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Preamble:

The rangeland restoration and Meat Naturally initiative in the northern Eastern Cape has been driven by Conservation SA in partnership with local NGOs (LIMA, INR and ERS), as a collective under the Umzimvubu Catchment Partnership (UCPP) since 2013. This is outlined in the Rangeland Toolkit produced by the UCPP collective in February 2016 (www.umzimvubu.org/toolkits/rangeland).

The million dollar question remained: HOW to sustain a sufficient supply of quality cattle off soundly managed rangelands, without dependence upon external funding. CSA’s Meat Naturally Pty business model (MNP) provides a market context (buyers and revenue flow), while this model provides a scaffold for sustaining the supply: a pro-poor entrepreneurial enterprise with dual benefits for rural livelihoods and ecological infrastructure, with positive conservation and biodiversity outcomes, simultaneously building the resilience of both rural communities and the landscapes they depend upon.

Compiled by Sissie Matela and Nicky McLeod, on behalf of Conservation SA and the UCPP collective
1. PURPOSE OF THE MODEL & RATIONALE FOR THE INTERVENTION IN THE EASTERN CAPE COMMUNAL GRASSLANDS

The Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-4), which is a 2014 mid-term review outlining progress made towards achieving the goals and targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, indicates that ‘plausible pathways exist for achieving the 2050 vision for an end to biodiversity loss, in conjunction with key human development goals, limiting climate change and combating land degradation. However, reaching these joint objectives require changes in society, and in particular major transformations of food systems. Analysis of the major primary sectors indicates that drivers linked to agriculture account for 70 percent of the projected loss of terrestrial biodiversity. Solutions for achieving sustainable farming and food systems include sustainable productivity increases...by restoring ecosystem services in agricultural landscapes’.

South Africa’s grasslands constitute some of our most important catchments, with less than 18% of these strategic water source areas under formal protection (NBA 2011). Grasslands contribute an estimated R8000/km² per annum as natural grazing value (NBA 2011, pg 5), while their value as ecological infrastructure is inestimable.

“In impoverished rural areas, where the cash economy is a sporadic trickle, natural capital contributes significantly to people’s direct daily consumption (such as food, clean water, fuel wood and building material), income generation (such as the sale of medicinal plants and reed mats) and a crucial safety net for households in times of shock or need. This contribution from the natural environment is seldom considered, yet it holds substantial value. Small reductions in ecosystem services can have large welfare impacts (NBA 2011 pg 48)”

The MNP rangeland stewardship and restoration approach has potential to address multiple developmental challenges simultaneously, including:
- Biodiversity threats, exacerbated by alien infestation & rangeland degradation
- Increased water security, fostered through improved catchment management
- Governance challenges, building in traditional and respected practises
- Poverty and livelihood issues, enhancing livestock-based enterprises and generating job-equivalent income for rural households

The basic principle underpinning the MNP approach is that healthy rangelands will produce increased quantity (within carrying capacity) and quality of livestock, which, with improved market access, will improve returns for rural livelihoods, with a positive feedback loop for better rangeland stewardship to support this stock, resulting in improved basal cover and grassland biodiversity, with improved ecosystem services. Livestock can thus double as livelihood assets as well as a tool for landscape management and restoration.

A ‘model’ was defined by the collective partners involved in the 2015 Umzimvubu rangeland restoration toolkit (CSA, ERS, LIMA, INR) as a tested, offer-able intervention package, or a practically proven way of doing something, which for the objective of this exercise, is within in a development intervention context.

The overall approach is the result of an initial vision developed by the Umzimvubu Catchment partnership in 2012 for restoration of the catchment, based on the overarching hypothesis that improved stewardship and livelihoods are inextricably linked:
- A healthy Umzimvubu Upper Catchment ecosystem will improve the grazing potential for livestock and the quality and quantity of water available and thereby enhance food, water, and economic security in the face of climate change;
- The state of these ecosystems lies in the hands of people who live within them who will restore or conserve rangeland and freshwater systems when it is beneficial to them and they have the tools to do so;

At the time of writing, the UN had recently adopted a stance in support of pastoralism and rangeland management as a key climate resilience and livelihood augmentation strategy.
The overall objectives of the Meat Naturally rangeland restoration model are to **improve rural incomes and secure water, food, and climate change resilience for the long term benefit of people and nature**. The methodology for implementing this model is provided in the Rangeland / MNI Toolkit, produced by the Umzimvubu Catchment Partnership Programme, which can be accessed at [www.umzimvubu.org/toolkits/rangeland](http://www.umzimvubu.org/toolkits/rangeland).

This exercise identified and explored some of the constraints for securing the ‘grassland to grill’ concept, and the report provides initial recommendations for a **framework of key elements (please refer to figure 1 below)** to facilitate a **regular sustained supply of healthy cattle off improved communal rangelands to the Meat Naturally Pty business structure**, by rural communal stock farmers.

### 2. UNLOCKING LIMITATIONS AND OBSTACLES FOR HEALTHY RANGELANDS AND DEVELOPMENT THROUGH SUPPLYING MNP

Successful land restoration efforts, or conservation outcomes, have been achieved in other developing countries as a result of improving livelihood security and resilience, namely poverty alleviation outcomes, often more successfully when the latter is the primary objective. This dual aim can be achieved through unlocking the constraints faced by land rights holders, users and governance structures: building social capital to restore the natural capital which underpins livelihood security.

Extensive literature review from southern and east African experience summarised in the mid-term report for this model development (see annexure 1) indicates that some of the central, almost non-negotiable, elements for sustained pro-poor conservation interventions are underpinned by restoring social capital and governance, and include:

- **allowing traditional institutions to function effectively** through identifying and addressing or removing constraints;
- **integration of restoration efforts into existing local regulations** and sanction systems;
- **clearly linking conservation actions with livelihood resource improvements** through recognition of existing knowledge, capacity and ownership by stakeholders, and fostering peer-exchange learning;
- **support and guidance, through adaptive co-management**, rather than imposition by external agents, which is strongly aligned with the first two points above.

The MNP sustainability model in principle aligns with the above precepts, and should focus on:

- **identifying and securing valued rangeland assets** and threats to it (natural capital);
- **identifying and enhancing functional local governance systems** within that landscape (social capital);
- **incorporating value-adding actions and benefits** linked to livestock and rangeland use;
- **linking the above interventions through stewardship agreements** between MNP and supply communities.

The MNP model provides access for stock farmers, through a negotiated stewardship agreement for improved rangeland management and specified livestock supply, to mobile auctions and husbandry-linked benefits. To date, six successful auctions have been held in the Matatiele area (see annexure 2), involving over 150 households realising an average of R16 000 per household per auction. The model hinges on the annual or bi-annual sale of cattle at village-based auctions, and the regular supply of healthy cattle off improved grassland for these auctions: the sales are both an incentive and reward for compliance by stock owners and grazing management structures with agreed stewardship conditions, including grazing management for improving grassland quality and cover. A 5% commission from the sales (lower than formal auction commissions of 6%) will be re-invested through grazing management structures as benefits for compliance, and to cover auction overheads.
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Sustaining a regular quality supply of livestock for these auctions will be the deal-breaker for success of the business model: extracts from the literature research carried out during this exercise indicate that formal cattle auctions in the past have met with limited success for the following reasons (Vetter, 2013):
- people prefer to keep their cattle, serving the range of non-cash livelihood activities;
- mistrust of the marketing system;
- low prices and high costs of getting cattle to auction sites.

Salomon, Bayer, Moyo and others (in Vetter, 2013) attribute the limited success for improving income from livestock auctions sales to:
- insufficient grazing land and grazing quality;
- small average herd size (low numbers of excess for sale);
- weak institutional capacity to manage common grazing resources;
- low stock productivity due to disease, drought and theft.

These concerns and findings are re-iterated in the Matatiele experiences. The majority of livestock sales occur within the communal areas (Ainslee, Bayer and others in Vetter, 2013, and Pers. Comm. with Focus Discussion Groups), where a greater sense of trust among like people prevails. Many owners also keep small stock: greater understanding of the contribution of the latter to livelihoods and social dynamics could open potential for increasing general livestock sale volumes, where small stock represent a smaller fraction of the flock, and have a higher reproductive rate, being replaced more quickly (Bayer et al in Vetter, 2013; pers.comm. Dr Merida Roets, Kokstad). It would also facilitate greater participation by women and a higher percentage of the target community, many of whom own small stock but not cattle, and this do not currently benefit from the MNP market access benefits. This is an important principle for MNP support facilitators and partner agents to explore, in order to avoid elite capture by already better-off cattle owners.

In the mid-term report (annexure 1) we explored the role of livestock as a multi-purpose resource: while commercial ranchers keep livestock mainly for income purposes (i.e. breeding for sale), rural communal households keep livestock for dual purposes:

a. Traditional and cultural use (assets, draught, lobola, funerals and other ritual purposes, etc) AND
b. For commercial purposes (cash income from sale through auctions).

Respecting and building this dual herd composition, through breeding programmes for the former to supply the latter commercial component, while allowing owners to retain their traditional herd component, could contribute to increased security of supply for MNP auctions.

These obstacles and their proposed redress actions, based on discussions with stakeholders including stock owners, are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: OBSTACLES AND PROPOSED ACTIONS TO REDRESS THEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBSTACLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People prefer to keep their cattle (serving the range of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-cash livelihood activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrust of the marketing system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low prices and high costs of getting cattle to auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient grazing land and grazing quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Small average herd size (low numbers of excess for sale)
- Increased technical husbandry interventions to support breeding and productivity rates of both cultural and commercial stock in herds.

### Weak institutional capacity to manage common grazing resources
- Increase social capital capacity: identify, revive and build upon traditional governance systems, including grazing associations, with savings groups model as ‘co-operative management’ structure.

### Low stock productivity due to disease, drought and theft
- Husbandry support, feed supplements as incentives, rotational grazing / rest to improve fodder stock and quality and build resilience, support for ‘aggravating factors’ through ecorangers and police links.

---

### 3. THE UMZIMVUBU EXPERIENCE: WORKABLE SCENARIOS FOR REPLICATION

After three years of piloting in the Ward 14 area of Matatiele, focused group discussions (FGDs) were carried out in three villages (Motseng, Thaba-chicha and Mafube) that have been part of different grazing management programs facilitated by the implementing partners, namely CSA, LIMA and ERS. A summary of the discussions is provided in annexure 3. The purpose of these discussions was outlined by the facilitators as:

‘Sustainable livestock farming for red meat production: how can we secure effective community participation, by the different tiers within communities, through land and water management of communal rangeland, in order to produce adequate desired quality of cattle, independent of external funding to supply the market on an ongoing basis, contributing to better livelihoods’. A semi-structured interview process was utilised with three groups:

**Motseng village**: has been a part of an intensive livestock and rangeland management effort for 3 years, building on a prior land stewardship relationship. Input has been intensive, based on an agreed rotational grazing programme with a communal herd. Throughout the period, support for the community has aimed at supporting livestock owners to become livestock farmers. In their first auction, the community sold a lot of livestock, the second one it doubled and the third one it decreased notably (refer to the auction statistics in appendix 2). This huge difference and change is attributed to improper planning for long term livestock management, and the incentive of, and excitement generated by, the inoculations done prior to the first auction. The Motseng project had intensive ecoranger support, with night kraaling of the communal herd facilitating some exciting recovery of groundcover in areas cleared of alien wattle stands.

**Thaba-chicha**: seven villages have ecorangers supporting herders on a rotational rest basis, without a communal herd, but with some voluntary night kraaling for trampling. They have had three years of husbandry support and three auctions in conjunction with Motseng owners, as part of the wider ward 14 interventions.

**Mafube** has tested rotational rest for 3 years as a form of grazing plan for rangeland management, also as part of support for alien plant clearing. They have had 2 auctions.

In all these areas, there are people interested in what they are doing and want to take things to the next level meaning turning auctions into a business model: this largely depends upon the community’s co-operation and willingness to do the work.

Informal discussions with livestock owners in the Mzongwana area of Ward 7 in Matatiele also added to the lessons learnt from the FGDs. Mzongwana participants commenced a trial rest area in the previous season (2015/16), with limited input from five part-time ecorangers supported through the DEA NRM programme to keep livestock out of the agreed rest area. This was successful in leaving standing winter fodder, with
supplements provided to those owners who agreed on the rest area. An initial auction was held at the start of winter this year, with a follow up auction planned for November 2016.

The FGD findings and Mzongwana feedback were combined with several think-tank exercises with facilitators and implementing partners, to try and structure and rate several scenarios emerging from the pilot project experience and FGD feedback, which scenarios could be replicated as a means of supplying MNP.

These scenarios are outlined in Table 2 below, and provide a simplified summary of options within the greater model to suit the various enabling or constraining conditions within the landscape and social systems of an area.

**Scenario 1** is a no intervention, or control, scenario, reflecting the current status in many communal areas, where no rangeland governance system is in place, or is dysfunctional.

**Scenario 2** has some degree of mobilisation intervention, with a fairly low intensity of facilitation and external inputs, at around R200/ha rangeland, with low to medium benefits after one year of testing. It is based on some degree of functional governance which is being revived through mobilisation and facilitation support. This reflects the situation at Mzongwana which is being further tweaked with increasing awareness by, and collaboration with, land users, specifically traditional leadership and livestock owners. Increased participation is in response to observation of the success of rested areas, provision of supplement blocks to participating owners, and an initial successful auction.

**Scenario 3** has a slightly higher intensity of inputs, reflecting the piloted work in the Thaba Chicha area villages of ward 14, where husbandry inputs have been a key incentive for participation and fairly strong traditional leadership prevails, with a system of penalties for transgressions. It has a slightly better cost-benefit ratio than the other options. Cost per hectare estimated at R350.

**Scenario 4** is based on the full scale approach piloted in the Motseng area of ward 14, with the highest intensity of inputs (facilitation, time and expense for husbandry training and equipment) and high overall benefits for both livelihoods and the landscape. Average investment cost per rangeland hectare is R600 (or R13 800 including alien plant clearing). This the most costly and intense scenario to replicate. This has also been translated into a R10 000 investment per stock owner for the first year of establishment (G. Nel, pers. comm.)

The intensity of the interventions in any of the scenarios should be based on the readiness for uptake, as well as resourcing: see sections 4.1 and 4.2 for description of these ‘readiness’ elements, and which scenario would be most appropriate for a beneficiary community, as described below in Table 2:

---

*A community mapping exercise during the initial mobilisation and feasibility stage will help everyone (support partners and community members) to understand the landscape elements and who grazes where. It also assists with determining ‘uptake readiness’, leadership issues, rangeland status and social capacity, helping to establish the intensity of support required.*
### TABLE 2: SCORING MATRIX FOR DIFFERENT PILOTED GRAZING MANAGEMENT SCENARIOS IN MATATIELE, UPPER UMZIMVUBU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COSTS AND BENEFITS RATED AS FOLLOWS on SCALE 1-5:</th>
<th>SCENARIO 1: open access, unmanaged, no rest, no interventions</th>
<th>SCENARIO 2: low intensity - rotational rest, no herd or night kraaling, limited ecorangers, some trampling with lick blocks e.g. MZONGWANA &amp; MAFUBE</th>
<th>SCENARIO 3: medium intensity - managed rotational rest, no communal herd, limited ecorangers, night kraaling e.g. THABA CHICHA &amp; MVENYANE</th>
<th>SCENARIO 4: high intensity - managed rotational grazing with communal herd &amp; ecorangers, night kraaling, incentives e.g. MOTSENG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED INVESTMENT COSTS FOR FACILITATION &amp; INPUTS / HA</td>
<td>0 (very low)</td>
<td>4 (medium low) R200/ha</td>
<td>2 (medium high) R350/ha</td>
<td>1 (very high) R800/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCEIVED INVESTMENT COSTS TO COMMUNITY to MAINTAIN</td>
<td>0 (very low)</td>
<td>4 (medium low)</td>
<td>3 (medium)</td>
<td>2 (medium high)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BENEFITS PERCEIVED / REALISED</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Low to medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium to very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a) Herders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b i) Stock farmers &lt; 5 large AU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b ii) Stock farmers 5 – 30 LAU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b iii) Stock farmers &gt; 30 LAU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c) Non-stock owning residents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d) Traditional Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.e) Female headed h/holds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. BENEFIT FOR LANDSCAPE:</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a) rangeland /grassland status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b) cleared areas / IAP control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATING CRITERIA USED BY GROUP FOR SCORING COSTS AND BENEFITS:**

1. based on estimated costs for 3 year input incl:  
- Facilitation inputs: personnel and travel  
- Training and capacity building  
- equipment, inoculations, etc

2. including estimates for:  
- time attending meetings & workshops  
- changed practise  
- herders fund for wages  
- other?

3. including estimates for:  
- auction income  
- perceived stock value & quality  
- training & capacity building  
- improved grazing quality  
- extended season  
- resources like thatchgrass, water  
- status in community

4. including estimates for:  
- Rangeland  
- graze composition  
- biodiversity  
- Groundcover & infiltration  
- Cleared area control  
- no regrowth  
- % grasscover
4. READINESS FOR UPTAKE OF THE MODEL

The outlined scenarios are a factor of several pre-existing factors, including resourcing, which are discussed below, and which determine, limit or guide the intensity of input effort and structuring of options for establishing partner communities within the MNP business model.

4.1 Key requirements for success of managed communal grazing programmes

The MNI / Rangeland Toolkit sets out the process for undertaking the process of establishing whether a community or livestock owning group is willing and ready for participation in the MNP programme, and the methodologies and steps will not be repeated here. However, assessment of the pilot project experiences, and interviews with key stakeholders indicated several ‘deal breaker’ elements which determine if a community can and want to be involved, and what level of input is required to get them to MNP ‘readiness’, i.e. ability to sell a minimum number of cattle at least once a year, on an ongoing basis off sound rangelands, complying with a grazing agreement, and receiving benefits. A mobilisation and awareness exercise, involving participatory planning and mapping, is highly recommended for establishing sound understanding, land use objectives and relationships, and informing the state of readiness and potential intervention input and support needs.

The starting point for planning and intervention is enormously determined and influenced by the state of readiness of a community and its landscape and resources, which in turn are direct factor of a variety of elements: the latter need to be properly assessed and integrated so that they can be addressed and restored as needed, and monitored, and include at minimum:

a) **LEADERSHIP**: strength of Chief and Headmen, and their capacity & influence, affects acceptance and impact of grazing programmes, and degree of support for compliance and sanctions. Presence and effectiveness of grazing committees / associations and their capacity to drive the ‘supply side’ and rangeland management compliance;

b) **STATE OF LANDSCAPE RESOURCES AND RANGELAND**: highly degraded rangeland and riparian areas, as well as extent of alien plant invasion and erosion, will obviously require different restoration interventions and intensity from a landscape where grassland and water sources are intact and functional. Rehabilitation is a process to achieve an ecological functioning state. Restoration is to an approximate original undisturbed state. Incentives are required to encourage different behaviour in order to reflect different, and improved, land use impacts, objectives and outcomes;

c) **SOCIAL COHESION**: degree of internal conflict and prejudices, willingness to herd and work together;

d) **COGNISANCE / RECOGNITION OF ‘MOBOELLA’**: ‘no perception’ state, through to some remnant practise, often linked with leadership;

e) **SECURITY, RISKS & TRUST**: stock theft, tenure security and trust of other households and leadership and external facilitators, affects willingness to invest in livestock development;

f) **EXTENSION SERVICES SUPPORT**: no existent, through to very active, and sometimes with opposing practises or alternate agendas;

g) **AVAILABILITY OF INPUT RESOURCES**: facilitation / human resources, capital and training investments, prior relationship between IA and community, time etc. Is funding available for a scenario 2 lower intensity approach, or should it be modified to scenario 3 or 4 which require more resourcing.

4.2 Programme design variables based on ‘uptake readiness’ and requirement levels

**ZONING of GRAZING AREAS**: managed graze (scenario 4) vs exclusion rest areas (scenario 2 and 3), determined by the above elements, and communal collaboration;
EXTENT AND INTENSITY OF ECORANGER SUPPORT & RESPONSIBILITY: less intense i.e. selected existing herders subsidised through owners / herders’ fund or auction percentage and training inputs to assist with rotational rest monitoring (scenario 2), through to full-time EPWP-funded ecorangers for more intensely managed rotational graze scenarios 3 and 4;

EXTENT OF LANDSCAPE RESTORATION REQUIRED: relatively intact rangeland with water sources, requiring management, through a range of landscape situations and degrees of degradation, to a situation where restoration would borderline on being feasible, and a wise investment of resources;

HERD STRUCTURE: scattered individual herds kept out of exclusion / rest area (scenarios 2 and 3) OR grouped single communal herd in rotational managed graze system (scenario 4);

The programme design for supply community intervention and support must be based on the DEGREE OF INVESTMENT REQUIRED, including MATERIALS, EFFORT AND TIME, TO REACH SUSTAINABILITY, and is bound by availability of resources, as well as ‘UPTAKE READINESS’. Where funds are being requested, programme design and intensity of design variables will inform the budget requirements.

4.3 Building on capital

Once readiness and willingness are established through consultation and mobilisation, three core building blocks are required for sustaining the MNP supply system. These are stream lined into SOCIAL CAPITAL, NATURAL CAPITAL AND STEWARDSHIP AGREEMENTS, which link the former two, and are outlined as follows:

SOCIAL CAPITAL: INSTITUTIONS, PARTICIPATION AND GOVERNANCE

- COMMUNITY MOBILISATION & TRUST
  Collective action and planning through increased capacity and awareness
  Stock owners becoming stock farmers: an occupation supporting livelihoods
  Linking events and support with community calendar and functions

- THE RIGHT MANAGEMENT: TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS
  Identifying existing, or prior / obsolete village-based institutions, and reviving them
  Helping owners / structure to become a Savings Group (preferable), Co-op or Trust through relevant capacity building and legal process support

- VULNERABLE GROUPS: AVOIDING ELITE CAPTURE
  Inclusion of small stock owners to reach more households
  Involvement of women and youth in mobilisation phase

- ROLE OF ECORANGERS and HERDERS
  Extent of support required (herder capacity) and available (funding for establishment)
  Selection of herders and rangers by stock owners, through understanding their functions
  Training support through Ecoranger curriculum (CSA)

- INVOLVEMENT OF EXTENSION SERVICES AND OTHER SUPPRT FOR LONG TERM HUSBANDRY
  Communication with regional officials, involvement in planning and activities

NATURAL CAPITAL: TECHNICAL AND PRODUCTIVITY ELEMENTS

- INCREASING STOCK PRODUCTION: HUSBANDRY AND HERD ISSUES
Understanding role of livestock – the dual purpose herd
Setting carrying capacity targets
Identifying problems for productivity and supporting health promotion and treatment access

- IMPROVING GRASSLAND FOR ECOSYSTEM SERVICES
  Grazing management options: intensity, holistic practices, rest etc
  Alien plant clearing and follow up
  Use of trampling effect through night kraaling
  Establish grazing plan based on agreed areas and processes with local institution

LINKING SOCIAL AND NATURAL CAPITAL THROUGH STEWARDSHIP & INCENTIVES

If MNP is to become a successful, and in this context we mean sustainable, continuing to access a reliable supply of veld-raised livestock, then a bilateral supply and demand relationship needs to be established and maintained. Central to sustaining performance by both parties is an agreement, based on certain actions by both parties for which agreed returns will be provided – a transaction between equals on a business basis. The agreement outlines the commitments of both parties (MNP/IA and community) for the set period, and should be seen as a business OFFER from MNP to which a village / group agrees to if they see value in it for them.

This process should be guided by CI’s Conservation Stewardship Programme process, a well-established and proven approach for establishing and sustaining conservation agreements which foster improved livelihood outcomes linked to improvements in land or species based stewardship actions.

5. MOVING FORWARD: REPLICATION AND EXPANSION

The summary of obstacles and redress actions in section 2 provides a key to unlocking a sustained supply of veld-raised livestock off healthy rangeland. The MNP model must be seen as two interdependent parts, namely:
SUPPLY: through pro-poor social and natural capital enhancing actions / interventions, which ensure healthy livestock supplied in required numbers, and
MARKET: auctions which facilitate the sale of healthy livestock, with commission from sales supporting ongoing supply, based on agreements with suppliers for sanctioned compliance.

Key factors to sustaining the supply side are GOOD GOVERNANCE and INCREASED STOCK PRODUCTIVITY. The tools and methodologies for implementing these actions are detailed in the MNI/Rangeland toolkit, but we take a look here at how local livestock structures can effectively drive the link between supply and market, incentivised through benefits derived in response to actions specified in an agreement between the supply (MNP) and market (community groups) parties.

5.1 Social governance and appropriate structures

The lessons derived through the group discussions, facilitator team evaluations and compilation of the ‘sustainability model’ have pointed towards simplified next steps for continuing to refine the rangeland restoration and MNP approach, without excessive dependence on external funding for start-up.

Each communal situation is unique, and yet some commonalities exist regarding structures and leadership. Lessons from the pilot experiences in the upper uMzimvubu point towards the following for developing appropriate structural arrangements:

a. Villages organise themselves as separate groups or cluster together, based on their geographic grazing areas and traditional leadership structures and relationships;
b. These groups identify the obstacles to sound range management and improved stock production, and develop approaches to address them: these will inform the actions upon which an initial agreement (first season) can be developed with an agent or with MNP, with the aim of supplying sufficient livestock off sound rangeland;

c. A proposed mechanism for institutional support is Savings Groups, whereby groups (village grazing associations or livestock committees, either existing, or obsolete and needing revival, as outlined in item ‘a’ above), which receive financial literacy and basic business training as per the model developed by SaveAct. These groups would need to be accepted and endorsed by the leadership structures, which should ideally be included in a group’s ‘committee’;

d. Groups could eventually combine or cluster as an area structure, becoming more formalised entities and registering as Associations, Co-operatives or Trusts if the savings Group model proves insufficient. During an interim replication phase, this seems to not be necessary and may in fact be too cumbersome and detract from the stream lining of the model.

e. In subsequent seasons, based on reviewing and revision of the agreement and agreed activities, the MN Trust will have beneficiary agreements with these entities, in the form of a ‘conservation agreement’, which clearly define the roles and compliance requirements for each party (entity and MNP). Profits from MNP doing business (of whatever type, commissions other sales/services etc) will be shared, with 60% going to the Trust. Dispersal of funds/benefits from the Trust to the different associations will be included in the subsequent agreement/s (i.e. season 2 and beyond) and again compliance and sanctions for both parties will be involved

Complimentary to financial and literacy training in the establishment phase (season 1), the groups would receive support from facilitating partners / Implementing agents / MNP directly for:

- technical herd health inputs (training, inoculations, supplements) to improve productivity and excess animals for sale;
- establishing agreed grazing areas and actions, and signing of an agreement for such, outlining compliance standards, means of verification, sanctions and benefits for compliance;
- training for, and auditing of, group-managed compliance monitoring mechanisms
- pre-auction readiness, and auction ‘post mortems’ to improve the preparation process

5.2 Increasing herd productivity and ‘excess to sell’

Low productivity is attributed to several factors, as outlined in section 2 and annexure 3, and can be addressed through technical husbandry support for:

- Improved access to breeding stock such as bulls, changed on an annual basis, and linked with inoculation of heifers and cows to prevent spread of disease: purchase and group ownership of such breeding stock could form part of a benefit package for compliant groups;
- Increasing calving rates through the above and through improved animal health: enhancing range fodder biomass through grazing management, access to winter supplements and appropriate inoculations are all crucial here, requiring technical support from an agent / facilitator or improved Extension services’ delivery;

Many households retain their traditional herd component, and are unwilling to sell these animals as excess: a targeted breeding programme which retains those animals for traditional use and as breeding stock to supply younger commercial animals for sale is advocated. A higher turnover of younger stock should respect, and
balance with carrying capacities for specific grassland areas and conditions, aligned with grazing plans, and inform the content of agreements.

Owners (farmers) would be encouraged to sell at least 10% of their herd per year: if this is supported by increased productivity, this is both achievable and sustainable.

5.3 Restoring rangeland productivity and grassland ecosystem services

The basic principle of this model is that healthy rangelands will produce increased quality livestock, which, with improved market access, will improve returns for stock-owning rural livelihoods, with a positive feedback loop for better rangeland stewardship to support this stock. The improved range stewardship will result in improved basal cover and grassland biodiversity and improved ecosystem services. Under appropriate management, livestock can thus double as livelihood assets as well as a tool for landscape management and restoration.

As discussed in the Rangeland Toolkit, livestock are known to be ‘engineers’ of ecosystems in terms of creating micro-habitats for plants and animals as well as modifying soil moisture and structure characteristics. Holistic-based planned grazing provides a natural, mechanical, low cost method of managing plants and sustaining soil through regeneration of cover, via trimming, mulching, manuring, and breaking up capped surfaces to allow infiltration of rainfall. Simultaneously, livestock health is improved through improved plant production, and they can be utilised for low cost crop field preparation rather than conventional draught or tractor ploughing and purchase of fertiliser.

UCPP pilot studies have shown that planned grazing and herding of cattle on land post the clearing of alien invasive plants results in increased grass growth and suppression of alien plant regrowth, due to hoof action and other factors involved in bioturbation, with minimal follow up requirement. Additional research on bioturbation (using hooves and dung for ‘kickstart’ trampling action and input of organic matter and local seed) and restoring natural groundcover has been identified as a priority in managing landscapes threatened by alien invasive plant spread. Please refer to annexure 5 for a short illustrated case study on the use of trampling with cattle herds to facilitate bioturbation. There remains much need for further research in the management and long term use of this tool, specifically regarding grassland recovery and composition, with initial results being very positive.

FIGURE 2: FEEDBACK LOOP BETWEEN GOOD RANGELAND STEWARDSHIP, HEALTHIER ECOSYSTEMS AND LIVELIHOOD IMPROVEMENT
5.4 Auctions as the turn-key link

Providing an on-site opportunity for sale of livestock, at market related prices, without the need to trek cattle for several days, at risk of losses en route, to commercial sale yards and pay 6% sale commission, has been enthusiastically received and supported by pilot communities in the Matatiele area. Although most traditional stock farmers want to retain some of their herd for non-commercial purposes (as discussed in section 2 and table 1 earlier) they are keen to increase herd productivity to produce extra for sale through commercial auctions. It is important for sellers to understand the market-related price per kilogram, and feel confident that they are participating as equals in the business transaction.

Auction readiness sessions are essential to assist stock owners with understanding the commercial system and cost per kilogram of different types of animals being offered and purchased. Sharing of auction statistics and trends, through ‘post-mortem’ or ‘howzit’ meetings with sellers, sharing auction data and addressing identified issues, can help to smooth out challenges and misperceptions and increase the long term supply of stock for sale.

Auctions should be hosted within a 10km radius of participant communities to optimise access for sellers. Ideally, no less than two sellers should be present, as there is some mistrust of single buyers and monopolies: this can be addressed through auction readiness support sessions. The MNP draft auction manual (annexure 6) provides an outline for facilitation partners, MNP and participant communities.

The auctions would generate commission on a 5% basis from the sale turnover, which would be managed by MNP to cover its operating costs. The detailed use of this commission is being developed through the MNP business model, but could roughly entail:

- **A return of part of the 5% auction fee / commission value** to Group members through incentives such as feed supplement advances, training, subsidised inoculations and facilitation costs of follow-up auctions, and possibly eventually as cash or a transfer once group accountability and compliance performance has been shown after at least a full season; even if ‘non-compliant’ sellers also participate in auctions, direct benefits only accrue to compliant members, incentivising increased compliance;
- **This would be linked to compliance with stewardship agreement actions and standards**, including maintenance of cleared areas, and rest areas being properly rested for the agreed period. The agreed portion of the 5% fee value could be withheld *pro rata* according to the degree of compliance assessed through monitoring and auditing, and groups would be provided a ‘second chance’ to show compliance;
- **The fee value would be channelled initially via an agent/ support facilitator in the form of benefits to the group**, working towards establishing a bank account, or trust account system under MNP, where each participating Group’s fee value is accumulated and disbursed according to agreed processes, for purposes identified by the Group and endorsed in the stewardship agreement;
- **Mid-term and annual reviewing and renewing of agreements** should evaluate the effectiveness of the system, allowing for refinements and modifications to be undertaken by both parties.

Auctions can be used as both an incentive and reward for compliance in relation to conservation agreements, but are also a mechanism to generate further interest by adjacent communities in becoming involved in the Meat Naturally programme. A simplified infographic model of this flow of supply and support is provided in figure 2 below, showing the supply flow, as well the ‘facilitation’ flows for establishment and ongoing support.

5.5 Test cases for replication during the next season

Two test cases are outlined in table 3 thereafter, outlined for existing Matatiele pilot communities, building on the existing relationships at Ward 14 and Ward 7, whereby the scenarios 2 and 3 (as described in table 2) are modified to suit the enabling and restricting conditions and ‘readiness’ in each area.
**FIGURE 3: PROPOSED SUPPLY FLOW AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT THROUGH MEAT NATURALLY PROGRAMME MODEL**

**MEAT NATURALLY PTY**

**SUFFICIENT FAT CATTLE FOR SALE AT VILLAGE AUCTIONS OFF HEALTHY RANGELAND**

**MID-TERM PHASE FACILITATION SUPPORT:**
- Facilitate Agreements
- Husbandry support
- Auction co-ordination
- Monitoring & compliance

**ESTABLISHMENT PHASE SUPPORT BY MNP & PARTNERS / AGENTS:**
- Awareness & mobilization
- Institutional development
- Landscape management support interventions
- Agreement design & compliance
- Auction preparation
- Training & husbandry

**VILLAGE GROUPS IN CLUSTERS WITH AGREEMENTS PER GROUP / ASSOCIATION**

**VILLAGE GROUPS IN CLUSTERS WITH AGREEMENTS PER GROUP / ASSOCIATION ENDORSED BY CHIEF**

**VILLAGE GROUPS IN CLUSTERS WITH AGREEMENTS PER GROUP / ASSOCIATION**

**PROCESS NOTES**

- MNP PROVIDES MARKET SUPPORT, OPERATING ON 5% COMMISSION FROM AUCTIONS

- FACILITATION SUPPORT CAN INCLUDE PARTNERS (SUPPLEMENTED WITH PARTNER'S FUNDS DURING ESTABLISHMENT) OR BE VIA MNP FACILITATOR. WILL DECREASE OVER TIME AS GROUP CAPACITY & COMPLIANCE INCREASES

- PARTICIPANT STOCK FARMERS IN GROUPS / ASSOCIATIONS SIGN CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS WITH MNP OR PARTNER / AGENT

- ESTABLISHMENT SUPPORT GUIDED BY STARTING POINT STATUS, CAPACITY AND UPTAKE READINESS, RESULTING IN SUITABLE DESIGN SCENARIO.

- CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS GUIDE ACTIONS ON GROUND AND SUPPORT RESTORATION OF RANGELANDS THROUGH THESE ACTIONS;

- COMPLIANCE BY GROUPS & AGENTS TO AGREEMENTS, THROUGH MONITORING BY FACILITATOR & AGENT, ENSURES ONGOING ACCESS TO MARKET VIA MNP SUPPORT, BEYOND ESTABLISHMENT PHASE, RENEWING & REVISING AGREEMENTS
### TABLE 3: DRAFT TEST CASES FOR APPLYING MNP SUSTAINABILITY MODEL SCENARIOS - PHASE 2 FOR 2016/17 SEASON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WARD 14 THABA CHICHA (scenario 3, modified)</strong></th>
<th><strong>WARD 5 AND 7 MZONGWANA (scenario 2, modified)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVES</strong></td>
<td><strong>METHODS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To have villages in Ward 14 who have already been applying Maboella grazing systems as part of DEA projects continue with grazing and livestock management;</td>
<td>- MNP and each village signs a Conservation Agreement (CA) listing each party’s commitments and expected benefits for the summer/autumn grazing and auction period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To prove that the market can be a vehicle to sustain the most necessary incentives required for improved livestock and grazing management initiatives.</td>
<td>- MNP contracts a facilitator (Raymond) to execute the signing of agreements with the livestock committee of each partaking village during September &amp; October 2016. Payment to the facilitator will be done per delivery of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>METHODS</strong></td>
<td>o Signed agreement by the livestock committee of each village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MNP and each village signs a Conservation Agreement (CA) listing each party’s commitments and expected benefits for the summer/autumn grazing and auction period.</td>
<td>o Completed list of livestock committee of each village attached to the agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MNP contracts a facilitator (Raymond) to execute the signing of agreements with the livestock committee of each partaking village during September &amp; October 2016. Payment to the facilitator will be done per delivery of the following:</td>
<td>o Name, signature and contact of village by the committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MNP and each village signs a Conservation Agreement (CA) listing each party’s commitments and expected benefits for the summer/autumn grazing and auction period.</td>
<td>o Completed list of livestock owners and livestock number for the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MNP contracts a facilitator (Raymond) to execute the signing of agreements with the livestock committee of each partaking village during September &amp; October 2016. Payment to the facilitator will be done per delivery of the following:</td>
<td>o Grazing area to be rested sketched onto provided topographic map in agreement with livestock committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement based on certain actions by both parties for which agreed returns will be provided – a transaction between equals on business basis.</td>
<td>o Alien cleared areas to be maintained by community sketched onto map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASIC CONTENT of AGREEMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>MNP commitments, covered by auction 5%:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement based on certain actions by both parties for which agreed returns will be provided – a transaction between equals on business basis.</td>
<td>- A folder returned to the livestock committee. In the folder will be included a printed map of the agreed upon rested area, copies of the agreement, livestock, owner and committee lists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MNP commitments, covered by auction 5%:</strong></td>
<td>- Provision of local cattle auctions as was done previously, at any time of year as long as a minimum of 70 cattle are on offer from the different villages. A 5% commission will be deducted from sellers which will fund the whole agreement and monitoring process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A folder returned to the livestock committee. In the folder will be included a printed map of the agreed upon rested area, copies of the agreement, livestock, owner and committee lists.</td>
<td>- Monitoring of compliance to grazing and alien maintenance by the facilitator during the summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monitoring of compliance to grazing and alien maintenance by the facilitator during the summer</td>
<td>- Where suitable compliance was found during the agreement period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Where suitable compliance was found during the agreement period</td>
<td><strong>IA commitments (ERS) subsidised through WWF, DEA NRM and auction %</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IA commitments (ERS) subsidised through WWF, DEA NRM and auction %</strong></td>
<td>- Copy of signed agreement/s, with agreed rest and maintenance areas on map, and clear flow diagram of compliance and non-compliance responses provided to group committees and explained to Ward Committee and Chief’s Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Act as link with MNP to arrange auctions (‘incentive’ in November 2016 and ‘compliance reward’ in late summer 2017) – support auction readiness with at least 70 animals signed up by 30 October. 5% commission deducted from all sales to cover auction costs AND possibly 50% of this goes back to compliant MGA members for next winter supplement advances.</td>
<td>- Local facilitator and trained reps from groups (ecorangers?) to monitor compliance and provide monthly reports to ERS, who will audit this compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MNP sustainability model Oct 2016**
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The agreement outlines the commitments of both parties (MNP/IA and community) for the set summer/autumn period. It must actually be seen as a business OFFER from MNP to which a village agrees to if they see value in it for them. Included in the agreement would be the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring of Compliance</th>
<th>Monitoring of compliance with grazing and alien maintenance plans by the facilitator during the summer, with reports submitted to MNP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Monitoring of compliance with grazing and alien maintenance plans by the facilitator during the summer, with reports submitted to MNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Facilitator will do two reports per month after completion of spot checks. Payment will be done to facilitator per report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o External compliance audit carried out by MNP to verify reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Provision of annual Covexin10 vaccination during May to all cattle;
- Training for two days provided to five representatives (nominated by each livestock committee) from each village on ecological, production and market literacy;
- Support by partner NGO Conservation South Africa on formation of livestock association or cooperative and capacity building.

- A production advance facility where livestock sellers can receive (delivered to Ward 14) a specific amount of winter lick after the autumn 2017 auction. The specific value to which this advance applies will be determined by the past stock and sales figures of each producer. The money will be recovered during the following auction and the costs of the items will not exceed what it would've costed a producer to purchase and collect similar item/s from Matatiele town;
- An alternative option to the production advance is a bulk buying option where compliant sellers can pay for (at a lower cost to the cost per product from the advance facility) any amount of winter lick at the time of being paid after Autumn auction;
- Employment of two persons from each village (nominated by respective livestock committees) for five days during the week of each auction event.

Community commitments via village livestock committees:

- Provision of all information as listed above;
- Compliance within the rested grazing areas during the summer and autumn periods (Facilitator does spot checks, payment per report);
- Maintenance of the agreed-upon alien cleared area as mentioned above - this will be follow up clearing, not initial clearing;
- Proof of minimal numbers of stock on offer one month (30 days) prior to any auction event by completion of stock on offer lists coordinated by nominated village coordinator

Where suitable action compliance (see below under community commitments) is found based on auditing of reports from groups and facilitator, the following will be provided for compliant group members in first season:

- subsidized relevant inoculation via State vet/MNP to be agreed during negotiations;
- institutional training, including basic financial and market literacy for at least 20 group members
- technical husbandry training, for at least 20 members or their selected herders
- pro-rata feed winter supplement subsidies for auction performance
- support negotiation for improved breeding stock access
- provide ecorangers and 3 extra local persons with stipends to support Nov auction, and establish 'rangers / herders' fund mechanism managed within groups to pay 6 local people to support further auctions, based on membership fees and portion of 5% paid to MNP (to be agreed on...)

Community commitments via Mzongwana Grazing Association / village livestock groups:

- provision of required livestock and owner data
- compliance with agreed rest areas as per map appended to agreement, during summer months
- maintenance of cleared IAP areas by own herders through follow up
- participation in training on rangeland care, husbandry, market and financial literacy
- provide list of at least 70 animals 21 days prior to set auction dates, co-ordinated through village based facilitator Sbu Mkize
- facilitate non-compliance penalties / sanctions (see below)
SANCTIONS FOR NON-COMPLIANCE
- Non-compliance is determined after two events where photographic evidence shows grazing in agreed upon rested areas
- Non-compliance for maintained alien cleared area will be checked once during February 2017. Livestock committee/community will be made aware of the result of this report and will have one month to rectify (apply follow-up) to avoid non-compliance.
- Non-compliant or non-partaking villages may still be permitted to sell at the auction if infringements of the agreement are found on only 2 of the six occasions. Villages with more than 2 infringements, will not have the benefit of the returned incentives from the 5% commissions paid. Villages with infringements found every month will not be able to participate in the auction process. Infringements can be found by Facilitator and/or on any MNP senior staff or CSA staff spot check.
- With holding of benefits in proportion to degree of compliance, including training sessions, feed supplement subsidies, and in extreme case, postponing auction until compliance achieved
- MGA members report non-compliant members/herders to MGA, with extra/internal sanctions decided upon by MGA quorum, including fines from Chief and withholding support/participation in auctions and training

AGREEMENT PERIOD
October 2016 to June 2017 initially, with renewal based on performance
Mid October/ November 2016 to June 2017 (two seasons, with mid-term review) followed by renewal based on review of performance and agreement content

TARGET VILLAGES
WARD 14 THABA CHICHA
- Letlapeng, Liqalabeng, Mapoliseng
- Mataleng, Mangopeng, Nicefield
- Moiketsi
- Motseng (modifying from scenario 2 to 3)
- add others once these are signed up
WARD 7 MZONGWANA
- Hillside
- Sfolweni / Ngcwengana
- Pote, Manzi, Kolweni
- Dumisa & Mgeni
- Pamlaville and Mathias if co-operation shown

Above left: night kraal site showing post-clearing trample recovery on left and control are on right, under scenario 4.
Above right: initial auction for Mzongwana community, which sold 80 cattle for 60 households, realising R400 250.
6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT PHASE

The next phase, which could be termed establishment phase 2, provides an opportunity to test the replicability of the model in a real world situation, i.e. where funds are limited for various facilitation and resourcing costs, such as ecoranger wages, training and capital support overheads. The scenarios within the model allow for a spectrum of support intensities and situations, as no two communities are ever exactly the same.

Husbandry support during both establishment and mid-term support phases should be on a subsidised basis to encourage commitment by stock owners, rather than dependence upon external agents.

As outlined in figure 3, facilitation of establishment (getting to auction readiness) will require varying levels of external support via partners and donors, while in the mid-term support phase, i.e. post-establishment and after a season or two of agreements, MNP support and operating expenses could be derived from auction commissions, the 5% fee from which could contribute towards both auction management overheads as well as the incentives and benefits for compliant supplier group members as defined in the revised agreements.

By selling through MNP and signing a conservation agreement with a partner agent or MNP, the participant livestock groups will be entitled to enter a beneficiary agreement with the Meat Naturally Shareholders Trust. Within 30 days of the end of each financial year, dividends of the total profit of MNP will be disbursed according to the % contribution to the total market auction income (i.e. a farming group that sold 500 cattle would be entitled to a greater proportion of the profit-sharing than a group that sold 70 animals in the same year.) The value of the dividend will include profit generated via training or grazing planning as well. The % fee is constant for the business service provided, and this cannot shift, however, a community can access an advance for livestock improvement from MNP that is paid back via the auction process.

It is recommended that MNP invite other potential target areas to the upcoming season’s auctions as an ‘taster’ for introducing MNP in their areas, including e.g. Lesotho, Mkemane (which has a remembered ukaval’amadobo system of closing camps for resting), Maloti-Drakensberg areas and Sinxaku in Ntabelanga, opening up potential supply areas for expansion of the MNP concept to other willing and interested communal areas which face similar degradation and livelihood challenges. Peer exchange through such interactions is invaluable as a social capital enhancement tool: potentially, participating supply communities could eventually become catalysts and trainers of willing new groups of livestock farmers, building the MNP supply base in a very cost effective manner across the communal landscape.

ANNEXURES:

1. Mid-term report: literature review and context
2. UCPP and MNP Auction statistics
3. Focus group discussions summary
4. Illustrated case study of bioturbation / trampling with a managed herd
5. MNP Auction manual (draft)