

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA)

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): SKEPPIES Fund (SKEP Partnering In your Environment)—A fund for Conservation and Development in the Succulent Karoo – Pilot Phase

Implementation Partners for this Project: DBSA, SKEP and CI Partnership

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): March 1, 2006 – February 28, 2007

Date of Report (month/year): 6 June 2007

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

SKEPPIES was implemented as a pilot programme in the 2006/2007 financial year. It was jointly funded (R350,000 each) by the DBSA and CI and was intended to promote economic development of poor rural communities living within the Karoo, while also promoting conservation of the unique resources of SKEP, which occurs in the rural areas of the Northern and Western Cape. This pilot programme sought to test the application of a number of small loans and grants for rural communities in developing their own economic and income-generating projects (arising from the application of sound environmental programmes) in order to improve their standards of living.

Several projects were appraised, approved and implemented in the pilot phase and will be discussed later in the report.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: A programme of integrated conservation and development projects have received funding and technical assistance from a DBSA, SKEP, CI Partnership and future collaborative arrangements for the establishment of the SKEPPIES Fund.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	

<p>-10 development projects with a conservation outcome are either completed or ongoing.</p>	<p>A total of 17 projects were developed and supported in the pilot phase exceeding the initial target. The following is the current status:</p> <p><u>Disbursed 12:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anatolian Dog – livestock guarding dogs to protect stock from predators 2. Khaim-Ma hiking trail – building of the trail and training of tour guides 3. Kharkams Phantoms Rugby Club community dev and conservation awareness 4. Kookskem - opening doors for women in the broader tourism market with food as a stepping stone 5. Memory Stick business - drafted wooden sticks and picture frames made from port Jackson vegetation 6. Nieuwoudtville gateway to the succulent Karoo - job creation to establish community based hiking trail in Sutherland 7. Reptile interpretation centre – exhibition for reptiles of the area 8. Rooiberg hiking trail (phase 1) – trail development and mentoring 9. SALT rehabilitation 10. Sutherland guides 11. Fryers Cove protected area – rehabilitation of area degraded by land mines and off road vehicles 12. Rooiberg hiking trail (phase2). - trail development and mentoring <p><u>Committed (not disbursed yet) 5:</u> beneficiaries to comply with processes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bitterfontein Green building project – eco-tourism (chalets, recreation area using natural building methods 2. Garies Secondary school – fostering tourism culture 3. Jantjeberend medicinal plant – nursery for useful plants 4. Seals and Gannets management on bird island – saving an important breeding colony 5. Richtersveld Rooiberg guesthouse infrastructure – water system improvement
--	--

CEPF and DBSA commit additional \$350,000 to the establishment of the SKEPPIES Fund.	The pilot phase of the programme was deemed a success and in this regard both parties desire to continue with the partnership arrangement and move to implement a 2 year programme. Discussions are underway between stakeholders to sign a MoU by July 2007.
--	---

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

- The pilot project exceeded its targeted number of projects to be supported during the period in review.
- All projects approved demonstrate links between conservation and development.
- Project applicants seem to understand well the aims of the fund (bringing together development and biodiversity) as seen in the project ideas.
- The processes and procedures that have been set up post project approval (before disbursement) serve a good purpose of good governance and financial management.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

None

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

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

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: Local government and civil society capacitated to develop and implement 7-10 projects that involve a direct conservation benefit through support from CI, SKEP and DBSA and their networks of technical expertise	
1.1. Potential projects identified through the SKEP network by the Project Management Committee.	Review of potential projects by SKEPPIES PMC and three projects for first phase selected by March 2006.
1.2. Three potential project implementers are supported to develop their initiatives into an integrated conservation and development project by July 2006; receive their funding by September 2006; and are implemented and reviewed on a quarterly basis from receipt of funds.	Met with each of the three identified project on-site to develop proposal according to DBSA template as reviewed by PMC by July 2006 for first tranche, by September 2006 for second tranche, and November 2006 for final tranche.
1.3.	Grant agreements signed and funding

Three additional project implementers are supported to develop their initiatives into an integrated conservation and development project by September 2006; receive their funding by November 2006; and are implemented and reviewed on a quarterly basis from receipt of funds.	transferred to project applicants by September 2006, by November and by February 2007 respectively.
1.4. Two to four additional project implementers are supported to develop their initiatives into an integrated conservation and development project by November 2006; receive their funding by January 2007; and are implemented and reviewed on a quarterly basis from receipt of funds.	Site visits by PMC members to projects on quarterly basis from receipt of funding.
Output 2. Partnership arrangements, operational procedures for the effective establishment of a SKEPPIES Fund in place.	
2.1. MoU between CI, SKEP CU (SANBI), and DBSA is signed for operationalising pilot phase by April 2006.	Draft MoU revised and final submitted to partner agencies for signature by mail and courier. Signed in March 2006
2.2. Report of recommendations for partnership arrangements submitted to CEPF and Development Grant Fund by December 2006	Quarterly PMC meetings held either during site visits or special meeting to discuss, evaluate, and capture lessons/issues for future integration into report of recommendations on operational procedures.
2.3. Partnership contracts/MOU in place (based on recommendations) for establishment of SKEPPIES as an effective Small Grants Facility by March 2007.	Report of recommendations (including criteria) drafted by PMC as agreed upon by the members and submitted to CEPF and the DBSA Development Fund by December 2006.

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

The link between development, biodiversity and conservation ensured that project ideas were both original and varied as they brought together two elements that have not been grouped in project implementation before.

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

- Some projects raise issues around sustainability in the long term. For some projects further project development is needed for subsequent phases to address this issue
- The Skeppies programme needs to develop a stronger unifying image and that in turn needs to make stronger linkages to broader province (or even nationwide) initiatives – e.g. marketing drives etc.
- The disbursement of funds has shown to be slow due to a number of reasons mostly because of recipients compliance issues

- Some project applications have duplicated work of other project ideas – benefits can be derived from a stronger focus on the project development function identifying similar threads in projects and for such project ideas to be consolidated

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.

- The Skeppies pilot phase has shown that issues around development and biodiversity and conservation can be brought together and implemented successfully.
- Project applicants seem to understand well the aims of the fund (bringing together development, biodiversity and conservation) as seen in the project ideas.
- The mix of project partner and funders has shown the ability to successfully manage a small grant fund mechanism – although more capacity may be needed when the number of projects increases.
- The number of projects originally set out to be approved has been fully achieved in the first year.
- The processes and procedures that have been set up post project approval (before disbursement) serve a good purpose of good governance and financial management.

Further work needed:

- Some projects raised issues around sustainability in the long term. For some projects further project development is needed for subsequent phases to address this issue.
- The Skeppies programme needs to develop a stronger unifying image and that in turn needs to make stronger linkages to broader province (or even nationwide) initiatives – e.g. marketing drives etc.
- The disbursement of funds has shown to be slow due to a number of reasons, mostly because of recipient compliance issues.
- Constraints placed by \$5000 limit on project approval (without seeking additional CEPF approval).
- Some project applications have duplicated work of other project ideas – benefits can be derived from a stronger focus on the project development function identifying similar threads in projects and for such project ideas to be consolidated.
- An independent evaluation needs to be undertaken
- The agreement between DBSA and CI needs to be revised. The DBSA felt that the agreement was more of a service provider agreement rather than a partnership agreement – especially if CI is looking to duplicate this small grant mechanism elsewhere.

- Need to bring in other funding sources.
- The DBSA management fee needs to be increased (proposing 6%)

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

Redesigned the application form and translated it into Afrikaans.

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

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	Notes
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

***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 funded 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 funded 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 pilot phase of the programme was deemed as a success and in this regard both parties desire to continue with the partnership arrangement and move to implement a 2 year programme. The parties have committed a further US\$350,000.00 each for a 2 year programme. Discussions are underway between stakeholders to sign MoU by July 2007.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
--

It is recommended that a broad level MoU be entered into between CI and the DBSA and that a separate agreement be signed with CEPF (the funding arm of CI) for the delivery of the programme work plan for the period 2007/2008.

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, 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
No

If yes, please also complete the following:

For more information about this project, please contact:

Name: Lindiwe Sibanda
Mailing address: PO Box 1234, Halfway House - 1685
Tel: +27 11 313 3094
Fax: +27 11 206 3094
E-mail: lindiwes@dbsa.org