

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: South African National Biodiversity Institute

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): *The SKEP Coordination Unit: Ensuring Strategic and Effective Conservation Action in the Succulent Karoo Hotspot*

Implementation Partners for this Project: Conservation International; Botanical Society of South Africa; Western Cape Nature Conservation Board; WWF-SA; South African National Parks; Wildlife and Environmental Society of South Africa; Northern Cape Department of Environment and Nature Conservation.

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2009

Date of Report (month/year): August 2009

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The project has allowed for a more coordinated conservation approach in the Succulent Karoo. The establishment of the SKEP Coordination Unit and housing of the unit within SANBI created conditions that were conducive for managing a set of diverse; but mutually beneficial relationships from the multiple stakeholders that make up the Succulent Karoo Ecosystem Programme. SKEP as a programme was, and will continue being a success because of the anchoring and embedding role that the SKEP CU has played and still continues to play.

The CU, in addition to playing the secretariat role for CEPF funded projects, also played a key role in putting together strategies that will ensure the sustainability of the SKEP as an ecosystem programme. Of note in this regard is the engagement that the CU initiated with government departments to secure support for conservation actions in the Succulent Karoo, as well as the involvement of the CU with the emerging land reform and biodiversity stewardship initiatives in the country.

Overall, the project was able to catalyze awareness and action from a wide range of conservation and developmental agencies. To further take forward this piece of work, the recently completed Ecosystem Services research and Succulent Karoo Research Strategy will be used to help inform investment strategies and land use decision making in the Succulent Karoo.

We are grateful to CEPF for the resources given to us to stimulate and sustain conservation initiatives in the Succulent Karoo; without the grant; it would have taken a little longer for SANBI to mobilize the kind of awareness and excitement that the project has managed to create.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: *The people of the Succulent Karoo are coordinated, resulting in implementing strategic and effective conservation activities in the SKEP geographic priority areas of SA. This project will manage a streamlined and capacitated SKEP Coordination unit that will continue to build awareness, facilitate communication between enabling agencies, implementers and partners, and catalyse action in CEPF priority areas as part of the development of a long-term SKEP Programme for Conservation and Sustainable Development of the SKH.*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	

<p>1. 50% of the long term conservation targets as defined in the SKEP strategy are secured through coordinated programme by 2008</p>	<p>A more concise indication of the conservation targets already secured will be revealed when the SKEP programmatic M&E framework gets operational. At this stage, and as can be seen from the CEPF 5 year assessment report, over half a million hectares of land have been secured for conservation in the Succulent Karoo.</p>
<p>2. Civil society and other partners are actively involved in activities that contribute to the conservation of the SKH</p>	<p>The SKEP CU has played a key role in ensuring that civil society partners are actively involved in conservation activities in the Succulent Karoo. To mention but few, Conservation International has been pivotal in catalyzing activities in the Hotspot, most recent example being the establishment of the Namakwa Biodiversity Advisory Forum. WWF-SA has also been a very important partner in the Succulent Karoo. Through the Leslie Hill Succulent Karoo Trust; WWF-SA has worked tirelessly in acquiring priority land in the Succulent Karoo. Both these agencies form part of the SKEP South African Implementation Committee, as well as the SKEP Executive Committee. There are also other civil society partners that are actively involved in the conservation of the SKH, like the Endangered Wildlife Trust, whose focus on the SKH is on the conservation of the endangered riverine rabbits. The Cape Leopard Trust is also active in the region, focusing on peaceful co-existence between farmers and wild leopards in SKH. We also have academic and research institutions actively involved in the SK. The Agricultural Research Council is active in the hotspot, devising innovative ways of managing rangelands and building up the capacity of the residents of the communal areas to manage and care for the surrounding biodiversity. The University of Cape Town is also involved in a groundbreaking mine rehabilitation programme; out of the initial research project, Namaqualand Restoration Initiative, a new company has now been formed called Nature, Restore and Innovate and the focus is to expand the scope of mine rehabilitation in the Namaqualand region. Our Public Sector partners have also been instrumental in conservation actions in the biome; Capenature in the Western Cape province and The Department of Environment and Nature Conservation in the Northern Cape province have been very active. The SKEP CU plays a central role in coordinating the activities of these partner organizations to ensure that their actions are in line with the SKEP strategic objectives.</p>
<p>3. Anchor projects in each priority area are developing new and innovative partnerships between various land-use sectors.</p>	<p>Our Anchor projects worked on building and strengthening partnerships in priority areas. The Gouritz Initiative is operating in the Little Karoo, while the Knersvlakte Steering Committee meets regularly in the Knersvlakte. All the priority areas in the Namaqualand region are now falling under the banner of the Namakwa Biodiversity Advisory Forum, and the SKEP CU played a major role in setting up the Advisory Forum.</p>

<p>4. Partners generate and share relevant information and lessons within the SKH</p>	<p>The SKEP CU convened regular Anchor Projects Forums were held where anchor projects would come to share lessons with each other. Bi-annual partner's conferences were held, and these conferences provided platforms for sharing lessons and using knowledge gathered to inform future implementation and continuous improvement in programme implementation</p>
<p>5. Partners aligns their priority conservation action to support the SKEP vision</p>	<p>The SKEP partnership has evolved and strengthened over time. The Department of Environment and Nature Conservation in the Northern Cape; Capenature in the Western Cape; and a range of civil society organizations mentioned in point 2 have all aligned their actions in support of the SKEP Vision, and the SKEP CU was instrumental in facilitating the strengthening of the partnership.</p>

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

As indicated in the columns below, the project was highly successful in achieving the set objectives. The SKEP CU acted as the glue that held all other CEPF projects together. The CU brought all stakeholders together through partner's conferences, workshops and anchor projects exchanges. The Coordination functions have been taken up by SANBI now and into the future. Through the programmatic M&E framework currently being finalized, the CU will be able to monitor and evaluate programme impacts. The development of the knowledge and information management system will also be completed by the end of September.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

One of the major unexpected and positive impacts was the launch of the Namakwa District Critical Biodiversity Maps. This was the culmination of a SKEP CU approved and CEPF funded project that was undertaken by Phil Desmet. The Namakwa District is now on its way to becoming the first municipality in South Africa to publish a bioregional plan.

Another positive impact is that SANBI has taken over the responsibility for the SKEP CU, and there has been a seamless integration between the CAPE and SKEP Coordination Units to facilitate more efficient operations.

The SKEP CU also got greatly involved on the emerging discourse on land reform and biodiversity stewardship in the country. At this stage, the SKEP CU is the focal point for the land reform and biodiversity stewardship initiatives in the Northern Cape and gives input in shaping the programme at a national level

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs:

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: SKEP CU is fully operational within SANBI	

with SANBI HR, communications, IT, administration and financial support.	
<i>1.1. Current CU staff contracts re-negotiated and signed by SANBI HR by July 2005</i>	CU staff contracts were signed by SANBI HR and staff were fully integrated with the SANBI systems
<i>1.2. New project developer and communications intern recruited and inducted by Sept 2005</i>	Project Developer and the Communications Intern were appointed in 2005. The Communications Intern was later appointed as the Communications Officer.
<i>1.3. Smooth transition to new biodiversity center with other bioregional programmes, for better collaboration by September, with IT infrastructure in place by October 2005</i>	SKEP CU moved and still continues to occupy offices at the Biodiversity Center together with other bioregional programmes. There is now stronger collaboration between these bioregional programmes, particularly the CAPE programme. The IT infrastructure is in place and supported by SANBI's IT
<i>1.4. SKEP CU financial and HR policies are implemented by SKEP programme assistant in consultation with SANBI finance and HR departments by Oct 2005</i>	The SKEP Programme Administrator implemented HR and financial policies with the help of the respective departments within SANBI. This was the case up until Dec '08; in January '09, these functions were integrated with those of the CAPE programme.
<i>1.5. All operational equipment including computers and a SKEP vehicle secured with financial support from Mazda Wildlife fund by Dec 2005</i>	All operational equipment was secured. Furniture, computers and a SKEP vehicle were all secured to help with the operations
<i>1.6. 5 additional funding sources are secured by SANBI's bioregional directorate by 2008</i>	SANBI has contributed in kind to sustaining the SKEP CU by creating a post in the SANBI establishment for a Programme Developer. Though no funding sources for projects have been secured just yet; the conservation marketplace was held in May '09. Out of this event, there is now real potential to secure funding from a number of agencies; among which are the Department of Water and Environmental Affairs; the Expanded Public Works Programme and the British High Commission
Output 2: Governance structures are in place and operational with a SA Implementation committee, priority area steering committees and an appropriate Bi-National MOA between NNF and SANBI, all governed by the SKEP MOU.	
<i>2.1. SKEP National and binational MOU's signed by Dec 05.</i>	The SKEP MOU was signed by partners in 2006. To date, 11 partner organizations have signed the MOU
<i>2.2. SKEP SA Implementation steering committee holds first meeting of members by end of Oct 2005</i>	The SKEP SAIC held its first meeting in 2005, and held regular meetings after that to give strategic guidance to the programme at large. The SKEP CU acted and continues to act as a secretariat for the SAIC and all other governance structures.
<i>2.3. Annual strategic review workshops for Namibia and South African priority area strategies held in CPT by November 2005</i>	The strategic review workshops for the two country priority areas were held annually until 2005 when SANBI and NNF took over coordination functions for South Africa and Namibia respectively. After this period, the SKEP CU housed by SANBI has held a major

	strategic review workshop in June 2008. The product of this workshop was a SKEP 5 year Strategic Plan for the period 2009-2014.
<i>2.4. Quarterly SA Implementation committee meetings continues to provide strategic guidance to coordination unit</i>	SA Implementation Committee meetings were held on a quarterly basis initially, but as time went on, it was decided that these meeting should be held only twice a year. SKEP CU was responsible for organizing these meetings, and this function will continue into the future.
<i>2.5. CU attends quarterly Priority area steering committee meetings, ensuring strategy gaps are identified and addressed.</i>	CU staff attended almost all priority steering committee meetings and gave strategic guidance when necessary
<i>2.6. Appropriate thematic task teams for guiding specialist activities are identified and implemented</i>	The 2008 strategic review workshop identified key thematic areas to be focused on to ensure success of the SKEP. These are: Mining; Climate change and renewable energy; Biodiversity and Livelihoods; Grazing; as well as Building Local government capacity to implement SKEP programmes. These task teams will be established over the next 12 months.
<i>2.7. Monthly SKEP TWG meetings continues, with strategic input from CI, BOTSOC, SANBI and the SKEP CU's scientific adviser</i>	Initial TWG monthly meetings were held to give guidance to the CU and review project proposals and discuss matters relevant to the efficient functioning of the SKEP. This TWG later evolved into the SKEP Reference Group; which has now evolved into the SKEP Executive Committee which meets quarterly. The scientific adviser provides input when required to at the Exco meetings
<i>2.8. SAIC commits to specific roles and responsibilities with respect to the implementation of the SKEP</i>	Bilateral liaison with partners is still continuing. However, a number of partners mentioned in point 2 of the project purpose are actively involved and have taken up responsibilities for the implementation of the SKEP
<i>2.9. Namaqualand Biodiversity Forum established and operational</i>	The Namaqualand Biodiversity Advisory Forum was established and launched in July'09. SANBI and the SKEP CU together with a number of partners form part of this forum. Memorandum of Understanding has been drafted and will be signed before the end of 2009
Output 3: Anchor projects are supported to deliver outcomes of priority area strategies.	
<i>3.1. Anchor project staff and steering committee members all trained in roles, responsibilities and coordination activities.</i>	The Anchor project's staff and committee members received training during the transitional period from having regional coordinators to the era of Anchor projects. Most of the regional coordinators played crucial roles in setting up and running the Anchor projects
<i>3.2. 5 priority area steering committees are active and coordinating actions by Dec 2005</i>	5 priority are steering committee were set up and became active in 2005. These are (1) The Gouritz Initiative; (2) Knersvlakte steering Committee; (3) Bokkeveld Steering

	Committee; (4) Bushmanlands Steering committee; and (5) Namaqualand Wilderness Initiative. To date, the Gouritz Initiative and Knersvlakte Priority Area steering committees are still active. The Bokkeveld, Bushmanlands and NWI now form part of the Namakwa Biodiversity Advisory Forum
3.3. <i>Priority area strategy reviews, visioning and planning workshops held annually.</i>	Each priority area held strategic review workshops annually. The resolutions of these workshops were then presented for discussion at the annual Anchor Projects Forums.
3.4. <i>Anchor project staff all attend SKEP quarterly lessons sharing workshops</i>	All Anchor projects staff attended initial quarterly lesson sharing workshops. This evolved into annual Anchor Projects Forum
3.5. <i>Project developer quarterly field visits implemented with 10 new projects developed by June 2006</i>	Project Developer conducted field visits to assist projects throughout the duration of this project
3.6. <i>2 projects per priority area receive project development support and implementation support by Dec 2005</i>	Projects in all targeted priority areas received project development support and on-going post-inception support.
Output 4: Programmatic M&E effective and guiding conservation strategy, investment and stakeholders in SK	
4.1. <i>At National bioregional forum collaborate on effective M&E indicators that measure both national and regional sustainable development strategies.</i>	SANBI convened a National bioregional Forum on Monitoring and Evaluation. The forum has enabled efficient collaboration between the bioregional programmes; and helped streamline indicators.
4.2. <i>A national M&E framework established by Dec 2005,, in collaboration with CAPE and STEP</i>	The Biome-wide SKEP M&E framework has been developed by the CU, and indicators refined. Currently, all bioregional M&E frameworks are under review to enable a more efficient and standard M&E system
4.3. <i>M&E strategy developed and implemented by June 2006</i>	The M&E strategy was developed later on, in 2008, and is also currently under review by an external expert.
4.4. <i>One innovative M&E pilot project implemented by SANBI CPU team by Sept 2005</i>	This was also delayed, and will be implemented once the M&E is fully operational during the last quarter of 2009
4.5. <i>M&E manual and training programme developed for project implementors by Sept 2006</i>	The CAPE programme has developed a very concise M&E manual, so To avoid duplication; the manual developed by the CAPE programme will be equally applicable to the SKEP regions. The need therefore to develop a SKEP specific manual was eliminated and now a training programme will be developed from the existing CAPE manual
Output 5: Stakeholders within civil society, government and donors are aware of the SKEP strategy, goals, achievements and opportunities and are sharing experiences.	
5.1. <i>Communications strategy developed and implemented by Sept 2005</i>	The SKEP communications strategy was developed and implemented through the appointment of the communications intern who later became a fully fledged communications officer

<p>5.2. SKEP communications intern capacitated through weekly meeting with CI communications officer</p>	<p>The SKEP Communications Intern had her capacity built up through regular engagements with the experienced CI person responsible for communications up to a stage where the Intern became a fully independent Communications Officer.</p>
<p>5.3. Annual SKEP partners conference implemented producing a popular lessons sharing document.</p>	<p>The SKEP partners conferences were held, and documents detailing proceedings and recommendations were produced by the communications officer</p>
<p>5.4. Quarterly thematic task team meetings held to share lessons and identify gaps.</p>	<p>The need for these thematic task teams was rendered insignificant due to the many forums mentioned in this report that dealt with a number of these thematic issues. So the thematic task teams were never functional</p>
<p>5.5. SKEP CU staff attends and distributes the lessons at the Namaqualand Colloquim</p>	<p>SKEP CU helped resource the Namaqualand Colloquim and CU staff attended and popularized SKEP through distribution of material and lesson learnt at the forum</p>
<p>5.6. SKEP CU staff attends Annual Arid Zone and Fynbos forums</p>	<p>Annual AZEF and Fynbos Forums were attended and are still being attended by CU staff. For the AZEF, the CU provided support such as funding some student posters over the past couple of years.</p>
<p>5.7. Quarterly communications through media releases, e-news letters and website updates</p>	<p>SKEP communications has been vibrant and informative. E-news releases are done on a monthly basis and reports on new development within the CU and the broader SKEP partnership</p>
<p>5.8. Knowledge and information management system implemented and available via SKEP website</p>	<p>The SKEP website is currently being developed to make it a vibrant knowledge management system. This will be ready for use in October 2009</p>
<p>Output 6: CEPF activities are coordinated and guided by an effective project review, project development and monitoring and evaluation system.</p>	
<p>6.1. Review panel, including scientific review experts established and reviewing all CEPF proposals</p>	<p>A project review panel was established that consisted of scientific and social experts to review all CEPF proposals. All subsequent CEPF funded projects went through this review panel.</p>
<p>6.2. All LOI's reviewed by priority area review panels with strategic input from scientific and technical expertise, quarterly</p>	<p>All LOI's were reviewed by the review panel to avoid clash of interest if this function were to be performed by priority area panels as most of them were applicants themselves</p>
<p>6.3. CEPF investment portfolio reviewed annual strategies published</p>	<p>The investment portfolio was regularly reviewed through forums like the Anchor Projects Forums and Partner's Conferences. Resolutions of these forums were distributed among the participating partners.</p>
<p>6.4. Quarterly Financial and performance reports monitored and verified by periodic field visits.</p>	<p>Quarterly financial reports and performance reports were reviewed and verified by regular site visits</p>
<p>6.5. Process all project applications, by supporting through communication on progress and integrating new ideas from review quarterly</p>	<p>All project applications were processed and communication made with all project</p>

	proponents. Progress on project implementation was reported on through quarterly financial reviews and performance reviews that were done twice a year. These reviews helped in promoting more efficient implementation of projects.
Output 7: The SKEP biodiversity conservation business case is strengthened with policy and decision makers in non-conservation land use sectors by increasing their knowledge and practical understanding of the explicit links between livelihoods and local economic development and the conservation and sustainable use of SK ecosystem services and biodiversity	
<i>7.1. Research report identifying priority SK ecosystem services, the value they contribute to local economic and social development programmes as well as the current and potential threats to these services and ultimately to sustainable development interventions at regional and local level.</i>	The study on SK ecosystem services was conducted and a thorough and extensive report has been produced. The report identifies key ecosystem services in the SK and shows how these services enhance livelihoods and income generation in the SK.
<i>7.2. The translation of the ecosystem services research product into a publication for dissemination to government policy and decision makers in non-conservation land use, economic sectors and social development programmes as a tool for increasing understanding of the manner in which ecosystem services and biodiversity underpin the foundation of sustainable development interventions.</i>	Work is currently underway to simplify the key thematic areas of the ES report to ease comprehension of the issues by our key governmental partners and potential donors

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

The SKEP CU project had been the anchor of all CEPF activities in the SK. One of the major successes was the full integration of the CU functions into SANBI' systems; this helped ensure the sustainability of the coordination unit far beyond the time period set out by the CEPF grant. The CU was also directly involved with helping develop most of the projects that were funded through CEPF and formed part of the review panel that approved over 80 projects, totaling over \$7.5 million. The CU also played a critical role in managing and sustaining the SKEP partnership, by hosting forums and workshops that required partner's participation. To this end, a 5 year post CEPF strategic plan has been developed by the SKEP partnership, and it will take a continued partner engagement strategy to have this strategy implemented, a role SANBI has committed to playing. The CU also provides secretariat support to the South African Implementation Committee as well as the SAIC Exec; without this support, the SKEP governance structures would in all probability collapse. The support given to Anchor Projects ensured that these projects were implemented within the parameters of the overall SKEP strategy. Major successes towards the end of the project were the production of a very thorough Ecosystem Services report on the SK, the production of the Succulent Karoo Research Strategy and engaging in the national discourse on land reform and biodiversity conservation

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

The development of the Knowledge Management System and the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the programme were delayed. But this piece of work will be completed before the end of October 2009; so this does not in any way affect overall impact of the project. The completion and operationalization of the SKEP M&E system was also delayed; but this also has not had a negative impact on the project. The M&E framework is currently being reviewed by

an external reviewer who is looking at strengthening alignments with other bioregional programmes in South Africa. The product will be a much better framework and more coordinated work on monitoring ecosystem programmes in the country.

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.

When the CU was first constituted, its functions were much decentralized, with regional coordinators throughout the SK who worked with stakeholders on the ground. This enabled better coordination of activities at a regional level. This exercise however proved to be very resource consuming, and it was dropped in favour of a centralized Coordination Unit based in Cape Town. Though the latter form of coordination had its benefits, like providing more strategic oversight to the programme; the relationships and community visibility that regional coordinators had got diluted. The lesson from this experiment with coordination was that what is ideal and operationally desirable is not always a resource-efficient way of doing things.

The second lesson we learnt from this project was that it takes time to anchor ideas and programme in a new milieu. It took the CU a lot of time to get buy-in from government departments. This was more as a result of historical factors than the incapacity of the CU. Conservation had long been perceived in a negative manner in the SK, particularly in the Northern Cape part of the SK, so the lesson learnt in this regard is the importance of grounding conservation initiatives at a local level, and of working with people who understand the culture and societal dynamics of local populations.

The third lesson learnt from this project was the realization that on implementing ecosystem programmes; you cannot divorce the success of the programme from the broader socio-economic needs of the people living in the target areas. In the succulent karoo, where economic opportunities are scarce and poverty is rampant, people are largely dependent on their natural resources for livelihoods and as a source of energy. It is therefore of crucial importance to integrate people's quest for proper living and the biodiversity conservation imperative. To this end, the 2008 strategic review workshop decided to have biodiversity and livelihoods sub-programme for the SKEP.

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

The project was subjected to a major design change in the middle of its implementation. The SKEP CU moved from Conservation International, an NGO, to SANBI, a government institution. This was coupled with the restructuring coordination structures from decentralized regional structures to a much more centralized coordination unit based in Cape Town. This had its advantages and disadvantages. While the decentralized coordination made SKEP more visible on the ground in priority areas; the centralized model of coordination allowed for more strategic oversight of the programme and for creating more linkages and networks.

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

When the project was started, it had its full complement of staff. This allowed for more efficiency in implementing the project. But due to the time-bound nature of the project and the relatively insecure contract bound employment, most members of staff left for permanent jobs somewhere else. This staff turnover was not positive at all for the project as new staff took sometime to operate smoothly.

However, the functions of the coordination unit were performed to the highest levels possible. The SKEP CU was the centre around which the entire CEPF grant revolved. The CU acted as the secretariat for all the other projects, reviewed progress and gave recommendations for improved project implementation to all the other projects. Furthermore, the CU coordinated governance structures of the SKEP, identified strategic gaps, commissioned studies to help understand challenges in the SK. All these factors contributed immensely to the success of the project and in turn, the success of the entire CEPF grant

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
SANBI	A	\$ 273,894.3	In kind co-financing for the duration for the programme
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	

****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 Unit is continuing to coordinate conservation actions in the Succulent Karoo. There is a 5 year strategic plan in place; and the South African National Biodiversity Institute has already created one post for a SKEP CU staff member in its establishment. This will be expanded in future as resources become available.

In order to further consolidate the gains made in this project, and create conditions for a seamless mainstreaming of SKEP priorities to local government and other locally based organization in the Succulent Karoo, SANBI has also applied to CEPF for a consolidation grant. This will help anchor SKEP coordination in local government and give SANBI time to mobilize more resources for future coordination.

But with or without the consolidation grant, coordination will continue, though it will be at a slower pace if the consolidation grant proposal is not approved.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEPF grant catalyzed a lot excitement and created a lot of awareness about the rich biodiversity of the Succulent Karoo, and a lot has been achieved thus far. An almost inevitable fact however is that in a region where there is intense contest for scarce resources, sustaining this excitement and continuing with the conservation actions rely a great deal on the availability of resources, particularly from donor agencies.

The SKEP CU identified this challenge and is currently engaging local institutions and mobilizing government resources to further embed conservation on the daily practices of the people and industries operating in the Succulent Karoo.

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: Lubabalo Ntsholo

Organization name: South African National Biodiversity Institute

Mailing address: SKEP; Private Bag X7; Claremont; 7735

Tel: +27 21 799 8817

Fax: +27 21 797 1940

E-mail: Ntsholo@sanbi.org