

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

| | |
|--|--|
| Organization Legal Name: | African Conservation Trust |
| Project Title: | Mkuze River Conservation Project - Expansion of the Protected Area Network |
| Date of Report: | 31 January 2013 |
| Report Author and Contact Information | Paul Cryer - Ecologist- Protected Area Expansion (t) +27325257532 (c) +27728042596 (e) paulcryer@telkomsa.net |

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

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

Grant Amount: \$116,178.00

Project Dates: May 1, 2011-December 31, 2012

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

Emvokweni Community Trust – The ECT is currently going through a conflation of legal, logistical, financial and functional crises such they were not in a position to support the MRCP. On the one hand the ECT has provided us with an understanding of what can go wrong in community conservation initiatives and on the other hand, the situation within Somkhanda has made neighbouring communities reluctant to engage with conservation initiatives and this was and is an ongoing challenge.

Wildlands Conservation Trust – Beyond assistance and support as the RIT, WCT supported with stewardship direction, the planning of the long term MRCP strategy, priority species advice, the conducting of METT scores, and liaison with the ECT.

Zululand Hunters – The role of Zululand Hunters was curtailed by the termination of their lease to manage and hunt on Somkhanda. Before their exit from the project area, they assisted in the establishment of the first MRCP base in Somkhanda, orientation within the project area and the conducting of the initial METT score.

WWF – Black Rhino Range Expansion – The WWF BRREP assisted with the emerging direction and strategy of the MRCP; whilst the project had a very strong social component we had to ensure that the plans were going to ultimately benefit priority species conservation. This was achieved through a number of meetings with Jacques Flammand to align local strategy with a more regional strategy.

EWT – Carnivore Project – Similarly, the EWT played a role in guiding our emerging strategy to incorporate a situation that would ultimately benefit wild dogs.

KZN Wild Dog Management Group - The Group provide support through the dissemination of information regarding the release of wild dogs in other areas; this will affect the manner and timing of wild dog management within the MRCP area.

Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife – Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife assisted with the second MRCP Base, supplying documents regarding provincial protected area expansion strategy, the conducting of PRAs and other community meetings

Wildlife ACT – The staff of Wildlife ACT, particularly Simon Morgan, Bruce Lombardo, Wishwell Mabuya and Chris Kelly provided support and guidance in developing the revised MRCP strategy, especially when we started to see the implosion of Somkhanda and the naivety of our initial MRCP ideas.

Zululand District Municipality – provided the integrated development plan for the Zululand District

Conservation Impacts

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

The MRCP engaged with conservation issues at a time when social, economic and environmental pressures were altering the local people's perceptions of those issues such that, during the project period, stakeholders revealed dissatisfaction with conservation values and outcomes, saying they would benefit outsiders and not local people. These sentiments manifest themselves as a reluctance to engage in any conservation proclamation process and increased illegal harvesting. The MRCP engaged in a process of relationship building with the relevant stakeholders that aimed to reconnect them with external resources that would be beneficial to them and then reframe their environmental context such that they could perceive that their desire for economic sustainability would involve environmental protection and that this environmental protection could be

- a. Governed and managed by them and
- b. Receive external support from formal governance structures as well as conservation bodies.

The result of this process is that the MRCP area is now committed to a course of action which has already resulted in community agreements that improve land use. These agreements will secure responsible use of vulnerable habitats and this in turn will benefit the priority species within the project area (notably wild dog, rhino and cycads). Furthermore, by indicating that environmental protection does not diminish or undermine land tenure, the possibility of securing a linkage between Somkhanda Game Reserve and ZRR has been re-opened; this was not the case at the beginning of the project period.

In terms of the ecosystem profile, the MRCP has addressed issues of improved land use which can be measured in hectares, benefits to priority species and the initiation of processes to secure linkages between existing protected areas. But perhaps more importantly the MRCP had to respond (and radically alter its direction) to challenges that would have caused the project to fail. These challenges stemmed from the near managerial and financial collapse of one of the anchoring protected areas, Somkhanda Game Reserve. At the proposal writing phase of the MRCP, Somkhanda was the case study to be emulated elsewhere but soon into the project the stakeholders were using Somkhanda as an example of all that is bad.

In response to this situation the MRCP team had to sit back and say to the stakeholders that we didn't have a successful model to roll out. So for starters we had to take a step backwards and listen to how those stakeholders perceived the situation and then to set up a communication network that could absorb and respond to what was emerging. What did emerge was that we would need to view the entire community area as an entity and not merely focus on the areas of critical ecological significance; if we were to ask the local communities to take responsibility for the area's environmental sustainability then we would need to ensure that the social and economic security of those communities were equally secure. So the MRCP expanded its "examine water

delivery” objective to food security and what it terms “Conservation Agriculture”. ACT has successfully used the MRCP to leverage additional funding for the implementation of Conservation Agriculture within the project area.

The combination of a dynamic stakeholder communication network, in conjunction with an approach that integrates social and agricultural components with environmental ones, has been developed into a methodology that has broader applicability. The principles of this methodology can be applied in other project areas and used to develop long term plans that have broad based community support.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

As mentioned on Pg 8 of the Ecosystem Profile the three scales of measuring outcomes (area, species and linkages) are geographically and logically interconnected

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

- Protected area expansion in terms of the Protected Areas Act
- Creation of linkages between protected areas
- Protection of vulnerable riverine landscape including endangered plant species
- Reduced subsistence poaching and added rhino security
- Sustainable economic benefits as a result of ecotourism opportunities in conjunction with traditional land uses.
- A replicable model for integrating the needs of traditional land use with conservation and economically driven nature based tourism/hunting.

Actual Progress Towards Long-term Impacts at Completion:

In focusing on the land abutting the Mkuze River south of Somkhanda Game Reserve, the MRCP has worked with three communities and one private landowner. Signed agreements with the three communities have resulted in a commitment to environmentally sustainable practices and the development of land use plans that will result in stewardship processes. At the beginning of the project period, the private landowners of Zimanga were adamant that they would not enter into any stewardship process to secure land in terms of the Protected Areas Act and this stance became more firmly entrenched as Somkhanda’s situation worsened. Through commitments from ACT to assist in conservation initiatives in Zimanga, the possibility of formal proclamation of that area is being revisited. So in terms of the long term agreements the following has been achieved:

| Planned Long Term Impact | Actual Long Term Impact |
|--|--|
| Protected area expansion in terms of the Protected Areas Act | Agreements with the three communities refer to the initiation of stewardship programs which will result in land being proclaimed under the Protected Areas Act. Discussions with community members and tribal authorities have focused around the category of “Protected Environment”. |
| Creation of linkages between protected areas | Negotiations with the owners of Zimanga, regarding formal proclamation, has now been re-opened and this in combination with a portion of community land, could constitute a linkage between Somkhanda Game Reserve and ZRR. |
| Protection of vulnerable riverine landscape including endangered plant species | The commitment of the three communities (within the signed agreements) will secure vulnerable landscapes. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Reduced subsistence poaching and added rhino security | No progress in this area has been made, however as the agreements are implemented this should change. |
| Sustainable economic benefits as a result of ecotourism opportunities in conjunction with traditional land uses | Tourism benefits have not been realized as yet but the economic benefits of the “Conservation Agriculture” (see Question 5 of the Performance Tracking Report Addendum) are starting to manifest themselves within the three communities. |
| A replicable model for integrating the needs of traditional land use with conservation and economically driven nature based tourism/hunting | This is being achieved although it is very different to what was anticipated at the beginning of the project. The replicable model is based on integrated land use planning where economic sustainability is locally generated and maintained by the communities rather than land/resource swaps driving an externally driven economic system. |

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

- A signed agreement for a new community reserve within the Pongola-Magudu Key Biodiversity Area
- The development of a planning system that could deliver water to communities thereby increasing the area under conservation and improving water quality of the river.
- Create the potential for connectivity between Somkande Game Reserve & Zululand Rhino Reserve

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

| Planned Short Term Impact | Actual Short Term Impact |
|---|--|
| A signed agreement for a new community reserve within the Pongola-Magudu Key Biodiversity Area | For each of the three communities within the project area, there are signed agreements, making the commitment to sustainability and this includes stewardship processes. All three communities liked the concept of “protected Environment” classification and specifically not the “Nature Reserve” category. This standpoint comes from what they view as a failed Somkhanda coupled with the perception that “reserves” constitute the loss of land. If we get Somkhanda right and then illustrate that the Protected Areas Act specifically guards against loss of tenure, then we could readdress this issue. |
| The development of a planning system that could deliver water to communities thereby increasing the area under conservation and improving water quality of the river. | Interaction with community members through the PRA process proved the “land for water” swap idea to be unacceptable. Instead a planning system was developed that focused on sustainable communities and this would include land use planning that will lead to increased protection of riverine systems and formal proclamation of land through stewardship processes. |
| Create the potential for connectivity between Somkande Game Reserve & Zululand Rhino Reserve | Through the agreement with the Mandlakazi Community and the negotiations with the oners of Zimanga, the potential for a connection between Somkhanda and ZRR has been made. |

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: 14145

Species Conserved: A project to propagate and reintroduce cycads into the project area begins in March 2013 and similarly, effects of the MRCP that will tangibly benefit Black Rhino, Wild Dogs and other priority species will be measured after the conclusion of the CEPF component.

Corridors Created: Signed agreements with the three communities within the project area coupled with the re-initiation of the stewardship process in Zimanga has created the geographic possibility of a Somkhanda/ZRR linkage. There is, however much to be done in terms of aligning management intentions for the various areas as well as initiating and completing proclamation processes. This becomes another follow on project.

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

Two challenges affected the direction of the project and both of these manifest themselves very early on. The first was that it became apparent that Somkhanda Game Reserve was on the brink of managerial and financial crisis. The second was that the local communities viewed nature conservation bodies as entities that would take land away from people; this would be tolerated if tangible benefits would be returned to the communities but for the people in the MRCP area, Somkhanda stood as a sharp example of undelivered expectations. Consequently, our aim within the MRCP shifted to reframing the communities' perception of conservation, to remove unrealistic expectations and then find common desires between the needs of the local communities and those of biodiversity conservation.

What emerged from this was the relinquishing of the "conservation land in exchange for water delivery" idea in favour of establishing sustainable communities in which key components of the environment would recognized and protected.

The original proposal referred to making contact with the stakeholders then conducting two stakeholder meetings to discuss findings of the project team and map a way forward. What actually emerged was nine community meetings and countless informal ones. The initial emphasis of these was to communicate to the communities that we (the MRCP Team) were not arriving with a plan (or perhaps more correctly that we had jettisoned our plan on perceiving its naivety). Instead we wanted to come to understand what the community thought and then establish a forum where we could develop a plan together, combining local knowledge and needs with desired external expertise.

On the negative side, this process took time. This was unnerving not only because of the projected time frames being trashed but also because the MRCP team (consisting largely of misanthropic scientists) had to relinquish its own objectives in favour of empowering the communities with rightful tenure to construct their own objectives. The focus of the MRCP shifted to building relationships, providing or sourcing knowledge and input as it was needed and then trusting the process. After a very slow and suspicious start, a real trust relationship has been established and this is perhaps the greatest success of the MRCP.

On a practical level, what emerged was a commitment to the concept of sustainability manifested in protecting critical environmental components, improving agricultural practices and establishing stewardship processes within the MRCP area (see below)

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

| |
|---------------------------|
| 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 Land Use Planning and Protected Area Expansion

Product/Deliverable 1.1. - Base established in project area.

Product/Deliverable 1.2. - Initial engagements with stakeholders made.

Product/Deliverable 1.3. – Participatory Rural Appraisal report. Follow on projects identified (emanating from the PRA that will lead to the sustainability of the expanded protected area network). Funding proposals for the follow-on projects compiled and submitted.

Product/Deliverable 1.4. - Initial land use analysis.

Product/Deliverable 1.5. - Stakeholder workshops held to establish agreements for a new protected area.

Product/Deliverable 1.6. - Information gathering for management planning and protected area expansion planning.

Product/Deliverable 1.7. - Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) score comparison at initiation and completion of project

Component 1 Actual at Completion:

Product/Deliverable 1.1. – An MRCP Base was established in project area. The first of these proved to be problematic from a security perspective and was consequently moved from Somkhanda Game Reserve to Mkuzi Game Reserve. This base has also experienced security issues with the theft of paving, roofing timber and tools.

Product/Deliverable 1.2. - Initial engagements with stakeholders were made and these relationships have been expanded into an established communication network with ongoing meetings which are extending beyond the CEPF involvement in the MRCP.

Product/Deliverable 1.3. - The initial Participatory Rural Appraisal was completed and then extended and expanded to form the basis of the stakeholder communication network. Follow on projects were identified from the PRA/stakeholder communication network and funding proposals for the follow-on projects have and are being compiled and submitted. The follow-on projects that have been adopted and are currently being worked on pertain to conservation agriculture, community food security and cycad conservation. Other work pertaining to wild dog conservation and rhino security is also being done but not as a direct result of the MRCP.

Product/Deliverable 1.4. - land use analysis within the MRCP was completed with the use of aerial photographs and field work. (note: a vegetation map for the area was not compiled and this needs to be done)

Product/Deliverable 1.5. - Stakeholder workshops, to establish agreements for a new protected area, were held with the three communities within the MRCP area. The workshops were open to all community members and were well attended. Large (A1) sized versions of the agreements were presented on flip charts at these meetings and in depth discussions were held about what was to be agreed. At the conclusion of these discussions the final versions of the Land Management Agreements (between each of the three communities and ACT) were printed on site and signed by the tribal leaders (Ndunas)

Product/Deliverable 1.6. - Information regarding land tenure, current land-use, priority species conservation, species lists (fauna and flora), potential economic possibilities was gathered.

Product/Deliverable 1.7. - Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) scores for Somkhanda Game Reserve were measured prior to the commencement of the MRCP (in Feb 2011) and in at the conclusion of the CEPF involvement in the MRCP (in Nov 2012). Analysis and copies of these METT scores will be attached.

Component 2 Planned: Priority Species Protection

Product/Deliverable 2.1. - Listing of existing or possible priority species relevant to the project area.

Product/Deliverable 2.2. - Communication with nearby protected areas regarding priority species strategies.

Product/Deliverable 2.3. - Identification of ecological principles applicable to priority species within the project area.

Product/Deliverable 2.4. - Mapping of desired areas for priority species conservation.

Component 2 Actual at Completion:

Product/Deliverable 2.1. - priority species relevant to the project area was listed.

Product/Deliverable 2.2. - Communication was established with ecologists and protected area managers of adjacent areas regarding priority species strategies.

Product/Deliverable 2.3. - Ecological principles applicable to wild dog, black and white rhino and cycads researched and included within the priority species report.

Product/Deliverable 2.4. – Maps pertaining to priority species conservation were produced and included within the priority species report.

Component 3 Planned: Linkages between Protected Areas:

Product/Deliverable 3.1. - Prioritization of the linkages as a stakeholder objective.

Product/Deliverable 3.2. - The identification of threats and critical areas to protected area linkages.

Product/Deliverable 3.3. - The inclusion of linkage possibilities within the proposed boundary of the new community reserve.

Component 3 Actual at Completion:

Product/Deliverable 3.1. – The concept of creating a protected area linkage between Somkhanda Game Reserve and the Zululand rhino Reserve (ZRR) was raised and acknowledged as a desirable outcome with the stakeholders in control of Somkhanda, Zimanga (formerly Hlambanyathi) and ZRR. The Madwaleni Community, who also play a role in the creation of a protected area linkage are conspicuously absent from this list (see below under “threats”).

Product/Deliverable 3.2. – The following threats, issues and critical areas to protected area linkages were identified:

- The Emvokweni Community Trust (responsible for the management of Somkhanda) is in disarray and in spite of being included in discussions, is unaware of the need or planning process for the protected area linkage.
- The managerial and economic status of Somkhanda has made other stakeholders vary wary of any association such that the concept of dropping fences with Somkhanda has become theoretical with the required conditions seeming very unrealistic at this juncture. The deteriorating situation at Somkhanda was a major challenge to the MRCP because its stability was fundamental to the objectives of the MRCP; as the stability of Somkhanda’s situation shifted, so too did the MRCP objectives. The communities south of the Mkuze River were against a “Nature Reserve” classification for any of their land as a consequence of what they were hearing about Somkhanda.
- Political tension between the managers of Zimanga and ZRR was/is evident.
- At the outset of the project, the owners of Zimanga were adamant that they would not be interested in any form of stewardship process to proclaim land under the Protected Areas Act. (It should be noted that through interaction with the owners/managers of Zimanga, the prospect of stewardship has been reopened and this in itself is a positive outcome of the MRCP).
- The area of Impala Ridge (the land south west of Zimanga, lying between Somkhanda and ZRR) is embroiled in a land claim dispute. In terms of traditional boundaries, this land falls within the Madwaleni Community Area, but until the issue is resolved, inclusion of the Madwaleni Community within the linkage negotiations is politically inappropriate.
- The first mining applications have been lodged some 20 km south of the project area.

Product/Deliverable 3.3. - The possibility of stewardship has been reopened with the owners/managers of Zimanga and the area of Impala Ridge (albeit with its associated land claim dispute) has been included within the area of the Madwaleni Memorandum of Agreement.

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

At the proposal writing phase of this project, I (Paul Cryer, Project Leader) had the idea that the communities within the project area would readily proclaim land that they weren't using in exchange for water delivery in areas that they were using. My perception was naïve in two respects: firstly, just because the communities were not living on sections of land didn't mean they didn't value that land. Secondly, the communities were familiar with the nature reserve concept and the historic political associations of the concept combined with immediate knowledge of Somkhanda made them resistant to any process that would diminish their land tenure.

How did this affect the project? If we had pursued the nature reserve category of protected area it would have been in opposition to community sentiment. We could not do that and this meant that, instead, the MRCP had to expand its view in three ways:

1. With the communities' unfavourable view of conservation, we focused on building relationships with communities reiterating at every stage that the isolationist fortress mentality was not being employed within this project. Our aim was to increase the communities' land tenure and do so in a manner that emphasized the importance of them becoming the conservationists of the land.
2. To link human sustainability to environmental sustainability. In other words we were no longer just looking at the land that had high biodiversity value. We were looking at the entire community area and attempting to establish systems that would simultaneously create socio-economic stability and protect critical ecological components of the environment.
3. The protected area category (in terms of the Protected Areas Act) that was more applicable to the community areas was the Protected Environment rather than the Nature Reserve. This category was perceived as less threatening to communities and it meant that we could get the communities to commit to stewardship processes within this part of the project. As the communities become more familiar with the stewardship process, they may come to see that the nature reserve category is not as restrictive as they currently perceive, does not diminish their tenure and may afford them additional economic opportunities. But this will take time.

On a less significant note, the field work of the project was meant to include a vegetation map of the project area and this was not done. Whilst this will be very useful and will be done at some stage, its absence did not affect the outcome of the project.

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

The elements of the evolving methodology (relationship building with communities, shared visions, and holistic ecology) have been seen as instrumental in securing the successes of the MRCP. In order to recognize, adapt and replicate the components of the methodology, ACT has formed the "Applied Ecology Unit" which brings ecologists, sociologists, agricultural experts and other specialists into a cohesive team. This team is now being utilized in four other ACT projects. The formation of this unit, and its use in other areas, comes directly from lessons learnt from the MRCP. The following attachments will be submitted electronically:

1. A description of the Applied Ecology Unit

2. A description of the Conservation Agriculture course that were conducted in the MRCP area.
3. Memorandum of Agreement between Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife and ACT regarding Stewardship.
4. Memorandum of Agreement between the Madwaleni Community and ACT regarding the commitment to environmental protection, sustainable development and stewardship
5. Memorandum of Agreement between the Esikhuthwaneni Community and ACT regarding the commitment to environmental protection, sustainable development and stewardship
6. Memorandum of Agreement between the KwaDlakuse Community and ACT regarding the commitment to environmental protection, sustainable development and stewardship
7. Maps showing the boundaries of the three areas.
8. METT Comparisons and analysis

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)

Between the submission of the LOI and the approval of the proposal, this project had its budget reduced by 33% and its duration halved. The process of protected area expansion could not be similarly condensed (quite the reverse) so it meant that our aim, within the CEPF component of the Mkuze River Conservation Project, was to get us half way; we needed to identify new conservation areas but not complete the process of protection. Whilst we have achieved that goal, it feels dissatisfying to write a concluding report by saying “we are half way there”. Having said that, there are results benefits that are already measurable. The relationship between conservation NGOs and communities within the project area are strong and committed. The follow on projects have already resulted in the adopting of sustainable practices within the project area, added food security for the communities and these are soon to be followed by the first employment opportunities within the communities, water delivery to food gardens, and the implementation of a community run cycad propagation and reintroduction program.

On a mundane and logistical level, our projections with regards to transport were woefully inaccurate, firstly because the nature of community engagement results in many meetings being cancelled, postponed and duplicated such that a process that should require 1000km of vehicle usage ends up requiring 3000km. Secondly, we budgeted for the running cost at a standard rate when the terrain was much more taxing than that used to calculate standard rates; both the Nissan 1400 and the Toyota Hilux have been exhausted beyond what was anticipated.

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

We underestimated the time and cost associated with setting up communication networks with rural communities. It can't be rushed and the prioritization of issues lies with the community and not the facilitators. With relationship building as the cornerstone of community conservation,

budgets and timeframes need to be sufficiently resilient to cope with the unpredictable components of this process.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

The protected area framework as defined by the South African Protected Areas Act or the IUCN either is inherently associated with western developed world culture. We need to redefine the protected area concept so that the objectives of biodiversity conservation are met within a framework that has relevance to local rural communities.

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 |
|----------------------------|------------------|---------|--|
| German Embassy | B | \$34000 | This was used to set up conservation agriculture within the MRCP area. The 16 farmers attended a ten day course in conservation agriculture in the KZN midlands. |
| GEF | B | \$73500 | We are in the 2 nd round of negotiations with this grant but it has not yet been finalized. |
| African Conservation Trust | D | \$73470 | \$70350 as per proposal plus \$3120 for volunteer time (value calculated as follows:320 volunteer days @ R65/day) |

***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.

At the outset, our expectation was that we would have a replicable model based on protecting unoccupied land in exchange for the provision of water. We underestimated the value that people placed on land and learnt that “un-occupied” does not translate into “unwanted”. In addition to this, we underestimated the communities’ antagonism to conventional conservation practices.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

Incorporating the above mentioned discoveries into the MRCP resulted in a shift in direction that evolved an holistic methodology towards land use and protected area expansion, one in which the communities determine what land should be protected and then empowers them to protect it by linking them with external resources. This methodology is proving (so far) to strengthen the

communities' land tenure and this is inducing a desire to protect the land resulting in reduced conflict between people and conservationists.

Whilst this methodology is still new, it has induced sufficient interest for ACT to become involved in the planning of other protected area expansion initiatives. To this end, ACT has established an Applied Ecology Unit, being spearheaded by Paul Cryer and CEO, Francois du Toit. The AEU has already been engaged in 4 potential protected area expansion initiatives, (in various nodes around KwaZulu-Natal). These initiatives will include conservation agriculture, protected area expansion and the ethos of genuine community driven land management planning frameworks. The AEU seeks to leverage community needs and an understanding of natural resource management, with sustainable conservation and agricultural practices.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

N/A

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Some comments from the project leader:

1. This project turned out to be more complicated than we imagined at the outset and with added timeframes, altered budgets and the re-thinking of methodologies, that complexity affected all involved. I am grateful for the assistance and flexibility of all involved, from the CEPF and the RIT, Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife and other project partners as well as the ACT directors and support teams.
2. An aspect of the project that never came out in the performance tracking reports was that I grew to become very attached to the communities in which we worked. Contrary to my historic misanthropy, I found myself looking forward to going back there and seeing familiar faces. My Zulu is still too awful to keep up with community meetings without some assistance but it is good enough to have unhurried conversations under trees or on rural roads in my bakkie/pick-up. Those conversations became the glue that connected me to the people.
3. Many of the challenges within this project were associated with the management crises that emerged at Somkhanda Game Reserve at the outset of the project. In the last few weeks, new possibilities have emerged that may inject resources into the reserve. It is my hope that the holistic and collective methodology of the MRCP will be applied there and that the reserve does not default to a fortress methodology of conservation; it may be difficult for us to steer it from that fate.

Paul Cryer
January 2012

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.cepfn.org, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Paul Cryer

Organization name: African Conservation Trust

Mailing address: PO Box 310, Link Hills, Hillcrest, 3652, South Africa

Tel: +27728042596

Fax:

E-mail: paulcryer@telkomsa.net

*****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

(May 1, 2011 – Dec 31, 2012)

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 May 1, 2011 – Dec 31, 2012. (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 | 11603 | 11603 | Initiating conservation principles and securing agreements with communities south of Somkhanda has resulted in added security of the riverine ecology in that area. In addition to this, steps are being taken to apply the integrated methodology developed in the MRCP to the Somkhanda Reserve and its communities. |
| 2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement? | Yes | 0 | 0 | The CEPF component of the MRCP ends before the proclamation of new protected areas. The agreements with the three communities of the project do include the initiation of stewardship processes; this becomes a follow-on project that ACT is already engaging in. |
| 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. | Yes | 25996 | 25996 | The re-initiation of a stewardship process for Zimanga, along with the signed agreements with the Madwaleni Community, the Esikhuthwaneni Community and the KwaDlakuse Community, coupled with the added value to Somkhanda, strengthens biodiversity conservation and resource management in the Pongola-Magudu KBA. The hectare total comes from a combination of Somkhanda, the three community areas and Zimanga. Maps to be attached. |
| 4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares. | Yes | 14393 | 14393 | This total is derived from the re-initiation of a stewardship process for Zimanga, along with the signed agreements with the Madwaleni Community, the Esikhuthwaneni Community and the KwaDlakuse Community. |
| 5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below. | Yes | 3 | 3 | The Madwaleni Community, the Esikhuthwaneni Community and the KwaDlakuse Community |

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

Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

| Name of Community | Community Characteristics | | | | | | | Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|---|--|--|-------|
| | Small landowners | Subsistence economy | Indigenous/ ethnic peoples | Pastoralists/nomadic peoples | Recent migrants | Urban communities | Communities falling below the poverty rate | Other | Increased Income due to: | | | | Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices | More secure access to water resources | Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc. | Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc) | More secure sources of energy | Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit | Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management | More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and governance. | Other |
| | | | | | | | | | Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices | Ecotourism revenues | Park management activities | Payment for environmental services | | | | | | | | | |
| Madwaleni Community | X | X | X | | | X | | X | | | | X | | X | | | | X | X | | |
| Esikhuthwaneni Community | X | X | X | | | X | | X | | | | X | | X | | | | X | X | | |
| KwaDlakuse Community | X | X | X | | | X | | X | | | | X | | X | | | | X | X | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | 3 | 3 | | |

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit:

