

# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** South African National Parks

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** Raising Awareness of the Unique Biodiversity of the Tanqua Karoo and Roggeveld Priority Region

**Implementation Partners for this Project:**

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** July 1, 2005 – April 30, 2007

**Date of Report (month/year):** 24 February 2008

## II. OPENING REMARKS

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

This project has not posed many problems, except for the fact that capacity was exceptional low, which created huge pressure on the implementing staff to perform. Furthermore has the exchange rate caused a huge decrease in the funds initially asked for, leading to some outputs not being completed, and some not to full extent. Overall, I believe however that this project reached it main goal, which was to create opportunities and open up visions for this special part of South Africa. The fact that SANParks have allocated +/- 1000000 US dollars to this park since this project started is proof of that. In addition, was the first Section Ranger ever being appointed in the succulent karoo as well as further staff appointments, like duty managers, etc. These are also a first in the succulent karoo. As a catalyser, this project was a huge success story.

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

**Project Purpose:** Establishing an edu-tourism center creating linkages between local people, farmers, tourists and researchers where information can be disseminated, guiding these sectors in appropriate biodiversity conservation action.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b>	
There is an increase in the conservation status of the land neighboring the Tankwa Karoo National Park	Most of neighboring farmers seems to adapt various forms of conservation friendly methods. Much more contact between park staff and farmers.
The community in the Tanqua Roggeveld are asking for information on how to manage and utilize the Succulent karoo more sustainably	Study groups being established – asking for research projects – flowing from more contact between farmers and conservation staff. Need to still do the farmers day to ensure some projects to be established.

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

Impact objective as described in opening statement. The performance indicators can only be measured effectively over a longer period, but the initial assessment is that a lot of local people are aware of Tankwa National Park and what we would like to achieve. Various questions are dealt with through our channels, raised from the farming community, and assistance is sought on certain aspects of field management. Although currently happening at low scale, we believe that with capacity building and the first communication lines established, we have set a good platform from which to communicate and assist in the longer term.

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

Not really, except for the huge tourism growth into the area, as well as massive financial support from SANParks itself.

<b>IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS</b>
----------------------------

**Project Outputs:**

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Output 1: Information is available at a central place to ensure that peoples choices are guided in such a way that biodiversity conservation benefits.</b>	
<b>1.1</b> Facility is up and running by April 2006.	Done
<b>1.2</b> Information has been collated and is available for public use by April 2007.	Struggle due to connectivity – 80%
<b>1.3</b> There is an 15% increase in the number of visitors to the park who are aware of the biological importance of the threatened and unique species in the Tanqua Karoo by April 2007.	Done
<b>1.4</b> The unique features of the TKNP are identified by March 2006.	Done
<b>1.5</b> Education Routes are established and are clearly marked for use with self guide booklet by December 2006.	Not enough funding
<b>Output 2: A framework for Awareness activities have been developed and implemented focusing on the following sectors, farming, scientific researcher, schools, civil society and local government</b>	
<b>2.1</b> 30 Local farmers are aware of the importance and opportunities of biodiversity conservation of the region by March 2007.	60% - still need to do the farmer's day.
<b>2.2</b> Scientists are active in researching relevant issues in the Tanqua karoo and Roggeveld region by March 2007.	Hand in hand with the farmers day
<b>2.3</b> 200 School learners are aware of the importance of	Not enough funding – 70 learners were accommodated.

the biodiversity of the region by March 2007.	
<b>2.4</b> A high level bus tour for Calvinia community members and politicians has been arranged by April 2007.	Not enough funding – will do with the launch of the park with SANParks funding. Very good contacts were however built with the mayor of Calvinia and various officials from DEAT Northern Cape through this project and some of its outputs.
<b>Output 3: Conservation action and activities for each of the targeted sectors are identified and implemented.</b>	
<b>3.1</b> Farmers have identified two research projects to be registered by the individual at relevant institutions by December 2006.	Projects identified, still to be finalized on a farmers day.
<b>3.2</b> Two schools have established a longterm eco-project by March 2007 to be managed by the learners on an annual basis.	Not be able to do due to funding.
<b>3.3</b> Link tourism SMME development to the tourism component of the Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor by November 2006.	Done.

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

With the capacity constraints throughout the project as well as exchange rate causing little funding, some outputs have not being met. Overall, I believe that the outputs were reached to an 80% extent. Although some outputs have not being reached, it does not mean nothing has being done. Lot of discussions has taken place with various departments regarding certain objectives of this project, which also slaughtered in the overall management plan for Tankwa National Park. Issues were addressed and I believe that with the development of this park and the initial groundwork that have being done, this project and its outputs have contributed largely to the future achievement of most of these goals.

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

I do not think so, if capacity and funding were better, everything would have realized.

## V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

None

## 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.***

The project went smoothly, except for the fact that we did not have enough implementation staff. Since receiving these funds, Tankwa National Park has really come alive with lots of funding from SANParks side, which also have put a lot more stress on the little capacity that we had in Tankwa. Although affecting the project, we see this as a good thing. Budgeting well upfront also create challenges with constant exchange rate changes in South Africa. In South African Rand we lost almost a quarter of our funding due to this.

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

The success of the project can be directed to the sheer passion by our little staff component to make Tankwa National Park one of the leading National Parks in South Africa. This over optimism has probably caused a few hick-ups, not anticipating the impact if SANParks also deliver funding, as did happen. The overall design process went smoothly, and would only changed minor objectives if we were able to read the future.

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

As above.

**VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING**

**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.**

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
SANParks	A	70000USDollars	Assist this project
SANParks (DEAT)	B	850000USDollars	Tourism Projects

**\*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 project will continue, as this was also the establishment of the head office from where the park will be managed in the future. As adaptive management is part of Park Management plans, as well as building relationships with neighboring and local communities, this project will continue well into the future.

**VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

None.

## VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

**Please include your full contact details below:**

Name: Conrad Strauss

Organization name: South African National Parks

Mailing address: P.O. Box 299, Calvinia, 8190

Tel: 027 - 3411927

Fax: 027 - 3412814

E-mail: [conrads@sanparks.org](mailto:conrads@sanparks.org)