

# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** Eden to Addo Corridor Initiative

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** *Eden to Addo Corridor Initiative*

**Implementation Partners for this Project:** No Implementation partners

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** May 1, 2006 – December 31, 2008

**Date of Report (month/year):** January 2009

## II. OPENING REMARKS

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

Project indicators changed early in the project due to delays in the GRI Stewardship Strategy and the inability of SANParks to sign an MOA between Eden to Addo, CapeNature and SANParks. In the absence of the strategy it was agreed that the Land Management Agreements described in the project indicators should rather be Proud Partner agreements that all the GRI stewardship partners could implement. The GRI took responsibility for developing the Proud Partner project but this was also stalled because of the Stewardship Strategy. Partners agreed to continue engaging with landowners and to use other stewardship tools such as alien veg clearing plans and focused projects until the strategy was completed. At this point Eden to Addo started looking for a stewardship mechanism to implement independently of the conservation agencies and to adopt a project-driven approach to stewardship in order to achieve CEPF outputs. Projects included drafting and implementation of the alien veg management plans using local contractors, botanical surveys, the development of information materials such as newsletters, fact files and a plant poster, a mammal monitoring project and the drafting of a document "Towards the conservation of the Craggs/Bitou corridor" which paves the way for a Protected Environment.

After scrutinizing the Protected Areas Act it was decided that a Protected Environment would be the best option as it can be implemented by an individual or organization and presents an opportunity to bring land formally into conservation. It was too late to build the Protected Environment into the CEPF project but all project outputs and purpose level indicators were tailored to this goal for the rest of the project period. In essence, the project became an exercise in paving the way for the pilot of a Protected Environment. The Table Mountain Fund has subsequently funded a pilot project for the two corridors that were the focus of the CEPF project.

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

**Project Purpose:** *Private sector involved and investing in stewardship activities in a way that also promotes a diversity of livelihoods amongst previously disadvantaged communities.*

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b>	
1. Minimum 100 landowners (or 1500ha's) consulted willing to manage their land for conservation by signing Land Management Agreement by end Sept 2008.	No land management agreements signed. 97 landowners engaged
2. Minimum 1500 hectares managed for conservation according to Land Management Agreement by end 2007.	3574ha's with alien vegetation management plans. Approximately 1000 ha's currently managed for conservation albeit without any agreement.
3. One volunteer Champion identified within each of the nine Eden to Addo Land Management Agreement areas by end December 2007.	1 volunteer champion in the Craggs Corridor 2 volunteer champions in the Bitou Corridor
4. Membership fee paid by all member landowners within 3 pilot sites in contribution to drafting of Stewardship Management Plans by end Sept 2008.	Funds raised by mega hike instead.
5. Minimum 2 Special Public Works Programme contractors employed within each pilot site for the implementation of Stewardship Management Plans by end Sept 2008.	3 SPWP contractors employed in 3 separate projects for the implementation of alien vegetation management plans

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

The project set out to gain land for conservation in a formal manner. When it was revealed that capacity constraints on the part of CapeNature (unable to enter into and service stewardship agreements over and above existing targets), and policy constraints on the part of SANParks (no mandate to work off reserve) prevented formal stewardship negotiations we were in essence prevented from negotiating any land for formal inclusion in the conservation estate and thus from achieving our intended objective.

This meant that there was a lot of innovation as the project progressed and efforts were made to meet our objectives. Thus original performance indicators changed substantially.

In spite of these challenges I feel that we have achieved our project purpose of *“Private sector involved and investing in stewardship activities in a way that also promotes a diversity of livelihoods amongst previously disadvantaged communities”*.

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

Positive impacts:

- The GRI Stewardship Working group that continues to meet every 6 weeks to share experiences and information.
- The identification within environmental legislation of a potential stewardship tool that can be implemented by the private sector

Negative impacts:

- As stated in an early progress report: “As a private sector initiative working with Gt. conservation decision-makers we have found it time consuming, bureaucratic and challenging to say the least”.

## IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

**Project Outputs:**

### Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Output 1: Partnerships established, landowner willingness secured and pilot sites for Stewardship Management Plans identified.</b>	
<i>1.1. Agreement between key implementing partners including CapeNature, GRI, E2A negotiated and signed by end May 2006</i>	SANParks unable to sign MOA due to policy constraints.
<i>1.2. 9 Landowner Membership Agreements signed with landowners across the project area by end 2007</i>	No agreements signed. Working relationships developed in the absence of formal conservation agreements. These will be pursued in the Protected Environment project.
<i>1.3. 3 Pilot sites for stewardship management plans identified and assessed by end Feb 2007.</i>	Pilot sites identified.
<b>Output 2: Stewardship Management plans funded and developed and Special Public Works contractors identified for implementation of plans in pilot sites.</b>	
<i>2.1. Database compiled of Special Public Works programme contractors by end October 2006.</i>	Done
<i>2.2. Funds raised for the drafting of Stewardship management plans for 3 pilot sites by end March 2007</i>	R130 000 raised from the Eden to Addo Mega Hike for use in implementing projects and drafting of management plans.
<i>2.3. Stewardship Management plans drafted for 3 pilot sites in partnership with CapeNature, GRI and Local government by end December 2007</i>	"Towards the Conservation of the Craggs/Bitou Corridor" completed as precursor to comprehensive management plans required for Protected Environment.
<i>2.4. Stewardship Management Plans implemented by landowners in 3 pilot sites by end Sept 2008</i>	Alien veg clearing plans implemented by some landowners in 2 pilot sites
<b>Output 3: Project management and co-ordination of Eden to Addo supported.</b>	
<i>3.1. Eden to Addo Managed in consultation with relevant partners for the duration of the project by end June 2006</i>	Done
<i>3.2. Networks established in relevant C.A.P.E. initiatives including GRI, Stewardship Task Team and relevant working groups by end June 2006.</i>	Done
<b>Output 4: Potential Stewardship contracts identified</b>	
<i>4.1. Potential sites for Stewardship Contracts emerging from the Eden to Addo project to be identified and referred to CapeNature and GRI for follow-up by Stewardship Programme by end Sept 2008</i>	Due to capacity and policy constraints mentioned above CapeNature and SANParks unable to pursue potential contracts.

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

We failed dismally at Output 1 for reasons explained above but the process of failing forced us to be creative in how we move forward and led to alternative ways of reaching our goals (yet to be met).

We surpassed our own expectations in Output 2 by raising sufficient funds to launch smaller projects and sourced in excess of 1000 person days from local communities for alien veg clearing.

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

Output 1 and Output 4 were not realized. It was disappointing to not be able to negotiate firm stewardship agreements with landowners and the overall impact of the project was adversely impacted but only from Eden to Addo's perspective. As far as I know the landowners themselves are not disillusioned because we continue to engage with them and will attempt to do what we failed to do in the CEPF project, in the next phase.

## **V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS**

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

## **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.***

NGO's by nature, are less bureaucratic and more impatient than government agencies. As an NGO, if you think you have a project that is innovative and new DON'T link your outputs to the approval of the agencies. Engage with them, inform them of what you're doing and then go and do it (with donor approval of course).

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

The project was designed with consensus of all the stewardship partners in mind (CapeNature, SANParks (GRI) and Eden to Addo. When consensus could not be reached on the signing of the MOA that would allow respective partners to negotiate stewardship agreements then NOBODY was allowed to negotiate these agreements. Project design could have provided for this eventuality providing the NGO with an alternative option.

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

It's very difficult to assess what contributed to the success or failure of the project as far as execution goes. A lot of time was spent in meetings with partners that amounted to little concrete progress as far as implementation is concerned e.g. failed MOU and Proud Partner programme. However, the meetings did provide a good platform to share information.

## **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>Date Received</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Eden to Addo	C	\$13000	Jan 07 & Dec 08	Spent R60 000 during CEPF project.

WESSA	C	\$2400	Jan 08	Small clearing 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.**

The project is currently entering phase 2, the pilot of a Protected Environment within the 2 corridors that were the focus of the CEPF project. In addition, funding has been secured to extend the two corridors inland in the direction of Addo Elephant Park. The sustainability of current funding hinges on landowner willingness to enter into Protected Environment agreements which will bind them to a management plan.

### 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: Pamela Booth  
 Organization name: Eden to Addo Corridor Initiative  
 Mailing address: PO Box 56, Sedgefield, 6573  
 Tel: 044 356 2825  
 Fax: 044 356 2825  
 E-mail: [pam@edentoaddo.co.za](mailto:pam@edentoaddo.co.za)