of employment?

........................................................................................................

Q15. What monthly income/wage/ salary does she/he receive?

........................................................................................................

Q16. What is your combined/total monthly income for the household?

........................................................................................................

Q17. How many dependants do you have?

........................................................................................................
Q18. What are their names and ages?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Date of Birth/ Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Benefits and other income

Q19. Other than the monthly incomes listed above do you have any other sources of income or means of making money? Y/N

Q20. If Yes, what are the other sources of income, please describe this?

.................................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................................

Q21. How much money do you make from this and how often? (if more than one source of extra income list these separately)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source (list separately)</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source (list separately)</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source (list separately)</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q22. Do you have access to schooling for your dependants? Y/N
Q22. 1. If Yes, describe where (on the farm/in town) and for how many children?

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

Q23. Do you have access to electricity? Y/N

Q23. 1. If Yes, describe (prepaid, the farmer pays for me or I buy my own?)

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

Q24. Do you have access to clean water? Y/N

Q24. 1. If Yes, describe (a running tap in your house, outside my house, elsewhere on the farm - type e.g. borehole/dam/river)

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

Q25. Do you have access to sewage and sanitation? Y/N

Q25. 1. If Yes, describe (flushing toilet in the house/outside toilet (type - long drop/flushing)

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

Q26. Are you supplied with working clothes? Y/N

Q26. 1. If Yes, describe? (What and how often)

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

Q27. Do you have access to transportation for trips to town? Y/N

Q27. 1. If Yes, how many and how often? (state length of trip)

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

Q28. Are you provided with training or have you been trained previously? Y/N

Q28. 1. If Yes, describe

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

Q29. Does the farmer pay UIF on your behalf? Y/N
Q30. Do you receive any form of medical assistance? Y/N

Q30.1. If yes, please describe (the farmer pays for all my medical, he takes me to the doctor but I pay for myself)

Q31. Do you receive any pension benefits? Y/N

Q31.2. If yes please describe, state how much and how often where applicable? (I presently receive pension payouts – indicate from where (govt or farmer/the farmer will provide me with a pension when I retire/ the farmer has a pension fund for me)

Q32. Do you own any livestock? Y/N

Q32.1. If yes, list what kinds and how many?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livestock Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle (Cows/Bulls/Tollie)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses/ponies/donkeys/mules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q33. Does your homestead have access to arable land that you use for cultivation? Y/N

Q33.1. If Yes, how many fields, what size and what crops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop type</th>
<th>Size of field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q34. Do you receive any funeral benefits? Y/N

Q34.1. If Yes, describe (I am provided land for a grave, the farmer pays for funerals)
Q35. Indicate which of the follows rations you receive on a monthly basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity (kg etc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize Meal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Beans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinned Fish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Packets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peanut Butter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powdered Milk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tins of Jam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken Pieces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunlight Soup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q35. What other benefits/ration do you receive from living on the farm or from the farmer?

........................................................................................................

........................................................................................................

**Section E: Housing**

Q36. No of people living permanently in the house? ........................................

Q37. Detailed description of the house?

   No of Rooms (distinguish bedrooms from lounge and kitchen)

   .................................................................

   Size ................................................................

   Type (brick, wood, zinc, face brick) ........................................

   Roof Type .....................................................
Section F: General

Q38. Do you have any questions, comments or queries?

..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
Annexure 4:
List of groups and or individuals consulted during the process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>How and When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Land Affairs</td>
<td>One on one meetings and also in group meetings during the Public participation Process during the Strategic Environmental Assessment process. Regular telephonic conversations on a weekly basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>One on one meetings, thus far three meetings over the last year (2002-2003) and as part of the Addo Planning Forum (APF) meetings, which takes place every three months. Two independent interviews during the RPF process – one on one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing</td>
<td>One, one on one meeting thus far and they have been invited to sit on the APF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>One, one on one meeting thus far and have also been invited to sit on the APF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer’s Associations</td>
<td>One on one meetings at least every second month, two workshops and they also sit on the APF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>5 open, public meetings, one on one interviews as inclusion arose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm workers</td>
<td>5 open, public meetings, one on one interviews as inclusion arose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>