CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Botanical Society of South Africa

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Putting Conservation Plans to Work (although project subsequently referred to as Putting Biodiversity Plans to Work)

Implementation Partners for This Project:
- **SANBI BGIS (formerly CPU of CapeNature)**
- **CapeNature (formerly Western Cape Nature Conservation Board)**
- **Pilot municipalities: Drakenstein, Swartland and Cape Agulhas Local Municipalities, and Overberg District Municipality**

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): 1 January 2004 – 31 December 2005, extended by amendment to the grant agreement to 31 July 2006.

Date of Report (month/year): September 2006

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The Municipal Systems Act in South Africa requires each municipality to draw up an Integrated Development Plan (IDP). An IDP must include a spatial component called a Spatial Development Framework (SDF), and is required to take environmental considerations and sustainable development into account. IDPs and SDFs are updated every five years. This legal requirement provides an excellent opportunity to mainstream biodiversity priorities in the land-use planning system.

The focus of Putting Biodiversity Plans to Work (PBPTW) was on the Western Cape Province only, even though the Cape Floristic Region extends into the Eastern Cape province. Information was shared over the course of the project with a sister project, Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Planning and Development in the Eastern Cape, undertaken by the South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) and the Wildlife and Environmental Society of South Africa (WESSA). The Western Cape's Department of Environment Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP) deals with development planning and environmental authorizations in the Western Cape Province, and was a key stakeholder in the project. The Western Cape province has five district municipalities and approximately 30 local municipalities.

This project built on the Botanical Society's Cape Lowlands Renosterveld (CLR) fine-scale conservation planning project, completed in 2003, taking its outputs and developing them further to produce biodiversity priority maps and land-use guidelines for pilot municipal areas. In addition it drew on spatial products of South Africa's first National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment (NSBA), undertaken in 2004.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: **Land-use planners and decision-makers understand and use biodiversity priority maps and land-use guidelines to curtail habitat loss in selected priority areas for**

biodiversity conservation, and best practices for incorporating biodiversity into land-use planning and decision-making are adopted throughout the Western Cape.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
Indicator 1: Spatial Development Frameworks in at least two pilot municipalities meaningfully incorporate information on conservation priorities from the relevant biodiversity summary maps and land-use guidelines within a year of the completion of the project.	Spatial Development Frameworks in four municipalities incorporated project maps and associated information before the end of the project.
Indicator 2: Biodiversity priority maps and land-use guidelines for other municipalities in priority areas are developed over a five-year period following completion of the project (in line with the roll out of fine-scale conservation planning in priority areas as part of the CAPE programme).	This work is the primary focus of Component 5.1 of the CAPE GEF programme. Lessons from Putting Biodiversity Plans to Work are playing a large role in informing how the biodiversity priority maps and land-use guidelines for other municipalities are being developed.
Indicator 3: 80% of Environmental Impact Assessment reports for activities in pilot areas refer to and use meaningfully information from biodiversity priority maps and land-use guidelines within a year of completion of the project.	[This indicator was removed when the logframe was revised to accommodate the extension of the project. It is not an appropriate purpose indicator as environmental assessment consultants were not a primary audience of the project, which focused on planning consultants and officials.]
Indicator 4: Provincial systems and guidelines (for example on EIAs and SDFs) incorporate explicit, meaningful and sufficiently detailed content to ensure that biodiversity priorities are routinely taken into account in land-use decisions.	The Provincial SDF incorporates biodiversity priorities, and DEA&DP is committed to ensuring that these are reflected in district and local SDFs. The provincial SDF manual will be revised in 2007. South Africa's environmental assessment system is in flux, with the implementation of new national EIA regulations on 1 July 2006. Significantly, DEA&DP is developing a provincial roll-out of Putting Biodiversity Plans to Work, in collaboration with CapeNature and the CAPE programme. Component 5.2 of the CAPE GEF programme will take forward this work, building on the foundation laid by PBPTW.
Indicator 5: There is no deterioration in ecosystem status of threatened vegetation types. (Ecosystem status reflects loss of habitat in relation to biodiversity target.)	This will be able to be assessed only in the longer term, using the C.A.P.E programme's M&E framework and the National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment, which will be conducted by SANBI every five years. The development of the CAPE M&E Framework is underway, as is the development of a national monitoring and reporting framework for biodiversity, led by SANBI. Ecosystem status will be a key indicator in both.

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

In collaboration with municipal SDF consultants, CapeNature regional ecologists, other CapeNature staff, and various initiatives, the project incorporated maps and information into four SDFs. In addition, through engagement with DEA&DP and the provincial SDF consultants, spatial biodiversity information and accompanying guidelines were included in the Western Cape Provincial SDF (PSDF).

PBPTW laid the beginnings of what must be a continued dialogue between the conservation agencies, conservationists, municipal officials and provincial officials. A framework and a set of relationships was set in place for a way forward for improved biodiversity priority information and co-operative decision-making, which will support meeting the above purpose indicators.

Significantly, DEA&DP is now developing a provincial roll-out of Putting Biodiversity Plans to Work, in collaboration with CapeNature and the CAPE programme. This demonstrates the extent to which DEA&DP's planning directorate has bought into the aims of Putting Biodiversity Plans to Work, and is an important mainstreaming success.

A vital outcome of the project was a collective deepened understanding of the type of biodiversity information required to support land-use planning and decision-making, and a suite of lessons and recommendations to improve future information and implementation approaches, particularly but not only in the CAPE GEF programme Components 5.1 and 5.2.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

There were several unexpected positive impacts:

- The formal outputs of PBPTW focus on *products* (maps, guidelines, supporting materials) and the *capacity* of relevant officials and consultants to use them. An equally important though less tangible output of the project has been the *relationships* built between the various natural resource management agencies working in the pilot municipal areas. The project officer, Nancy Job, spent much time facilitating and building relationships between, for example, CapeNature officials, municipal officials, Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (DWAF) officials, DEA&DP officials, Department of Agriculture officials, consultants, and others working in each of the pilot municipal areas. The existence of personal relationships between staff members in these different departments and agencies, which often operate in relative isolation from each other, allows for improved land-use planning and decision-making.
- Lessons from PBPTW have informed not only the roll out of the CAPE programme, but also a range of provincial biodiversity plans and related initiatives in other bioregional programmes in South Africa. This has been facilitated by SANBI's role in ensuring that lessons are shared between bioregional programmes and between provinces.
- South Africa's Biodiversity Act (Act 10 of 2004) allows for bioregional plans to be formally published, giving them increased weight in land-use planning and decision-making. SANBI has developed norms and standards to guide the development of bioregional plans across the country. These norms and standards draw heavily on the lessons and insights that have emerged from PBPTW.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs*: Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	**Actual at completion**
Output 1: Biodiversity summary maps and land-use guidelines have been developed for at least two pilot municipalities by the end of Quarter 3 (September 2004)	
1.1 Scan for similar international materials completed by end of Q1.	Scan (international and national) completed.
1.2 Draft maps and land-use guidelines for at least two pilot municipalities by end of Q3.	Completed.
1.3 Feedback on draft maps and guidelines obtained through one-on-one work with intended users during	Ongoing throughout project and incorporated into final products.

Q4, Q5, Q6.	
1.4 Final maps and land-use management guidelines for at least two pilot municipalities by end of Q7.	Posters, GIS data, and detailed land-use guidelines were prepared for three local municipalities. GIS data with basic guidelines was prepared for a further four municipalities. These were completed by Feb 2006.
1.5 Copies made and distributed to relevant officials and other users by end of Q8.	Final products distributed to appropriate people by March 2006.
Output 2: Supporting materials have been developed to assist officials, consultants, NGOs and decision-makers to use biodiversity summary maps and land-use guidelines wisely.	
2.1 Draft supporting materials by end of Q3.	Draft booklet prepared.
2.2 Feedback on draft supporting materials obtained through one-on-one work with intended users during Q4, Q5, Q6	Ongoing throughout project.
2.3 Final supporting materials by end of Q7.	Booklets produced to accompany posters and GIS data for three local municipalities. Booklet titled *Biodiversity Priorities: Supporting Land-Use Decision-Making in Threatened Ecosystems and Special Habitats*. Booklets were customised for each local municipality. Completed in Feb 2006.
2.4 Copies made and distributed to relevant officials and other users by end of Q8.	Booklets distributed to the appropriate people in March 2006.
Output 3: Guidelines have been developed on how the outputs of existing broad-scale conservation plans (CAPE, SKEP, STEP) can be used in land-use planning and decision-making in the absence of a biodiversity priority map based on a fine-scale conservation plan.	
3.1 Draft guidelines by end of Q1.	Draft guidelines prepared.
3.2 Feedback from intended users obtained during Q2	Feedback obtained via a workshop, meetings and email communications.
3.3 Final guidelines by end of Q3.	Final guidelines produced and placed on BGIS website (http://bgis.sanbi.org)
Output 4: The CPU has the capacity to develop and mainstream biodiversity summary maps and land-use guidelines for other areas.	
4.1 Three CPU staff members participate in relevant project meetings and workshops throughout the project, Q1-Q8.	The CPU (housed in CapeNature) became BGIS (housed in SANBI) over the course of the project. The changed role of BGIS meant that this was no longer an appropriate objective. However, Selwyn Willoughby of BGIS played an important role in providing GIS support to the project.
4.2 All materials developed are available for download (with user-friendly interface) on the CPU website by the end of Q8.	PBPTW products are available on the BGIS site (http://bgis.sanbi.org)
Output 5: Selected officials have the capacity to apply biodiversity summary maps and land-use guidelines effectively in the land-use planning and decision-making process.	
5.1 Officials, consultants and NGO members who should be closely involved in the project are identified by end of Q1.	Completed.
5.2 Training workshop held on how to use draft biodiversity priority maps and guidelines at end of Q3.	We adopted the approach of identifying role players within each municipality and working with them one-on-one with specific inputs to the SDF.
5.3 One-on-one support provided to participating officials, consultants and NGO members to assist in applying draft biodiversity maps and guidelines in specific land-use planning and decision-making cases, during Q4, Q5, Q6.	One-on-one (or small) meetings took place throughout the project. The focus was on involvement in the process of developing the SDF, and on facilitating relationship-building between the various organs of state involved in natural resource management in each municipal area. Nancy held more than 200 of these meetings over the course of

	the project, so it became difficult to document each meeting. However, the process of engagement with each pilot municipality is captured in the final project report on methods and lessons (see Output 6).
5.4 Final maps and guidelines presented at a workshop to a wider group of officials, consultants and NGOs (beyond those directly involved in the project) in Q8.	Time and resource constraints meant that a final, broad workshop was not feasible. However, Nancy presented key lessons from the project to the CAPE Implementation Committee on 1 August 2006.
Output 6: Methods are documented for developing biodiversity priority maps and land-use guidelines for new areas, and for building capacity of officials, consultants and NGOs in new areas to use these products effectively.	
6.1 Methods for developing biodiversity priority maps and guidelines trialed and documented by team members during Q2 and Q3, and refined during Q4, Q5, Q6.	Team workshop held to extract lessons and key points.
6.2 Methods for training users of biodiversity priority maps and guidelines trialed and documented by team during Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6.	Team workshop held to extract lessons and key points.
6.3 Draft report on standard method for development of biodiversity priority maps and land-use guidelines completed by end of Q7, final report by end of Q8.	Draft and final project report developed, capturing methods and lessons.
6.4 Draft report on standard methods for capacity building (including workshops and one-on-one mentoring and coaching) developed by end of Q7, final report by end of Q8.	Draft and final project report developed, capturing methods and lessons. Important to note that no standard training methodology was developed, as has been discussed in previous performance tracking reports. The focus was on one-on-one situated support.
6.5 Draft capacity building workshop formats developed by end of Q7, finalised by end of Q8.	[This output indicator was removed when the logframe was revised to provide for extension of the project.]
Output 7: Effective project management mechanisms are established, including a project monitoring and evaluation system.	
7.1 Project Officer recruited by end of month 1.	Completed
7.2 Project advisory group established by end of month 1; quarterly advisory group meetings take place throughout the project.	Completed. The role of the advisory group was critical in the early phases of the project, when the project was new to people, the project team was finding its direction, and the advisory group provided an important forum for discussion on a range of issues related to mainstreaming biodiversity in land-use planning and decision-making in the Western Cape. During the second part of the project, discussion about the direction of the project was less important, and the project team found it more effective to draw on the expertise of certain advisory group members on a one-on-one basis, as needed. The final advisory group meeting was used to get input from members on the key lessons learnt in the course of the project.
7.3 Project management systems set up by end of month 1 and operating efficiently throughout the project.	Completed
7.4 Project outputs, activities and budget regularly monitored and evaluated throughout the project.	Completed
7.5 Existing channels within BotSoc and CapeNature used to inform stakeholders and the public about the project (e.g CapeNature communication dept, Veld & Flora), at intervals throughout the project.	Veld & Flora articles published at the beginning and end of the project. Item in CAPE E-News.

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

A "Biodiversity Package" was provided directly (with one-on-one handover) to three local municipalities (Drakenstein, Swartland, Cape Agulhas) as well as to the Overberg district municipality (this district package includes information for each of the five local municipalities contained within the district). A poster and a booklet were prepared specific to each of the three local municipalities, in two languages (English and Afrikaans), thus completing the complement of municipal products planned for this project.

One-on-one handover involved loading the GIS information directly on to the computers of the planners in Swartland and Cape Agulhas municipality, the environmental officer/PIMSS center computer at the Overberg District, an environmental officer at Overstrand municipality and the GIS head technician at Drakenstein municipality, accompanied with discussions about the information, and multiple follow-up meetings. A CD containing a set of GIS information and explanatory text infosheets for all of the local municipalities in the Overberg District was also handed out at a workshop with the Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative (ABI) partners (including SANParks, CapeNature, Overstrand local municipality and Western Cape Department of Agriculture.) Key implementing CapeNature staff working within Drakenstein municipality and Swartland municipalities also received draft GIS information and infosheets. Finally, four sets of consultants working in the Drakenstein municipality, the SDF consultants, Strategic Environmental Assessment consultants, State of Environment Report consultants and Urban Edge Study consultants, received the information, as did the SDF consultants working on the five local municipalities within the Overberg District.

The project team adapted its approach to each pilot municipality based on the existing structures and initiatives in the area. This was a strength of the project - a one-size-fits-all approach was not appropriate given different circumstances and levels of capacity in different municipalities. One-on-one meetings, and participation in existing structures and forums, proved to be a more appropriate and effective way of facilitating uptake of biodiversity information in land-use planning than holding training workshops.

As an added benefit, meetings organised as part of PBPTW gave role players from different departments and agencies a valuable opportunity to communicate with each other. Often these different departments and agencies work in relative isolation of each other. This was partly the reason for keeping the focus to one-on-one and small group meetings, rather than large workshops. As noted, a key focus of the project was relationship building. This often occurs more effectively in a small group session where real dialogue is possible, than in a large workshop, where people don't necessarily get a chance to know each other.

Examples from Drakenstein municipality of how the project's products were received and used include the following:

- A presentation and launch of the biodiversity priority poster, undertaken by the municipal official who has been out champion for that municipality, at a conference attended by local government officials from around the country and world-wide.
- Drakenstein municipality is taking the information was have provided and further adapting it to their own internal processes, such as developing a checklist of how to approach development applications using the information we have provided, as well as beginning to think of ways to incorporate monitoring and evaluation of the state of biodiversity within the municipality into their procedures for commenting on development applications.

Also in Drakenstein municipality, Nancy played a key role in facilitating the establishment of a Natural Resources Reference Group that brings together officials from the municipality, DWAF, CapeNature, agriculture, and other natural resource-related agencies. We believe that this is a powerful model that may be useful for other local and district municipalities who wish to improve co-ordination between different departments and agencies responsible for natural resource

management. The biodiversity priority map and accompanying guidelines provided an important basis for agreeing on explicit common goals and facilitating co-ordination in this regard.

The process of engaging with pilot municipalities has been documented in the final project report: Job, N & Driver, A. 2006. *Putting Biodiversity Plans to Work: Project Report and Recommendations*. Cape Town: Botanical Society of South Africa.

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

Output 4: The CPU staff member participating in our project moved to DEA&DP but continued to participate in the Advisory Group in his DEADP capacity. The CPU moved from CapeNature to SANBI. In its new form, BGIS plays the role of serving spatial biodiversity information nationally and is not involved directly in mainstreaming biodiversity priority maps at the local level.

Output 5 was realized, but not through formal training workshops which were originally intended as part of the project methodology. The project team instead decided to focus on one-on-one and small group meetings where we looked at the information and applied it together with the officials, in the context of the SDF. The project revolved around involving municipal and other stakeholders in the development and uptake of maps and guidelines in the pilot municipalities. This included facilitating relationship-building between various stakeholders involved in natural resource management in each municipal area, including but not limited to the municipalities themselves, CapeNature, Western Cape Department of Agriculture, and to a lesser extent the regional office of the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry. This was as much an output of the project as the production of more tangible products such as the maps and accompanying booklets.

Output 1, the development of the biodiversity package for municipalities, took longer than anticipated for several reasons, including the following:

- Because the planning domain of the Cape Lowlands Renosterveld (CLR) fine-scale biodiversity plan did not follow municipal boundaries, we had to “patch in” the gaps using results from the National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment and the C.A.P.E. transformation layer. This involved GIS skills and a series of discussions, meetings and judgement calls that were more time-consuming than anticipated. (This process yielded major lessons for future fine-scale biodiversity planning initiatives, and was undoubtedly worthwhile.)
- Development of a CLR package for the CPU website was an important but time-consuming additional product of the project.
- Most of the key information needed for the biodiversity package for each municipality (e.g. information about the significance of and management recommendations for priority sites) was not captured in the CLR planning process. Nancy had to solicit and synthesise this information from relevant experts and available literature.

The overall impact of the project was negatively affected by the partial or delayed completion of these outputs.

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 required.

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.

For a more detailed discussion of lessons and recommendations, see Job, N & Driver, A. 2006. *Putting Biodiversity Plans to Work: Project Report and Recommendations*. Cape Town: Botanical Society of South Africa

Lessons for fine-scale biodiversity planning projects:

- Fine-scale biodiversity planning products should align with municipal boundaries. If they don't, information has to be patched in afterwards in order provide full municipal coverage. This is a time-consuming headache, and is likely to result in second-best products.
- Fine-scale biodiversity plans should identify where biodiversity targets should be met, rather than just providing a map of where options for meeting biodiversity targets remain and where they don't. In other words, an ecosystem status map or an irreplaceability map is of limited use for land-use planning and decision-making, because it does not provide guidance about which areas are best for meeting biodiversity targets. In particular, explicit ecological corridors should be designed as part of the biodiversity planning process.
- Supporting information (including descriptions) should accompany the map of critical biodiversity areas. This supporting information should be captured during the biodiversity planning process, when the relevant experts are on hand.
- Guidelines for land-use planning and decision-making, linked to critical biodiversity areas on the map, should be developed during the biodiversity planning process. This is not a trivial process; time and resources should be budgeted for it. It may be appropriate to appoint a dedicated guideline coordinator in addition to the project coordinator and the biodiversity planner. The guidelines should as far as possible align with provincial policies. If possible, management guidelines should be provided for key sites, especially those that are state owned.

Lessons for mainstreaming the use of fine-scale biodiversity plans in land-use planning and decision-making:

- A crucial starting point for mainstreaming biodiversity in land-use planning and decision-making is a single map of biodiversity priorities for each municipality, which all relevant stakeholders (including the municipality, CapeNature, provincial and national agriculture, DWAF, the Catchment Management Agency, local NGOs and other initiatives e.g. CAPE projects active in the area) can use as a basis for planning and decision-making. This may sound obvious, but is easier said than done, especially in areas where several iterations of biodiversity planning have already taken place. It is primarily up to the biodiversity sector to determine the best areas for meeting targets, and to develop a single map that reflects biodiversity priorities.
- It is important to work through structures that already exist in local and district municipal areas - this ensures sustainability, predictable decision-making (based on commonly agreed priority areas), widens the support for the project, and draws on local expertise and buy-in.
- It is necessary to be flexible and patient, and to take advantage of opportunities as they arise – often unexpectedly.
- Ideally, to fully support taking biodiversity information to municipalities would require one liaison person / facilitator per district municipality.

A suggested sequence for engaging with municipalities:

- Gather together the best possible information about the biodiversity priorities in that municipality, prior to initiating engagement
- Identify existing structures / initiatives at work in the municipality
- Develop an organogram of the municipality and have a champion help identify who is key, although don't cancel out people based only on this information
- With support from existing initiatives and champion, identify appropriate opportunities such as the SDF, SoER, management plan(s) for key site(s), prioritising commonage and other municipal-owned land for biodiversity importance, inputs into municipal rating mechanisms, invasive alien species control plans and prioritisation, site visits etc.
- Provide information to consultants, or inputs to management plans etc
- Field trips are useful, although they are time-consuming to arrange
- Engage with municipal planners, not just to hand over the products but to provide ongoing interaction and support over a period of time.
- Show planners how guidelines can be useful to them (guidelines are often seen as the biodiversity sector trying to get priorities taken up at the expense of other sectors).
- Use practical and useful case studies to facilitate uptake
- Spend time on follow through (includes repetition within meetings of key agreements and follow up email of action items)
- Engage with municipal politicians, who are as or more important than officials in terms of their influence on decisions
- Work simultaneously with district municipality, as information about the local municipality is also pertinent to the district

General lesson

- For an exploratory, pilot project which is trying to influence institutional systems and build institutional capacity in a complex environment, two years is a short timeframe. One should not attempt such a project in less than two years, and three years is probably a more realistic timeframe.

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

The project was intentionally experimental, with substantial time built into the project implementation process for development and refinement of draft products. This proved absolutely necessary.

Many organs of state, at the local, provincial and national levels, are involved in land-use planning and decision-making. In the early stages of the project this felt quite overwhelming, as it was not possible for a project team of two people (only one of whom was full-time on the project) to interact effectively with all these organs of state at all these levels. It took some initial exploration, discussion and thinking to confirm that a focus at the local level was indeed appropriate.

A two-month orientation phase for the project officer at the beginning of the project may have assisted in this regard. This would have allowed explicitly for initial exploration and familiarization with the complex institutional environment, without a simultaneous (unrealistic) expectation to deliver hard outputs.

An aspect that was underestimated in the project design was the importance of focusing not just on the development of products and building capacity of individuals to use them, but also on the establishment of institutional channels for uptake and continued use of the products. Effective working of these institutional channels relies heavily on facilitating relationship-building between

key people involved. As noted, the project actively addressed the establishment of these relationships.

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

As discussed, the implementation of this project has relied heavily throughout on involvement of relevant stakeholders, often through close working relationships and partnerships, including with CapeNature and DEA&DP. The work focused not just on the development of products (maps and guidelines) but also on building relationships between relevant roleplayers and stakeholders at the local level, who often work in isolation from each other. Building these relationships, and buy-in to a common set of biodiversity priorities, is difficult to capture as a tangible project output, but is a crucial part of mainstreaming biodiversity in land-use planning and decision-making and an important contribution of this project. Nancy's personal role in facilitating these relationships, through listening carefully and providing genuine understanding and support, was crucial to the success of the project.

The contributions and support of many individuals outside the project team, particularly but not only CapeNature staff members, was also crucial to the success of the project. The long list of acknowledgements in the final project report reflects this.

Unfortunately the appointment of the CAPE Specialist Advisors in DEA&DP, as part of Component 5.2 of the CAPE GEF programme, has taken longer than expected, so there will not be a handover period between Nancy and the Specialist Advisors. However, Mandy is on the CAPE Land Use Project Management Committee, and if required Nancy can be contracted to provide input and expert advice.

More precise project management would have helped in meeting certain deadlines, e.g. through setting dates for project outputs earlier to ensure they were executed. Clear specifications and conceptualization for project outputs was lacking at the outset. Although this was a ground-breaking project, more attention should have been paid to this.

Many CAPE projects work in relative isolation of each other. People are ubiquitously over-extended and thus poorly able to meet the demands of exploratory pilot projects that are attempting to break new ground. Better coordination, alignment and articulation of agreed priorities would help immeasurably.

VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

None

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

None

VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

For more information about this project, please contact:
Name: Mandy Driver, Private Bag X101, Pretoria, 0001, South Africa
Tel: +27 12 843 5000
Fax: +27 12 843 5219
E-mail: driver@sanbi.org