

# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** Conservation International

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** Raising Awareness and Building Local Capacity for Project Design and Implementation linked to SKEP Conservation Targets

**Implementation Partners for this Project:**

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** July 1, 2003- January 1, 2005

**Date of Report (month/year):** March 2005

## II. OPENING REMARKS

***Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.***

The last 18 months was experienced as a period of great excitement and learning. The excitement was two fold, the programme ventured into untested waters and yet the team constantly remained open and optimistic about what we could face around the next corner. Secondly stakeholders in the regions were expectantly waiting for SKEP to deliver on the regions biodiversity and development needs.

Thanks to CEPF and their willingness to experiment a new approach for conservation in a fairly unknown region of the world. Also thanks to the willingness of CI- SAHP after a request from stakeholders to take on the coordination function of this programme, in absence of a local organization

The Succulent Karoo with its many undiscovered treasures has produced human gems like that of the SKEP coordination team. This was achieved despite the hardships and challenges of working on a big vision. When we started out, our ultimate goal was that the people of the Succulent Karoo should take ownership of their unique living landscape in a way that conserves biodiversity in a sustainable manner. We always said, conservation as a land use instead of.

Despite the many challenges that lie before us, we have truly lit this vision in the hearts of many. Time will tell of the success of building the right foundations for sustainable conservation.

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

***Project Purpose:***

The purpose of this project is to build local conservation capacity in a SKEP Coordination Unit that will raise awareness, facilitate communication and partnerships between various land-use sectors, and catalyze action in CEPF priority corridors as part of the development of a long-term SKEP Programme for Conservation and Sustainable Development of the SKH.

These various elements have been achieved and a more capacitated CU now exists responsible for Coordination activities, building partnerships and supporting project development and implementation.

In looking back on the ideals set for this team, maybe we were over optimistic in what could be achieved in the short time frame for which this project was implemented. The most important lesson learnt however has to be that when we apply for using conservation funding we often underestimate the complexities of implementation and we often under budget for time to capacitate people outside of our direct control.

### **Planned vs. Actual Performance**

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b>	
<i>SKEP Sub-regional offices are recognized as an effective independent presence for integrating biodiversity concerns into Land-use issues in region by December 2004.</i>	5 SKEP sub-regional offices were established with success in Namibia and South Africa. These offices have become central points for communication on SKEP strategic opportunities and CEPF funding options.
Stakeholders are developing projects that are addressing priority corridors guided by local as well as regional expertise.	To date a total of 126 projects have been submitted to CEPF, of which the majority was catalyzed by the SKEP coordination unit and its activities
New and innovative partnerships between various land-use sectors are developing as a result of SKEP Coordination team interventions.	5 sub-regional advisory committees exist with several project steering committees where the various land-use sectors are engaging on the activities of the programme.

***Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.***

The SKEP Coordination Unit has been making steady strides towards achieving its overall purpose. Integral to this progress has been the presence of a network of sub-regional coordination offices, each with its own coordinator and assistant. It created a local presence and gave people a basis from which to learn more about the Program and its greater purpose. This certainly could not have been achieved over such a vast area by consultants or organizations from outside the region, as is often the case in conservation programs. Therefore, not having an office in the Hantam-Tanqua-Roggeveld (HTR) Region initially was problematic but the situation improved when the office was set up. The sub-regional presence provides people with an access point from which to gather information about the program and request support for developing projects. It is a point from which a local coordinator can reach out to the community and a means for the Cape Town coordination office to keep in touch with the local developments. During the recent evaluation discussions on the role of the sub-regional were highlighted as one of the successes of the programme thus far. Even though too expensive to continue in its present form, the CU would have to continue keeping a local presence in the regions. Based on our current partners, most of who have indicated their willingness to becoming the face for the programme in the region through managing queries and request form stakeholders in the region.

Even though some of the Coordinators did not have formal conservation backgrounds or much experience in coordinating conservation programs, to start with, the linkages to local organization that they brought to the program were far more valuable for this phase of the program. In addition, the life experiences they brought, having been teachers and poverty relief project coordinators in the SKEP area, were extremely valuable, and only people with a strong understanding of the region or at least with a strong willingness to learn very quickly could have added such value.

Many have cited CI's choice to employ people from the region as very strategic, since two of the first steps identified at the Action Planning workshops were to build local partnerships and raise awareness. Without those steps, the program would have existed in a vacuum and civil society would not have been engaged in the overall program as effectively. The time it took to achieve this was not long because the partners were engaged early during the process, during the Action Planning phase. The Coordinators already had a good idea of who those partners were and their continued physical presence in the region made local people trust the process a bit more.

There is greater conservation capacity in the region now that at least one Coordinator and Assistant in each sub-region has been trained and is working in conservation. In addition, all the people they have and will still share their knowledge and experiences with about conservation and development will also have a stronger grasp of these issues. The management and facilitation skills, as well as the biodiversity conservation knowledge they gained, is a valuable contribution to the region. A highlight was the ongoing mentoring and network building of these coordinators. A recent intervention by Prof Norman Meyers on the global perspective of the conservation challenges proved once again that there now exist greater capacity within this team and those around them to understand and respond to the conservation challenges of the region. Every participant in the weeklong course scored above 70% for producing a paper and presentation on a subject from the region.

**Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?**

If one considers the overall impact of the project, it has gone far beyond expectations. Every output was delivered on, with some changes to activities as the project progressed. A key impact for the project was to address the capacity needs, and increase the awareness ultimately leading to ownership of the vision for SKEP. A total of 13 new conservationists have been trained and some of them have been offered positions of responsibility in the conservation sector. There is a high degree of ownership, and can be seen through the varied civil society organization currently involved in projects currently being implemented. The project has truly catalyzed action in the various land use sectors with new partnerships like the Bushmanland Conservation Initiative between Botsoc and Black Mountain Mine to establish a multi-owned protected area.

The project was also very successful in maintaining the momentum generated during the planning phase. The only negative impact was that many underestimated the level of capacity of the region in developing conservation-focused projects, which at times resulted in slow delivery of the projects objectives.

A key activity for the future role of coordination is to strengthen its capacity to assist smaller organizations with project development and implementation support.

**IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS**

**Project Outputs:** Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Actual at Completion</b>
<b>Output 1:</b> A SKEP Coordination Unit exists with appropriate staff, effective administration and financial systems under the guidance of Conservation International and other local agencies.	This unit now exists with the full financial and administration support of CI. The CI-SAHP has gone the extra distance in their support, and has truly capacitated the unit's staff to manage their finance and operations. They all now have an understanding of developing project financial and technical reports. The support of the members of the TWG has supported in the strategic as well as some of the HR and staffing challenges.
<b>1.1.</b> SKEP Coordination Unit Staff are secured and operational in Cape Town and five sub-regional offices that are effectively linked as a network through management by the SKEP Programme Manager	This was completed successfully, and as the CU moves into the next phase, many of the existing staff has been approached by some organization to continue with implementing SKEP projects.
<b>1.2.</b> TWG consisting of Eco-Africa, Botsoc, NBI and CI established and meeting on monthly basis according to attached terms of reference	The TWG exists and continues to support the programme manager in providing strategic direction. Eco-Africa due to personal circumstances was not able to form part of the TWG, but Botsoc, CI-SAHP and SANBI signed the TOR and have successfully been functioning.
<b>1.3.</b> Appropriate administrative and financial management strategies are in place for field offices and are assisting SKEP Coordination Unit to deliver within budget.	The finance department has provided guidance and support with the appropriate financial templates and policies. These now exist and they are all in line with the CI financial policies.
<b>1.4.</b> Financial sustainability of the Coordination Unit is secured through the development of a funding strategy by July 2004 and implementation by December 2004.	Key to the financial sustainability of the CU was the fundraising support of CI-SAHP. A clear strategy was developed in 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2004, however the approaches were to help cover the core cost of the CU through some endowment funding. This has not materialized. Secondly it was also critical to get the appropriate legislated institutions to support the long-term implementation of the programme. This was successfully negotiated with SANBI the new legislated institution responsible for the implementation of bioregional programmes. They however still need some catalytic funding, but will

	<p>be responsible for assisting in National government funding for long-term implementation.</p>
<p><b>Output 2:</b> Local sub-regional co-ordination teams have developed the capacity to address biodiversity-questions and to undertake and assist local stakeholders in project design and management.</p>	<p>The Coordinators have a much broader understanding of and desire to want to know more about conservation and development issues. The training has given them greater confidence to address biodiversity concerns in their sub-regions; to facilitate workshops and chair meetings; to do presentations; and the skills to manage their offices on a daily basis.</p> <p>Besides the formal training sessions, coordinators also found that being exposed to people at senior levels of CI, government officials, and representing SKEP at forums has boosted their confidence and built their capacity tremendously. Had they been confined to just local issues, they would not have started developing their own bigger picture of what happens in the broader conservation sector.</p> <p>The coordinators are more skilled in designing and developing projects. They spent a lot of time going out to community members to assist them in developing their ideas into project proposals. Even though some of those projects were rejected, the learning process was extremely valuable and the feedback they received from project reviewers made them stronger project developers.</p>
<p><b>2.1.</b> Capacity of sub-regional Coordination Teams assessed and ongoing support provided by monthly field visits from the SAHP Director, Communications Manager, Scientific Advisor, Financial Manager and SKEP Programme Manager.</p>	<p>This activity seemed to be very valuable for the coordination team, as during these visits much mentoring and capacity was build. Trip reports are available in the SKEP office.</p>
<p><b>2.2.</b> Quarterly SKEP training sessions in core competencies for conservation project design and implementation (e.g. project management, conflict resolution, financial management, proposal writing, etc.) are designed and implemented with co-coordinators and project applicants</p>	<p>All training sessions were two fold, one part focusing on hard skills for managing their work and the other with a more biodiversity focus. The hard skills training included, facilitations skills, conflict management, Insights personal development and communications course, Advanced presentation skills, CI's management training course, CI financial management and policies, 4 P communications training, Proposal writing and log-frame training, communications tool kit training, report writing, media liaison and basic excel training.</p> <p>Botsoc provided the biodiversity training, in partnership with the Institute for Plant conservation from UCT. Their training sessions ran concurrent with the SKEP quarterly training and were always implemented based on the treats of the region where we were having the training week.</p>
<p><b>2.3.</b> Each SKEP Coordinator and assistant participate in two other development course (costing less than \$150) and run an internal training session with other co-coordinators on activities related to their current expertise (e.g. tourism, conservation, environmental education, etc.)</p>	<p>Each coordinator and assistant was allowed to recommend a training session that they could attend, these included Computer training, basic English writing, presentation skills, environmental education, tourism and conservation planning.</p>
<p><b>2.4.</b> Improvements and performance monitored through innovative review and feedback process on annual basis through SKEP and CI evaluation consultations</p>	<p>All SKEP staff evaluation forms completed according to the CI annual performance criteria. In addition to this we commissioned a consultant to produce an independent evaluation of the SKEP</p>

	CU teams. This report has now been finalized and will form an appendix to this report.
<b>Output 3.</b> SKEP offices are generating awareness by serving as a focal point for information dissemination of CEPF application procedures and biodiversity conservation and sustainable land use in the region.	<p>Awareness raising has perhaps been the biggest success of SKEP. The coordinators and assistants have done an excellent job of informing the general public in their sub-regions about SKEP. To quote the CEPF Africa Grants Director, "Other coordination units are located in cities, and have occasional presence/communication with their vast regions. Unless they travel all the time, they cannot have the presence that SKEP has had." The coordinators went out to the public to tell them about the program and to invite them to submit proposals. They visited their farms, attended their meetings and invited them to the local SKEP offices. Local people more greatly acknowledge the importance of conserving biodiversity and achieving targets. The long-term approach to establishing partnerships with relevant organizations and having numerous meetings with them to establish their needs and explain to them what the program is about has also been highly beneficial. The presence of the local offices, staffed by people from the region, has been invaluable for informing people about the program and securing their commitment to SKEP. "People from the region can communicate very well with the neighbors, and often this helps when people do not trust a new idea or initiative." The enthusiasm the coordinators have for their work has also been an encouragement for people to get involved.</p> <p>There have been positive spin offs like the Southern Namaqualand office hosting a biodiversity awareness day with SANParks for the Paulshoek community. The RARE project in Steinkopf is getting the message of biodiversity conservation out into schools in the communities. Besides the awareness around funding opportunities from CEPF, awareness has also been created about the mere importance of biodiversity conservation and sustainable land-use.</p>
<b>3.1.</b> Local stakeholders are made aware of SKEP and CEPF strategies and priorities through the production and circulation of quarterly SKEP media release, fact sheets produced and articles submitted for publication in media.	In every sub-region stakeholders have been informed through the use of media, with regular articles and radio interviews. Each priority area has a priority area strategy fact sheet and information on the activities within the region. These are now being edited by CEPF for listing on the CEPF website. These media releases included new projects that received CEPF funding, to completion of project with articles showing the benefit of the programme for local people.
<b>3.2.</b> Strategies for effectively using Sub-regional advisory committees for dissemination for generating awareness about CEPF and SKEP developed by Dec 2003, and effectively implemented in Jan-Dec 2004	Key to the dissemination of the SKEP information was through the sectoral representatives on our advisory committees. In some cases members of these forums took the responsibility to inform their constituencies of the SKEP activities.
<b>3.3.</b> Two presentations a month done by sub-regional co-ordination teams at relevant local forum and events	This was exceeded with up to 5 done with various stakeholders per month. These local forums included the IDP's, farmers union meetings, municipality days, community open days, schools, various departments including agriculture, water

	affairs, National Parks, Ostrich chamber etc. This can be verified through the diversity of trip reports submitted by sub-regional teams.
<b>3.4.</b> One radio presentation/interview conducted by sub-region team per quarter on biodiversity related topics	Also successfully implemented with some regions having a regular slot on radio for speaking on the conservation challenges of the region.
<b>3.5.</b> Awareness raising field trips for local stakeholders are hosted by SKEP team to link local land owners and scientists in each sub-region every Quarter.	These trips place in each region, with Antje Burke supporting this in Namibia, Jan and Annelise Vlok in Southern Karoo, Peter Carrick and Richard Cowling in HTR, Coastal and Namaqualand, Annelise Le Roux and Nick Helm in Uplands and Knersvlakte respectively. One high-level trip with Brian Huntley from SANBI and David Daitz from Cape Nature was also implemented with support from Jaco Venter, Annelise Le Roux and Kobus Kritzinger from Cape Nature.
<b>Output 4.</b> Stakeholders are supported to design effective conservation projects in line with the CEPF/ SKEP annual strategies for priority regions as a strategic and catalytic approach to rolling out the SKEP 20-year strategy.	Stakeholders are generally pleased with the support they have received from the Coordinators in terms of assisting them with the CEPF application procedures, providing them with updates on the program and facilitating the project review process. They were doubtful whether the level of support would have been as good if the sub-regional offices were not there. However, they were expecting a greater number of projects to be coming from the ground.
<b>4.1.</b> Priority region strategies based on the results of the SKEP Fine-Scale Action Planning Workshops endorsed by the Sub-regional Advisory Committees by 1 November 2003 and available on the CEPF web-site by 10 November 2003.	This activity has been delayed, and is now in its final stages of completion with the edits being completed by CEPF for placing on web site.
<b>4.2.</b> A minimum of six project applicants per sub-region will be supported by co-ordination teams using their facilitation skills in training, designing and aligning projects with CEPF and SKEP strategies to develop CEPF LOI's during the first quarter of the project to demonstrate action of SKEP and CEPF in the region.	This was achieved, however the number of actual projects to receive funding measured the success of these intervention. As mentioned above that the success of the SKEP programme was the decentralized approach to coordination, but one could argue that the team was too ambitious in its ability to deliver really good conservation project with a economic development end result. Considering that the CU teams needed to build their own capacity as new comers to the conservation sector, expecting them to also produce really comprehensive project with a core biodiversity focus was unrealistic. As part of the CU evaluation, this element was highlighted as needed attention, and this could be addressed by strengthening the programme project development capacity with more strategic input from a well skilled project developer.
<b>4.3.</b> Strategy for supporting all potential applicants to CEPF developed by Dec 2003 and refined by Coordination teams at Quarterly Training sessions and implemented accordingly.	This strategy has been evolving since the inception of this project, and the programme staff is much clearer as to how this could work. T Most of the strategy has been captured in both the lessons learnt document as well as the independent CU evaluation. These will form as supporting documents for the new approach.
<b>4.4.</b> 7 Priority strategy review workshops implemented to plan for year two project implementation and share lessons learnt from year one by May 2004.	Strategies have all been reviewed and year two activities are currently being catalyzed. The change in approach from year one, was to focus on developing an anchor project, which will be the number one conservation activity to achieve the conservation target, with several supporting

	<p>projects. This has dual benefits, in that one key project could now play an element of coordination, while still achieving and implementing the number one conservation activity.</p>
<p><b>Output 5.</b> Stakeholders are guided to co-ordinate and develop partnerships for more effective conservation action through the active involvement of the SKEP Advisory Committee in the CEPF project development and review process.</p>	<p>The local Advisory Committees are an excellent and useful forum for engaging and representing local stakeholders, as is the TWG in engaging and representing higher-level institutions and the Scientific Advisory Committee in engaging and representing biodiversity. It is evident that all forum members have a sense of wanting to make SKEP work and they feel responsible for bringing their part in order to make the program successful. Some people have been extremely passionate and critical about the program but for the purpose of highlighting certain shortcomings that they can see need to be addressed.</p> <p>The variety of different perspectives that enter the review process is phenomenal, with so many people getting involved both in the region and elsewhere. Even if everyone's inputs are not useful all the time, it spreads the feeling of responsibility and is a visible indication of a decentralized contribution to decision making.</p> <p>Partnership are developed as a necessary means to make project more successful, and spreading the responsibility beyond one organization. To date the Advisory forums have played a key role in identifying the key partnerships, through the project review process, and their quarterly meetings.</p>
<p><b>5.1.</b> Sub-regional advisory committees established with all land use sectors represented are active in advising project design and appropriateness in line with strategies and regional activities ensuring co-ordinated action</p>	<p>All sub-regional advisory committees are functioning and have greatly contributed to the success of the programme. They have representatives from the various land use sectors as depicted in the organagram attached at the end of this report. In all but one regions, advisory committee members have been trained in the CEPF review procedures and the programme have benefited from the better-articulated reviews from these members.</p>
<p><b>5.2.</b> Feedback provided to CEPF and project applicants through CEPF review process by sub-regional Coordinators within 2 weeks of receiving an LOI.</p>	<p>This is an ongoing activity that the Cu has struggled with throughout this project for two reasons. One because the reviews were often not strategic enough, with limited input to defend a decision from the CU, and secondly at times these reviews were late.</p> <p>To assist in the finalization of these reviews CEPF and the CU have come up with a project decision-making time line, which allows a longer period for reviews and does not create unrealistic expectations for projects on answers.</p>
<p><b>5.3.</b> Sub-regional coordination teams facilitating focus meetings to enable new partnerships for conservation action</p>	<p>Based on the review project development meetings would be facilitated by the CU teams. This has resulted in many successful applications and a variety of new partnerships.</p>
<p><b>5.4.</b> Four partnership project development meetings facilitated each by sub-regional co-ordination team per quarter</p>	<p>Simply asking organization to partner was not enough, and the CU often had to arrange for partners to get together to share their expertise and experiences. This has resulted in very innovative</p>

	<p>partnerships, for example the relationship that now exists between the partners in the Gouritz area, the new partnerships in the Namaqua Uplands area, as well as the strategic partnership in the HTR with agriculture and the municipality. At times our approach was received with some resistance, like in the implementation of the Sutherland Succulent route project. However as a result of the teams intervention a new project could be developed for providing jobs to the unemployed of the region.</p>
<p><b>Output 6.</b> SKEP co-ordination unit is supported operationally and strategically by Conservation International's global experience.</p>	<p>CI as a global player has provided numerous opportunities for the SKEP Cu hosted by the SAHP for sharing lessons. This was done in several forms, the most recent opportunity the attendance of the SKEP programme manager and the Northern Namaqualand sub-regional coordinators attendance at the IUCN's world conservation congress in Bangkok. The monthly tele-conferencing meetings with Africa Division VP has identified several opportunities for funding SKEP activities, including the support for smaller initiatives in the SKEP strategy.</p>
<p><b>6.1.</b> SKEP Manager and one SKEP Coordinator's participation at CI's Annual Planning event in 2004.</p>	<p>This event took place in April 2004, with great success. The programme manager was able to contribute to the overall theme of the conference through a plenary presentation on the capacity and partnership building success of the programme. It was also during this trip that additional funding opportunities was identified to support the development of biodiversity businesses through Verdi Ventures, to visit the programme early in 2005, as well as the opportunity to fund some of the stewardship activities in the Namaqualand regions with funding from the Malago Foundation.</p>
<p><b>6.2.</b> Reviews of CEPF project proposals on SKEP, which reflect the global expertise of CI, are submitted to CEPF by the Africa Division Vice President within 2 weeks of their receipt for integration into comments provided back to applicants.</p>	<p>These have all been submitted by CI Senior VP and SAHP Director, providing strategic guidance.</p>
<p><b>6.3.</b> Strategic opportunities for capacity-building and co-funding support for SAHP activities in the SK are identified during monthly telephonic meetings between the SAHP Director and Vice President of the CI Africa Division.</p>	<p>One of the capacity building opportunities from which the SKEP programme benefited was the CI management training course that was attended by the programme manager and Director. This course was then secured through CI support for various local stakeholders in CPT in September of 2004.</p> <p>A second opportunity was the attendance of the programme manager at the IUCN world conservation congress in Bangkok.</p>
<p><b>6.4.</b> Five new potential funding sources for biodiversity conservation activities in the SK are identified by CI-DC and a strategy to target these sources is developed in conjunction with the SAHP and Africa Fundraising Director by September 2004</p>	<p>The SAHP Director and Communications manager went on a fund-raising trip in last quarter of 2004, where the director attended the CI Board meeting to promote the activities of the programme, and look for new funding opportunities. Some of these are currently being explored with support from the CI Development department.</p> <p>A key partnership with the DBSA has been explored, supported with several visits, to explore future support for the regions through a Conservation and development fund. A proposal</p>

	<p>for this has already been submitted to both CEPF and DBSA.</p> <p>A second proposal for supporting training of Municipal staff in project development, ensuring a stronger biodiversity link has also been submitted and is currently under review.</p>
<p><b>6.5.</b> Two additional proposals for funding initiatives by local partners are developed by the Africa Division Staff with the support of the Division Fundraising Director and SAHP Director by July 2004.</p>	<p>The SAHP director has also been involved in drafting 10 small grant application to the IUCN's project fund. These projects are all to support local organization for the implementation of the SKEP strategies.</p>
<p><b>6.6.</b> Three proposals are developed by the Africa Division Staff with the support of the Division Fundraising Director and the SAHP Director to ensure the financial sustainability of SKEP-support function of the SAHP by December 2003.</p>	<p>Several proposal shave been developed, one major one being the funding of the SAHP core costs through the development of a endowment fund. This however has proven very difficult, and the SAHP director is currently back in DC to consider following up and furthering discussions with CI's development department, to support its core cost for SKEP.</p>
<p><b>6.7.</b> Monitoring and capacity building in financial management by CEPF grantees in the SK is conducted by the CI Senior Financial Manager as requested by CEPF.</p>	<p>This has been an ongoing activity supported by the SAHP financial manager assisting applicants with developing financial templates. Only one request came in from CEPF, as most of the larger institutions implementing SKEP projects already had some experience with CEPF financial systems.</p>
<p><b>6.8.</b> Financial reporting by SAHP overseen by CI Senior Financial Manager.</p>	<p>All financial reports have been submitted under the guidance of CI financial director for Africa.</p>

***Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.***

This project was highly successful in all its outputs, except for its support for project development. There are huge lessons to be learnt from our approach, particularly considering the capacity of the region. Much more information has been captured in the supporting document as the evaluation of the SKEP CU.

***Were any outputs unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?***

No, all outputs and activities were realized and implemented. Some to greater degree of success than others.

**V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS**

***Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.***

**VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT**

***Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.***

**Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/failure)**

The project implementer has to be involved in the project design. This is difficult as existing managers in key positions develop often projects and they then hire new staff responsible for implementation. An additional activity that would have been useful in the project design would have been to develop the project with the core CU staff including all the sub-regional coordinators. This once again emphasis that who-ever implements the project has to be involved in the project development, other-wise there will be areas of misinterpretation.

The project design used the log-frame methodology, and the managers involved were directly responsible for its implementation. This methodology once understood, is very useful, particularly during monitoring and project management of the various elements.

**Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)**

<b>VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING</b>
--------------------------------

**Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.**

No additional funding has yet been secured for this project, except for the commitment of SANBI to support the next phase of the Coordination unit under the new Bioregional programmes directorate.

Co-funding was secured at local level through in kind support from a range of stakeholders. These usually took on the form of discounts from our suppliers in particular Business Presentations Groups who kindly donated us with free facilitation time for many of the raining interventions. The total amount of this in kind support amounted to approximately \$ 7500.

Other support funding came from the Eye-design who gave their design costs for all the awareness materials for free. This amounted to \$ 5000. SANBI through their MOU with CI gave our office space for free supporting us with \$ 1500.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

**\*Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- B** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)*
- C** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*
- D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

**Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.**

The SKEP coordination will continue for the next three years under SANBI as the new institution. This is a significant move and a success of this project, as SANBI is the nationally legislated authority for managing and facilitating stakeholders and civil society organizations for implementing bioregional programmes like SKEP. As a maturing programme, the Coordination needs of SKEP have evolved and a plan for transferring Coordination from CI to SANBI has been outlined to continue to address the programmes priority needs. It was always the intention of CI to ensure that the program is eventually transferred to a South African statutory body. At the time of submission of the SKEP capacity building and awareness project, there was little to no understanding of what the Coordination Mechanism would or should be and how it would relate to other statutory bodies and local stakeholders or what the institutional home should be. Having tested a model over the last 18 months, the mechanism has become clearer and the SKEP Coordination Unit has evolved into an effective team supporting conservation in the Succulent Karoo. Stakeholders and agencies believe in the vision and trust in the programme among previously anti-conservation sectors has been built.

As a result, a careful transition process is currently being implemented that will maintain momentum, ensure transparent input and understanding, and successfully integrate the coordination functions into appropriate institutions. After careful review and evaluation of the institutional future for SKEP, the appropriate institutional for future coordination of SKEP was identified as South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI).

A project proposal to support SANBI in implementing a coordination unit, using existing and new coordination structures but keeping to the same decentralized model of coordination, to facilitate conservation action within the SKEP priority areas has already been submitted to CEPF. SANBI being the legislated authority mandated to facilitate bioregional programmes now has established a directorate for Bioregional Programmes, making it the appropriate institution to continue to manage and facilitate the partnership development and conservation action of SKEP.

Although the SKEP Coordination function will be transferred from CI to SANBI, CI SAHP remains dedicated to the SKEP Vision and will be supporting the overall vision by developing a small grants facility called the Conservation and Development Fund. It will address the numerous skills-base and financial challenges that can prevent SKEP from achieving its vision: “The people of the Succulent Karoo take ownership of and enjoy their unique living landscape in a way that maintains biodiversity and improves livelihoods now and into perpetuity.” In addition to this CI, will also develop a project called Municipality training to support mainstreaming biodiversity targets and priorities into municipal decision making mechanisms, thereby ensuring appropriate alignment of local development goals

## VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF aims to increase sharing of experiences, lessons learned and results among our grant recipients and the wider conservation and donor communities. One way we do this is by making the text of final project completion reports available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and by marketing these reports in our newsletter and other communications. Please indicate whether you would agree to publicly sharing your final project report with others in this way.

Yes \_\_\_yes\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please also complete the following:

**For more information about this project, please contact:**

Name: Owen Henderson  
Private Bag X7, Claremont, 7735  
South Africa  
Tel: +27 21 7998655  
Fax: +27 21 7626838  
E-mail: [ohenderson@conservation.org](mailto:ohenderson@conservation.org) or [henderson@sanbi.org](mailto:henderson@sanbi.org)

# Conservation International

**Sarah Frazee (SAHP Director)**

## *Scientific Advisory Board*

Antje Burke – Namibia  
Timm Hoffmann – Institute of Plant Conservation  
Mark Anderson – Northern Cape Nature Conservation  
Guy Mitchley – National Botanical Institute  
Annelise Le Roux – Western Cape Nature Conservation Board  
Matthieu Rouget – Institute of Plant Conservation  
Karen Esler – University of Stellenbosch  
Richard Cowling – SAHP Scientific Advisor  
Howard Hendricks – South African National parks

## **Technical Working Group**

Richard Cowling – Scientific Advisor  
Kristal Maze – Bioregional Programmes Director (NBI)  
Mandy Driver – Botanical Society

Tessa Mildenhall (SAHP programme Manager)

Owen Henderson (SKEP programme Manager)

Bronwen Williams (SKEP Programme Assistant)

SKEP Namibia

SKEP Northern Namaqualand

SKEP Southern Namaqualand

***SKEP Hantam Tanoua***

SKEP Southern Karoo

**Advisory Committee**  
(Please find attached a list of advisory Committee members)

**Advisory Committee**  
(Please find attached a list of advisory Committee members)

**Advisory Committee**  
**(Please find attached a list of advisory Committee members)**

**Advisory Committee**  
(Please find attached a list of advisory Committee members)

**Advisory Committee**  
(Please find attached a list of advisory Committee members)

Yvonne Adriaanse  
(Coordinator)

Wilna Oppel  
(Coordinator)

Malinda Gardener  
(Coordinator)

Kirsten Freckleton  
(Coordinator)

Susan Botha  
(Coordinator)

Kauna Schroder  
(Assistant)

Clarice Franks  
(Assistant)

Rosline Cloete  
(Assistant)

Vacant  
(Assistant)

Jean de Souza  
(Assistant)

### Advisory Committee Per Sub-region

Namibia		Northern Namaqualand		Southern Namaqualand		Hantam Tanqua Roggeveld		Southern Karoo	
Name	Organisation	Name	Organisation	Name	Organisation	Name	Organisation	Name	Organisation
Dr Antje Burk	Enviro Science	Vries Joseph	Khai-ma Municipality	Wilna Ooppel	SKEP	Jaco Venter	WCNCB	David Daitz	(CEO) WCNCB
Leonora Joodt	Karas Regional Council	Jannie Loubser	PIMS	Nadia Heyns	De Beers	Helga van der Merwe	Scientist	Ivan Donian	(BUM) WCNCB
Timotheus Mufeti	Nacoma Project	Russel Smart	SANParks	Martin Langenhoven	West Coast District Municipality	Henk van Wyk	Landbou Unie	Annemarie Gebhart	Department of Education
Dr Malan Lindeque	Ministry of Environmental and Tourism	Abe Koopman	Namakhoi Meent management	Jannie Laubser	PIMS	Tinnie Jaarsveld	<b>Commando</b>	Clive Moses	Land Affairs
Dawid Mouton	Scorpion Zinc Mine	Michelle Yates	BCI	Albertus Dyson	Department of Agriculture Western Cape	Cecil van der Westhuizen	<b>Department of Agriculture</b>	Willem Smith	Department of Environmental Affairs
Manfred Goldbeck	Nature Investments	Joseph Cloete Hennie Nel	Richtersveld Municipality.	Louis Van Wyk	Garies District Municipality	Sammy Brand	<b>Department of Education</b>	Jan Kapp	Department of Environmental affairs
Dr Gillian L Maggs	Kolling NBRI of Namibia	Ivan Groenewald	LED-Tourism	Thys Mentoor	Griqua Ratelgat Initiative	Cpt van Wyk	<b>SAP</b>	Henry Hill	Eden District Municipality
Colleen Manheimer	National Herbarium of Namibia	Adrienne Farmer Leonard Losper	Education	Sakkie van der Poll	Department of Agriculture Northern Cape	Charles Williams	<b>SPP</b>	Deon Haasbroek	Department of Water Affairs
Dr Sindila Mwiya	Ministry of Mines and Energy	Morné Farmer	RARE Educator	Elbie Cloete	WCNCB	Anthony Mietas	<b>Karoo Hoogland Municipality</b>	Jan Smit	Department of Agriculture
Christopher Brown	Namibia Nature Foundation	Ronnie Newman	SPP	Bergwaldt Rhode	West Coast District Municipality	Noel Viljoen	Hantam Municipality	Hannes Muller	Department of Agriculture
Teofilus Nghitila	Ministry of Mines and Energy	Louis van Wyk	Kammiesberg Municipality	Charl Du Plessis	WCNCB	Huibrey Theron	Farmer's Union	Kobus Nel	Department of Agriculture
Gunther Stubenrauch	Stubenrauch Planning Consultant	John Corjeus	WARD committee	Christo Paulsen	Matsikame Tourism Board	Conrad Strauss	Tankwa National Park	Louis Jordaan	Organised Agriculture
Alexander Speiser	Enviromental Consultants	Leslie Beukes	Khai-ma	Emerentia De Kock	SANParks	Karel Nel	Community Development	Rali Philander	Emergent farmers
Piet Swiegers	Community Klein Aus Trust Fund	Gert Engelbrecht	Meent committee	Giel De Kock	SANParks	Erica Doman	Namaqua District Municipality	Hein Gerstner	Tourism

Sam Shikongo	MET	Christo Smit	Department of Agriculture	Jaco Rheeder	WCNCB		Jane Green	Conservancies
Willie Humphies	SNAFU	Willem Louw	Rich/Park	Priscilla Magerman	SANParks		Tineke Kraaij	SANParks
Salman Jacobs	Karas Regional Council	Harriet van Schalkwyk	Environmental Officer - Black Mountain	Russel Smart	SANParks		Lorna Watt	WESSA
		Nieuwoudt Bettie	Boerevereniging	Walter Hendricks	Matzikama Municipality		Lorraine McGibbon	BEEP & Green
				Theresa Steele	Namaqua Sands		Ena McIntyre	BOTSOC
							Annelise Vlok	Scientific Services
							Wietsche Roets	Scientific Services
							Johan Terreblanche	Police and Justice
							Willem Botha	Private Sector

*SUCCULENT KAROO ECO-SYSTEM PROGRAM  
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE SKEP SUB-REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE*

**1. BACKGROUND**

The Succulent Karoo Ecosystem Programme has evolved from a unique systematic and participatory planning process. A one-year process was led by a consortium of five institutions, Eco-Africa Consulting, the Botanical Society of South Africa, the National Botanical Institute of South Africa, the Ministry of Environment of Namibia, and Conservation International and resulted in broad consensus around a vision and 20-year strategy (the Succulent Karoo Ecosystem Plan) to achieve biodiversity conservation and sustainable land-use in this important ecosystem.

In Action Planning Workshops at the Biome, Sub-regional, and Priority Area level, the need for a mechanism to ensure that momentum was not lost and that stakeholders were assisted to realize the SKEP vision was consistently identified. At these workshops, representatives from the various sectors were nominated by workshops participants to serve as sectoral representatives on Sub-regional Steering Committees consist of representatives of key sectors, containing expertise and knowledge on a wide range of fields.

**These interim steering committees (representing sectoral interests from tourism, commercial farming, communal farming, mining, local government, conservation, education, and law enforcement) recruited a coordinator for their sub-region. In several regions, the committees opted to offer the coordination position to the individuals who had been involved in the SKEP planning phase, in others, the coordinators were new hires.**

**Each coordinator, with the participation of their sub-regional committee, then appointed an assistant and the SKEP Coordination Team now consists of 10 field staff in 5 sub-regional offices located throughout the Succulent Karoo. This team is working in their sub-region to raise awareness about importance of biodiversity conservation and to assist entities within their sub-region to develop projects and take advantage of opportunities (financial, training, planning, etc.) that will support the conservation and sustainable land-use objectives of SKEP.**

**SKEP places a strong emphasis on a participatory, integrated and transparent process for the roll-out of the SKEP 20 year strategy. As part of this policy these sub-regional steering committees have now become Advisory Committees throughout the biome.**

The intention of establishing the Sub-regional Advisory Committees is to localize program roll-out. It is of critical importance for the sub-regional coordination units to have access to and input from local expertise and knowledge in order to advise the funder of appropriateness of project proposals. At sub-regional level the needs of communities and state of the environment are known, and the indication of appropriateness of proposed projects to address these needs are more realistic. By engaging with stakeholders on a sub-regional level to obtain representation for the various sectors SKEP ensures a grass-roots approach to conservation.

## **2. MEMBERSHIP OF THE SKEP SUB-REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

The SKEP Coordination Units will solicit co-operation from various stakeholders to ensure that expertise is available to assist the coordination unit in its functions. All members will annually be nominated, before 1 April, by the respective organizations and authorities.

The SKEP Coordination Unit will strive to solicit representation from the following sectors within the sub-region

- Local government representatives falling within the sub-region
- Agriculture
- Tourism
- Communal lands
- Conservation agencies
- Education
- Community Safety
- Youth
- NGO's that have regional representation

Members co-opted per project will be:

- Identified per project where additional expertise that does not exist within the Advisory Committee is needed.

Institutions and organizations within the different sectors will be invited annually to nominate one representative plus a second to serve on the SKEP Sub-regional Advisory Committees

## **3. STATUS AND PURPOSE OF THE SUB-REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

The SKEP Sub-regional Advisory Committee (SAC) is a voluntary body functioning within the ambit of cooperative governance, institutional coordination and integration of objectives. The SKEP Sub-regional Advisory Committee will have no legal status with its members to be mandated / nominated by the various organizations / authorities, to act as representative. The SAC is responsible to report only to the SKEP Biome-wide Advisory Committee and the Biome wide SKEP manager.

**The main purpose of the SKEP Sub-regional Advisory Committee is the assessment of all project proposals submitted for review by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, the donor funding the first 5 years of the SKEP 20 year strategy, as well as providing the coordination unit with advice and information to ensure that the coordination units operate in a effective and productive manner.**

**4. FUNCTIONS OF THE SUB-REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

- The SKEP Sub-regional Advisory Committee will review project proposals that fall within the context of the organization they represent and within their field of knowledge and expertise. Members will indicate support or not support for the commitment of funds to prioritized projects within a particular period.
- The SKEP Sub-regional Advisory Committee will direct the sub-regional coordination unit's actions and activities continually in the context of the conservation needs in the sub-region as well as in context of the SKEP conservation targets.
- The SKEP Sub-regional Advisory Committee will advise the coordination unit of the effective pooling and application of available resources (human/financial/natural) in order to ensure the reaching of SKEP's conservation targets and effective implementation of the SKEP 20 year strategy.
- The SKEP Sub-regional Advisory Committee will, where members are aware of opportunities to promote the program roll-out, advise of appropriate organization or mechanism to be involved in the process as well as inform the co-ordination unit of issues that needs to be addressed or taken notice of that impacts on Biodiversity conservation.

**5. STANDING RULES OF ORDER**

**5.1 Chairperson**

The chair will be taken by SKEP Coordinator to ensure effective integration of all sectors as part of their TOR as core staff in the sub-region. In the absence of the SKEP coordinator the chairperson will be elected by the members of advisory committee, at the beginning of meeting.

**5.2 Meetings**

- In order to perform the duties mentioned in Paragraph 4, the SKEP Sub-regional committee will meet once a quarter.
- The need for ad hoc meetings might arise, in which case notice of such an ad hoc meeting must be given by the secretariat at least 72 hours in advance.

**5.3 Secretariat**

- The SKEP Sub-regional Coordination Unit will provide the secretarial functions. The following services will be provided by the secretariat:
  - Give written notice of meetings
  - Draw up the agenda according to the order of business
  - Keep the attendance register
  - Take the minutes of the meetings and circulate to all members within ten (10) working days after the meeting
  - See to all the necessary arrangements, correspondence and communications with regard to the meetings
  - Supply the members with any documentation to be discussed, two weeks in advance of next meeting
  - Provide meeting facilities

#### **5.4 Notice of Meetings**

- The secretariat will give at least ten (10) working days notice of meetings.
- The notice shall set the time, date and place of the meeting and shall include the Agenda for the meeting.
- The secretariat will provide the members with all the necessary information in order for members to prepare.
- Meeting dates will be decided upon at the end of each meeting
- The secretariat will give at least 72 hours notice of ad hoc meetings.

#### **5.5 Venue of meeting**

- Quarterly meetings of the SKEP Sub-regional Advisory Committee will be held rotationally at venues in the sub-region in order to have a fair distribution of traveling distances to members.

#### **5.6 Agenda**

- The agenda shall be finalized by the secretariat and delivered to the committee members not later than ten (10) working days before the committee meeting.
- The agenda shall be drawn up in accordance with the order of business.
- Committee members may place items on the agenda by submitting them, in writing and accompanied by the relevant information, to the secretariat not later than twelve (12) working days before committee meetings.
- Urgent matters that may arise after the specific time may be placed on the agenda at the meeting with the consent of the meeting.

### **5.7 Quorum**

As this is not a decision making body, consensus will be strived for, but a quorum is not critical, however opinions will be sourced by other members telephonically before going forward on issues raised.

### **5.8 Attendance Register**

- The secretariat shall keep the attendance register in which all participants present at the committee meeting shall confirm attendance by signature.

### **5.9 Minutes**

- The secretariat will keep proper minutes, in Afrikaans/English, of the meetings. Persons tasked by the meeting to perform certain duties shall be clearly designated in the minutes.
- Resolutions taken at the meeting should be properly minuted.
- The minutes shall be sent to all committee members within ten (10) working days after each meeting.

### **5.10 Order of Business**

- The order of business at the SAC shall be as follows:
  - i. Opening
  - ii. Attendance register and apologies
  - iii. Adoption of the agenda
  - iv. Adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting
  - v. Progress with aspects arising from minutes
  - vi. Matters arising from the previous meeting's minutes
  - vii. New business
  - viii. Urgent matters
  - ix. Feedback on progress of approval of projects
  - x. Date of next meeting
  - xi. Closure
- The chairperson may, with the agreement of the meeting, accept a request to discuss and decide on an urgent matter not on the agenda, or change the order of the agenda.

### **5.11 Proceedings at the Meeting**

- Committee members as well as other participants shall respect each another's point of view;

- Maximum participation of all participants shall be encouraged;
- Speakers shall speak to the point or issue under discussion or on a point of order;
- Whenever a participant speaks all present shall be silent so that the person speaking may be heard without interruption.
- Meetings will be conducted in either Afrikaans or English. During the session where project business plans are assessed the meeting will be conducted in the language in which the applicant feels most comfortable.