

# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** World Wide Fund for Nature-South Africa

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** *Land Conservation Facilitation for Leslie Hill Succulent Karoo Trust*

**Implementation Partners for this Project:** Wilderness Foundation

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** August 1, 2007 - December 31, 2008

**Date of Report (month/year):** 1 March 2009

## II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The Leslie Hill Succulent Karoo Trust (LHSKT) has provided significant funding over the years to secure important biodiversity rich properties across the Succulent Karoo. The Trust has largely contributed to the consolidation of existing protected areas but has also been instrumental in developing new ones including the soon to be declared Knersvlakte Nature Reserve and the Namaqua National Park.

In late 2007 WWF-SA secured funding from the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund to help assist the organization in utilizing the LHSKT funds more effectively. The Trust is a separate body which has substantial resources for land acquisition in the Succulent Karoo. In accordance with its trust deed funds can only be provided to WWF-SA in order to purchase land. WWF thus purchases land using approved Trust funds and manage the entire acquisition process. WWF has to date relied on statutory conservation bodies such as CapeNature and SANParks to highlight properties for purchase and ensure the necessary management of any land purchased with resources provided by the Trust. Increasingly, the ability of such bodies to take on the management of additional land has been reduced to the extent that the Trust was receiving fewer applications from these bodies with most applications on an ad hoc basis with little forward planning. The Trust can only provide funds for land purchase and not for management, and has limited resources to investigate alternative models of securing land through acquisition or to prepare specific property deals for the Trust's consideration.

In 2006 the Trust commissioned a Land Acquisition Strategy which was completed by Dr Philip Desmet along with stakeholder input. The strategy identifies a number of priority areas in the Succulent Karoo which present opportunities for the expansion of conservation areas. The CEPF funding enabled WWF to contract additional support from the Wilderness Foundation in the form of Matthew Norval to assist in further refining and implementing the recommendations from the Land Acquisition Strategy.

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

***Project Purpose:*** Opportunities and mechanisms for land acquisition to expand protected areas in the Succulent Karoo biome are identified and implemented.

### Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b> <i>1. Clear implementation plan with land acquisition options and legal framework for effective management alternatives in place for all of the priority areas identified by the Desmet report by December 2008.</i>	There is a clear implementation plan for all of the areas identified in the Desmet report. Options for acquisition are clearly outlined and a process for approaching those acquisitions put in place. Management options remain vested with statutory bodies.

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

The project largely achieved its intended objectives with the exception of developing very clear way forward with regards alternative management arrangements for properties, particularly with communal land. Alternative management options have been explored but the time frame of this project and the nature of the properties secured did not allow for much deviation from the standard management arrangements with the three conservation agencies. There are however opportunities that could be looked at and these include potential partnerships with communities and neighbours in Namaqualand and Bushmanland.

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

No

### IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

**Project Outputs:**

### Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Output 1: Establish legal / institutional constraints and opportunities and legal options for securing land in at least 4 areas identified through the 2006 Philip Desmet report entitled "A Strategic Land Acquisition Policy for the Leslie Hill Succulent Karoo Trust".</b>	<p><b>Focus on Gouritz Initiative (Little Karoo), Tankwa NP, Kamiesberg/Namaqua NP and Goegap NR.</b></p> <p><u>Little Karoo:</u> At project inception there was some concern from the Trustees regarding focus on the Little Karoo since Leslie Hill himself had indicated that he felt that the area had received sufficient attention. However the Desmet report specifically mentioned this area as one providing many opportunities for consolidating existing reserves. In addition the region also faces considerable and immediate threats regarding land use and opportunities may well be lost if not immediately capitalized on. This is in contrast to northern Namaqualand where land use is relatively stable. WWF therefore deemed it prudent to focus on this area in order not to lose key properties.</p> <p><u>Tankwa:</u> Desmet also prioritized this as an area of expansion, particularly eastward. The project aimed to provide additional support to SANParks to further the expansion of the Tankwa NP to capture both unique succulent</p>

	<p>diversity and to improve management effectiveness.</p> <p><u>Central Namaqualand:</u> The focus here was to engage SANParks on their expansion plans for the Namaqua National Park to use LHSKT resources strategically. While the area has enjoyed considerable support from the Trust there remain opportunities to conserve succulent vegetation units not yet within protected areas. As the park has expanded at a rapid rate consideration also needs to be given to the purchase of key properties in order to improve management effectiveness.</p> <p><u>Northern Namaqualand:</u> The eastward expansion of Goegap NR is identified in the Land Acquisition Strategy as a priority area. As it has not benefited much from the Trust in the past the project provided support to the Northern Cape provincial Department of Tourism, Environment and Conservation (DTEC) to determine potential expansion areas and to conclude some initial purchases. Many opportunities exist and will require ongoing attention in order to adequately conserve the unique features of this landscape.</p> <p>The Kamiesberg/Namaqua NP areas as well as Tankwa NP fall under the management of SANParks and sufficient institutional capacity exists for them to have made use of LHSKT funds on a regular basis. The additional resources provided through this project focused on working with the management and expansion staff in setting priority purchases within the broader expansion footprint and to facilitate closer collaboration between SANParks and DTEC especially in the potential development of corridors/stewardship arrangements between the Namaqua NP and Goegap NR.</p> <p>CapeNature has benefited sporadically in the past from LHSKT funding but progress with securing a number of key properties seemed to have stalled for a number of reasons including the changing land market which caused considerable price increases as well as some local uncertainty over the purchase criteria of the Trust. For this reason it was necessary to reassess priorities and approaches. The project played a key role in unlocking internal bottlenecks within CapeNature and increasing the co-ordination of expansion activities. This was addressed by working together with the local management team and this resulted in a number of applications being submitted to the Trust for consideration.</p> <p>In Northern Namaqualand DTEC was supported with a view to expanding the Goegap Nature Reserve, close to Springbok, which has not increased in size for over 18 years. A short and medium term expansion plan was developed for the reserve and the management team now also has a better idea of their expansion options and further applications to the Trust should be forthcoming.</p> <p><b>The need for a balance between short term/immediate requirements and long term planning will remain a challenge</b></p> <p>There will always be some degree of tension between developing and meeting the strategic objectives of the Trust and being opportunistic with regard to key properties that become available. In all of the four priority areas there were important properties that could have been acquired already but inertia and poor coordination within the agencies prevented this</p>
--	---

from happening. More recently, once these more obvious properties (high biodiversity and/or strategic value and mostly adjoining existing reserves) were identified the approach was to support the agencies to complete the application process and to begin negotiations with the owners. Thereafter attention was given to assisting the agencies to think about their medium and long term expansion plans in order to limit ad hoc applications and to determine more realistic budgets and operational management requirements. As expansion plans become more comprehensive and as acquisition progresses opportunistic purchases will be reduced. Some of the tension between the agencies and the Trustees regarding price could be as a result of this phase in the acquisition process and this makes it vital for the Trustees to be well briefed on the expansion plans in the priority areas so that progress can be made.

**Institutional constraints are largely related to operational budgets required to manage expanding PA's**

Since the resources of the LHSKT are finite, the Trustees would ideally like to see the Trust make small catalytic contributions that lever larger co-finance support from other sources. Unfortunately, funding for land acquisition is always challenging and of the three agencies that are receiving support only SANParks is in a position to co-finance any land acquisitions. The provincial conservation agencies are often cash strapped with steadily decreasing budgets to manage increasing conservation areas. This situation is unlikely to change in the medium term and it would be unrealistic to expect DTEC and CapeNature to acquire land under the present circumstances and at best they should be supported to ensure that sufficient operational budgets are allocated to ensure that the additional land acquired is well managed.

These two agencies (and to a lesser extent SANParks) would benefit from the allocation of a proportional operational budget when acquiring new properties to kick start management activities (e.g. internal fence removal and alien vegetation removal). If this could be possible it would greatly enhance the contribution that newly acquired properties make to the protected area as a whole.

**The statutory agencies remain the logical option for securing land**

Alternative management options have been explored but the time frame of this project and the nature of the properties secured did not allow for much deviation from the standard management arrangements with the three conservation agencies. There are however opportunities that could be looked at and these include potential partnerships with communities and neighbours in Namaqualand and Bushmanland.

**Bushmanland should be given special attention as an emerging new national park.**

Bushmanland was specifically mentioned in the Land Acquisition Strategy and considerable conservation planning work has already been carried out by the Botanical Society of SA as part of their Bushmanland Conservation Initiative. In discussions with Mark Botha (Botanical Society of SA), Mike Knight, Giel de Kock and Steve Holness (SANParks) and others this area was highlighted as one requiring a more structured approach. In a parallel

	<p>process SANParks and DTEC held discussions around jurisdiction and there is consensus that the development of this park needs to proceed with the support of both these agencies. Furthermore SANParks has made a commitment at a board level that every effort will be made to create a new national park in the Bushmanland region. To support this process some of the CEPF funds have been allocated for a study to determine land ownership and recent transactions within the footprint of the proposed conservation area in order to allow SANParks to make informed decisions regarding the consolidation and acquisition options in this area. This task has not yet been concluded but will be made available to SANParks as soon as possible.</p> <p><b>Legal: Further thinking is needed on land swaps; title deed restriction and resale as well as alternative management options.</b></p> <p>Many potential acquisitions are complicated by the current owner wishing to continue with farming activities elsewhere and considerable funding could be saved if this could be facilitated. In other circumstances the subdivision and resale (or sale of individual titles) of property bought as part of a larger transaction but not required for conservation could also generate additional funding which could be used to finance key property purchases. While the statutory agencies remain the logical option to secure effective land management on properties purchased further thinking needs to be developed on alternative land management options. From initial planning work carried out in the Bushmanland area it is apparent that some of the landowners in the planning domain would be amenable to manage neighboring properties especially when this would be beneficial for existing commercial tourism and conservation related activities. This would require the development of management contracts which cover issues related to liability and auditing.</p> <p><b>Tax incentives</b></p> <p>Thanks again to the Botanical Society considerable progress has been made in this field that now allows private landowners that formally manage land for conservation purposes to benefit substantially from a suite of tax incentives. This innovation can also be used as a means to encourage private landowners that might not want to sell to contribute to the broader expansion footprint in critical biodiversity areas. The potential for privately owned conservation land to qualify for tax incentives also raises the potential for 'revolving' land purchase whereby important properties are bought, declared as reserves and then resold with title deed restrictions. The new owners are then in a position to qualify for the incentives and the funds recouped through the sale can then be used elsewhere. This could be particularly attractive not only in building protected areas that include a range of state and private land but also for property 'islands' that do not offer opportunities for linkages to existing protected areas.</p>
<b>1.1. Clear procedures with relevant institutions and legal options are outlined for land acquisition and management for 4</b>	<b>Improvement to the process for approving funding applications</b>  In the past, applications were sent to the LHSKT via WWF in an ad hoc manner with no specific application format. In early 2007, WWF developed a basic application form, but during the course of the project it became clear that the funding application process should be further refined to ensure that applicants provided more detailed economic valuations for the

<p><i>areas identified by the Desmet report by December 2008</i></p>	<p>properties sought. In addition the Trustees felt that more consideration should be given to the question of social safeguards during the application process. The application form has subsequently been revised to reflect these aspects</p> <p><b>Coordination</b></p> <p>It is recommended that all acquisition activities are coordinated from a single focal point within WWF that includes the responsibility for interacting with the conservation agencies and individual landowners as required.</p> <p>In the application process reference is made to the role of a WWF Land Consolidation representative. At this stage this position does not exist but there would be value in having such a person who could play a coordination function for the LHSKT as well as for WWF with regard to all land consolidation.</p> <p><b>Negotiations</b></p> <p>It is always preferable for the agencies requesting funding to conclude their own negotiations as they often have an existing relationship with the landowner and furthermore will ultimately be responsible to manage the land and the associated infrastructure. When this capacity does not exist the WWF focal point will be responsible for appointing a suitable negotiator.</p> <p><b>Follow up on declaration and management</b></p> <p>During the application process the agencies make a commitment to ensuring that the newly acquired properties are appropriately declared and managed as protected areas. Much emphasis is placed on what will happen to the land once acquired but at this stage there is no follow up to verify this commitment. While there is no evidence to indicate that this is not taking place, a final report by the agencies should conclude the acquisition process.</p> <p><b>Collaboration between agencies and other role players</b></p> <p>Activities in the Succulent Karoo remain uncoordinated and a joint planning exercise with the conservation agencies and NGO's is recommended. The conservation sector needs to agree on what is required before engaging with other role-players. This will reduce confusion and improve effectiveness. The progress and challenges applicable to the Knersvlakte should be included in this discussion to ensure the integration of efforts.</p> <p><b>Operational budgets</b></p> <p>Proportional operational budgets (e.g 5% to 10% of purchase price depending on needs) should be allocated to the conservation management agencies when acquiring new properties to kick start management activities (e.g. internal fence removal and alien vegetation removal). This principle could also apply should properties be managed by communities in future which would then promote local employment opportunities.</p> <p><b>Land price evaluations</b></p> <p>The economic valuation for the properties identified by the agencies for</p>
--	--

	<p>purchase represents an important component of the application process and more often than not signifies the point at which the Trustees decline an application. The Trustees will increasingly be faced with difficult decisions where the asking price significantly differs from the valuation and yet the conservation argument is compelling. There are cases where the asking price is below the valuation and even then prices raise questions. There is also some pressure on the agencies to submit accurate applications with all the necessary arguments presented. The recommendation is that land price valuations and agricultural potential evaluations should be seen as a guide to both the Trust and the parties involved in negotiating the sale but that sound conservation arguments taking a long term view should prevail.</p> <p><b>Social components</b></p> <p>It has been reported that the land acquisition activities supported by the LHSKT have the potential to negatively impact on the lives of people either living on the properties or seeing them as part of the land reform process. To ensure that this does not take place the recommendation is twofold. The Trust (through the WWF focal point) should immediately engage with the land reform process through SKEP to develop complimentary processes. In addition the agencies that submit funding proposal should be made aware that applications should seriously consider any negative implications for local people.</p>
<b>Output 2: Identify properties, appropriate prices to be paid and opportunities to partner with appropriate persons or entities. Facilitate the completion of biodiversity site assessments for all these properties.</b>	<p>This output has already been covered to some degree earlier. Key properties were identified in the four priority areas in collaboration with the relevant agencies. Biodiversity assessments and valuations were carried out as required and applications submitted to the trust for funding.</p> <p>After approval by the Trust, negotiations for two portions of Ratelkraal adjoining the Reserve in the north east were concluded. This expands the reserve by a further 8870 hectares.</p>
<b>2.1. Site assessments including property purchase value and biodiversity value completed for at least 8 key properties by December 2008.</b>	Biodiversity assessments completed for 4 properties in Little Karoo, 2 in Namaqualand and for 2 properties in Goegap. Economic assessments completed for 4 properties in Little Karoo and properties in Namaqualand.
<b>2.2. Agreements in place with appropriate institutions or entities to manage these properties by December 2008</b>	Agreement in place with Cape Nature for management of Little Karoo properties (when purchase concluded) and agreement in place with DTEC re Goegap properties.
<b>Output 3: Identify and where possible secure legal declaration and management arrangements. Develop a clear proposal and process for conserving each area identified in the Trust's land acquisition strategy and an implementation schedule.</b>	All of the properties purchased during the course of this project have been for the expansion of existing protected areas. The agencies responsible for the future management of the land all provided written undertakings to declare the new properties as protected areas and to manage them appropriately. This undertaking is submitted as part of the application process and it would be worthwhile to have a follow up procedure to confirm that these steps have in fact been carried out.

<p><b>3.1. Implementation schedule with a clear proposal and process for conserving each area identified in the Desmet report completed by December 2008.</b></p>	<p>The Land Acquisition Strategy should be reviewed every 5 years (next review 2011) and with this in mind recommendations made are in the short and medium term as fine scale plans remain outstanding for three priority areas which will influence the focus of the Trust once they are available.</p> <p><b>Steytlerville Karoo ( Springbokvlakte)</b></p> <p>The opportunity to secure this property for conservation was lost in 2004 when it was sold to a neighbouring farmer and it is presently used for livestock grazing. As it is an important property the trust should consider purchasing it should it come on the market again in the future. With the change in ownership it would be worthwhile to have the WWF focal point make contact with the new owners to try and secure future purchase options should these arise.</p> <p><i>Short term action: WWF focal point to make contact with the new owners.</i></p> <p><b>Little Karoo</b></p> <p>Gouritz River corridor</p> <p>Various opportunities have been identified but as already mentioned these exceed the budget made available for the area and some of the properties have been withdrawn from the market. CapeNature is in negotiation with the owners of the property known as Aardvark and an outcome is imminent.</p> <p><i>Short term action: Trustees to indicate final ceiling for acquisition in the area. CapeNature to conclude negotiations currently underway and then review their options and prepare applications to the LHSKT.</i></p> <p><i>Medium term action: CapeNature to commit to the regular review of their expansion plan and to keep the Trust informed.</i></p> <p>Springfontein</p> <p>This property is considered to be of exceptionally high biodiversity value and has been earmarked for purchase for some time. Mr Hill himself visited the property and was of the view that it should be secured if at all possible. Several attempts have been made to honor this wish but negotiations with the owners have to date been unsuccessful. It is recommended that the Trust addresses a formal letter to the owner to ascertain if the property is in fact for sale at this time. If it is not, then the trust can request the owner to inform them if the situation changes thereby avoiding the current impasse. Contact between the owner and the Trust should be through WWF.</p> <p><i>Short term action: WWF focal point to correspond with the owner confirming interest to purchase and indicating communication channels to avoid confusion.</i></p> <p>Anysberg Nature Reserve</p> <p>A number of properties within the Anysberg expansion footprint have been identified as important to purchase due to their succulent biodiversity significance as well as their proximity to the existing protected area. Recent</p>
---	--

	<p>progress has been hampered due to the difficulty in contacting the owners of high priority properties.</p> <p><i>Short term action: CapeNature to commit to assessing the possibility for further short term acquisition in this area and informing the Trust of the outcome.</i></p> <p><i>Medium term action: CapeNature to commit to the regular review of their expansion plan for the Little Karoo and to keep the Trust informed.</i></p> <p><b>Worcester-Robertson Karoo</b></p> <p>No identification of suitable properties has taken place in this region as the priority areas remain undefined as yet.</p> <p><i>Medium term action: Await the outcomes of the Upper Breede River Valley Fine-Scale Plan and ensure that the area receives attention in the revised Land Acquisition Strategy.</i></p> <p><b>Tankwa-Roggeveld</b></p> <p>Roggeveld escarpment</p> <p>This area has benefitted considerably support from the Trust and a decision needs to be made regarding the level of ongoing support that will be provided.</p> <p><i>Short term action: SANParks to provide the Trust with an updated short and medium term expansion plan and indicate the level of support that could be expected in the future.</i></p> <p><b>Nieuwoudtville-Hantam</b></p> <p>Limited identification of suitable properties has taken place in this region as the priority areas remain undefined as yet.</p> <p><i>Short term action: DTEC to confirm the current availability of the strategically important property at the entrance of Oorlogskloof. If purchase remains an option the Trust should make a formal approach through the WWF focal point.</i></p> <p><b>Knersvlakte</b></p> <p>The ongoing development of the Knersvlakte Reserve remains the objective of this priority area.</p> <p><i>Short term action: CapeNature commits to presenting the Trust with a schedule for the official launch of the reserve to take place within 2009.</i></p> <p><i>Medium term action: The planners and managers responsible for the Knersvlakte Reserve should make input into the revised Land Acquisition Strategy but should also take part in the coordination activities recommended across the biome.</i></p> <p><b>Central Namaqualand</b></p>
--	---

	<p><b>Kamiesberg uplands</b></p> <p>This area holds much potential for expansion including ambitious links with the Namaqua National Park and the CI initiatives underway. Progress with a stewardship framework options under DTEC adds further to the range of options available.</p> <p><i>Short term action: CI, DTEC and SANParks to commit to meet to evaluate the potential for collaboration in this area.</i></p> <p><i>Medium term action: based on the outcomes of this collaboration the parties will submit funding application to the Trust on an ongoing basis.</i></p> <p><b>Namaqua National Park</b></p> <p>Namaqua National Park has benefitted substantially over the years from the Trust and continues to expand as it reaches its full potential. Emerging opportunities include that referred to above and the Kommagas option also discussed earlier. Ongoing applications are to be expected as new areas of succulent diversity and strategic importance become available within the expansion footprint.</p> <p><i>Short term action: SANParks commits to the process outlined above and to generally ensure that conservation actions in the area are well coordinated.</i></p> <p><i>Medium term action: SANParks to provide the Trust with applications on an ongoing basis and to update the Trust on refined expansion plans.</i></p> <p><b>Bushmanland</b></p> <p><b>Bushmanland Inselbergs</b></p> <p>Bushmanland will become an important focus area with the potential to develop into a new national park offering unique opportunities for collaborative management models between SANParks, DTEC, Anglo and local communities.</p> <p><i>Short term action: The study to determine ownership details and transaction records in the park footprint is to be concluded and made available to SANParks for further refinement. SANParks commits to working closely with the WWF focal point to develop a plan for the establishment of the new park. SANParks commits to engaging with the SKEP and DTEC structures to ensure the integration of activities on the ground.</i></p> <p><i>Medium term action: Once the park establishment plan had been agreed to SANParks will submit funding applications on an ongoing basis</i></p> <p><b>Northern Namaqualand</b></p> <p><b>Eastward expansion of Goegap Nature Reserve</b></p> <p>The expansion plan of the Goegap Nature Reserve has been determined and the priority properties for purchase have been identified. It is recommended that that the plan is refined and presented to the trustees for 'in principle' approval. This will enable the reserve management team to initiate discussions with landowners regarding potential sales.</p>
--	--

	<p><i>Short term action: DTEC to present the Trust with a refined expansion plan and a cost estimate. Once in principle approval has been given funding applications will be submitted. In addition DTEC commits to commencing discussions regarding the future management of the portion of Ratelkraal bordering on Concordia.</i></p> <p><i>Medium term action: DTEC will continue to refine the expansion plan and keep the Trust updated and will submit applications as required.</i></p> <p>Fyftienmyleberg/Oorgrabies, Umdaus and Harras</p> <p>This area is broadly identified as a priority in the Land Acquisition Strategy but requires a systematic conservation plan as there are many important areas. Management options are also not obvious and require further investigation.</p> <p><i>Short term action: WWF focal point to liaise with SANParks and DTEC regarding the status of a conservation plan for the area. Based on the outcome of this discussion the agencies are to present the Trust with an intervention plan.</i></p>
<b>Output 4: Establish relationships with the political heads of SanParks, SANBI (through SKEP), Northern Cape DTEC + MEC, CapeNature + MEC and HOD. (WWF has good relationships at the working level of these institutions, but it is necessary to secure political buy-in at the higher levels to secure the necessary resources for management of the lands).</b>	Discussions were held with all of the institutions and individuals as required. The level of awareness and support is generally good but ongoing communication will be required to maintain this. The opportunity for improved coordination amongst all the role players within the conservation sector in Succulent Karoo has been referred to earlier and this will further foster a broader appreciation of the role of the LHSKT.
<b>4.1. Statutory conservation agencies receive suitable resources to manage protected areas expanded through the Leslie Hill funds. Political support for and understanding of the benefits of establishing new protected areas.</b>	The original objective of this output was to ensure that the conservation agencies and provinces allocate adequate budgets that will allow the properties purchased to be well managed. This will require further high level engagement and the operational budgets made available for the provincial agencies in particular needs attention. The development of a new national park in Bushmanland will come under scrutiny from both provincial and national structures and it would be prudent for DTEC and SANParks specifically to promote ongoing understanding and support of this development at this level.
<b>Output 5: Ensure that LHSKT land acquisition occurs in the context of broader conservation action in the Succulent Karoo, especially with regard to SKEP anchor projects and other conservation planning interventions. Part of the outcomes of this project</b>	The work of the LHSKT has been well integrated into the range of conservation activities underway in the Succulent Karoo. The potential for additional corridor development and closer collaboration including stewardship arrangements should also include DTEC and other organizations active in the area.  WWF input into the SKEP Strategic Plan 2009-2014 ensures many objectives shared with the LHSKT Land Acquisition Strategy. Closer liaison between LHSKT with SKEP needs to continually be ensured.  SANParks is a major role-player within the biome and ongoing interaction

<b>will be to highlight any potential negative social impacts of any potential land purchases and put steps in place to avoid any potential adverse impacts on communities.</b>	with SANParks particularly in Namaqualand and Bushmanland has thus far ensured that the LHSKT is seen as part of their broader expansion and development plan in new and existing areas of focus including transfrontier initiatives.
<b>5.1. New land acquisition supports SKEP anchor projects especially Namaqualand Wilderness Initiative, Bushmanland and Knersvlakte.</b>	While Conservation International driven Namaqualand Wilderness Initiative offers potential for land purchase there is a greater need to support incentives for communal land management which at this stage is not feasible as part of the trusts mandate. There are considerable opportunities for further collaboration in this area and communication between CI and SANParks could be improved to ensure a coordination of efforts.  Knersvlakte is already entrenched as a priority for LHSKT and significant strides have been made with Bushmanland as a priority for a new Protected area.
<b>5.2. The Leslie Hill Land Acquisition Strategy is refined and updated through input from other initiatives such as Fine Scale Conservation Plans.</b>	The CEPF funded project allowed for frequent interaction with John Gallo and the reference group that supported the development of his decision support system. This exercise proved extremely useful as it widened the debate of the role of the LHSKT and highlighted a number of challenges that the trustees face in balancing the wise allocation of funds and in securing land for conservation.

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

The project largely achieved its intended objectives with the exception of developing very clear way forward with regards alternative management arrangements for properties, particularly with communal land.

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

Alternative management options have been explored but the time frame of this project and the nature of the properties secured did not allow for much deviation from the standard management arrangements with the three conservation agencies. There are however opportunities that could be looked at and these include potential partnerships with communities and neighbours in Namaqualand and Bushmanland. This has not significantly impacted the project.

## **V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS**

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

**Social Safeguards:** The acquisition of land in the Succulent Karoo as in other parts of South Africa raises a number of socio-economic issues due to the history of dispossession and extreme poverty in the areas in which the Trust is active. The risk of incurring negative impacts as a result of land purchase is twofold. Farm workers resident on the properties often face uncertain futures when the land use changes from agriculture to conservation. The second potential negative impact concerns land purchased for conservation purposes that could have been acquired for land reform purposes. In this case local communities and municipal authorities are immediately at odds with the conservation agencies upon transfer.

The first scenario can largely be mitigated by the agencies playing close attention to the relevant legislation during the negotiation and purchase process. South Africa has excellent legislation to protect the rights of farm dwellers which in many cases supersede the social safeguards required by international donors.

The second scenario will require further collaboration with the land reform process to try and reduce conflict over land use. While not yet fully explored the potential for mutually beneficial partnerships exists between conservation and the land reform imperative. SANBI have initiated a land reform and stewardship engagement and WWF will be engaging further with this process on behalf of LHSKT.

The improved application process itself as well as personal interaction with conservation managers has improved the awareness levels with regard to the possible negative social impact of land acquisition. This can be further improved by not only drawing attention to the relevant legislation to ensure compliance but to encourage the development of creative partnerships that could provide benefits for local communities wherever possible.

## 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.***

The Little Karoo best illustrates the conundrum presented to the Trust as it is facing some serious direct land use threats and property prices will continue to rise beyond what would be considered their reasonable agricultural value. It is within this evolving framework that new conservation areas need to be created whilst being mindful of not paying excessive prices for land or chasing land prices up. Land purchase approaches to landowners need to be carefully managed with agreed mandates held by the negotiation team and agreements need to be concluded as rapidly as possible.

The effectiveness of the Trust in the Little Karoo has been hampered further through prolonged and unfocussed attention on the property known as Springfontein. This property has long been identified as a priority (and is highlighted by Desmet as such) and although approaches were made to the owner it does not appear to actually be for sale. It is unfortunate that this property is being seen as part of the R10m bundle as it effectively excludes the purchase of other available priority properties from being purchased. The Springfontein example also highlights the impact of uncoordinated acquisition activities, the ultimate result being no successful purchases being concluded and the failure to secure areas with high succulent diversity. The Gouritz corridor raises a number of issues regarding the potential impact of the Trust in an area with ever reducing options to acquire properties with high biodiversity values. A limit of R10million has been placed on this area for land purchase and this is unfortunate as this will not even secure the properties that are available for immediate purchase. This does not take into account other properties that should be secured but have not yet been fully investigated.

We are of the opinion that divergent views provided directly or indirectly to the trust have not been constructive and that attempts to pay below market prices for important biodiversity sites have resulted on a number of opportunities having been lost. This is also in part due to different interpretations of how funds can be spent in the priority areas identified (i.e. they do not have to include sites of special biodiversity only but can also contribute to the management effectiveness of existing protected areas).

It should also be noted that while conservation bodies are generally seen to be prepared to pay a premium for land, many landowners also perceive conservation agencies to be less likely to conclude agreements than private individuals. Some of the land owners within the priority areas have had numerous approaches over the years often characterized by poor communication. Landowner unwillingness to enter into further discussions is understandable and raises issues as

to how the LHSKT and WWF should coordinate negotiations to avoid such perceptions. The image of conservation has suffered as a result of this lack of integrity on the part of would be purchasers and this style should be avoided at all cost.

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

The project initially aimed to establish legal options for land management arrangements outside of statutory bodies. However, given that there was no clear community land identified for this possibility, it was unrealistic to expect this as an output given the relatively tight time frames for the project.

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

Slow response times and lack of internal co-ordination within some of the statutory bodies meant delays in actual property identification and purchase.

## **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.***

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Date Received	Notes
LHSKT	C	\$260 000	Nov 08	The resources of the Trust have been used in close alignment with the CEPF funds for this project and leveraged as a direct result
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		

***\*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 LHSKT still has significant resources to invest and WWF has the mandate to ensure that this happens as effectively as possible. WWF will therefore be responsible for implementing the findings of this report and maintaining the momentum that has been generated. As a key partner of the SKEP programme, WWF is committed to ensuring that the resources of the LHSKT are most effectively utilized for the ongoing conservation of the Succulent Karoo. This project has played an important role in assisting WWF to refocus and realign its support to the LHSKT.

### **VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

There is a valid concern amongst the trustees that once a premium price is paid for a property in a particular area this then sets the per hectare rate for properties in the future. Unfortunately property prices have escalated significantly in all of the focus areas and this is due to a range of factors. Evidence suggests that the demand for land by the conservation agencies is not the key driver, although it is certainly a factor. This trend of accelerating land prices is unlikely to be reversed and if land is to be secured for conservation, while there are still options, then it will have to be expected that at times prices paid will exceed the agricultural valuations.

### **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: Thérèse Brinkcate

Organization name: WWF South Africa

Mailing address: Private Bag X2, Die Boord, Stellenbosch, 7613

Tel: +21 888 2836

Fax: +21 888 2888

E-mail: [tbrinkcate@wwf.org.za](mailto:tbrinkcate@wwf.org.za)