

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Conservation South Africa
Project Title:	Embedding Lessons and Leveraging Networks from the CFR and SK CEPF Experience in MPAH
Date of Report:	30 July 2012
Report Author and Contact Information	Sarah Frazee, sfrazee@conservation.org

CEPF Region: Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany (South Africa)

Strategic Direction: 4, Enabling environment

Grant Amount: \$18,363.00

Project Dates: May 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012

Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner): The Wildlands Trust RIT -

Conservation Impacts

Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal):

Understanding of the CEPF and conservation project development, particularly around the lessons from the SKEPPIES Fund, the CAPE governance structures, Green Choice and national PES planning processes have been shared at various organizational outreach meetings in the Eastern Cape.

Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion: Project proposals and small grants were approved for projects by ARC, ERS, SWC, the Cedarville Conservancy, and EWT stewardship. Other project applicants like R3G were also supported to submit their application, but this particular project did not have an institutional home from which to operate. This portfolio of projects and project applicants are now also reaching out to smaller NGOs and CBOs to help them access and develop good, strategic projects from the CEPF. In the first few months of the project, the time with the WCT project coordinator Dumile Tshingana was considered valuable by the RIT team.

Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal): At the request of the RIT, CSA particularly focused on the stakeholders in the Umzimvubu region and this area now has several ongoing projects and a new partnership structure that is recognized by local and national government. CSA provided co-financing to develop a strategic framework for the CEPF project development by local organizations to contribute

to and the resulting Umzimvubu Catchment Partnership Programme provides a 20-year vision that reflects the tremendous learning from the CAPE and SKEP Programmes.

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion: CEPF has approved five projects to the tune of nearly \$500,000 that received support from CSA under this grant. CSA has contributed \$60,000 in co-finance to developing the Umzimvubu Catchment Partnership and an additional \$10,000 in training support for farmers in the Cedarville Conservancy and staff of ERS in livestock management and monitoring and evaluation frameworks supported through prior CEPF investments in Green Choice (see Cape Floristic Region Portfolio.) CSA has also submitted co-funding proposals to the value of \$14 million that will support sustainability of some of the key CEPF projects, including the Cederville Conservancy, EWT, ARC, SWC, and ERS projects.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected:
Species Conserved:
Corridors Created:

Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.

The RIT was functional quite early on in the project. There was open communication between the RIT and CSA, but there was no real need for lots of hand-holding. This allowed CSA to rather focus on leveraging and developing a bigger programme (based on the success of the CAPE and SKEP approach to landscape level conservation) under which smaller CBO projects could be supported and coordinated.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

There have been countless unexpected impacts of this project. The creation of the Umzimvubu Catchment Partnership Programme involves 30 organisations that will now cooperatively work towards the goals of the CEPF investment profile in 4 KBAs and two prioritized corridors (Highland Grassland and Pondoland) along a freshwater ecosystem. The programme, as a whole, is greater than the sum of its parts. It has attracted numerous academic and research institutions that will generate new knowledge for the region, larger NGOs and organizations are regularly engaging with both these academics and smaller NGOs and CBOs, and government is enthusiastically supporting the new alliance based on the sharing of lessons from the CAPE and SKEP experience. The power and momentum of this alliance was already felt in May 2012 in which the partners (many supported by CEPF or introduced to each other through CEPF project development workshops) participated in a Water Day for the Alfred Nzo District which highlighted the role of natural resource management in water service delivery (see proceedings attached.) Additionally, the Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Authority were able to participate in a learning exchange to Costa Rica on PES with CI as a result of the introductions and ideas from the project, and the UNDP project coordinator for ECPTA has called CSA to consult on ideas for that project as well which has led to new ideas from CAPE and SKEP being transferred there too.

Project Components

Project Components: *Please report on results by project component. Reporting should reference specific products/deliverables from the approved project design and other relevant information.*

Component 1 Planned: Lessons from CAPE and SKEP projects shared to support the RIT team

Component 1 Actual at Completion: Within the first four months of the project, I participated in two field trips with the RIT and hosted two project development workshops. During these trips, there was plenty of time to share many of the lessons from CAPE and SKEP programme which I hope helped the RIT get up and running. However, it must be said that the RIT team is great, and required little support.

Component 2 Planned: 3 large grant applicants supported to develop high quality CEPF projects, with a particular focus on the Eastern Cape.

Component 2 Actual at Completion: EWT, ERS, and R3G were supported to submit CEPF projects. CSA has also continued to support these and other grantees and organizations working in the Umzimvubu watershed and its respective KBAs as they implement their grants to learn from the lessons of the CAPE and SKEP projects, especially with regards to stewardship institutional lessons, sustainable agriculture monitoring and evaluation, and governance issues.

Component 3 Planned: RIT is supported to develop co-financing and sustainable financing partnerships for MPAH Profile strategy.

Component 3 Actual at Completion:

Between Jan-2011-June 2012, CSA has invested >\$70,000 in co-financing the MPAH Profile in the Eastern Cape, has secured an additional \$50,000, attracted the interest of the DBSA, Coca-cola Foundation, and Walmart in collaborative ventures in the Umzimvubu Catchment (a priority catchment in the Ecosystem Profile), and submitted a proposal for a new PES Trust of \$7million that, if successful, can provide a sustainable funding vehicle for the PES work catalysed by the CEPF.

Were any components unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project? As this really was a small project aimed at regional capacity building, there were no components unrealized and the impact of the project will likely only really be known as the UCPP and its partners undertake their work.

Please describe and submit (electronically if possible) any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

- Umzimvubu Catchment Partnership Programme MOU and Fact Sheet
- Trip reports
- Water Day Proceedings

Lessons Learned

Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings) CEPFs flexibility in approving this project allowed for great leveraging of CSA technical experience and financial resources into supporting other local civil society in a region with limited breadth of capacity. This has facilitated the achievement of the project goals, but also the development of a solid foundation of partnership between the RIT and CSA staff, particularly for work in the Eastern Cape.

Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

CEPF as a mechanism provides an opportunity to generate a learning community at both the Hotspot and the landscape scale. This project allowed for interactions between the RIT and their work at the MPAH level and CSA work at the catchment level in mutually beneficial ways. While the MPAH partners learned about experiences in the other hotspots, CSA met and learned about MPAH and is now transferring those lessons back to CAPE and SKEP landscaped. Growing networks and working together to invest in good project design seems costly and time-consuming, but it is worth it.

Additional Funding

Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of the CEPF investment in this project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

**Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:*

- A Project co-financing (Other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B 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.)*
- C Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*
- D In-Kind contributions can include staff and volunteer time, supplies, and other materials your organization provides to the project.*

Sustainability/Replicability

Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name:
Organization name:
Mailing address:
Tel:
Fax:
E-mail:

*****If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages*****

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

CEPF Global Targets

(Enter Grant Term)

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

Project Results	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.				Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?				Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.				
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.				
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.				

If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table

