

# CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** Conservation Management Services

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** Providing Guidelines for Game Fencing in the Gouritz Initiative Rooiberg-Gamkaberg to Outeniqua Nature Reserves Corridor

**Implementation Partners for This Project:**

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** February 1, 2006 – March 30, 2006

**Date of Report (month/year):** 13 June 2006

## II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The project was completed during the last week of May 2006 and a final technical report was given to the Gouritz Initiative (GI) coordinator on the 31<sup>st</sup> May 2006.

## III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS

### 1. What was the initial objective of this project?

The original objective was to inform the GI with respect to corridor development between provincial nature reserves within the GI megareserve complex. The specific information required revolved around large rare mammals (Cape mountain zebra and leopard) and the creation of links across private land that these (and other) animals could use to get from one reserve to another to further the genetic and ecological interests of metapopulations.

Specific objectives were:

- a) Determine the best and critical routes for links.
- b) Determine potential for larger wildlife within these links.
- c) Design game-fenced boundary specifications, routes for fences and prioritise areas for corridor establishment.

### 2. Did the objectives of your project change during implementation? If so, please explain why and how.

The objectives did not change.

### 3. How was your project successful in achieving the expected objectives?

Firstly, it was possible to submit a workable corridor plan to the GI staff. This provides a clear focus for them, as it identifies the "critical" landowners in terms of

the necessary corridor development, and they can now proceed with their negotiations without wasting time and money on areas of secondary importance.

Secondly, with a clear corridor (route) plan, it was possible to focus on broad habitat evaluation and come up with a list of game species that can be considered for implementation within the corridor. These guidelines are critical because without them, landowners may introduce extralimital game that may be problematic in terms of negative habitat impact or that may compete with historically indigenous wildlife species.

Thirdly, while investigating the best routes for game fencing, further areas were identified for inclusion within the bigger corridor. By their inclusion, and hopefully the subsequent enlargement of the Gamka Reserve, it will be possible to reduce the overall cost of game fencing around the corridor area. The GI staff can now include these “new” areas in the programme of negotiations with important corridor landowners.

Lastly, during the fieldwork, I identified some key landowners who were clearly unhappy about proposed partnerships with the conservation authority. This was reported to the GI staff who then arranged for a meeting to discuss the plans for corridor development with one of the landowners.

**4. Did your team experience any disappointments or failures during implementation? If so, please explain and comment on how the team addressed these disappointments and/or failures.**

No disappointments or failures were encountered. As with all projects of this nature, it would have been excellent to continue with corridor development investigation beyond the area of the brief, once I got going. This would, however, have been beyond the brief and funding of the brief.

**5. Describe any positive or negative lessons learned from this project that would be useful to share with other organizations interested in implementing a similar project.**

In general:

- First talk to landowners before earmarking their land for important corridor links. One or two public meetings are not enough, numerous personal visits and field visits are necessary to build trust and achieve co-operation. Only once the confidence of all landowners has been gained, should one start with the specifics of corridor design.
- Work on “benefits” to the landowner before raising the possibility of including private land in any kind of conservation initiative. The practical aspects of partnerships should be well considered prior to negotiations. Although my brief did not include negotiating with landowners, I did find myself unavoidably involved. The GI staff do not have clear answers to typical questions about contracts, game ownership in an open system, who will be entitled to what and the legal implications.

**6. Describe any follow-up activities related to this project.**

Guidelines for corridor development were provided for a specific study area. This project should continue to include the other parts of the corridor development area. This will, however, have to be done as separately funded, further projects.

The GI staff must now continue with negotiations with the landowners. In cases where key landowners will not co-operate, purchase of the land should be investigated in order to secure the corridors. (See recommendations in the attached technical report).

Game-fencing requirements are an important product of this project and Cape nature and the GI staff must now commence with planning the corridor boundary fence construction and funding.

**7. Please provide any additional information to assist CEPF in understanding any other aspects of your completed project.**

- A. The completed project is one of a number of very similar projects that need to be done in order to establish the required corridor links across private land.
- B. Ecological corridor design for biodiversity, the potential for larger wildlife (ie: on private game farms within the corridor area) and game-proof boundary fencing (specifications and routes) are all inextricably linked in the Gamka study area. Game-farming is an ever increasingly popular land use in the area and already fenced game farms play a pivotal role in corridor design in this case.

<b>IV. ADDITIONAL FUNDING</b>
-------------------------------

*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.)

**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.**

No additional funds were required or acquired for the completion of this project. Additional funding will, however, be required to enable similar guideline studies in the other parts of the Gamka corridor area. The work must continue if the objective of linking Gamka Mountain Nature Reserve to the Attakwaskloof Reserve (to the south) and to the Rooiberg Nature Reserve (to the west) and to the Swartberg Nature Reserve (to the north) is to be achieved. These are primary Gouritz Initiative objectives.

For this corridor project to continue, additional funding will have to be motivated by the GI office as a matter of urgency.

#### **V. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The final technical report is attached. The main corridor planning maps have not been included, as only hard copies in A2 size were prepared. The GI office intends having the maps digitized shortly, after which they can be forwarded by e-mail to the CEPF.

#### **VI. 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](http://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 ✓  
No

If yes, please also complete the following:

**For more information about this project, please contact:**

**Name:** Ken Coetzee  
**Mailing address:** 4 Chestnut Street, Heather Park, George, 6529  
**Tel:** 044 - 8708472  
**Fax:** 044 - 8708472  
**E-mail:** ConsKen@cybertrade.co.za



**KEN COETZEE  
GAMKA CORRIDOR PROJECT MANAGER**