

## CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Wilderness Foundation
<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Promoting Management Effectiveness in Protected Areas in the Albany, Amathole-Sneeuberg and Pondoland Conservation Corridors</b>
<b>Date of Report:</b>	31 July 2013
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Matthew Norval Tel: +27(0)41 373 0293 matthew@sa.wild.org

**CEPF Region:** Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany

**Strategic Direction:** 2. Conservation and land use in 22 KBAs

**Grant Amount:** US\$160,720

**Project Dates:** 1 June, 2011 to 31 May, 2013

**Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):**

### **1. South African National Parks (SANParks)**

SANParks is the conservation management agency responsible for Camdeboo and Mountain Zebra National Parks. They represented the park management teams from these two parks who participated in the project, and also enabled site visits at the parks for the project manager and managers from the other reserves involved.

### **2. Mount Camdeboo Private Game Reserve**

Mount Camdeboo Private Game Reserve represents one of the private reserve components of this project. They made the park management team and the directors available for the implementation of the project including enabling site visits at the reserve for the project manager and managers from the other reserves and national parks involved.

### **3. Plains of Camdeboo Private Nature Reserve**

Plains of Camdeboo PNR represents another of the private reserve components of this project. They made the park management team and the owner available for the implementation of the project including enabling site visits at the reserve for the project manager and managers from the other reserves and national parks involved.

#### **4. Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency (ECPTA)**

ECPTA is the conservation management agency responsible for Dwesa-Cwebe and Mkambati Nature Reserves. They made the reserve management teams from these two reserves available for the implementation of the project including enabling site visits at the reserves for the project manager and managers from the other reserves involved.

### **Conservation Impacts**

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

The main contribution of this project was in Strategic Direction 2. Conservation and land use in 22 KBAs

The Mountain Zebra National Park complex is identified as a key biodiversity area in the ecosystem profile so the involvement of four protected areas within this complex has contributed to the implementation of the ecosystem profile.

Additional benefits are a result of a contribution made under the following outcomes:

#### **Outcome 1:**

The conservation status of under capacitated and emerging protected areas in 3 priority key biodiversity areas strengthened protection of the Mkambati and Dwesa-Cwebe reserves in Pondoland North Coast, South Africa.

#### **Outcome 2:**

Conservation areas expanded and land-use management improved in 19 priority key biodiversity areas through innovative approaches.

*Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.*

The project has resulted in a marked improvement in the METT scores in the participating protected areas and awareness regarding the methodology has improved at both protected area management level as well as within the agencies. As planned this project has also had a positive influence on the Camdeboo-Mountain Zebra Corridor project underway. This has been through improved management effectiveness of important sites within the corridor and an emphasis within both projects on the importance of managing protected areas ( national parks, provincial reserves and private reserves)appropriately in order to ensure that the important conservation and biodiversity attributes are maintained. The two Wild Coast reserves made the most noticeable improvement by the end of the project and overall they benefitted by this specifically. It is also hoped that the concepts learned during the implementation of this project can also influence the possible expansion of the Wild Coast Reserves.

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

- Measurable improvement at project sites themselves.
- Demonstrable improvements in the way protected areas are managed within the hotspot.
- Conservation management activities within the agencies and organisations participating in the project are improved and additional protected areas within the hotspot recognize the value of the METT and peer learning intervention.
- The peer learning and support elements of this project are sustained beyond the initial project funding to create an environment conducive to the formalization of linkages and conservation corridors.

### **Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:**

- Measurable improvement took place at the 6 project sites
- It would be difficult to claim an overall improvement across the hotspot but the project has definitely ensured that the concept of effective management and continual improvement has become part of the hotspot lexicon.
- Conservation management activities within the agencies and organisations participating in the project have definitely improved
- The peer learning and support element of the project is likely to be sustained in the inland protected areas as they have now developed a good working relationship and are all involved in the corridor. It is likely that the 2 Wild Coats reserves will continue to interact as they form part of the same management region and have similar challenges.

### **Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal):**

- Up to 25% improvement in the METT scores in the project sites.
- Peer learning and support network established and functioning.
- Practical implementation plans developed for all project sites to assist reserve managers in improving management
- Cooperation and information sharing between agencies and protected area managers from different organisations has not taken place at any significant level and this should be remedied within the short term. The desired outcome is that this project promotes dialogue and peer learning to promote more effective protected area managers who are then in a position to evaluate and implement creative expansion and consolidation activities while acknowledging the important roles that their parks play regionally.

### Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

As can be seen in the table below, the basic goal of improving METT scoring up to 25% has been achieved.

<u>Reserve</u>	<u>Previous (before project was started)</u>	<u>Baseline Score</u>	<u>Final Score</u>	<u>% increase from baseline</u>	<u>% increase from Previous</u>
Dwesa-Cwebe Nature Reserve	37 %	41%	55%	14%	18%
Mkambati Nature Reserve	36%	52%	65%	13%	29%
Camdeboo National Park	67 %	62%	76%	14%	9%
Mountain Zebra National Park	73 %	76%	83%	7%	10%
Mount Camdeboo Private Game Reserve	None	50%	58%	8%	Not applicable
Plains of Camdeboo Private Nature Reserve	None	52%	61%	9%	Not applicable
<b>Total increase</b>				<b>65%</b>	

**Peer learning:** The peer learning opportunities created as part of the project contributed to its overall success. As described in previous points the peer learning clusters have formed due to geographic location of the reserves but the mechanism for interaction is in place and the reserve managers are more likely to engage across geographic and agency boundaries than before the project commenced

The METT should be seen as the tool that stimulates the concept of continual improvement. Each reserve has been assisted with the development of a practical implementation plan, which can be implemented post project.

The Wilderness Foundation remains committed to continue to support the agencies in general and the reserves involved in this project in particular in anyway considered helpful to the overarching goal of promoting management effectiveness across the hotspot.

### Please provide the following information where relevant:

**Hectares Protected:** 83 344ha: This represents the total size of the six reserves involved in the project where management was strengthened.

**Species Conserved:** n/a

**Corridors Created:** n/a

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

The project team is comfortable that both the short-term and long-term impact objectives of the project have been achieved.

***Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?***

The improvements in the METT scores of the two national parks was unexpected. They are two well established and managed protected areas and improvements were expected to be far more likely in the 2 private reserves and 2 provincial reserves. While these 4 reserves did improve considerably it was a pleasant surprise to have the 2 national parks benefit as much as they contributed to the process.

## **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:**

Improved management effectiveness of six existing protected areas

**Component 1 Actual at Completion:**

Final METT results are as follows:

1. Dwesa-Cwebe Nature Reserve: Baseline - 41%, final - 55%, increase of 14% ( 20% from pre project to final);
2. Mkambati Nature Reserve: Baseline - 52%, Final - 65%, increase of 13% (29% from pre project to final);
3. Camdeboo National Park: Baseline - 62%, Final - 76%, increase of 14%;
4. Mountain Zebra National Park: Baseline - 76%, Final - 83%, increase of 7%;
5. Mount Camdeboo Private Game Reserve: Baseline - 50%, Final - 58%, increase of 8%;
6. Plains of Camdeboo Private Nature Reserve: Baseline - 52%, Final - 61%, increase of 9%.

A total of 65% increase for all the reserves.

The accurate observation is that the results probably indicate a combination of factors. There is no doubt that improvements have been made to the effective management of the reserves but the increased familiarity of the system by the managers has also improved. This should also be seen as a positive outcome

**Component 2 Planned:**

Peer learning and support takes place amongst protected area management teams

**Component 2 Actual at Completion:**

By project end date, peer learning sessions have been carried out at each project site as planned. The final report has also been completed and the protected area managers have been encouraged to make use of the peer learning network established as part of the project. The Wilderness Foundation is committed to contributing to this ongoing interaction post project if at all possible

**Component 3 Planned:**

Management intervention and implementation frameworks are developed for six protected areas in order to fast track improvements in management effectiveness

**Component 3 Actual at Completion:**

Each reserve manager was given the opportunity to have input into the final report to ensure that it was a true reflection of what was carried out as part of the project. In addition the final reserve based peer learning session allowed the managers to present the successes, opportunities and challenges in the reserves they manage. This formed the basis of the implementation plans which each reserve manager now has which should guide activities in the medium term to encourage further improvement.

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

All component-level targets planned have been achieved.

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

The basic approach of the project was to use the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) as a means to determine existing levels of management effectiveness and through a series of interventions with the reserve management teams use the project period to achieve a meaningful improvement. The METT can be used not only to influence the on-reserve activities but can be used as a means to nurture creative approaches to tourism and job creation initiatives, stakeholder involvement, expansion and stewardship.

The use of the METT also allows the project executants to develop good working relationships with the protected area managers and their teams and this facilitates the creation of an enabling environment to develop further interventions.

The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) was originally developed to assess a target set by WWF and the World Bank to improve management effectiveness in forest protected areas. The methodology is a rapid assessment, based on a scorecard questionnaire. The scorecard includes all six elements of management identified in the IUCN-WCPA Framework (context, planning, inputs, process, outputs and outcomes), but has an emphasis on context,

planning, inputs and processes. It is very basic and simple to use, and provides a mechanism for monitoring progress towards more effective management over time. It is used to enable protected area managers and donors to identify needs, constraints and priority actions to improve the effectiveness of protected area management.

The METT has a number of objectives which include:

- It is capable of providing a harmonised reporting system for assessment of the 'effectiveness' of protected areas;
- It is suitable for replication; It is able to supply consistent data to allow tracking of progress in effectiveness over time;
- It is relatively quick and easy to complete, and thus not reliant on high levels of funding or other resources;
- It is easily understood by non-specialists; and
- It is nested within existing reporting systems to avoid duplication of effort ;
- The METT has been widely tested and applied around the world, notably in respect of NGO and donor-funded (e.g. GEF) protected area projects.

In the main METT assessment form, 30 questions are asked, each with a four point scale (0, 1, 2, and 3). The intention is that the scale forces respondents to choose whether the situation is acceptable or not. Generally 0 is equivalent to *no or negligible progress*; 1 is *some progress*; 2 is *quite good but has room for improvement*; 3 is *approaching optimum situation*. A series of four alternative answers are provided against each question to help assessors to make judgments as to the level of score given. In addition, there are three groups of supplementary questions which elaborate on key themes in the previous questions and provide additional information and points. Where questions are not relevant to the protected area, they are left out and the scores adjusted accordingly.

The scores are totalled and the percentage of the possible score calculated. It is noted that the whole concept of "scoring" progress is however fraught with difficulties and possibilities for distortion. The current system assumes, for example, that all the questions cover issues of equal weight, whereas this is not necessarily the case. Scores will therefore provide a better assessment of effectiveness if calculated as a percentage for each of the six elements of the IUCN-WCPA Framework (i.e. context, planning, inputs, process, outputs and assessments).

As part of the application of the METT in South Africa, the system was adapted to make it more relevant to South African conditions. The adapted version is known as METT-SA Version 1, 2008. Further adaptations have resulted in METT-SA, Version 2 (2010) which can also be applied to Marine Protected Areas, and further revisions are expected to enable evaluating the management effectiveness of conservancies and stewardship sites.

## 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)***

Project design and implementation needs a balance between formal process and ability to allow things to happen spontaneously: by setting aside sufficient time for scheduled activities we were able to benefit from unplanned interactions between the protected area managers that added to the overall success of the project.

It is worth taking the time at the start of a project to ensure that all stakeholders have clarity on the process planned to take place during the course of the project, roles, responsibilities and outcomes envisaged.

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

From the outset the risks faced by this project were minimal as the partners enjoy a good relationship and there is wide agreement that the METT is the best tool to effect the positive change required. The project team was small and the success of the project was largely based on existing relationships and skill sets which again limited the risk.

***Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:***

- **Involvement of partners in planning:** The Wilderness Foundation largely played a coordination and facilitation role where the process was guided in order to achieve maximum effect but meaningful outcomes develop as the partners start to actively contribute to these outcomes and the means to achieve them.
- **Allow sufficient time for processes to take place:** It takes time to develop and implement processes that enable reserve managers to engage meaningfully and sessions were always consciously structured so that there was sufficient time to allow this to take place.
- **Allow for sufficient interaction between the partners:** While an important outcome of the project is an improvement in METT scores the interaction between the managers is also a vital project component and scheduling needs to take this into account.
- While the merits of the METT system itself remains debatable amongst protected area managers it is a valuable tool to stimulate discussion, peer learning and to promote the concept of continual improvement with regard to management.



- **Peer learning opportunities** presented during site visits is a fantastic way to facilitate discussion and do improve protected area management at a practical level.
- **The focused approach of the project** has proved successful in that the groups are small and discussions can take place at a very personal level. This along with the site visits and the practical approach to protected area management challenges has assisted in the project achieving its goals. Considerable effort went into ensuring that the managers had sufficient time to interact and discuss issues beyond the rigid METT guidelines. The deliberate selection of reserves to take part in this project in support of the Camdeboo/Mountain Zebra Corridor has proved effective.

## 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.*

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Wilderness Foundation	Project co-financing	\$ 5300	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in-Kind</li> <li>• Office space for project management (Port Elizabeth): \$215.00 per month x 24=\$ 5160.00</li> <li>• Use of meeting facilities: 2 meetings @ \$70.00 = \$140</li> </ul>
South African National Parks	Project co-financing	\$ 340	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in-Kind</li> <li>• Accommodation for assessments: 6 people @ \$45.00 per person per night x 1 night = \$270</li> <li>• Use of park facilities for meetings:1 meetings @ \$70.00 = \$70</li> </ul>
Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency	Project co-financing	\$ 1220	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in-Kind</li> <li>• Accommodation for assessments: 6 people @ \$45.00 per person per night x 4 nights = \$ 1080</li> <li>• Use of park facilities for meetings:2 meetings @ \$70.00 = \$140</li> </ul>
Private Reserves (Mount Camdeboo Private Game Reserve and Plains of Camdeboo Private Nature Reserve)	Project co-financing	\$ 1290	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in-Kind</li> <li>• Accommodation for assessments: 6 people @ \$45.00 per person per night x 4 nights = \$ 1080</li> <li>• Use of reserve facilities for meetings: 3 meetings @ \$70.00 = \$210</li> </ul>

**\*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.)*

## **Sustainability/Replicability**

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

The only possible risk to sustainability at a park/reserve level is the transfer of protected area managers to other parks. While this could be seen to have a positive impact on the park receiving the new manager there is concern that implementation activities planned in the original park could suffer delays. During this project two managers were transferred. One was sufficiently early on so that the negative impact was limited while the second transfer was towards the end of the project. Risk was mitigated by ensuring that the organizations were aware of the support available through the project by peers as well as post project support offered by the Wilderness Foundation.

***Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.***

Sustainability of the process and ability to implement METT methodology within these protected areas and the responsible management agencies has certainly been enhanced as a result of the project. While the ability to replicate this project in others areas was identified as a possibility Wilderness Foundation has submitted a LOI for a proposed intervention in the Futi Corridor in Mozambique using the same methodology and approach. It is hope that a contribution will be able to be made in this part of the hotspot.

## **Safeguard Policy Assessment**

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

No actions were necessary during the implementation of this project.

## **Additional Comments/Recommendations**

The Wilderness Foundation is grateful to CEPF for the funding that enabled this project to be carried out. The excellent cooperation with the partner organizations is also acknowledged. The methodology and approach has had the impact planned and Wilderness Foundation would be happy to contribute to any associated projects or processes within the hotspot or beyond, that would benefit from such input.

## 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](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

### **Please include your full contact details below:**

Name: Matthew Norval

Organization name: Wilderness Foundation

Mailing address: P.O. Box 12509, Centrahil, Port Elizabeth, 6006, South Africa

Tel: +27 (0)41 373 0293

Fax: +27 (0)41 374 1821

E-mail: [matthew@sa.wild.org](mailto:matthew@sa.wild.org)

**\*\*\*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, 2012 to May 30, 2013. (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.	Yes	83344ha	83344ha	Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.  Management effectiveness was improved in the following protected areas: Camdeboo National Park (14%): 19405ha; Mountain Zebra National Park (7%): 28412ha; Plains of Camdeboo Private Nature Reserve (9%): 8827ha; Mount Camdeboo Private Game Reserve (8%): 14000ha; Dwesa-Cwebe Provincial Nature Reserve (20%): 5700ha; Mkambati Provincial Nature Reserve (25%): 7 000ha. The objective of improving METT scoring of up to 25% was achieved as indicated above.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	No			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.	No			
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	No			

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



