Projects and Business

Consultancy Reg 2003/081418/23



P.O. Box 165 OKIEP 8270 Republic of South Africa Tel: 027-744-1130 Fax: 027-744-1057 Cell: 084-666-8217 prekepret@kingsley.co.za

Director: Steven Davids. MBA (US); MA (UCT); member of Project Management South Africa (PMSA member 2170); registered as Candidate Construction Project Manager at the South African Council For The Project And Construction Management Professions (SACPCMP member B/027/2004); associate member of the Institute of Management Consultants of Southern Africa (IMCSA).

1 June 2004

Nina Marshall Africa Grant Director. Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)

Dear Nina

CONSERVATION AWARENESS RAISING PLAN FOR THE BUSHMANLAND INSELBERG GEOGRAPHIC PRIORITY AREA - final report.

I submit the final report for the above project and hope everything is in order.

Please be so kind as to use the closing certificate on the last page to sign off the project. Please fax it through to me on +27-27-744-1057 and post the original to the above address.

I was a pleasure doing business with you and I hope to be of service to you soon.

Thank you very much.

Yours truly,

Steven Davids - Director

FINAL PROJECT REPORT

1	Project Name	2
2	Project status	2
3	Major deliverables	2
4	Summary of Project	2
5	Lessons learned	6
6	Major deviations from plan	8
7	Conclusion 1	1

1 Project Name

Conservation Awareness Raising Plan For The Bushmanland Inselberg Geographic Priority Area

2 Project status

Finished.

3 Major deliverables

A CD that contains the plan in Adobe acrobat format. This CD was posted 31 May 2004 to Nina Marshall in Washington. A copy was provided to Wilna Oppel, Coordinator Northern Namaqualand Sub region.

4 Summary of Project

The Namaqualand Projects and Business Consultancy (Namprocon) was commissioned by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) to write an Awareness Raising Plan for the Bushmanland Inselbergs geographic priority area. That plan consists of two parts, namely a Background Report (Part 1) and an Implementation Plan (Part 2).

1. Relationship Between Part 1 And Part 2 Of The Document Series.

Part 1 contains the background to and the principles underlying the Awareness Raising Plan. The intended audience is people who are more scientifically inclined and who want to know the reasons behind certain statements and actions proposed in the plan itself. Part 1 deals with the following four aspects in greater detail:

- The expectations of the smaller group of stakeholders in the Bushmanland Inselbergs region.
- The expectations of the broad group of SKEP's stakeholders as these expectations are reflected in the policy documents of SKEP.
- A best practice model for awareness raising.
- That which best suits the social economic environment of the Bushmanland Inselbergs area.

Part 2 is an attempt to construct an Implementation Plan from a synthesis between the four aspects which were dealt with in greater detail in the background report. The intended audience is people who are not scientifically inclined, who are not interested in the background and whose only interest is the plan. Part 2 is intended as a stand-alone document and therefore sometimes repeat aspects mentioned in the background report.

In line with other best practice models of awareness raising the Implementation Plan (Part 2) will need to be constantly revised in the face of new developments on the ground. Awareness raising is inherently a dynamic process. This revision must be done on the basis of the principles and guidelines established in Part 1.

2. Summary of Part 1 of 2: Background Report.

The Awareness Raising Plan is in principle based on the expectations of the stakeholders involved in the SKEP process. The expectations of the stakeholders were determined in the following ways:

- The project-brief for the Bushmanland Awareness Raising campaign was examined.
- SKEP's policy documents were studied because it is believed that they contain guidelines on what SKEP expects from the awareness raising campaign. The following policy statements were examined: the vision, the 20th strategy with its targets and goals, guidelines on the funding directions and the project-briefs for the projects that were identified for the region.
- The proceedings of the Action Planning Workshop organized by SKEP and held at Swartkoppies on 3-4 of April 2003 were scrutinized.
- Sixteen interviews were held with a selected group of stakeholders. During the interviews the stakeholders gave invaluable guidelines on how the awareness raising campaign must be structured around the target groups within the specific socio-economic context - a context where the community generally is poor, often divided, lack skills and are spread over a very wide geographic area.

The expectations of the stakeholders were complemented by further research.

- Firstly, a desk study was done of other awareness raising campaigns and related literature. A philosophical approach and best practice model for social marketing that best suits the expectations of the stakeholders was chosen. Further insights were also gained from an analysis of other relevant studies.
- Secondly, social data on the Bushmanland Inselbergs geographic priority area was analyzed and conclusions applicable to the awareness raising campaign were drawn from it.
- 2. Summary of Part 2 of 2: The Implementation Plan

Campaign theme:				
The Bushmanland – your land. Protect it today if you want to survive				
tomorrow! You can make a difference.				
Three types of umbrella messages accompany the campaign:				
We live in a unique landscape.				
 Biodiversity is integrally linked to an improved living conditions and apple appropriate and integrally 				
socio-economic survival.				
 Conservation threatening behaviors must change. People will be motivated to change, barriers to change will be lowered and desired 				
behavioral systems will be strengthened and sustained.				
Main goal: Use environmental education and communication in				
partnership with other SKEP projects to create a society in the				
Bushmanland where the locals take ownership of their unique landscape				
because they understand the important role biodiversity plays in their future				
socio-economic survival. Awareness Raising will focus on the following two				
target groups, namely the schools and a section of the community.				
Strategy:				
• The new concept of conservation will be introduced to a large target				
audience of about 7716 people on the basis of a the expectations of				
SKEP's stakeholders, a six point plan for social marketing and				
needs of the Bushmanland.				
• The emphasis is on awareness raising and social change firstly				
through the personal involvement of the community in implementing				
the awareness raising project and secondly through the fact that a				
substantial number of the public benefit financially from the project.				
Target audience and individual strategies:				
• People attending schools - about 2385 children or 20% of the				
community: Develop a comprehensive program that forms an				
integral part of the mandatory school curriculum.				
• Sections of the community – about 5331 people in total between the				
ages 15 to 65: Have a mass media campaign connected with a combination of temporary employment and teaching directed at the				
masses. Simultaneously have a small group one-on-one approach				
with community leaders or groups.				
Outcomes and deliverables:				
 The 60 000 ha conservation target of SKEP is not damaged but 				

 nurtured by the community. Increase the conservation knowledge of the target group so that in a random posttest on basic conservation issues 80% of the target group pass at a level of 75%. Change selected behavioral systems so that a society is created that can sustain conservation. A significant number of the locals received financial benefits from the campaign. Two members of the local community (i.e. the permanent personnel) received intensive training on running an awareness raising program and projects in general. Teachers trained on environmental issues. 			
 The development of learning materials that are integrated into the mandatory curriculum and supervised by the learning Area 			
Managers.			
Structures to support project.			
• A three member management committee selected by an annual stakeholder meeting.			
Mentorship.			
 Duration: 4 years and on going. Phase 1 - first three months: Establish infrastructure. 			
 Phase 1 - first three months: Establish intrastructure. Phase 2 – Year 1 and 2: Penetrate market by making people aware 			
of the new message and develop and establish the schools'			
 program. Phase 3 – Year 3 and 4: Consolidate position, strengthen and sustain conservation friendly culture while monitoring schools' program. 			
 Phase 4 – Begin in year 4 and culminate in year 5: Investigate ways to extend the life of project. 			
Project Budget: (at exchange rate of 1US dollar = 6.5 S.A Rand)Total:SA Rand 1,644,995.00;US\$ 253,076Cost per head:SA Rand213.00;US\$ 33			
Office:			
 Physical Address: A rented building in Pofadder 			
• Telephone number, fax number, e-mail address: <i>To be determined</i> .			
Bank account number: To be determined			
Number of personnel:			
 Fulltime: 2 fulltime members sourced from local community and trained. 			
 Temporary: Tasks are sourced out to members of the community employed on a temporary basis. 			
 Associated members: Rare educator and Environmental Officer of Anglo American 			
Some of the office infrastructure:			
 1 bakkie; 2 desks and office chairs; 5 chairs for trainees and visitors; 1 computer; 1 laser jet printer and a video projector. 			

5 Lessons learned

Major problems.

- The plan was written shortly before national elections were to be held. This meant that the municipality, a major stakeholder, was not readily available for interviews. The municipality's view was they had to be consulted before other regional players could be interviewed. This position was respected but it had a chain reaction on the schedule.
- Other SKEP projects for the region had not been awarded and there was therefore no input from their implementers.
- One major stakeholder, BotSoc, only started their project implementation when the writing of the awareness raising plan was near its end. For understandable reasons BotSoc and the SKEP program coordinator did not want the farmers or other regional stakeholders to be interviewed. This is obviously better for the whole program, but not so good for the writing of the Bushmanland Inselbergs awareness raising plan.

Issues to be followed up.

- The exact borders and size of the Bushmanland Inselbergs area.
- The target groups of this awareness raising campaign, BotSoc and the Namakwa District Municipality's Tourism Department.
- The need for an overarching awareness raising campaign for the Succulent Karoo to do awareness nationally and internationally and to coordinate the awareness campaigns of the various geographic priority areas.
- The need or not for the Bushmanland to have an own brand logo or flagship specie.
- The working relationship between the protected area, the awareness raising campaign and the resource centre, if it materializes, needs to be cleared up. This is especially so in view of the fact that BotSoc already uses an office building located on a farm while this Background Report recommends that the awareness raising campaign must use an office building in Pofadder.
- It is recommended that the project to build a water pipeline from the Orange River to some farms must be salvaged because the lack of water for the stock animals poses a major barrier to conservation friendly practices by the farmers.

Highlights.

- The majority of interviewees had very busy programs. Notwithstanding this, they were eager to contribute and often went over the time. It appears as if the interviews helped to strengthen their buy in into the project.
- The data that came from the interviews saved a lot of time and effort that otherwise would have gone into more laborious literature studies. The interviews also opened avenues to information that would have been difficult to reach through desk studies.

Other lessons learned.

- SKEP's participatory approach is highly recommendable and it must be continued.
- Workshops have an invaluable place to gather information and to secure stakeholder involvement. The valuable tool of the workshop needs to be complimented by other means of information gathering and strengthening stakeholder commitment - the interview forms one such complementary tool.

6 Major deviations from plan

Item (Number refer to	Planned	Actual and Comment
number in LOI)		
DURATION:	3 months	Extended to 4 months because of the increase in scope and the
		stakeholders wanted more time to study the plan and to give their input.
COST:	US\$ 9026	US\$ 10967 due to the increase in scope. Final financial report already
		submitted.
Scope		Increased on request of SKEP's field coordinator to include a more detailed
		study on the farmers.
		The original 5 interviews were increased to 18 on requests from the
		stakeholders, SKEP's Coordinator Northern Namaqualand Sub region and
		because and the availability of stakeholders
Tangible deliverables	Plan in pdf and MS	Plan only in pdf format because:
(4.15.1)	word format	• The MS word files used are big and therefore in the form of MS Word
		master documents. Not be people know how to use the master
		document function of MS word and it is not possible to convert the
		master document and its subdocuments into an ordinary Word

		 document. The many cross references used in the original documents will in all probability display as garbage on many other computers. Excell was used in the writing of the plan and this would mean that the end user must have MS Excell on his computer to access the data. If the files are in PDF the enduser only needs one program to read the files.
Meetings and workshops	Provide chapters one	The full draft plan was delivered to the stakeholders. During interaction with
(4.17.4); Quality (4.18)	by one as they are	the stakeholders it became clear that this was the most appropriate method
	finished to the	to be used.
	stakeholders.	
	Have a final meeting	At the presentation that was held in Okiep during April 2004 it was agreed
	or workshop to prove	that a final meeting will only be held if there are drastic changes to the draft.
	plan	Since there were no drastic changes, no workshop or final meeting was
		held. The following responses were received:
		The responses from Michell Yates and SKEP Northern
		Namaqauland were incorporated in the final plan.
		The Khai-ma municipality approved the draft telephonically without
		any changes.

	Some stakeholders were contacted telephonically during May but did not
	give their response by the time the project was to end. The stakeholders
	that were contacted were PIMS, the District Municipality and the
	department of Education. During the telephone conversation no one had
	any serious problems with the plan thus far.
Measurable	The order of the chapters was slightly changed.
characteristics: (4.15.3)	The Afrikaans summary was left out because the stakeholders proved to
	have an adequate understanding of the English used.

7 Conclusion.

This was a social project that involved many stakeholders and in these type of projects deviations are often the norm. However, the deviations encountered in this project did not cancel out the regional objectives and the final plan is in essential a true reflection true of the original goals and of the stakeholders' wishes.

No plan is guaranteed to succeed. However, it is the believed that the contributions by the stakeholders and this complementary research drastically increased the probability of success for the Awareness Raising Campaign for the Bushmanland Inselbergs geographic priority area.