

Restoration Ecology

March 2012/ Vol. 20, No.2

## **No Evidence-Based Restoration Without a Sound Evidence Base: A Reply to Guldemonnd et al.**

Phumza Ntshotsho,<sup>1,2,3</sup> Belinda Reyers,<sup>4</sup> and Karen J. Esler<sup>2</sup>

*1 Present address: Natural Resources and the Environment, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, PO Box 395, Pretoria 0001, South Africa*

*2 Department of Conservation Ecology & Entomology and Centre for Invasion Biology, Stellenbosch University, Private Bag x1, Matieland 7602, South Africa*

*3 Address correspondence to P. Ntshotsho, email [pntshotsho@csir.co.za](mailto:pntshotsho@csir.co.za)*

*4 Natural Resources and the Environment, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, PO Box 320, Stellenbosch 7599, South Africa*

DOI: 10.1111/j.1526-100X.2011.00846.x

### **Abstract**

Evidence-based practice is not possible without an evidence base. Guldemonnd et al. confuse our attempt at assessing the status of the evidence base of restoration programs in South Africa with attempting to assess whether restoration is evidence-based. While we fully agree with them that there is a need to assess whether practitioners use evidence in their decision-making, we assert that use of evidence is the last step in the evidence-based approach. It is preceded by the generation (and documentation) of evidence through baseline condition assessment, proper goal setting, sound monitoring of the impacts of the chosen intervention as well as effective dissemination of resulting evidence. To answer the question whether restoration is evidence-based would require the assessment of all stages from generation to use. We chose to start at the beginning, a logical place to start.