

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Conservation International

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): *SKEPPIES Project Development Support*

Implementation Partners for this Project: Development Bank of South Africa (DBSA)

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): November 1, 2006 – March 31, 2009

Date of Report (month/year): 06/2009

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The "Basic Training on Conservation Trust Funds Workshop was held 31 March to 2nd April in Cape Town and attended by around 6 African Trust Funds most of them in their inception stage. At that occasion Melissa Moye, the facilitator from WWF-US said something to the effect: "SKEPPIES is the first non-fund I came across that has everything in place of a fund".

This statement summarizes what the CEPF grant has meant for SKEPPIES as well as the present status of SKEPPIES. The CEPF grant has enabled SKEPPIES to:

- Have a wide range of conservation and development projects we support through small grants and thus contributing to achieving the conservation and development goals of SKEP.
- SKEPPIES became a brand in its own right and acquired a certain momentum.
- Developed best practices and created a long-term mechanism through which donors can channel their funding to grassroots projects that support the SKEP 20-year conservation targets.
- Expanded the number of individuals, NGOs and less-established organisations that have an opportunity to become involved in conservation action.
- Strengthened linkages between conservation and development.
- Strengthened the network of stakeholders that support long-term conservation action.
- Expanded local capacity for financial administration and provided technical expertise and regular support to local civil society and government.
- Helped to unlock the developmental potential of biodiversity conservation by creating jobs and assisting in starting or expanding businesses.
- Used global and local expertise to support strategic project development to ensure that its projects are viable and sustainable, both economically and environmentally.

- Mentored a local individual into the role of project developer and then into the role of SKEPPIES Fund Manager.
- Developed a monitoring database and an innovative photographic monitoring and evaluation system.
- Brought in the Development Bank of Southern Africa as a SKEPPIES partner and leveraged US\$ 305,000 from the Bank for grant disbursements, as well as in-kind contribution of three DBSA staff to the project.

However at the very same time we are not yet a truly independent fund and have identified other areas that need further development to consolidate and strengthen our gains. The following still needs to be done:

- Conduct a review of SKEPPIES in terms of its institutional structure, with the aim of converting SKEPPIES from a CI project into an independent Fund.
- Audit both the development and conservation impacts of SKEPPIES and make recommendations for improved outputs where necessary.
- Expand the SKEPPIES donor partnership beyond CEPF and DBSA to ensure its financial sustainability, and leverage long-term support from the DBSA to the Fund.
- Consolidate and improve systems and procedures for project application, approval, monitoring and completion, in particular to verify the contribution of the projects to conservation outputs.
- Increase project grantee mentorship.
- Align projects granted so that they support the creation of conservancies or some other form of stewardship agreement.
- Link our projects to the markets to ensure their long term profitability and sustainability.

This CEPF grant has enabled SKEPPIES to lay a solid foundation on which a grant-making institution can be erected.

NOTE: The exchange rate that will be used throughout this report is 1 US\$ = 9 ZAR

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: *Project beneficiaries have access to project development support from SKEPPIES and are working within the systems being tested and developed.*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	

<p>1. At least 75 people are employed in jobs that contribute towards economic development in an environmentally sound manner.</p>	<p>The projects approved contributed directly or indirectly to the creation of a minimum of the following:- 391 new jobs, the capacity building of 807 people, the empowerment of 410 women, the creation of 42 new businesses, adding value to 67 businesses and raising the awareness of 119,596 people about conservation and development.</p>
<p>2. At least 60 applications for grants are being made to SKEPPIES.</p>	<p>61 applications were made to SKEPPIES management committee to the total value of US\$ 666,312. It is estimated by SKEPPIES staff that for every project that makes it through the application process 10 enquires are being entertained. Thirteen projects to the value of 168,598 were rejected primarily because they were not aligned with the SKEPPIES objectives. A few projects withdrew because they did not see their way open to comply with SKEPPIES criteria to involve the community or to make their property available for conservation. 48 projects to a total value of US\$ 497,714 were approved. In addition a further 10 projects were developed during our involvement with the SKEP CAPE market place event. The development of these applications was supported by SKEPPIES Project team although not developed on our usual application form because of the combined event.</p>
<p>3. At least 100, 000 hectares of land are being managed for conservation while providing economic benefit to local communities.</p>	<p>The projects approved contributed directly or indirectly to a minimum of the following: 41,400 hectares were better managed, 6,259 hectares were added to conservation; 2 SKEP river process and 1 SKEP sand process and 1 gravel process were better managed; 242 Red listed plant species, 2 red listed bird species, 5 red listed amphibians and 1 red listed mammal benefited.</p>

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

The project achieved most of its intended impacts and objectives. We erred on the side of caution and in some cases data were not available. That notwithstanding SKEPPIES broke into a new field and supported the creation of wider conservation areas to be declared in the long term. These areas supported did not necessarily materialize during the time this project was implemented.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

- The major unexpected impact was the SKEPPIES turned out to be a development organization and not a grant making organization. Grant making turned out to be a very small part of our work. The majority of the work went into developing projects in collaboration with applicants. Applicants were taken through the though process involved in developing a project, making it sustainable, and linking conservation with development. The detail of nature conservation was in many cases new to the applicants. For instance some applicants did not know how to send a picture via email. Even the opportunity to be in charge of projects was sometimes new and foreign to applicants.
- Another development was that SKEPPIES became a brand in its own right that implemented the objectives of its partners. SKEPPIES became a mechanism to introduce its partners (CEPF, CI and DBSA) and their objectives at grassroots level
- Our small projects themselves leveraged a considerable amount at grassroots level. In 2008, the only year we monitored, US\$ 190,168 was leveraged by our small grants from their partners through in-kind contributions.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs:

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: 28 to 32 eligible projects are identified and potential grantees are assisted in applying for the grant that is advertised through brochures.	
<i>1.1. Two to four additional project implementors are supported to develop their initiatives into an integrated conservation and development project by November 2006</i>	8 of the projects that applied were developed with the 100% support of the project developer while in only 3 projects the support can be described as minimal to none because the skill level of the applicants were such that a heavy involvement was not necessary.
<i>1.2. One to three project implementors are supported to develop their initiatives into an integrated conservation and development project by March 2007</i>	1 of the 4 applications that were developed had a 95% input and support from SKEPPIES manager. The rest of the projects had an average of 20% support input in the form of constant advise,

	checking of data, budgets, refinement of ideas, etc.
1.3. <i>Three project implementors are supported to develop their initiatives into an integrated conservation and development project by April 2007</i>	1 of the 4 applications that were developed had a 95% input and support from SKEPPIES manager. The rest of the projects had an average of 20% support input in the form of constant advise, checking of data, budgets, refinement of ideas, etc
1.4. <i>Three project implementors are supported to develop their initiatives into an integrated conservation and development project by June 2007</i>	1 of the 4 applications that were developed had a 95% input and support from SKEPPIES manager. The rest of the projects had an average of 20% support input in the form of constant advise, checking of data, budgets, refinement of ideas, etc
1.5. <i>Three project implementors are supported to develop their initiatives into an integrated conservation and development project by August 2007</i>	For the 2nd half of 2007 6 projects to the value of US\$ 58,370 were developed with the support of SKEPPIES and approved.
1.6. <i>Three project implementors are supported to develop their initiatives into an integrated conservation and development project by October 2007</i>	For the 2nd half of 2007 6 projects to the value of US\$ 58,370 were developed with the support of SKEPPIES and approved.
1.7. <i>One to three project implementors are supported to develop their initiatives into an integrated conservation and development project by December 2007</i>	For the 2nd half of 2007 6 projects to the value of US\$ 58,370 were developed with the support of SKEPPIES and approved.
1.8. <i>Sixteen to twenty project implementors are supported to develop their initiatives into an integrated conservation and development project from January 2008 to December 2008</i>	<p>During this period 13 projects valued at US\$ 179,097 (1 US\$ = 7.5 ZAR) were approved. The amounts of two of the approved projects (Taking South African Hoodia Forward and the Eco-grading System for the Succulent Karoo) were lowered from US\$ 18,700 to US\$ 2,700 by the selection committee.</p> <p>3 projects at a total value of US\$ 56,000 were rejected by the committee, namely Know your Reserve, Aspects of the Ecology of the Caracal and Restoration on De Beers Mines. One small project (Big Birds on Farms) was submitted but rejected by the Fund Manager as it obviously was not within the guidelines of SKEPPIES.</p> <p>6 of the 13 projects that applied were developed with the 50% and more support of the project developer while the rest of the projects had 20% or less because the skills level of the applicants were such that a heavy involvement was not necessary. Support range from site visits to see if project fits our objectives informing people of what we look for; helping the disadvantaged community to develop</p>

	<p>their ideas clearer; helping them to fill in forms; providing them with biodiversity data to see if project will attribute to our biodiversity targets; checking budgets and photo applications against the written application.</p>
<p>1.9. A minimum 3000 brochures in Afrikaans is developed and printed to promote SKEPPIES amongst the potential field of applicants by February 2008.</p>	<p>7000 brochures were printed in Afrikaans</p> <p>4000 English brochures were developed and printed. The Story of Laingsburg greening was developed into a booklet and 100 copies printed. As the financial survival of SKEPPIES became paramount 3 basic fundraising aids in electronic format was developed to be used by the fundraiser:</p> <p>a. Recommendation and support for SKEPPIES by NGOs and government b. Publication and publicity SKEPPIES received c. Evaluation by outsiders of SKEPPIES</p> <p>An annual report for 2008 was compiled. 1000 of these were published in hard copies and this is being used be used as marketing material when interacting with other donors. 50% of this cost was carried by our partner Development Bank of South Africa (DBSA) from their CEPF grant.</p>
<p>Output 2: Where necessary, partnerships with other scientific, community, business, and social programmes are developed to bring these expertises into SKEPPIES projects.</p>	
<p>2.1. A total of fifteen experts are consulted to give inputs into the various projects</p>	<p>This target was achieved. Experts gave advise on a regular basis such as in case of screening of Fryerscove protected area. The route is taken to involve experts in project implementation so that experts form part of the group applying for projects or are incorporated by applicants as is the case with Hiking trail, memorystick and Medicinal plant projects.</p> <p>In 9 of the 13 approved projects during Jan 2008 to Dec 2008 , people and organizations with fairly in-depth knowledge were involved. We moved to a situation where experts are involved in the development of the project itself before it is submitted for approval in order to give better quality to projects e.g. Department of agriculture gave input in Roodebergskloof Cleaning; Agricultural scientist lead and write Tweeriver Ram camp; Scientist who done research on project write Taking hoodia forward; Eco-schools program as leaders on their</p>

	<p>subject; Community program were submitted by NGO involved in this area.</p> <p>Our dependency on outside experts decreased with us having a customized GIS viewer. For biodiversity data and info, we were dependent on experts who often let us wait for weeks delaying our work.</p>
<p>2.2. Partnerships are built with ten to twelve social development organisations and departments to support project implementation</p>	<p>Partnerships were built with various government departments from many spheres and various social development organizations. Most projects are recognized in the District Municipality's Integrated and Development plans of the Northern Cape. In the Western Cape linkages were established with the Oudtshoorn municipality. This municipality managed the process project initiation and selection and distributed 60 application forms in conjunction with the Red Door initiative that supports small business. The benefit is that the municipality's officials are now on board to help develop SKEPPIES projects as part of their duties and did involve other local stakeholders.</p> <p>Another example is the wood for Memorystick project that is supplied by Department of forestry as part of their alien clearing program.</p> <p>From Jan 2008 to Dec 2008, 4 new formal organizations are involved and 4 new community groups in implementing SKEPPIES projects. The 3 formal organizations are University of free State, Centre for Development support (Hoodia project); Surplus Peoples Project (Rietjieshuis project); The Media and Training Centre for Health (Community Radio). The application of the fourth organization, namely Northern Cape Provincial Department of Tourism's Know Your Reserve was approved after recommendations by the management committee. What is encouraging is that 4 community groups implement SKEPPIES projects for the first time namely in Laingsburg, Tweeriver, Roodebergskloof, and Carolusberg.</p>
<p>Output 3: Management systems to administer the SKEPPIES program are put in place and fine tuned.</p>	
<p>3.1. The project application form is revised until an optimal version is agreed upon</p>	<p>Form is continuously being revised as part of the development of SKEPPIES and as the management committee fine tune its objectives.</p>
<p>3.2. A database of projects is developed to store important information about the suite of projects</p>	<p>Database was developed inhouse. This has the advantage that the database is constantly being revised as new insights are gained into what SKEPPIES wants to monitor. The database is also an active management tool and while it has its shortcomings, did receive compliments from IT experts and others involved in social- and conservation projects.</p>
<p>3.3. An innovative photographic monitoring and evaluation system has been put in place</p>	<p>Photos are taken and submitted as part of applications; report of fieldvisits by SKEPPIES manager; and as part of report back by projects. These photos are used in communications and as part of monitoring. Examples of photo applications were developed.</p>

<p>3.4. <i>A five year business plan for SKEPPIES containing the vision, mission, objectives, and some operational issues, has been developed and approved.</i></p>	<p>Business plan was developed and approved September 2008. However, the whole of CI International and CI south Africa is in flux so that it is virtually useless to develop the business plan as we are dependent on them and changes come too fast.</p>
<p>Output 4: A lessons learned report of the pilot phase has been developed as a guide for the full implementation of SKEPPIES.</p>	
<p>4.1. <i>A lessons learnt report is compiled with inputs from the SKEPPIES management committee and grantees and lessons are incorporated into phase 2 management of the fund.</i></p>	<p>Lessons learned are being done on a continueing basis and changes to SKEPPIES approach, forms, database etc. are being made as new insights are gained.</p> <p>A formal lessons learned process was done by a consultant Amanda Young during September 2008. After a formal 1 day workshop with SKEPPIES project implementers, interviews with other SKEPPIES applicants and stakeholders such as DBSA, a formal report was compiled.</p>
<p>4.2. <i>Lessons learned report was developed into a small booklet and at least 50 copies printed by Sept 2008</i></p>	<p>Development of the lessons learned report into a booklet was done inhouse by the SKEPPIES manager because CI communications department is overloaded. 200 copies were printed.</p>
<p>Output 5: Human resources supporting SKEPPIES is appointed and capacited to run an officially launched SKEPPIES.</p>	
<p>5.1. <i>One SKEPPIES assistant is appointed by latest end March 2008 and underwent induction.</i></p>	<p>Assistant started 11 February 2008 and induction was done for 2 weeks on various aspects, namely employment agreement went through.; general exposure to aspects of CI and some SKEPPIES projects by attending a Tourism Workshop held in Cape Town; Gotomeeting; SKYPE; Receive contacts of SKEPPIES; Project Management Database in MS Access. How to access and enter data etc.; Picasso; Train in camera use; Finance issues relating to SKEPPIES trips; eRoom download SKEPPIES data; Put data in "Cute" PDF; Business plan with policies and SKEPPIES procedures e.g. completing SKEPPIES application</p>

	forms, SKEPPIES monitoring and trip reports on projects; Planning and deliverables; Practical hands on training that includes visits to project for monitoring, writing up new projects, etc.
5.2. <i>Five to eight SKEPPIES champions were identified and underwent training by latest April 2008</i>	Three champion workshops were held from 10 to 12 June all over the biome with various people from NGO's and local government who declared themselves willing to be SKEPPIES champions. In Oudsthoorn (4); Springbok (4) and Calvinia (5) people were identified as champions.
5.3. <i>SKEPPIES personnel underwent training to effectively manage projects to achieve the desired impact in an African context</i>	One SKEPPIES personnel member underwent Training on Managing for Impact (Mfi), 15 - 25 September 2008, Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia. The other member could not attend because his passport was not ready. This training was attended by 26 people from 8 African Countries, namely Kenya, Zambia, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Mozambique, South Africa, Uganda, and Malawi. Training was organized in collaboration with Universities of Wageneingen and Haramaya, the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), and Khanya-aicdd. It was good to be reminded about existing tools, get new tools, have the opportunity to be exposed to people doing projects in an African context. In general it was worth while and an unforgettable experience.
5.4. <i>Two SKEPPIES personell are better capacited to operate SKEPPIES in line with world best practice after going on a small grants best practive exchange visit.</i>	SKEPPIES undertook an exchange visit to Latin America – the home of worldclass trust funds. In Ecuador we visited Fondo Ambiental Nacional (FAN), The Fund for the Protection of Water (FONAG) and the Fund for Paramou Management and the Reduction of Poverty. In Brazil we visited The Brazilian Biodiversity Fund (FUNBIO) and The Latin American and Caribbean Environmental Funds Network (RedLAC). Many electronic documents were brought with such as operations manuals for marketing, fundraising, investment and operations. These documents are extremely detailed and thorough, were developed with the input of experts and are the results of exchange visits to funds in Mexico, Bolivia, Chile and Peru took the original

	<p>organizations years and many thousands of dollars to develop. Through the exchange visit SKEPPIES were able to tap into these resources and in turn save years and thousands of dollars through leap frogging. Through its exchange visit SKEPPIES was one of the first Conservation Trust Funds to implement the new direction in international trust funds. The new direction for donors is to link Latin America and European Trust Funds with African Trust funds and to capacitate African Funds and to assist them with funding. The exchange visit was mutually beneficial. SKEPPIES is extremely proud that our peers could learn from our business like approach, our emphasis on both conservation and development, our monitoring system, and our emphasis on sustainability and partnership.</p>
<p>5.5. <i>SKEPPIES was officially launched at a session for SKEPPIES champions by latest April 2008</i></p>	<p>SKEPPIES could not be lauch as legal entity on its own because it still operates as a project of CI South Africa Hotspots.</p>
<p>Output 6: SKEPPIES management team functions effectively and source new donor partners.</p>	
<p>6.1. <i>A minimum of three management meetings were held per year with reports given, effective control was exherted and and planning thas aken place.</i></p>	<p>Management meetings were held at a regular basis. In 2008 the committee met 5 times. Sometime physically and sometimes via telephone conferences.</p>
<p>6.2. <i>Three to five potential donors were engaged on a regular basis and became part of SKEPPIES management and donors.</i></p>	<p>5 donors were approached (National Department of Environment Affairs; Provincial Department of Environment Affairs) De Beers and Anglo American. They were approached directly, via email invites to do presentations, invitations to do projects jointly (Anglo), invitations to be present on SKEPPIES project selection committee (Namaqualand District Municipality) and personal visits (De Beers); and inputs into important events of them (inputs into Department of Environment Affairs' National South Africa's Fourth Country Report On The Implementation Of United Nations Convention To Combat Desertification). Contacts experienced various levels of success with seemingly dead ends (De Beers) and possible new leads (Anglo and the National Department of Tourism's Desertification Fund). Judged realistically, it does not look that</p>

	<p>there will be any funds forthcoming from most of these sources before the present funding cycle ends but attempts will continue while other sources are investigated. A major stumbling block is SKEPPIES legal status as being part of CI international. This makes it difficult for donors to donate money tax free and especially De Beers and Anglo stated that SKEPPIES must get a way around this before they can be involved.</p>
<p>6.3. At least Two donor-fundraising conferences were held</p>	<p>Many donors were approached and introduced to SKEPPIES so that during implementation of this project it was felt that a donor conference was not necessary.</p> <p>At a later stage the Management committee decided on a fundraising event. This fundraising event with Donors was a huge success. The Annual report published as part of this received good feedback. However, due to the economic downturn experienced internationally, this still needs to translate into financial support for SKEPPIES although DBSA as partner recommit themselves to SKEPPIES for 3 years on a 200,000 US\$ per annum grant for disbursements only on condition we get other donors</p>
<p>Output 7: A monitoring tool measuring conservation and biodiversity targets are developed in cooperation with SKEP CU and other partners in conservation sector.</p>	
<p><i>7.1. SKEPPIES participated in SKEP CU and CAPE developing and fine-tuning of their monitoring tool.</i></p>	<p>SKEPPIES did attend a workshop of CAPE but their focus was not as expected. SKEPPIES adopted the monitoring tool of SANBI GIS to monitor biodiversity data. SKEPPIES also had a consultant working on this.</p>
<p><i>7.2. Draft is circulated and finetuned within SKEPPIES management group and other relevant stakeholders.</i></p>	<p>As SKEPPIES decided to incorporate SANBI GIS monitoring system it was not necessary to formulate a draft.</p>
<p><i>7.3. Final monitoring tool was adapted and incorporated into SKEPPIES electronic databasis.</i></p>	<p>SKEPPIES did incorporate the aspects SANBI's GIS system monitor into its application form and databasis. These criteria correspond with the SKEP targets so that SKEPPIES can now monitor its impact in terms of SANBI's and SKEP's biodiversity</p>

	criteria.
--	-----------

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

Most outputs were achieved and in combination helped to establish SKEPPIES and the objectives of its partners in the region.

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

The only unrealized output that is of critical importance for SKEPPIES is the fact that more donor funders for the Grant fund are not on board. But then again this output may have been over optimistic from the very start and did not take into proper consideration the way donors work and the time and dynamics that goes into involving them.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

This project had no such policies.

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.

- Introductory remarks:
 - SKEPPIES was fortunate in that it had the right mixture of successful ingredients to make it a success. It is not necessarily one, but a combination and interaction of these factors that contributed to SKEPPIES success.
 - Also some of the following lessons learned are very paradoxical in that the very challenges SKEPPIES experienced and our attempts to deal with it gave rise to a unique entity. The challenges and lessons learned are closely linked with the way SKEPPIES started out, namely resourcing small projects while at the same time and virtually at the same time develop structures.
 - The lessons learned apply to our small grants projects and to the SKEPPIES project
- PROJECT INTIATION AND DEVELOPMENT:
 - Should a similar project start out it will be good to have a network of similar projects available that can provide resource material such as application forms, data bases, operational plans, strategic documents etc that they can source from the start. We had to design these from scratch and it took us time. However, that also helps us to create something very unique. The Conservation Finance Alliance and RedLac are presently supplying such a network and resource basis which did not exited when

we started out. This will save time and money as existing documents and structures can simply be contextualized.

- Provide for a training session or exchange visit for the project implementer at the very start of the project and another one later on in the development of the project. An organization to visit during the exchange visit at the start must be selected very carefully. This is because Grants fund that are established may be very intimidating or contain too much info and structures for grants that are starting out. An exchange visit or training must just provide enough information to start out without overwhelming the trainee or let the up start fund want to have all structure perfectly in place.
- Appoint 2 people if start up from the beginning. A project developer that can illustrate that projects are needed and viable. A manager that can pay attention to fundraising and other strategic issues.
- Pre application site visits are valuable. This help in getting clarity on the project and also helping people to improve their project idea if on site discussions take place e.g. is this the correct location, you see people want to overexploit the water of a spring.
- A good camera and pictures is a must. A picture is worth a thousand words and that saying still applies. We used photo reporting. This was very useful as some people could not express themselves well in the essay application. We could check the photos against the essay application. Project from SKEPPIES staff as well as SKEPPIES project implementers build a database of achievements and this in turn can be used in communications and fund raising.
- The approval of funds does not necessarily translate into the start of a project. In fact, between the approval of funds and its actual start date a delay of a few months sometimes. The reasons for this are:
 - a. The one partner DBSA has legal requirements that need to be complied with by recipients such as tax clearance forms and supplier information forms that must be filled in. These forms take time to get.
 - b. People are more disadvantaged then was anticipated. They have difficulties filling in required forms of the partner DBSA; they need transport and electronic communication; they are not familiar with English; or scared to follow things up.
- From project initiation up to receiving the actual application takes from 2 to 3 months.
- Around 40% of people who originally indicated that they are interested in a project later do not submit proposals due to various reasons.
- The labor involved to develop small grants projects can escalate to a level far beyond the value of the project. Somewhere a point has to be drawn and found.
- The involvement of experts in the development of small projects leads to a better end result. However, too many experts involved can also escalate

the amount of work and delay the approval of the supposedly small projects

- One must budget more for work to be outsourced by consultants to prevent manager becoming too much involved and bogged down in daily operational tasks in order to free him for strategic operations such as interaction with potential donors.
 - It is difficult to upscale using existing structures no matter how good they are e.g. CI struggled to accommodate our database.
 - Training new employees is a must but sometimes takes much more time than anticipated.
 - No matter how good and solid your core basis projects, but if your legal organizational structure, makes it difficult for donors to donate free from tax and other legal hassles, you sit.
 - The work going into developing a small grants project is often very huge and costly. The only positive is that as the fund becomes better known and people have a better grasp of what is expected, this cost may come down.
- PROJECT EXECUTION:
 - A champion that promotes the Fund inside the organization as well as externally to outsiders is a necessity. We had this in the form of our director, Sara Frazee.
 - A good publication department that promotes the projects and fund is vital. No use you do nice and good projects but no one knows about it.
 - A management committee that gives inputs and support to field personnel is a must.
 - Project development personnel must have the social skills to interact with the communities at their level and be able to assist them in developing projects. Before anything else this is the mayor requirement because we worked with a developing community.
 - Accept that you are dealing with a developing community. Our customers were not clear on what they want and we had to assist them so that they get clarity on what they want. Because we were bringing a new product to the market, conservation and development, we had to be patient to merge ideas of people on the ground with our objectives. Some people could not send an email and we had to teach them. Applications have many mistakes and it was a case of working with people often 101 in order to complete the project and bring it to an acceptable level.
 - Engaging high level donors, building relationships with them, providing in their requests was more time consuming than anticipated.
 - MONITORING:
 - Monitoring in a developing context means mentoring. You cannot apply the strict monitoring principles of PMBOK or what you studied at university on projects in a developing environment. You must stick to the project objectives but be lenient in terms of schedule.

- A good electronic database is a must as it assists in keeping track and making life easier for staff.
- Keep good record of project statistics i.e. what was achieved in terms of biodiversity and conservation data. If these data are presented in a clear format it helps to promote the project
- CLOSURE:
 - It is not always possible to secure long term funding for grants as easy and quickly as we thought originally. Although people see the value of it, good relations need to be cultivated and this takes time.

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

- The fact that DBSA as partner was from start involved in disbursements and the handling of that side of the admin. This caused them to be an active partner. More, we could rely on the expertise and resources of this national development bank. In addition it kept a good distance between disbursements of funds, the organization keeping the funds and SKEPPIES staff.
- The fact that we were hosted in a well established NGO, CI, that assisted with many of our functions such as IT, HR etc meant that we could pay attention to project implementation
- The fact that the management committee was also the project selection committee at the start. This caused a sense of ownership in the project and ensured their knowledge of all projects approved and implemented.
- The deliberate approach that we will be a computer-based organization that is virtual with electronic data available everywhere on our computers played a major role. This decision was also based on our lack of human resources. It enabled us too.
- The truth “start with the end in mind” paid off dividends. We were conscious of what is expected of us at the end of the reporting period and this guided our actions and project design.

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

- See our answer above that is repeated here PROJECT EXECUTION:
 - A champion that promotes the Fund inside the organization as well as externally to outsiders is a necessity. We had this in the form of our director, Sara Frazee.
 - A good publication department that promotes the projects and fund is vital. No use you do nice and good projects but no one knows about it.
 - A management committee that gives inputs and support to field personnel is a must.
 - Project development personnel must have the social skills to interact with the communities at their level and be able to assist them in developing projects. Before anything else this is the mayor requirement because we worked with a developing community.

- Accept that you are dealing with a developing community. Our customers were not clear on what they want and we had to assist them so that they get clarity on what they want. Because we were bringing a new product to the market, conservation and development, we had to be patient to merge ideas of people on the ground with our objectives. Some people could not send an email and we had to teach them. Applications have many mistakes and it was a case of working with people often 101 in order to complete the project and bring it to an acceptable level.

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.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Date Received	Notes
Development Bank of South Africa (DBSA)	B	\$ 305,000	Duration of project	DBSA gave match funding only for small grants and money to be paid out to small grants funds
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		

****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.

SKEPPIES went through a critical period where we were well known, with many great projects and interest from various parties, but no real committed funds. Since then the following happened:

- Ford Foundation committed US\$ 138,000 for a project that dovetail with SKEPPIES objectives and of that amount US\$ 40,000 must go to project disbursements. This grant was made in May 2009.
- As a result of the commitment of Ford Foundation, the DBSA committed a further US\$ 40,000 towards project disbursements.
- Our partners and the responsible department in DBSA committed themselves to approach DBSA for a grant to SKEPPIES for US\$ 222,222 per year over 3 years.
- ABSA Bank, one of the biggest South African banks, invited us to submit proposals for projects to a value of around US\$ 24,000. While ABSA does not fund SKEPPIES directly, this is the start of a relation that we are positive will grow. It now appears as if we must relinquish this offer because South-African firms do not prefer to give to international organizations. Reason is if they donate to South African organizations they get a tax break and CI South Africa may not become an independent South African NGO anymore. This statement applies to Absa, Vodacom and Escom.
- Vodacom, one of the three cell phone operators in South Africa, invited SKEPPIES to submit applications to fund 2 SKEPPIES projects to a value of 20,000. This too is regarded as the start of a relationship.
- Similarly Escom invited us to submit applications to them.
- We are also assisting our Wildernis program to implement an SDC funded project in Namibia on the same basis as SKEPPIES. We are hopeful that this will become the start of an expansion of SKEPPIES into Namibia.

We were invited by Kula, a big South African organization providing small loans to people, to be involved with them. Unfortunately this may have brought us in conflict with the banking laws and lending laws. Also because this would have been a totally new set of structures (loans) we declined.

We are also involved in the Conservation Finance Alliance group. This is interested in financing conservation Trust funds but this is a long term relationship.

We have great confidence that with a mixture of projects providing short term bridging finance and longer term relationships SKEPPIES will have a good future.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

However, it is recommended that CEPF should consider an involvement much longer than 2 years in these types of projects. The 2 year period is just enough to service specific needs, demonstrate the value, to create a momentum, establish a good reputation and portfolio of projects, and build a good foundation. On this basis other funders are willing to build and usually want to phase in their involvement because they want to establish if the Small Grant Fund will be able to fulfill their objectives. In order for Small grants to become fully independent and for CEPF funds to have a lasting effect, it is recommended that CEPF consider a five year involvement in small grants funds.

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, 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: Steven Davids

Organization name: SKEPPIES at Conservation International

Mailing address: sdavids@conservation.org

Tel: SKEPPIES - Small Grants Facility for Conservation and Development in the Succulent Karoo

A partnership project between CEPF, DBSA, CI, and SKEP
c/o Kirstenbosch Botanical Garden

Private Bag X7

Claremont, 7735

SOUTH AFRICA

Fax: +27 (0)21 761 5462

E-mail: sdavids@conservation.org