

FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Name: *Botanical Society of South Africa*

Project Title: *Partnerships, Cooperative Management and Incentives to Secure Biodiversity Conservation in Priority Areas in the Cape Floristic Region*
(a.k.a. the Conservation Stewardship Pilot Project.)

Project Dates: *July 2003 – September 2004*

Date of report: *October 2004*

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

This project was an ambitious undertaking to change the way a statutory conservation agency approached biodiversity conservation. It was implemented while the agency was being restructured (with attendant job insecurity and reallocation), and at a time when numerous additional political and social demands were being placed on the agency. It had to overcome an entrenched mindset of protected area focused budgets and priorities, and a culture of under-valuing conservation extension work. The project also had to overcome national resistance to working with landowners to conserve, and played a key role in changing national Biodiversity and Protected Areas legislation to support stewardship approaches.

The project has successfully changed the way the organization functions (and has shifted some of the priorities to biodiversity in production landscapes), has attracted a new generation of committed conservation professionals to it, trained more than 15 staff in the use of Stewardship as a tool, inspired at least four other initiatives to adopt and adapt the stewardship approach, and laid the platform for a significant attempt at meeting the extensive conservation targets set for the Cape Floristic Region.

The Project failed at securing suitable timely commitments from other government agencies to deliver incentives. While this did slow progress of landowner participation, several owners were fortunately sufficiently motivated to implement stewardship without major external support.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: *Natural habitat on private and communal lands is conserved to establish lowland biodiversity corridors and complement the establishment of mega reserves.*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	

<p><i>1. Institutions implement specific measures for co-operative management mechanisms and agreements and incentives within 5 years of project initiation.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCNCB Stewardship Programme initiated. • Working on Fire/CNC fire programme signed agreement with stew programme regarding fire management mechanisms. • ECape protected areas board have adopted co-operative agreements & incentives in key mega-reserves. • Provincial department of Agriculture adopted Area-Wide planning embodying a stewardship approach. • Working for Water and Working for Wetlands have adopted a private land policy which includes agreements & incentives
<p><i>2. Contractual conservation agreements are adopted by landowners in priority areas</i></p>	<p>None have been adopted yet, several are pending final legal processing in pilot sites, mega-reserves and areas adjacent to provincial reserves.</p>
<p><i>3. Remnant lowland habitats are secured for conservation and linked across landscapes within 10 years of project implementation</i></p>	<p>Cape Nature has produced a stewardship plan for the W Cape. Lowland corridors not secured at completion but in process of implementation in Agulhas Plain, Overstrand Municipality, Cape Metro, Theewaterskloof municipality, Drakenstein municipality and Swartland municipality.</p>
<p><i>4. Improved co-operation and co-ordination between off-reserve conservation projects results in successful adoption of mechanisms and incentives in the CFR by 2015</i></p>	<p>Adoption of proforma legal agreements by: CREW, Baviaanskloof, Cederberg & Gouritz Biodiversity Corridors. A Protected Areas Forum for the CFR that overarches political and institutional boundaries, adopts stewardship as the theme of its bi-annual meeting. Provincial Stewardship Association (representative body of landowners) initiated and established, which have adopted stewardship as the mechanism for off-reserve conservation. One area (W Coast) has opted not to use the Stewardship approach.</p>

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

Stewardship has been recognized as a landscape conservation tool by the majority of initiatives in the CFR. Only a few areas haven't opted to pursue the Stewardship approach. It is unfortunate that at project completion no actual agreements have been signed with landowners, and that the mitigation measures the project put in place to overcome the institutional obstacles to getting the agreements signed haven't been effective. This is a priority of Cape Nature's Stewardship Programme.

Nationally, The SA National Conservancy Association also recognizes stewardship and the IUCN country committee have created a working group to expand the role and cohesion of stewardship across SA.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

Positive

- The profile and conservation status of renosterveld and innovative approaches to its protection has been raised more than expected.
- Department of Agriculture has recognized stewardship for resource conservation within an agricultural system. Much improved personal relationships between Dept of Agriculture and Cape Nature staff at the ground level were facilitated by the Stewardship project. A key recommendation out of the recent National LandCare conference was that land-care and stewardship planning should be integrated.
- Stewardship products (e.g. site assessment mechanism) have been adopted and implemented by operational and scientific services staff of Cape Nature as a general biodiversity assessment tool.
- Alien Clearing Manual produced by stewardship staff adopted by City of Cape Town as their guidelines for parks department and conservation staff.

- A Stewardship Trust has been set up to unlock further landowner commitment through incentive delivery, and has been capitalized by donors who have recognized value of stewardship mechanism as a tool for critical habitat conservation.
- A Local Authority Nature Reserve (Paarl Mtn) reserve policy document has made provision for linking with other conservation initiatives such as stewardship.
- A civil society group (Overstrand Conservation Foundation) is lobbying for incentives from local authority using stewardship as the platform for incentive delivery.

Negative

St Francis conservancy hasn't adopted stewardship in its entirety or learnt from the experiences as much as the pilot project would have liked.

The West Coast Biosphere project appears to be using a different approach and not wishing to employ stewardship.

The Stewardship project has been too successful for its own good in some quarters and has elicited jealousies and turf competition within the agency.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs: Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project

Planned vs. Actual Performance

(Decision taken not to send all detailed project documentation to CIC due to overload).

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: Incentives action team (IAT) established.	
<i>1.1 Partnership formalized and signed. Memorandum of Understanding handed to the CAPE Implementing Committee (CIC) by the end of project month 1.</i>	Completed.
<i>1.2 Key project staff in place, and roles and responsibilities are agreed and committed. Documentation handed to the CIC by the end of project month 2.</i>	Completed.
<i>1.3 Workshop held to identify key stakeholders and workshop proceedings handed to the CIC by the end of project month 2.</i>	Completed.
<i>1.4 Strategic partnerships entered into with key stakeholders and partnership agreement document(s) handed to the CIC by the end of project month 4.</i>	C.A.P.E. has signed implementation agreement (which is signed by all strategic partnerships) that recognizes stewardship as an implementation mechanism. No Partnership forthcoming with WfW – failed communication. Partnership pending with dept Agriculture and Land Care.
<i>1.5 Necessary infrastructure and equipment procured by the end of project month 4.</i>	Complete
<i>1.6 Training strategy and schedule developed and strategy document submitted to the CIC by the end of project month 6. Training sessions and workshops proceedings submitted to CIC.</i>	Additional training and target audiences were developed during the project. The Project reached over 400 people during its 2 years. At least 15 people have each attended more than 3 training sessions.
<i>1.7 WCNCB regional strategic planning reflects Incentives Action Team operations and creates opportunities for other staff to engage with project activities.</i>	Business unit plans reflect stewardship plans at a cadastral level and other conservation services staff have pursued stewardship in priority areas.
Output 2: Appropriate co-operative management	

mechanisms and incentive schemes refined and documented.	
2.1 <i>Co-operative management models and incentives schemes need analysis revisited and refined.</i>	Three stewardship options conceptualized and developed and catered for in appropriate law. CNC now has access to Working for Water funds for alien clearing on stewardship sites. Fire management programs implemented as incentive in priority sites.
2.2 <i>Additional schemes developed and operationalised as incentives (e.g. public works schemes and rates rebates). Report handed to the CIC by the end of project month 7</i>	Rate exemption codified in law as incentive for secure stewardship. No scheme forthcoming from WfW during project timeframe, but planned for 2005.
2.3 <i>Operational procedure manual developed and delivered to the CIC by the end of project month 9.</i>	Ongoing learning & programme necessitated delay in production. Final copy to be finalized by CNC after project completion. To be completed at project completion.
2.4 <i>Incentive opportunities and schemes communicated to wider public and NGO members.</i>	Complete. Document circulated called "Implementing laws for conservation". More than 30 general presentations given to civil society groups, local authorities, representing over 3000 people.
Output 3: Lobbying strategy for institutional and legislative reform in place.	
3.1 <i>Strategy development workshop held with key stakeholders by end of month 8</i>	Several workshops were held throughout project, reacting to the timelines imposed by the law reform process in parliament.
3.2 <i>Policy and legislative reform options and position papers presented to relevant institutes and agency legislators.</i>	Presentations given to 4 national private conservation forum meetings, 2 parliamentary committees and 12 DEAT meetings, and 2 IUCN country committee meetings. 2 rates position papers developed.
Output 4: Priority areas for the establishment of pilot projects selected.	
4.1 <i>Identify suitable pilot project areas from the CAPE lowlands project and the CAPE CPU by the end of project month 8.</i>	Completed. Three pilot sites selected namely, Agter-Groenberg, Bot River, and Lower Breede River, using the CAPE renosterveld Lowlands fine scale conservation planning data.
4.2 <i>Stakeholder workshop held to select priority areas for pilot project establishment and proceedings submitted to the CIC by the end of project month 10.</i>	Completed.
Output 5: Pilot projects launched and co-operative management models and incentives schemes implemented.	
5.1 <i>Database developed and populated for selected pilot areas. Database developed by the end of project month 9.</i>	Database developed. Data captured and will be entered into database after project completion once finalized. Joint data capture with Area-Wide planning is occurring to increase efficiency.
5.2 <i>2 Negotiators appointed by end of project month 11</i>	Decision taken not to appoint negotiators but use extension staff instead, because willingness of landowners to negotiate with conservation staff was under-estimated. Obstacle to agreements was within the conservation institution and not usually with the landowner.
5.3 <i>A negotiation strategy for the pilot areas is in place by the end of project month 12</i>	Negotiation strategy captured in the form of communication guidelines in the Ops Manual. Individual strategies developed for individual sites which are being processed.
5.4 <i>Co-operative management models offered to all target landowners in each selected pilot area within 16 months of project initiation.</i>	Due to staff turnover not all landowners have been contacted in Lower Breede pilot site but completed in other two pilot sites. Additional area planned into Cape Nature's operations.
Output 6: Package the lessons learned from co-operative management models and incentives schemes and promote them.	
6.1 <i>Uptake of incentive schemes and of co-operative management models assessed. Iteration at month 14 & report completed by end of project month 23.</i>	Cape Nature's 3-year stewardship plan reported to CNC senior management and business unit staff. Verbal report given at Fynbos Forum Conference 04. Summary of plan: 148 properties have been targeted for stewardship in the next 3 years, which are expected to include 31 Conservation Areas, 26 Biodiversity agreements, 56 contract reserves, 20 yet to be allocated. Of these, 11 are in Critically Endangered ecosystems, 19 Endangered, 12 Vulnerable and 42

	Least Threatened ecosystems. To date, 32 sites have been assessed and recommended for stewardship status. Written report on incentive uptake not forthcoming because all originally envisaged incentives have not been adopted by relevant agencies. Work ongoing in other projects.
6.2 <i>Budget assessment and revision on months 8, 12 and 18.</i>	Budget revision completed for months 8 & 12. Final report due with project completion.
6.3 <i>Develop a marketing strategy for the further implementation throughout the CFR and highlight opportunities for the involvement of civil society, other agency extension personnel and formal conservation initiatives.</i>	Stewardship Video produced and disseminated as marketing tool to promote stewardship throughout CFR. Stewardship profiled at CAPE Protected Areas Forum in Oct 2004, and at Fynbos Forum in September 2004.

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

The impact of the CNC re-structuring was under-estimated, in that staff were not as focused and leadership was lacking on what the new priorities would be. This retarded predicted project success. Project staff deliverables were largely met but this was compromised where there were no dedicated staff. A key lesson for conservation agencies is that unless staff are dedicated to off-reserve conservation, they cannot meet their targets successfully.

Unrealistic expectations were set for what this project could achieve in the way of leveraging incentives from external agencies, especially Working for Water. To some extent the relationship with WfW was soured by previous experience, and mired in ongoing negotiations, but the project's failure here also represents a lack of understanding on our part in how to get this leverage, and what realistic timeframes should be put to this. If we were to redo the project, I would still be as ambitious as were then, despite these setbacks.

Support and commitment from other extension staff in Cape Nature was lacking, retarding the attainment of outputs and the negotiation process on specific sites. In particular, all staff were unclear on what their organization was able to do for landowners. Greater success would have been achieved if clearer direction had been given from directors to middle management to support implementation of stewardship amongst operational staff.

The team expected finality on the legislation reform process much sooner in the project, which would have provided clarity on the nature and form of stewardship agreements at a time when we could have deployed them. The uncertain legislative climate also threatened stable relationship with some landowners. Although we have achieved the outputs we wanted, we would have benefited from them more if it was earlier in the project.

Positives

The response from landowners was better than expected, and made clear that the main constraint is agency support & incentives, and not landowner willingness.

We have developed a new skills base and stewardship expertise. We were also able to use some existing skills to reach biodiversity targets.

Cape Nature has a vastly improved image in the pilot sites and agency-landowner relations are sound at project completion.

We contributed to the intellectual development of corridor conservation by adding "security" to agreements and specific guidelines & tools (capacity & expertise) for responsible resource management. Synergy was created at the individual interaction level (landowners, Agricultural

Extension Officers and Cape Nature staff) and at the community level (the first steps are in place to form pilot site reference groups). The potential in reference groups for resolving issues is untapped.

Extension staff have a better sense of the core challenge of stewardship viz: keeping landowners on a rope while ‘waiting’ for contract processing and incentive development.

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

Strategic partnerships with Dept Agric & Water Affairs (WfW) were unrealized and thus certain incentives eluded the team. This affected the speed of landowner negotiations, which in turn affected Board’s uptake of stewardship, as other staff were waiting to see how these would turn out.

The major problem for the team was that no contracts actually signed during pilot project duration. The project would have had much greater penetration into agencies and catalytic effects with other groups, projects and landowners if this had happened. We took the decision to rather endure this but ensure that stable and appropriate structures and systems were developed in Cape Nature to deal with contracts in the long term, than appoint short term contract lawyers to expedite the process. This is the only way we can ensure sustainability of the project objectives. The new laws have also delayed the process somewhat and have forced a total reorganization of responsibilities in Government agencies to deal with contracts.

Not having signed contracts didn’t help to win other landowners’ confidence, and has reduced potential media coverage.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

No environmental or social safeguards were triggered.

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.

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

The project was one of the first collaborative partnerships in the CAPE where true and fully integrated partners were responsible for implementing a project. This caused inevitable headaches for financial systems, staff procurement and contracts, and reporting, but these have all been sorted out.

The project proponents would have liked to have been formally involved or invited to assist with other CEPF project development or review, but this has hardly happened.

Greater communication with the CEPF Grant Manager and CAPE project developer would have been useful to restructure certain outputs to better meet the purpose and objectives.

CEPF should consider the short duration of key projects. Initial advice from CEPF was that this should be an 18-month project, whereas we were pushing for 3 years. Our recommendation is that

where projects are employing staff, and investing heavily in training, that CEPF considers much longer time frames to allow for recruitment, appointment, training and settling in of key staff. This is difficult even in 24 months.

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

The project should have had a functioning advisory committee with representatives from Dept of Agriculture, DAE&DP, Water affairs, and Working for Water. Although the Fynbos Forum Conservation Incentives Working Group was to provide the function, it lost momentum. A strong recommendation would be for CAPE working groups or task teams to be formally charged with taking on this role for other projects.

An over ambitious workplan set us up to not realize certain outputs, but pushed the envelope for what was considered possible by the team members. (Most of the team was only employed for 18-19 months of the total of 24.)

Invest careful consideration into recruiting staff as it is very important to have the right people in place – this critically determines success in meeting tricky outputs. This project considers itself lucky to have found the right staff and nurturing environment to allow them to find their talents. It could easily have been very different.

In future, we recommend allowing a 2 month orientation phase for new project staff – do not put heavy output expectations in that time so that they can get to grips with project. If new staff are employed, we recommend that funders insist that project partners formally commit to taking on project staff after project.

Better project management skills would have helped in meeting certain deadlines, e.g. through setting dates for project outputs earlier to ensure they are executed. CEPF could check that suitable skill training in this regard is available in a hotspot and is actually used.

Clear specifications and conceptualization for project outputs was lacking at the outset. Although this was a ground-breaking project, more attention should have been paid to this. Draw up drafts of all products earlier in the project which can be worked on and value added to them, rather than developing products throughout project life-span.

The CAPE funding has allowed the board to roll out stewardship beyond the project lifetime, and expertise developed in project has not been lost. Longer project durations (e.g. 3 years) are needed to ensure institutional stability when project ends, especially if no other external funding will be forthcoming for the institution, or to redirect internal budget priorities. This project also recommends a 3 month hand-over period to project partners/inheritors to secure project sustainability and maintain institutional memory.

Partnership projects need simple administrative & financial procedures. CEPF could check that this has at least been contemplated.

Capture lessons learnt more explicitly (every quarter) as they often get lost in the detail. This project had three dedicated sessions over 18 months to collate lessons. It should have been more frequent, and should have involved more people (although the quality of learning and sharing can be compromised in bigger groups).

Further specific, technical and “social nuance” lessons in land negotiation, extension approach, operations and communal stewardship are captured in the final lessons learned report in the accompanying CD with all project outputs and documents.

VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The project gave much specific and general input into the CEPF review process but has had no feedback. This would be greatly appreciated.

For more information about this project, please contact:

Mark Botha
Botanical Society of South Africa
Pvt Bag X10
Claremont 7735, South Africa
Tel: (27) 021 7972284
E-mail: capeveg@gem.co.za

**STEWARDSHIP PRODUCTS produced during Conservation Stewardship Pilot Project
(March 2003- September 2004)**

No.	Name of Product	Explanation	Available electronically (Y/N)
Tools & Products			
1	Stewardship Pamphlet #1 - <i>"Conservation Stewardship: Pilot Projects in the Swartland & Overberg"</i>	Pamphlet distributed to landowners in the 3 pilot areas & conservation agency staff & other stakeholders as a marketing tool. Printed in English & Afrikaans.	Y
2	Stewardship Pamphlet #2 - <i>"Conservation Stewardship: Options for landowners"</i>	Pamphlet distributed to landowner beyond the 3 pilot areas & conservation agency staff & other stakeholders as a marketing tool. Printed in English & Afrikaans.	Y
3	<i>"The Stewardship Programme - What landowners have to say about why they are committed to conserving natural habitats on their farms"</i>	Video produced in order to market the Stewardship Programme by interviewing a number of landowners who have bought into the stewardship philosophy	Y (MPEG on CD)
4	<i>"Taking Stewardship to the Landscape in Partnership with the People"</i>	Description of CapeNature's Stewardship Programme including goals & objectives, written as a paper for the World Parks Conference.	Y
5	<i>"Site Assessment for Biodiversity Value"</i>	Site Assessment form used to capture biodiversity features of a property. Purpose: To determine the biodiversity value of the site to establish the preferred stewardship option & determine what provisions should be included in a management plan for the site.	Y
6	<i>"Landowner Needs Assessment"</i>	Questionnaire used to capture a landowner's personal particulars, property information, characteristics of the natural areas, plans for the future, information needs & specific queries.	Y
7	<i>"CapeNature Stewardship Database"</i> & Stewardship sites database Help file.	This Microsoft Access database was developed to keep a record of stewardship agreements within the Western Cape Nature Conservation Board. The database is spatially organised and is linked directly to Arcview GIS.	N (Access database too large to email)

8	<i>"Stewardship Management Plan Proforma"</i>	Basic template of the contents which should go into a stewardship management plan.	Y
9	<i>"Ecological Auditing for Contractural Reserves & Biodiversity Agreements"</i>	Basic template of the structure of a audit form used to assess biodiversity management performance and to what extent the planned actions in the Management Plan are being implemented by the landowner and/or conservation agency	Y
10	<i>"Management Agreement for Contractural Protected Area" - proforma</i>	Legal agreement template for the landowner and conservation agency to sign in order to declare a property/portion thereof a Contractual Protected Area. Contains details of the relationship between the landowner & conservation agency, as well as management responsibilities.	Y
11	<i>"Agreement to declare a Nature Reserve" - proforma</i>	Consent form template which the MEC (or delegated authority) and landowner must sign, indicating the consent of both parties to declare their property/portion thereof a contractual protected area.	Y
12	<i>"Notarial Deed for Contractural Protected Area"</i>	Notarial deed template to be lodged at the deeds office which the notary public & quod attestor must sign in order to register the restrictions of the property against the title deeds.	Y
13	<i>"Biodiversity Agreement"</i>	Legal agreement template for the landowner and conservation agency to sign in order to declare a property/portion thereof a Biodiversity Agreement.	Y
14	<i>"Planning an Alien Clearing operation - Notes from field training at Porcupine Hills" - 16 August 2003</i>	Notes from field training on methods for undertaking an alien clearing mapping & scheduling exercise.	Y
15	<i>"Landowner Alien Clearing Manual" - November 2003</i>	Manual for landowners on how to effectively clear alien invasive plants, with step by step instructions and guidance on alternative methods, equipment, choice of herbicides etc.	Y
16	<i>"Understanding alien scheduling"</i>	Instruction document for staff or landowners that wish to map & schedule an alien clearing operation using Department of Water Affairs & Forestry (DWAF) approved methods.	Y
17	<i>"Operational Procedures Manual for implementing stewardship"</i>	Manual for staff that will implement a stewardship approach to conservation in a landscape, including step-by-step guidance on the procedures to follow and what tools to use.	Y (but not all appendices are available electronically)

18	<i>"Memorandum of Agreement between BotSoc and Cape Nature"</i>	An outline of the Memorandum of Agreement to implement the conservation Stewardship pilot project between BotSoc and Cape Nature.	Y
Minutes & Proceedings of Meetings & Workshops			
1	<i>"Proceedings & outcomes of the Stewardship Action Team workshop"</i> - 1, 2 April 2003	Proceedings of the first official workshop & operational meeting for staff to be involved in the Stewardship pilot project.	Y
2	<i>"Rates & Taxes catch-up for Stewardship Action Team members"</i> - 23 July 2003	Minutes of a training session for pilot project extension officers on understanding municipal rates, taxes and the opportunities for rates & taxes incentives.	Y
3	<i>"Landowner Negotiation Workshop proceedings"</i> - 24 July 2003	Proceedings of a workshop held in order provide guidelines for the do's & don'ts of landowner communication & negotiation.	Y
4	<i>"Field notes-2nd Renosterveld Information Sharing Session-Indicators of renosterveld condition"</i> - 25 June 2003	Field notes from a renosterveld field day held on Fairfield farm near Napier, to improve the ecological knowledge of extension staff and landowners about renosterveld.	
5	<i>"Field notes-4th Renosterveld Information Sharing Session - Pollinator Plant interactions in renosterveld"</i> - 18 Sep 2003	Field notes from a renosterveld field day held on Groote Post wine farm near Darling to improve the ecological knowledge of extension staff and landowners about renosterveld.	Y
6	<i>"Conservation Stewardship Workshop Proceedings"</i> - 5 November 2003	Proceedings of a workshop held to provide information on the details of stewardship options, the optimal order of events/operational approach for implementing stewardship in the landscape, legal provisions and restrictions in stewardship contracts and biodiversity criteria for conservation value site assessments of private properties.	Y
7	<i>"Minutes-Stewardship Operational Detail Meeting"</i> - 6 November 2003	Minutes of a meeting held in order to answer specific stewardship queries pertinent to individual Business Units and provide input and guidance from the Stewardship Programme team members.	Y
8	<i>"Crafting Management Plans for Stewardship"</i> - 28 November 2003	Minutes of a meeting held in order to re-evaluate the contents of traditional Management Plans and how these could be adapted & condensed for stewardship contract purposes.	Y
9	<i>"Lessons learnt minutes"</i> - 8 December 2003	Minutes of a meeting held for pilot project staff to reflect on and capture lessons learnt in implementing stewardship half way through project. Lessons were recorded for each individual pilot site, as well as for the	Y

		Stewardship Programme partnership in general.	
10	<i>"Lessons learnt in implementing Stewardship"</i> - September 2004	Lessons learnt after pilot project completion on land negotiation, landowner interactions, & extension operations.	Y
Media publications - newspaper & radio articles			
1	<i>"Conservation Incentives Project in the Cape Lowlands gets going"</i>	Veld & Flora Vol 89(2), June 2003 - backpage	N
2	<i>"Conservation Stewardship Project to be piloted in the Lower Breede River Area"</i>	Breede Brief Vol 47 - newsletter of the Lower Breede River - frontpage	N
3	<i>"Conservation Stewardship in South Africa: Landowners to Lead the Way"</i>	CEPF e-news, December 2003	Y
4	<i>"Women extend themselves"</i>	Veld & Flora Vol 89(4), December 2004 - pgs 136-137	N
5	<i>"Preserving the fynbos kingdom"</i>	Farmer's Weekly - 26 December 2003, page 34	N
6	<i>"Taking Stewardship to the People"</i>	Country Life, Jan 2004, pgs 84-86	N
7	<i>"New ways to bridge farming & conservation"</i>	Farmer's Weekly, 23 April 2004, pg 42-43.	N
8	<i>"Conservation Stewardship - a new approach to conservation on private land"</i>	Veld & Flora Vol 90(2), June 2004 - pgs 47 & 47	N
9	<i>"Renosterveld - uitvalgrond of skatryk natuur erfenis?"</i> (Translation: "Renosterveld - worthless land or rich natural heritage?")	Sentraal-Suid Koperasie Newsletter, April 2004, pg 1 & 2	N
10	<i>"Natuurbewaringsprojekte in the SSK-bedienings-gebied wat op die grondeienaar gefokus word"</i> (Translation: "Nature conservation projects in the SSK service area to focus on landowners")	Sentraal-Suid Koperasie Newsletter, June 2004, pg 1 & 5.	N

Total: 37 tools, minutes & articles produced in 18 months!!

LESSONS LEARNT THROUGH PILOTING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STEWARDSHIP IN THE WESTERN CAPE (from 2003 to 2004)

Lessons learnt in land negotiation

- Should a landowner wish to sell their property before negotiations have been completed and the stewardship contract signed, assist landowners with the property ownership transition phase (e.g. agree to meet with the new landowners to explain the stewardship intentions for the property, write necessary motivating letters so that all work is not lost)
- Don't rush people or pressurize a decision out of them - go at their pace.
- Expect landowners to talk to each other and compare the conditions and assistance laid out in their contracts. To counteract this, make it very clear that each contract is unique and that terms and conditions may legitimately differ. Let this be known upfront at the outset of the negotiation process.
- Do not negotiate with landowners without first receiving official mandate and the necessary go-ahead from the conservation agency manager responsible for the area (e.g. Do not negotiate alien clearing assistance before receiving a mandate from the manager that there is adequate budget for this assistance).
- Do not encourage adjoining properties who would like to go into a stewardship agreement together to sign one contract that covers all the properties. Each property must be found by its own, individual contract, although a collective management plan can be contemplated. It becomes very difficult to ensure compliance or prosecute non-compliance with contract terms if one contract governs all. Multi-stakeholder, single contract scenarios can lead to the creation of a section 21 company to manage the collective properties. However a section 21 company can end up being used by certain individuals to bulldoze the wills of other people, and leverage their own interests.

Lessons learnt in landowner interactions & explaining options

- Do not confuse landowners by explaining parallel processes or other conservation initiatives which might also raise expectations. Just keep the explanation simple and to the point.
- Expect the unexpected! e.g. change of company ownership or family trust composition(affecting their legal mandate to sign a contract), family trust funds deleted,

Lessons learnt in extension operations

- If people approach you outside of your conservation priority area or pilot area boundary and express interest in stewardship, an obligation remains to conduct a biodiversity site assessment in order to determine the way forward. Thereafter hand over the assessment outcomes to the relevant conservation service staff person. Show such landowners a map of ordered priorities for your area and clearly explain the capacity constraints in servicing all areas equitably.
- For landowners that are concerned about the future of a contract if the original extension person for the area leaves, explain the permanency of the contract beyond the lifetime of

staff individual involved. which prevents property status being threatened. Acknowledge risks upfront.

Lessons learnt in communal stewardship

- Research the background of a community very well before starting interactions. Find out all history of previous relationships, read up all meeting minutes etc. Do not enter a communal stewardship attempt lightly!
- Stewardship on communal land involves totally different dynamics to private land stewardship, and therefore requires specialized extension expertise. Dedicated staff & support are needed as well as professional group facilitation skills, as you are dealing with a number of different ideas for landuse, historical splits in families, age groups, and religion.
- Decision-making structures within a community can be lacking, and exacerbated by the community not being willing to organize themselves or recognise local authority structures. The mind-set prevalent in some communities is "what can you do for me"? - i.e. a hand-out mentality.
- For communal land where many stakeholders are involved (e.g. land transfer from Dept of Public Works to a community), it becomes vitally important to keep all stakeholders constantly informed at all times - if one party feels left out, the whole process can be derailed.

Lessons learnt in interacting with landowners - dealing with unique personalities

"Economic Edward"

This is an example of a commercial farmer who wants conservation to be a viable business proposition; He is very interested in how a conservation venture will benefit him and the economic implications thereof. The willingness of CapeNature to find workable solution through numerous meetings and negotiations, and their openness to being flexible (while still upholding the organizations policies), was a key to unlocking his commitment.

Lessons:

- 1.) An extension officer must be very familiar with the detail of all the relevant policies of the organisation they represent as well as other pertinent environmental legislation
- 2.) Communicate all possible restrictions and landuse limitations associated with a stewardship option upfront and as soon as possible in the negotiation process, to avoid disagreement later.

"Keen-bean Karen"

This landowner was exceptionally willing to enter into a formal commitment with CapeNature at the highest level (i.e. Contract Nature Reserve) regarding her land. However, the conservation value of the land did not warrant such stringent status, which was a great disappointment to the landowner. It then becomes a challenge to keep such landowners motivated to continue conservation efforts when they do not qualify for incentives or dedicated assistance due to the low biodiversity value of the property.

Lessons:

- 1.) Don't raise landowners' expectations about which stewardship status the property might be awarded until site assessment and review process is complete. Make it very clear that willingness to conserve is not the only requirement - the biodiversity value of the land is the determining factor.
- 2.) Do not rely on maps and the outcomes of systematic conservation plans only in determining whether a property falls into priority area for conservation. Nothing beats ground-truthing and observation in the field.

“Vasbyt Fanie”

The property in this example belonged to a family trust, which meant that complete consensus was required among all trust members before a stewardship agreement could be pursued. This took a long time to attain, as not all family members were in the same geographic location and a decision could only be made once the all members were assembled for a meeting. The key to unlocking the commitment of some of the more reticent and skeptical trust members was the highlighting that their previous investment into keeping the property cleared of aliens etc. would not be wasted. Rather, entering into a stewardship contract would secure the money previously spent by preventing someone else (or future family members) radically altering land use or allowing the aliens to grow back.

Lessons:

- 1.) Be persistent! Keep attempting to unlock landowner commitment, despite initial resistance or family trust politics.
- 2.) Use influential allies in the community (i.e. another “converted” neighbour) to persuade them to consider stewardship commitment & other creative tactics.
- 3.) To put the more skeptical landowners at ease stress the retention of their landowner rights & privacy.

“Professional Peter”

This landowner is not a typical farmer who wants to casually chat at length over coffee or a drink. He wants to be treated with business-like professionalism and efficiency. The key to unlocking his commitment was delivering very prompt follow-up on a query for practical assistance. The promptness of the follow-up by the extension officer concerned made the landowner see that he could take the conservation agency seriously, which established the important ingredient of credibility.

Lessons:

- 1.) Different strokes for different folks! - do not assume a stereotypical response from all farmers or presume that every landowner wants to be handled in the same way.
- 2.) Avoid busy farming seasons & paydays when trying to set appointments to see a landowner, as this shows unprofessionalism.

“Demanding Dawie”

Dawie does not farm commercially on his property but has had it as a Private Nature Reserve (under the old WCNCB ordinance) for a number of years. Since hearing about the stewardship options, this landowner has wanted the highest stewardship status for his property - or nothing else! In this regard, he became very demanding and rude with CapeNature staff to try and persuade them to grant the contract reserve status. The snag is that the biodiversity value of the land does not warrant the highest level of protection and associated landowner benefits. It is also apparent that he is mainly after the rates exclusion incentive only available to Contract Nature Reserves and any immediate financial advantage that can be made from keeping the property under conservation. Contract NR status or nothing!

Lessons:

- 1.) Don't be bullied into a contract by forceful personalities!
- 2.) Discern the real motive behind why the landowner is interested in entering into a stewardship agreement - a sincere desire to conserve or to leverage other personal interests or business plans.
- 3.) Maintain professional approach at all times despite opposition from the landowner.

Conclusion

Stewardship is not an overnight process - getting someone to sign on the dotted line for setting their land aside for conservation in perpetuity can involve many meetings and lengthy interactions. Due to the long-term implications of the commitment involved both from the landowner and conservation agency, it is important not to rush the process. It is better to have a few secured sites in places that count and meet conservation priority targets, than many hastily entered into agreements that are either legally flawed or not located in the priority areas for conservation.

From the lessons and examples quoted above, it is hopefully been made clear that there are many different personalities, needs and motives that can be encountered while implementing stewardship. The issues which arise are not always predictable and the process does not always proceed like clockwork. Therefore the implementation process must always remain somewhat flexible in order to cater for the people-centered nature of stewardship - after all it is people who inhabit the landscape who have the biggest impact on the use and conservation of the land and the ecosystems we are trying to conserve.

Challenges:

Two of the major challenges which exist at the close of the pilot phase of the Stewardship Programme and which need to be addressed to ensure the successful expansion of the Stewardship Programme into the future include:

- 1.) **Sufficient institutional capacity** to implement, audit and provide professional extension services to stewardship sites through skilled and **adequate human resources** (i.e. enough "feet on the ground" with the right people skills). Many more extension officers are required who can be dedicated to stewardship full-time and not have to use valuable extension time for permit administration and law enforcement - this could rather be allocated to inexperienced administration personnel.
- 2.) The ability of the institution or conservation agency to **honour commitments** made to landowners in terms of direct assistance and management interventions, considering the long-term nature of some of the stewardship contracts.