

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Rawsonville Wine & Tourism

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Botanical Assessment and Hotspot Identification for the Slanghoek Valley, Western Cape Province, South Africa

Implementation Partners for This Project: CapeNature and Provincial Dept. of Agriculture

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): November 30, 2004 – February 28, 2005

Date of Report (month/year): March 2005

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS

1. What was the initial objective of this project?

To conduct a Slanghoek valley wide survey of remnant natural habitat and to identify key botanical hotspots in the valley. Also to assign relative conservation value to all remnant areas, with a view to prioritising conservation actions and areas. A secondary objective was to collate this information so that agricultural development applications could be streamlined by cutting out the need for numerous ad hoc botanical surveys of different sites. Also to increase awareness of the threatened natural habitats in the area. Also to pilot the Landcare Area Wide Planning methodology. Also to train an intern or student in the methodology.

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

They did not change substantially, but we did realise that the capacity to implement the key recommendations was a major stumbling block. The recommendations involved detailed one-on-one interactions with 12 key landowners, in order to get them to buy into the results of the project, but it was soon realised that CapeNature capacity would limit interactions to a maximum of four key landowners. No training was effected as no suitable student could be found with suitable basic skills, enthusiasm, or time available.

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

The botanical survey was completed and provides a very useful overview of the entire area and its conservation priorities, and should significantly speed up any future development applications. It is now also easy to prioritise the properties according to biodiversity importance. This is a tool that will help CapeNature with its limited budget to focus on the important areas first. A poster and pamphlet were also produced and will assist in the extension process with the landowners and the community.

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.

Implementation is still largely outstanding, and is likely to be slow due to CapeNature capacity problems.

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.

- Positive: An Area Wide Planning approach is an effective way to assess the conservation priorities in an area, and provides a defensible approach to limiting development in key areas, but is reliant on a suitably experienced biodiversity assessor being available.
- Negative: GIS based mapping caused numerous problems in the final reporting stages due to incompatibility problems and different standards of digitising within CapeNature and Dept. Agriculture. The botanical consultant must be directly involved with checking the digitising at all stages to ensure that no errors are made in interpretation of the field maps.
- Negative: There must be capacity within the implementing agency to carry out the recommendations timeously, otherwise the landowners will get frustrated, and the project could become discredited.
- Negative: Innovative ways need to be sought for dealing with certain landowners who will bear more of the "conservation burden" due to them having large areas of high conservation value on their land. Most farmers believe that if the community at large believes that their land has a high conservation value then that community should be responsible for compensating the farmer for loss of potential agricultural income.
- Negative : The botanical consultant spent substantially more time on this project than was initially budgeted for.

- Negative: No suitable interns could be found for training during fieldwork, and there seems to be a general shortage of people who are keen and suitably skilled at least a basic level.

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

CapeNature and Agriculture Dept. interaction with key landowners will be ongoing. The project may lead to the use of the Landcare Area Wide Planning approach being used elsewhere in the region.

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

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
None			

**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.

V. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Additional funding is ideally required to increase CapeNature capacity to implement key findings, primarily in the form of appointing a full-time staffer to concentrate on the Slanghoek valley.

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:	Mr Dian Dreyer
Organization	CapeNature
Mailing address:	Private Bag X14, Paarl, 7622.
Tel:	021-871 1535
Fax:	021-872 5785
E-mail:	dian@kingsley.co.za