CONTEXT

• Historical legacy
• Extreme racial and gender inequalities
• 80% of population on 13% of land
• Unemployment and poverty
• Impact of environmental degradation and climate change
35.8 million people of working age in South Africa (15 – 64 yrs)

Youth 19.7 million (15-24 yrs)
- 9.9 million Labour force
- 6.3 million Employed
- 3.6 million Unemployed
- 9.8 million Not economically active

45% Black Female Unemployment

Adults 16.1 million (35-64 yrs)
- 11.1 million Labour force
- 9.2 million Employed
- 1.9 million Unemployed
- 5.0 million Not economically active
Socio-Economic Purpose

- Enhancing the livelihoods of beneficiaries
- Enhancing the human capital of beneficiaries
- Enhancing the social capital of beneficiaries
The history of plant invasions in South Africa
“Over simplified” Spectrum of Land Degradation

Desertification

Bush Encroachments & Invasives
South Africa Water Use

Water Use by Sector

- Agriculture, 60.00%
- Environment, 18.00%
- Urban and Domestic, 11.50%
- Mining and Industrial, 10.50%
NRM Programmes vision and purpose:

“to support sustainable livelihoods for local people through integrated landscape management that strives for resilient social-ecological systems and which fosters equity in access to ecosystem services.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRM Programme Targets 2017-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143 665 person days of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of wildfires suppressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 367 full time jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 429 small businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 354 hectares of degraded land and 132 wetlands under restoration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Challenge

- Government invests around R2 billion per year creating the equivalent of between 21 000 and 25 000 full time jobs.
- There is an annual demand for around R12 billion worth of investment with a potential of 95 000 jobs.
- Government cannot do it on its own.
Market Mechanisms

- Direct contracting
- Partnering with implementing agencies
- Land user incentives program
Resource allocation – prioritisation used in previous call for proposals

**Evaluation Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Poverty &amp; Unemployment, Local Household Income and Mean Living Level of Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct dependence on ecosystems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

- **Green**: No persons below the Minimum Living Level (MLL)
- **Yellow - Red**: Persons below the MLL

Legend

- **Blue**: Reliance on natural resources
- **Yellow**: Priority 1
- **Red**: Priority 2

Maps showing geographical distribution of poverty and reliance on natural resources.
Resource allocation – prioritisation used in previous call for proposals cont.

**Evaluation Criteria**

**Biodiversity**

**Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation**
Resource allocation – prioritisation used in previous call for proposals cont

Evaluation Criteria

Watershed services i.e. Water Flow Demand and Water quality

Fire Risk and vulnerability
Targets

Socio-economic Targets:
- 55% female
- 65% youth
- 2% disabled

Reality:
- Bureaucratic processes a challenge
- Reporting and data management
- Targets difficult to meet: Gender & Training
Outputs and Outcomes
Environmental and Social

- Improvement in containment of invasive species
- Land restored
- Decrease in disaster fires
- Capacity building programs
- Awareness campaigns

- Restore biodiversity
- Water security
- Productive potential of land
- Climate resilience
- Increased confidence and pride in work
- Greater public awareness
Outcomes – Economic Development

- Cycle of Poverty difficult to break
- Too few days of employment per person
- Irregular contracts and delays (due to systems)
- Very low wage levels
Challenge and Criticisms

Bureaucracy
Mindset
  Service Provider vs. Partner
  Expectation vs. Reality
Wage Rate
Advocacy
Conclusion: Is it really PES?

- Voluntary?
- Well-defined environmental service?
- Buyer/Seller?
- Conditionality?
Thank You