

.CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Conservation International-South Africa

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): *Greening the Namaqua District Municipality*

Implementation Partners for this Project: Botanical Society of South Africa, DTEC, Conservation International and Namaqualand District Municipality

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): July 1, 2007 – March 31, 2009

Date of Report (month/year): June 2009

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

During the implementation, the Project Coordinator, Nuchey Van Neel, left the employ of CI and implementation was carried out by the CI Namaqualand team who were involved in various aspects of the project.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: *This project aims to integrate conservation targets and land-use recommendations into the official structures and policy frameworks, and legislative documents of the Namakwa District Municipality in a way that will build public understanding and support to enable their implementation and ensure environmental sustainability of economic development in the region.*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	

<p>1. A legally adopted Spatial Development Framework that integrates the fine-scale conservation mapping and associated guidelines being undertaken by the Botanical Society is adopted by the NDM by February 2008</p>	<p>The Spatial Development Framework (SDF) process was initiated and driven by the NDM, while CI integrated the biodiversity information by compiling Biodiversity Profiles which were paired with the fine-scale municipal conservation maps and adopted as the Bioregional Plan at municipality and district level.</p>
<p>2. Public awareness and understanding of the SDF and its guidelines is generated through a public participation process from November to December 2008 and results in three new Integrated Development Framework projects that support conservation outcomes by December 2008</p>	<p>The process to generate public interest and buy-in involved multiple stakeholder workshops to identify how the SDF could help guide projects from planning to implementation. One IDP project was chosen by each of the six local municipalities to use as training modules to showcase how the SDF, with its integrated biodiversity profiles and maps, can provide guidance to the municipalities in their development efforts.</p>
<p>3. The uptake of a local conservation planner mentored during the project by the local or district government is undertaken by December 2008 to ensure that the SDF becomes a living document for the 5 year period of the SDF.</p>	<p>The Department of Tourism, Environment and Conservation (DTEC) provided a staff member from their office to guide and enhance the SDF process with workshops and training with local municipal officers. CI employed an individual to compile the Biodiversity Profiles for each local municipality and an overall profile for the NDM. Through this process, the local government has also developed much stronger ties and regular engagements on spatial applications with the Provincial conservation planning department and the creation of the Namakwa District Biodiversity Forum.</p>

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

The project raised awareness among district and municipal staff of the importance of biodiversity conservation in the globally unique Succulent Karoo. Municipalities are beginning to show a better understanding of the importance of planning their projects with proper research and expert input to ensure their region’s sustainable future. This project gave rise to a municipality biodiversity training project that is working to ensure that biodiversity conservation knowledge is embedded within all municipalities. Although the process is still ongoing for the six municipal projects, the SDF and biodiversity profiles have informed municipal feedback on several smaller IDP projects that have been submitted to SKEPPIES—an indicator that the information is being applied to guide decision-making.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

The creation of the Namakwa Biodiversity Forum as a vehicle for ongoing government coordination around the biodiversity priorities as put forth in the profiles and SDF is a positive impact that was not directly anticipated and came from the Municipal officials themselves. The fact that the national government had placed an Environmental Officer in the municipality prevented a desire by the municipality to hire a new Conservation Planner, however, the project was able to really empower this officer with information and assist in facilitating its uptake. Additionally, the process and information generated during this project has dramatically impacted the selection and development of various SKEPPIES projects.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs:

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: A biodiversity-based SDF and IDP for the Namakwa District Municipality is developed and legislated and is a model for the Northern Cape Provincial Economic Growth and Development Strategy.	Biodiversity priorities are strongly reflected in the Namakwa SDF and IDP and the District Economic Officer is taking the information and process as a model to the Provincial SDF strategy meetings this year.
<i>1.1. Specialist studies are contracted and completed by November 2007.</i>	Studies were done by a number of scientific experts who produced a number of useful documents and maps of the region; these are available the NDM date base website.
<i>1.2. Specialists are involved in integrating their plans into a single District level SDF that recognised core conservation areas, corridors, and special conservation habitats as well as recommendations for sustainable agriculture, mining, and tourism activities by January 2008.</i>	Specialists in a variety of fields of expertise were brought together in an intensive workshop to discuss and advise on the process of developing a “green municipality”. The Namaqualand Wilderness Initiative showcased many outcomes of this project and as a result, communal and commercial farmers are talking and focusing on sustainable agriculture workshops. A municipal-supported project was initiated to show how mining areas can be revamped to host more sustainable economic activities. Several eco-tourism projects were implemented to showcase alternative livelihood options.
<i>1.3. The final SDF is consolidated and legally adopted by May 2008.</i>	The approval of the final SDF was a lengthy, problematic and challenging process because elections were held in the middle of the process and municipal officials in many cases changed midway through. This resulted in the need to convince new people with different perceptions of the importance and applicability of the process and as a result the SDF’s legal adoption was delayed but ultimately approved during the time of the project.
Output 2: Three IDP projects are recommended and developed by communities in each of the 6 municipalities that are cognizant of and support the implementation of the SDP recommendations.	The SDF workshops were hosted in conjunction with the municipality and several community as well as larger projects were identified. Many of the smaller projects have been funded by SKEPPIES. For the larger initiatives, a training program was initiated to help municipalities operationalise their IDP’s and use the SDF to guide them during project implementation. 6 IDP Projects were chosen, one from each municipality, in order to guide each municipality, with its unique biodiversity. through its own learning process –which is ongoing.
<i>2.1. Representatives of communities from each of the six local municipalities of the NDM are involved in a series of three SDF charrettes to be held in November/December 2007.</i>	The SDF charrettes were held with excellent community participation, including municipal officials, local NGOs, experts and local SMEs.
<i>2.2. The environmental planner works with the local municipalities to ensure the development of 3 IDP projects that support the implementation of the SDF by December 2008.</i>	Three municipal road shows were organized which, educated the municipal officials on the SDF and its linkages to their IDPs. One larger meeting involved community members.
Output 3: A strong biodiversity understanding is integrated into the municipal government processes by a mentored environmental planner who becomes responsible for the Botanical	The Planner compiled Biodiversity Profiles for each local municipality that are easily understandable and form part of the municipalities’ IDP. A training program provided municipal officials with the

Society outputs for local government.	information they need to understand, appreciate and plan for their own unique biodiversity's conservation.
3.1. The Local Environmental Planner holds two scientific input meetings with the DBSA and NDM teams to build his/her understanding of the environmental plans in August and October 2007.	The joint DBSA and NDM meetings were held as well as separate meetings with both the DBSA and NDM. The DBSA SDF expert for Namaqualand Region was involved in additional meetings with communities and municipalities.
3.2. The Local Environmental Planner attends a minimum of three relevant meetings a month between December 2007-2008 with municipal council officials as well as branch offices of provincial agencies to ensure biodiversity is integrated into the agenda and workplans for these entities.	The Planner ensured that the SDF process was taken up in the DTEC workplans. DTEC was also involved in additional stakeholder meetings and meetings with NDM and other relevant provincial departments.
3.3. CI and NDM sign an MOU by October 2008 on the uptake of the Local Environmental Planner.	CI and NDM agreed that the environmental planner could not be taken up with the NDM offices because of the new appointment of a DEAT official at the municipal offices. This position was therefore supported by the CI project team to deliver outcomes and training to all the 6 widely scattered municipal offices in NDM – the largest DM in South Africa.

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

There were many obstacles in achieving the intended outputs. The constantly changing government staff was one of the biggest challenges. (even before the elections there was a long period of infighting as new political parties were formed and alliances aligned and realigned leading up to the election.) The other big challenge was the lack of understanding of biodiversity conservation and the subsequent misinterpretation of its importance. The outputs were reached with a lot of hard work and dedication to see the process through.

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

One output that was a particular problem was the plan to have the environmental planner taken up by the NDM. The appointment of an environmental officer was felt to be sufficient by the municipality but this compromise has perhaps resulted in a continued lack of biodiversity conservation expertise in the local area. However, the creation of the Biodiversity Forum will support this position with expertise from the provincial conservation authorities and Conservation International.

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.

Working with government is a long, slow process. It is easier to work with officials who are constant and perhaps place less of an emphasis on securing formal commitments in MOUs. They are important enabling tools, but a lot of time was wasted trying to reach politicians that could have been spent just training up and getting the officials excited about integrating biodiversity concerns into their work.

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

Exclusive emphasis on government can hinder and make achieving of project outcomes incredibly risky. It is essential to make them feel like leaders and this was critical for the project, but some of the other benefits of the project for guiding civil society projects were perhaps not optimized as the result of concentration on government. Thus, although the project was successful for what it was, in the future, we will design projects that target a wider group of decision-makers/influencing organizations to maximise project efficiencies and provide back up in cases of political upheaval.

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

The big hiccup was when the government appointed a Tourism and Environment Officer before the project had really gotten off the ground. As a result, the individual who was appointed is not necessarily best for ensuring the long-term purpose of the project.

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
DBSA	C	\$40,000	Aug 08	Municipal staff started hands-on training program on biodiversity conservation
Sarah Redlich	A	\$10,000	Jul 07-Mar 09	Staff salaries and core costs
Northern Cape Department of Tourism, Environment and Conservation (DTEC)	A	\$12,000	Jul 08-Jun 09	Support for the Bioregional Plan launch
		\$		

****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 DBSA has expressed interest in a follow up training for the municipal official on integrating biodiversity concerns into large scale infrastructure projects. If forthcoming, this will likely be carried out by CI utilizing the municipal links fostered by this project.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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: Charles Hutchinson

Organization name: Conservation International South Africa

Mailing address: Private Bag x7, Claremont, 7735 South Africa

Tel: 027 21 799 8791

Fax: 027 21 7615462

E-mail: c.hutchinson@conservation.org