

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Wildlife and Environment Society of South Africa – Eastern Province

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): The Gamtoos Valley Collective Land Management Project Phase 1: Assessing the Viability of Collective Land Management as a Model for Conservation in the Baviaanskloof Mega-Reserve Coastal Corridor

Implementation Partners for This Project: Baviaanskloof Mega-reserve Project Management Unit

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): November 1, 2005 - January 31, 2006

Date of Report (month/year): April 2006

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The project examines the potential to apply common property resource management principles to private land (what we call collective land management; but also referred to in the literature as “cross-boundary management”, “group farming” or “contemporary Common Property Resource systems”) in the Gamtoos Valley.

Collective land management is a system whereby landowners retain their individual titles but extend their resource base through a common property resource management arrangement and benefit from this and from making collective decisions and shared enterprise. Collective management decisions promise to be better matched to multi-scale natural processes that supply ecological goods and services. As such, such a system may be more resilient and have the adaptive capacity to deal with modern social and economic pressures of change. The approach combines flexibility, collaboration and appropriate scale may be the much-needed tool to address environmental and social decline in rural areas.

Our interest in the approach grew out of the apparent success of the Tilbuster Commons in Australia, an examination of emerging trends in the scientific literature and limited experience of this in the St Francis Conservancy Project. However, since there appears to be no local example of where such an approach has implemented, we first wanted to determine if landowners would be amenable to it before seeking to acquire funds for a longer-term project to establish a collective land management initiative.

III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS

1. What was the initial objective of this project?

The primary objective was to test the viability of developing a collective land management project in the Gamtoos Valley. The secondary objective, in the event that the collective land management approach is not viable, was to identify other community-based conservation projects that could be implemented in the Gamtoos Valley.

2. Did the objectives of your project change during implementation? If so, please explain why and how.

The objectives did not change.

3. How was your project successful in achieving the expected objectives?

Interaction with stakeholders indicated that the collective land management approach may not be appropriate, at this stage, for the Gamtoos Valley. However, the stakeholder engagement process identified other community-based conservation projects that may succeed in the Gamtoos Valley and developed a network of individuals that could support implementation of these projects.

4. Did your team experience any disappointments or failures during implementation? If so, please explain and comment on how the team addressed these disappointments and/or failures.

1) We failed to complete the project within the proposed timeframes (November 2005 to January 2006). The main reason for this was poor timing – due to the Christmas holiday period, stakeholders were simply unavailable for much of December 2005 and January 2006.

This was addressed by requesting an extension to the project. The cost of project implementation for the initial period was under the predicted budget and the CEPF agreed that we could utilize the unspent amount to partly finance the extension. The remainder of the required funding was provided by the WESSA Biodiversity Conservation Unit.

2) We should have made greater use of our partner organization, the Baviaanskloof Mega-reserve Project Management Unit (PMU), in the implementation of this project. Although the PMU did provide us with information and strategic guidance, an even closer collaboration with this unit would have been beneficial. Any future activity within the Gamtoos Valley by the WESSA Biodiversity Conservation Unit should seek to promote a closer working relationship with the PMU.

5. Describe any positive or negative lessons learned from this project that would be useful to share with other organizations interested in implementing a similar project.

1) There is much value in conducting a project development exercise before undertaking larger projects. The advantages of doing this - rather than simply attempting to implement a proposed project concept - are many and include:

- It provides project implementers with an opportunity to gauge whether their ideas are workable on the ground. This is a form of risk management, especially with

- regard to longer-term projects, as it reduces the possibility of funding being locked into unworkable projects that project implementers struggle to make work.
- It introduces project implementers to stakeholders and allows for stakeholders to participate in the development of the larger project (thus creating a greater sense of ownership).
 - It facilitates the formation of a network of individuals that can support project implementation.
 - It allows for project implementer to get a better understanding of where other organizations are involved in the proposed project area. Projects can thus be designed in a way that reduces duplication and minimizes the potential for “turf wars”.
 - It allows project implementers to identify other opportunities for conservation.

2) There are a range of potential partner organizations for conservation projects besides those traditionally associated with conservation. While I think the conservation community is beginning to realize this, we were nonetheless surprised by the level of engagement that we had with the Provincial Department of Social Development and the possibilities to link conservation with their objectives. These partnerships, and opportunities to marry conservation with other priority sectors, must be further explored.

6. Describe any follow-up activities related to this project.

The project identified a number of potential projects that could be implemented in the Gamtoos Valley. We wish to pursue three of these, at this stage. These are the Gamkab Conservancy Project, the Adopt-a-Highway Program and the Hankey Conservation and Community Development Project.

7. Please provide any additional information to assist CEPF in understanding any other aspects of your completed project.

Please refer to the Review of Literature and Case Studies Report and the Stakeholder Engagement Report for detailed information on the project and its outcomes.

IV. 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
WESSA BCU	A	\$8,200	Project extended beyond initial timeframes – the remainder of the funding required was provided by the WESSA BCU.
Mazda Wildlife Fund	C		Provision of a vehicle for use on the project.

***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.

Three Letters of Inquiry were submitted to the CEPF for projects that were identified in during the current project.

V. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

No further comments.

VI. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF aims to increase sharing of experiences, lessons learned and results among our grant recipients and the wider conservation and donor communities. One way we do this is by making the text of final project completion reports available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these reports in our newsletter and other communications. Please indicate whether you would agree to publicly sharing your final project report with others in this way.

Yes

If yes, please also complete the following:

For more information about this project, please contact:

Name: Brian Reeves

Mailing address: PO Box 12444, Centrahil, Port Elizabeth, 6006, South Africa

Tel: +27(41) 583 4120

Fax:

E-mail: breeves@wessa-bcu.co.za