CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Botanical Society of South Africa

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Facilitating the Transition from Conservation Planning to Action: Providing Biodiversity Specialist Support to the SKEP Coordination Team

Implementation Partners for This Project:
- **Conservation International Southern Africa Hotspots Program**
- **Leslie Hill Institute for Plant Conservation, University of Cape Town**

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): April 1, 2004-December 31, 2004

Date of Report (month/year): June 2005

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The planning phase of SKEP took place in 2002, and had four components: Biodiversity, Socio-Political, Economics and Institutional. The Botanical Society co-ordinated the Biodiversity Component, which involved undertaking a systematic biodiversity plan to identify geographic priorities for conservation action in the Succulent Karoo Hotspot. There was substantial collaboration between the Biodiversity Component and the other components, especially the Socio-Political Component.

This project built on the Botanical Society's involvement in the planning phase of SKEP, and helped to ensure that the information and expertise generated in the planning phase was not dissipated as SKEP moved into implementation. The need for this continuity is a key lesson from the project.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

***Project Purpose**:* The SKEP co-ordination team has and applies the necessary biodiversity and technical expertise to fulfill their role of building awareness, facilitating communication between enabling agencies and implementers, and catalysing civil society action in CEPF priority corridors as part of the long-term SKEP Programme for Conservation and Sustainable Development of the SKH.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
Indicator 1: The SKEP co-ordination structures are capacitated with the relevant biodiversity knowledge and skills to support implementation of the SKEP strategic directions in priority areas	*The SKEP co-ordination structures are capacitated with the relevant biodiversity knowledge and skills to support implementation of the SKEP strategic directions in priority areas*
Indicator 2: The SKEP technical working group has ensured a focus on biodiversity priorities at the strategic and project level	*The SKEP technical working group has ensured a focus on biodiversity priorities at the strategic and project level*

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

Members of the SKEP co-ordination team came from a range of educational and work backgrounds. They had differing levels of capacity and skills to begin with, and assimilated biodiversity knowledge and expertise at different rates. Their ability to apply the knowledge in implementation of priority area strategies also differed. Some members of the team clearly gained more from this project than others, but there was no formal assessment of these differences (it is difficult to imagine an appropriate mechanism for conducting such an assessment, given that this was not a formal course). Overall, the team as a whole seemed to acquire and apply the relevant knowledge and skills.

In achieving the purpose of the project, the project team worked closely with and was guided by the Cape Town-based SKEP unit, especially the field co-ordinator/capacity-building manager, Owen Henderson. The biodiversity and technical expertise developed through this project was complemented by the development of "generic" management and other skills through the broader capacity building programme for the SKEP co-ordination team.

The SKEP co-ordination structure is now in the process of being streamlined and transferred to SANBI. Some members of the SKEP co-ordination team will continue to play a direct role in SKEP, either in the co-ordination unit or in anchor projects in the priority areas, thus retaining the capacity built in this project within the SKEP programme. Other members of the SKEP co-ordination team have moved to other jobs and roles in their communities, often still within the Succulent Karoo Hotspot. Even if these new roles are not directly biodiversity related, the individuals involved may nevertheless be in a position to apply their knowledge and understanding of biodiversity in their new endeavors, and thus to contribute to mainstreaming biodiversity.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

An additional benefit of the project has been relationships built and strengthened between BotSoc, the Leslie Hill Institute for Plant Conservation, the SKEP Co-ordination Unit, and some SKEP projects. These relationships will be further built on during the ongoing roll-out of the SKEP programme. A general lesson from the C.A.P.E. and SKEP programmes seems to be that a dense network of relationships, particularly informal relationships, between the range of individuals and organisations involved, strengthens the programme and helps to provide a foundation for successful projects.

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: SKEP co-ordination teams have access to knowledge on key biodiversity topics and issues essential for their support role in achieving their geographic priority strategies.	
Indicator 1.1: Four training sessions and field trips conducted for the five co-ordination teams	Four training sessions and field trips conducted for the five co-ordination teams. These were conducted at SKEP training weeks in Sutherland, Calitzdorp, Luderitz and Port Nolloth.
Indicator 1.2: Three days one-on-one specialist time provided to each co-ordination team	Three days one-on-one specialist time provided to each co-ordination team, on request over the course of the project.
Output 2: SKEP co-ordination teams have the materials and other tools to support their activities.	
Indicator 2.1 Large format map of each geographic priority produced, showing vegetation types with conservation targets and	The teams were provided with electronic format maps (jpegs) and other relevant information, but not with large format maps. Project

other relevant information, with supporting material	funds allocated to the production of large format maps have not been used.
Indicator 2.2 CDs of SKEP layers made for co-ordination teams, and additional GIS layers requested by coordinators produced	CDs of SKEP layers made for co-ordination teams, and additional GIS layers requested by coordinators produced.
Output 3: Appropriate biodiversity and technical expertise has been provided to the SKEP Technical Working Group.	
Indicator 3.1 Nine Technical Working Group meetings attended	Technical Working Group meetings attended. (In practice, the Botanical Society has participated in the SKEP Technical Working Group over the full period of the implementation of SKEP, not just for the duration of this project.)
Indicator 3.2 Additional technical support to field co-ordinator provided on request	Additional technical support to field co-ordinator provided on request
Indicator 3.3 SKEP strategies for priority areas and CEPF LOIs reviewed as requested	SKEP strategies for priority areas and CEPF LOIs reviewed as requested. SKEP strategies for priority areas were reviewed at Technical Working Group meetings, sometimes just by TWG members, and sometimes with the relevant SKEP sub-regional co-ordinator.

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

The sessions at SKEP training weeks were well received, and played a key role in developing the relevant expertise in the SKEP team. The topics covered were determined in consultation with the SKEP co-ordination team. They included:

- Systematic biodiversity planning – what it is, how it was applied to develop the nine SKEP priority areas, how it can be applied at a fine scale within priority areas
- How to use ArcExplorer to make maps with the SKEP GIS layers
- Basic succulent karoo ecology
- Land degradation in succulent karoo ecosystems
- Options for restoration in succulent karoo ecosystems
- Socio-economic overview of SA and Namibia
- The policy and legal context for biodiversity conservation in SA and Namibia
- Socio-economic profiles of SKEP sub-regions (developed by sub-regional co-ordinators with guidance from BotSoc)
- Flora of the southern Namib
- Taxonomy – what and why?
- Stewardship – can we apply lessons from C.A.P.E. to the succulent karoo?
- Interacting with farmers – do's and don'ts

The CD of SKEP products developed for the co-ordination team has been useful for others as well.

One-on-one support to the sub-regional co-ordinators and the field co-ordinator was provided in an ad hoc way, on request.

Participation of BotSoc in the Technical Working Group helped to ensure that institutional memory and expertise on the identification of SKEP priority areas and the development of the SKEP strategy were drawn on in the establishment and implementation of the SKEP programme.

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

Large format maps of vegetation types and other biodiversity information for each priority area were not produced. The maps were provided in jpeg format, and could be printed out by the sub-regional co-ordinators and used in reports or other documents. The extra benefit of large format maps would been small relative to the time and cost involved in their production. Lack of these maps did not impact significantly on the overall impact of the project.

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.

A lesson that was brought home through the training session on the SKEP biodiversity planning methodology was the importance of SKEP co-ordinators having a clear understanding where the SKEP priority areas come from, and of the biodiversity targets set in the planning phase. Most of the co-ordination teams were not involved in the planning phase, so it was important not to take this understanding for granted.

As mentioned above, the importance of continuity between the planning and implementation phases of a bioregional programme was reinforced by this project. It is of great benefit to have several people who were involved in the planning phase of SKEP, also involved in the implementation and roll out of the programme. This project has facilitated the ongoing involvement of BotSoc in the SKEP programme, which has been important especially with regard to ensuring that the priorities agreed on in the planning phase (both spatial and thematic) are meaningfully carried through to the implementation phase. One implication of this for other CEPF programmes is that the identification of spatial priority areas and the development of an ecosystem profile needs to involve local champions and local expertise that can then be drawn on in the implementation phase of the programme.

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

The involvement of the SKEP co-ordination team in design of the project was important for its success.

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

Peter Carrick, a succulent karoo ecologist from the Leslie Hill Institute for Plant Conservation, played a key role in the training sessions and field trips. His availability to participate in three of the four training weeks contributed greatly to their success, and meant that he could get to know the SKEP team rather than just being an "outside expert".

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.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

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.)*

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

None

VIII. 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: Mandy Driver
Mailing address: Pvt Bag X10, Claremont, 7735, South Africa
Tel: +27 21 797 2284
Fax: +27 21 761 5983
E-mail: driver@sanbi.org