

# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** National Botanical Institute

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** Cape Coordination Unit

**Implementation Partners for this Project:**

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** 1 May 2002 to 1 April 2008

**Date of Report (month/year):** 30 May 2008

## II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The Cape Co-ordination Unit has been very successful in managing the overall C.A.P.E. programme, facilitating the work of the C.A.P.E. Implementation Committee and its executive, and providing strategic direction for the partnership as a whole. The unit has leveraged further funding through SANBI; and facilitated, managed and monitored a major GEF grant to the C.A.P.E. programme that has complemented the CEPF grant. It has also overseen a large suite of CEPF small grants, helping to build the capacity of civil society grant recipients in the process.

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

**Project Purpose:** Implementing agencies, funders, and civil society are effectively engaged in a coordinated and cooperative program which positively impacts conservation in the Cape Floristic Region

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b>	
Implementing agencies fulfill the stated objectives of the CAPE MOU	The major implementing partners remain highly involved through the various project management structures, including the C.A.P.E. Implementation Committee and the technical task teams that convene around every component of the programme. The C.A.P.E. programme, through the CCU, has demonstrated that it has considerable power in bringing different parties together to reach agreement on priority conservation actions. There are currently 24 signatory organizations to the C.A.P.E. MOU representing various levels of government as well as conservation agencies and civil society bodies.
A complementary suite of priority projects within the CEPF strategic funding directions have been successfully implemented as measured against the	A suite of 65 complementary projects have been implemented within the 4 strategic directions of CEPF.

Ecosystem Profile strategic plan.	
500 (35% of CAPE-registered civil society stakeholders are actively involved in a purposeful conservation activity/project and a further 500 active partners have been registered	The C.A.P.E. programme has exceeded this total in that there is excess of 2500 stakeholders on the database, many of whom are active through the various task teams and the C.A.P.E. Partners' Conference.
Funding and investment targets defined in preparation of GEF project are achieved (this quantum will be determined during the next 6 months as a result of a refined analysis of the funding requirements)	Funding and investment were achieved with the GEF investing a total of \$11 mil through the C.A.P.E. BCSD project. SANBI, mandated by law to coordinate bioregional programme activities, has continued to increase its financial support of the CCU through successive MTEF submissions. It is envisioned that SANBI will take up the support of the CCU into the future.

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

The project has been highly successful in terms of establishing the CCU and its role within the C.A.P.E. programme. The C.A.P.E. programme has strengthened partnerships within the region and enabled the sharing of information and expertise to the benefit of organizations and the environment. In some cases, where processes have been stalled for years, the neutral presence of the CCU and the C.A.P.E. programme has enabled consensus on a way forward.

Also, most of the C.A.P.E. projects have been inspired and enabled by true champions – whose vision, passion, and commitment catalyse action in the region. The challenge is to ensure that these initiatives are sustained and this generally means securing an institutional home for projects, innovations and the champions.

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

Unexpected impacts include:

Demands of programme coordination and mobilizing involvement by stakeholders leave the CCU little time for substantive technical work that the C.A.P.E. programme requires, or for getting involved in the details of partner projects. The choice is either to scale back the functions of the CCU, employ more staff, or seek support from partner organizations.

Although hosted by SANBI and in accordance with its governance framework, the CCU operates independently, reporting to the C.A.P.E. Implementation Committee on matters of programme policy and priority. The unit is not encumbered by allegiances and can act as an 'honest broker' among the partners without fear of favor. Being accountable to all C.A.P.E. Partners has also resulted in a heightened sense of responsibility.

Also, the CCU has had to strike a balance between ensuring that projects contribute to the overall goals of the C.A.P.E. programme, while not stifling innovation by trying to control projects too tightly.

<b>IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS</b>
----------------------------

***Project Outputs:***

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Actual at Completion</b>
------------------	-----------------------------

<b>Output 1:</b> CAPE Coordination mechanism to facilitate fulfillment of the Action Plan in place and operational with the full participation of implementing and funding agencies	
<b>1.1.</b> CAPE coordination committee meets at 6-monthly intervals and undertakes its obligations	It was essential that the C.A.P.E. Coordination Committee meet regularly as the programme was being initiated, however this has proved to be less feasible as more bioregional programmes were established. The CCC now meets only when there are matters which require its consideration.
<b>1.2.</b> CAPE Implementation Committee meetings convened at least quarterly and program implementation actions identified and monitored	The C.A.P.E. Implementation Committee has been convened every quarter since inception in 2002 and key program implementation actions have been identified, implemented and monitored.
<b>1.3.</b> Eastern Cape Coordination structure is established by June 2002, meets at least 4 times per annum and steers implementation in the Eastern Cape	The Eastern Cape Coordination structure was established and continues to meet quarterly. However, the Eastern Cape coordination unit has had significant capacity constraints since early 2007.
<b>1.4.</b> Annual CAPE strategy review undertaken by agencies and recommendations adopted	The C.A.P.E. strategy has been reviewed regularly throughout the course of the CEPF investment. A review of the first phase of C.A.P.E. (2001 to 2008) is currently underway.
<b>1.5.</b> CAPE Coordination Unit infrastructure and staffing in place by June 2002	Staffing and infrastructure in place.
<b>1.6.</b> All relevant bilateral and multilateral funding agencies are approached to contribute to funding partnership for CAPE	Global Environment Facility funding through the UNDP and World Bank has been secured.
<b>Output 2:</b> Civil society stakeholders and partners assisted to prepare and implement a complementary suite of CEPF project proposals.	
<b>2.1.</b> CAPE project development process is effective and Project Developer is undertaking an agreed program (20 longer-term projects in each Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, and 10 smaller projects in each of Years 1, 2, 3, and 4)	The project development process has been successfully implemented with 65 out of 145 applications being approved. An additional 3 small grant projects supported through the CCU small grants facility have also been implemented.
<b>2.2.</b> A complementary suite of fully developed project proposals is submitted to CEPF	As per 2.1 above.
<b>2.3.</b> Expert review panel established by June 2002 and CEPF proposals reviewed continuously within 3 weeks of receipt.	While a core panel of expert reviewers was identified, expert reviewers have often been identified and sourced on a proposal by proposal basis. This system has worked extremely well as the reviewers identified were able to make a meaningful contribution to the specific proposals under review.
<b>2.4.</b> CEPF small grants proposals reviewed within 1 week of receipt	CEPF proposals have usually been reviewed speedily.
<b>Output 3:</b> Communications strategy for engaging civil society as implementation partners operational and effective	
<b>3.1.</b> Strategy elements designed and implemented	The communications strategy has been reviewed annually and been implemented strategically.

including strategy elements and annual workplans, quarterly newsletters, list-serve, generic and project brochures, website, and action partners program	Campaigns like Fynbos Fynmense and Fynbos Footprint have been hugely successful in garnering support for the program with both civil society and government stakeholders. Electronic newsletters have been produced bi-monthly since 2003 and continue (alongside the C.A.P.E. website) to be the main means of regular communication with the broader C.A.P.E. stakeholders. A suite of publications have also been produced including the well received Fynbos Fynmense book and the project planning handbook.
<b>3.2.</b> Stakeholders representing complete geographic and sectoral dimensions of CFR registered with CAPE program	While this has been a challenge, enormous inroads have been made to increase the range of stakeholders participating in the program. Significant progress has been made in engaging with marginalized communities through the recent C.A.P.E. Partners' Conferences.
<b>3.3.</b> 100 action partners in first year and 200 per annum for years 2, 3, and 4 enter into agreements to undertake specified supporting activities	The C.A.P.E. action partners initiative has been reshaped into a more loose arrangement at the landscape level.
<b>Output 4:</b> Program and financial management system effective	
<b>4.1.</b> Full programmatic workplan and schedule developed by October 2002 and revised annually in April thereafter	A full workplan was developed in 2002 and has been revised annually. Implementation has proceeded as planned.
<b>4.2.</b> Procurement plan developed by July 2002, revised annually by April , and goods and services procured within planned timeframes and budgets	Procurement plan was developed, revised and implemented as planned.
<b>4.3.</b> Program budget managed according to financial plan and financial reports prepared monthly in appropriate formats	The programme budget has been effectively managed and financial reports prepared.
<b>Output 5:</b> Program monitoring and evaluation system effective	
<b>5.1.</b> Design of a program monitoring and evaluation system agreed by CAPE implementation committee within 6 months	The monitoring and evaluation system was initially delayed to include the GEF funded project and was implemented as of 2004. Since then a stakeholder driven process led by the CCU has been undertaken with the view to developing an M&E framework. This framework has been developed to gather up in one place all the information currently being collected by the various partners.
<b>5.2.</b> Monitoring on documented biodiversity, economic, and social indicators is initiated within 12 months and is reported annually in March or April thereafter	Monitoring of key indicators have been undertaken and reported on annually.
<b>5.3.</b> Project implementation progress reports prepared and reviewed (quarterly reports by CIC, and annual reports by CCC)	Project implementation progress reports have been prepared and reviewed quarterly by the CIC.
<b>Output 6:</b> Project level M&E system developed for projects that contribute to the C.A.P.E. Bioregional Programme, and CFR projects monitored and evaluated according to CEPF requirements.	

<p><b>6.1.</b> CEPF projects, quarterly financial and technical reports, and project completion reports evaluated as required, and feedback provided to project implementers, CEPF and CIC.</p>	<p>Quarterly reports have been reviewed and feedback to the respective projects has been provided. Final completion reports have also been tabled at CIC meetings for project partners to engage with. Monitoring support visits were also conducted to all projects which enabled the CCU to provide linkages to other relevant projects as well as provide support as required.</p>
<p><b>6.2.</b> Approach to project-level M&amp;E developed, and M&amp;E training materials developed, tested and refined through a series of M&amp;E workshops for key bioregional programme staff and project implementers.</p>	<p>As part of developing the M&amp;E handbook, which has recently been finalized and is currently being prepared for printing, a range of workshops , including the Project Developers Forum were convened to develop and test the materials. Participation included project implementers as well as bioregional programs staff.</p>
<p><b>Output 7:</b> Impact of CEPF investment in the CFR is assessed</p>	
<p><b>7.1.</b> Final assessment of CFR portfolio conducted</p>	<p>The assessment process was undertaken in December 2006 and January 2007 and culminated in the Strategy Review workshop held at Kirstenbosch in January 2007. Over 40 project implementers attended the workshop.</p>
<p><b>Output 8:</b> CFR small grants facility established, projects developed and approved in support of CFR Strategic Direction 2 and focusing on the following geographical areas: Eastern Cape, Gourits and North West Lowlands</p>	
<p><b>8.1.</b> Mechanism for implementation of small grants facility established</p>	<p>The small grants facility was successfully established and implemented. It was decided to focus all the resources on the Eastern Cape.</p>
<p><b>8.2.</b> Project development support provided as needed, especially in targeted project areas</p>	<p>Extensive project development support was provided the project proponents by the coordinator and project officer of the CCU.</p>
<p><b>8.3.</b> Projects with average value of \$ 15 000 developed</p>	<p>Three projects were approved, all implemented by WESSA Eastern Cape and in partnership with local partners including the Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality and civil society groups. The 3 projects are: 1) Development of the NMMoss action plan: catalysing the implementation of the NMMoss plan; 2) Van Stadens River Conservancy Programme: promoting biodiversity stewardship in the Van Stadens River Corridor; and 3) the Baakens Valley Recovery Project - enabling the regeneration of the Baakens Valley as a community conservation site.</p>
<p><b>8.4.</b> Projects reviewed and approved through peer review system</p>	<p>All projects were reviewed through the established peer review system and recommendations incorporated in the final project proposals.</p>
<p><b>8.5.</b> Projects monitored and evaluated</p>	<p>Projects were monitored as per 6.1 above.</p>
<p><b>Output 9:</b> Capacity for effective conservation management in the CFR developed by addressing skills development in the context of a strengthened enabling environment</p>	
<p><b>9.1.</b> Coordinator appointed</p>	<p>Dr Glenda Raven was appointed as the C.A.P.E. Capacity Development Coordinator and commenced work on 1 April 2007.</p>

<p><b>9.2.</b> Transitioning from the CEPF-supported TMF-CBP implemented to the C.A.P.E. Capacity-development programme successfully completed</p>	<p>The lessons learnt from the CEPF supported TMF-CBP have been taken forward as part of the C.A.P.E. capacity development program and has resulted in the approval of an additional 10 internship opportunities jointly supported by CEPF and the GEF funded capacity development component.</p>
<p><b>9.3.</b> Foundation for a financial and institutionally sustainable capacity-development programme in support of C.A.P.E. partner institutions is laid.</p>	<p>Extensive work has taken place both within the C.A.P.E. capacity development component as well as through SANBI's Human Capital Development initiative to lay a solid foundation for ensuring a sustainable capacity development programme for the sector as a whole.</p>

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

The project has achieved great success in terms of delivering the intended outputs, these include the development and support of a suite of implemented projects, many of which have found an institutional home, have been rolled out nationally or have served as a valuable testing ground for innovative work.

The communication strategy, which has focused most attention on supporting the immediate C.A.P.E. programme stakeholders, rather than spending precious resources on a broad-scale public awareness campaign, has proven to be highly effective at building civil society engagement within the programme. This has been demonstrated by the success of the various C.A.P.E. Partners' Conferences and their associated campaigns, as well as publications like 'Fynbos Fynmense'. It has also helped to build a sound reputation for the programme with key partners.

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

No outputs were unrealized.

**V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS**

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

Not applicable.

**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.***

While the lessons learnt over this phase of implementing the C.A.P.E. strategy have been numerous, this report highlights some key lessons central to coordinating C.A.P.E.

The 2006 publication "Fynbos Fynmense" records that the CCU has proven to be the most cost-effective unit funded by the CEPF in its global portfolio. The CCU has helped to engender confidence amongst potential donors about the risks of investment, and has shielded implementing agencies from laborious project development procedures by forming a bridge

between local organisations and international donors. The unit has struck a successful balance between ensuring that projects contribute towards the overall goals of the C.A.P.E. programme, while allowing space for innovation and for organisations to develop their own capacity.

A key lesson learnt early on was that, although located within SANBI, the unit needed to remain independent in order to be able to act as a mediator in conflicts between partner organisations and to work on unblocking institutional challenges. This was done successfully, although ensuring high-level commitment by government departments and visible “champions” of biodiversity remains an ongoing challenge. In general, having a strong, tightly functioning central co-ordination unit, while efficient and effective in ensuring programme implementation, can lead to a tendency by the organisations making up the partnership to rely too much on the unit to undertake work on their behalf.

A lesson learnt around communications was that with limited resources, more could be achieved by focusing attention on supporting immediate stakeholders through the publication of brochures, fortnightly electronic newsletters and annual conferences, rather than constructing a broad-scale public awareness campaign. This direction has been enhanced with the recent addition to the CCU of a learning network manager to maximise the exchange of knowledge and sharing of lessons across the partnership.

A final lesson is around the importance of the CCU staying involved in substantive technical work as much as possible. The complexities of co-ordinating the elaborate network of project partners, governance structures, funders, agreements and contracts that make up the C.A.P.E. programme have not left a lot of time for this, but the CCU’s lead role in developing the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the programme as a whole, through a participatory process of developing indicators with partners, has opened up this space again.

**VII. 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.***

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Cape Nature	A	\$ 71,429.00	
SANBI	A	\$ 328,255.00	In - kind & financial
World Bank	A	\$ 1,110,000.00	

***\*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.***

SANBI, as part of its expanding mandate for bioregional programmes, is committed to incorporating key positions within the CCU on the SANBI establishment. These include the recently filled Fynbos Programme Director position.

As part of the pathfinder process, the CCU will also be able to plan for its contribution to phase 2 of C.A.P.E.

## VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

None.

## VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

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

Name: Azisa Parker

Organization name: C.A.P.E. Coordination Unit, SANBI

Mailing address: Private Bag X7, Claremont, 7735

Tel: 021 799 8790

Fax: 021 797 3475

E-mail: [parkera@capeaction.org.za](mailto:parkera@capeaction.org.za)