

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Namib Desert Environmental Education Trust

Project Title: Environmental Education Program for The Succulent Karoo Hotspot in Namibia: Phase 1 - Program Development

Implementation Partners for This Project: Partners consulted in this project include: Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Brown Hyena Project, NamDeb and the Namibian Environmental Education Network.

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): Jan-01-2005-Apr-30-2005

Date of Report (month/year): May 2005

II. OPENING REMARKS

This project aimed to build the capacity to implement an environmental education programme in the Succulent Karoo. The project achieved the following:
Nine environmental education (EE) projects with four varying participant groups were developed that can be implemented in the Succulent Karoo Buffer Zone. The project also established what basic infrastructural and staff requirements are needed to implement these different EE projects. These EE projects were developed within the framework of a guiding document that lays out a vision, aims, objectives, principles and values. Lastly, this project identified the various hurdles of implementing an EE programme in Lüderitz and attempted to find some solutions to them. Lastly, it is hoped that an appropriate local stakeholder may in the future implement the EE programmes developed in this project.

III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS

1. What was the initial objective of this project?

The initial objective of this project was to create the guidelines, strategy, programme activities and desired outcomes for the implementation phase for an EE programme in the Succulent Karoo. This project was to be a building block.

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

WHY THE PROJECT CHANGED

The objectives of the project changed only a few weeks into the project due to two main reasons. Firstly NaDEET experienced an unexpected loss of staff that could not be replaced within in the project period. Secondly output 1's outcome was not as expected which required a change of outputs or a premature termination of the project. As NaDEET had already put a lot of energy and time into the project, it was felt that terminating the project was not appropriate. In addition, NaDEET saw the huge potential for an EE project in the Succulent Karoo and wanted to help initiate such developments to the best of its abilities. It was clear to NaDEET that we would not put in a further proposal for implementation (output 11) because we did not see a way for us to overcome the newly developed hurdles. We did feel that perhaps there would be other stakeholders that are in Lüderitz that could successfully implement an EE programme. NaDEET

therefore continued to develop the programme and looked for a new implementer which became an additional output.

HOW THE PROJECT CHANGED

The project had to take a step backward and first research the actual feasibility of the EE programme before the other outputs could take place. Funds originally allocated for outputs 8-11 were therefore reallocated to two new, closely linked outputs. They are:

- Establish the feasibility of the project (output a)
- Identify a truly local partner who could implement the project (output b)

Outputs 6, 8-11 were not longer viable within this project and were not completed.

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

With the shift in the project focus, the most resources were put into these two new objectives. A brief description of the outcome of each output below:

Output 1 became outputs a and b.

I. Output a- Establish the feasibility of the project

This project needs to overcome two constraints in order to be feasible: locating a qualified, dedicated environmental educator and securing suitable housing. During the project's research, NaDEET was unable to positively confirm that there were local environmental educators qualified for the job. Therefore one would need to be sourced from elsewhere in Namibia. This person (and family) would need to be able to have access to housing. Again, according to the research NaDEET conducted, there is no rental market for flats/ houses in Lüderitz and there is actually a major shortage in housing. As previously stated, a local person who already has housing would not be qualified to implement the recommended programme developed in output 3 and would need not only training but also more education. NaDEET feels that this would be outside of the realms of the EE programme's objectives.

II. Output b- Identify a truly local partner who could implement the project

After consultations with several stakeholders, the most appropriate local stakeholder who could perhaps implement this project would be NamDeb. It was established that the local NamDeb office in Lüderitz had renovated an old building from the ghost town, Kolmanskop, together with the local Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) and Raleigh International. The renovated building was to be an "Environmental Centre" with two main purposes:

- a Southern base camp for Raleigh International for 3-4 months of the year
- a place for environmental learning (no other specifics had been decided)

It was not to be a full time environmental education center but some kind of programmes should be offered according to the developing partners. The Environmental Centre was still under construction but should be finished in August this year. For NaDEET this seemed like an ideal project to link up with for a Succulent Karoo EE programme.

As NamDeb has control over the majority of the Succulent Karoo area (until it is National Park) and has considerable economic influence in the surrounding towns it would have perhaps been able to overcome the housing and staff problems mentioned previously. Within the project period, NaDEET did not finalise any agreements with NamDeb. NaDEET could not find any other appropriate party who was able to take on the implementation of any EE programme.

III. Output 2: Development of Guiding Document for EE Programme

This was done successfully. See Appendix 1 for Guiding Document (PDF).

IV. Output 3: Identification and development of programme components

This was done successfully. A draft document was developed with possible ideas and was discussed with various stakeholders in Lüderitz in meetings and via email. The actual implementing party would need to select programme components to be followed through. See Appendix 2 document for “Succulent Karoo Environmental Education Project Activities” table (PDF).

V. Output 4: Identification and development of expected programme outcomes

This was done successfully in conjunction with output 3. See Appendix 2 (PDF).

VI. Output 5: Identification of staff and infrastructure required

Depending on which projects were to be implemented there would need to be 1-2 full time environmental education staff. Some activities would be outsourced to specialists in that field but overseen by the environmental education staff. A fully equipped project office and vehicle would be needed to implement the project. A detailed analysis was not done due the new objectives outlined above. See Appendix 3 (PDF).

VII. Output 6: Development of work plan for implementation of EE Programme

Not achieved due to new objectives outlined above.

VIII. Output 7: Review of steps 1-6 with relevant stakeholders

This was done throughout the development process as outlined above.

IX. Output 8: Secure support from stakeholders

Not achieved due to new objectives outlined above.

X. Output 9: Revision and finalization of work plan

Not achieved due to new objectives outlined above

XI. Output 10: Development of budget

Not achieved due to new objectives outlined above

XII. Output 11: Development of full proposal for submission to CEPF for funding

Not achieved due to new objectives outlined above

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.

The beginning of the project was extremely disappointing as NaDEET experienced a sudden loss of staff. The NaDEET Team tried to work with the situation and to make the best of it.

The end of the project was also uneventful, as NaDEET had hoped to secure a new, more appropriate implementer for this project.

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. One of the main lessons-learned from this project is that although NaDEET has the expertise to develop and implement this project we do not have human or financial resources to follow it through. As a small NGO that has started up only 2 ½ years ago, we do not have the management capacity to administer a whole another separate project that is 350 km away from our base. We had started this project with unrealistic expectations.

With the change of the project outputs, the time period originally asked for was also not enough. An extension was not requested as it was felt that the outcomes of the other outputs were indicative enough that a phase two was not viable under present conditions.

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

Based on the development phase there are 1-2 projects that NaDEET would like to implement in the future if time and staff constraints allow. These are mostly the material development activities for teachers and learners. As these projects are quite small financially and in scope, funding would be sought through the Namibia Nature Foundation's Succulent Karoo grant recently established with CEPF.

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

N/A

IV. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

N/A

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.

V. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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, 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: Viktoria Keding

Mailing address: PO Box 31017 PioniersPark, Windhoek, Namibia

Tel: 063-693012

Fax: 063-693012

E-mail: nadeet@iway.na