

## CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Conservation South Africa
<b>Project Title:</b>	Consolidation of CAPE Conservation Gains: Engaging Agricultural Industries in South Africa
<b>Date of Report:</b>	April 16, 2012
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	H-J Hawkins, +27 21799 8708 (tel); hhawkins@conservation.org

**CEPF Region:** Cape Floristic Region

**Strategic Direction:** Consolidation

**Grant Amount:** \$193,054.00

**Project Dates:** 2008/7/1-2011/12/31

**Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):** The following stakeholders and partners were involved in the development of this proposal and will be involved in implementing this project and/or benefit directly from the CEPF consolidation grant for business engagements in the CFR:

1. C.A.P.E.
2. CapeNature
3. Rooibos Council of South Africa
4. Potatoes South Africa
5. WWF-South Africa
6. Conservation International South African Hotspots Programme
7. Flower Valley Conservation Trust
8. Biodiversity and Wine Initiative (Botanical Society of South Africa)
9. Wilderness Foundation (Citrus Initiative)

All of these partners were invited to partake in a prioritization workshop held on 25 March 2008 hosted by WWF and CI, in order to gather critical input from the initiatives on how they felt that the CEPF grant should be disseminated, in order to achieve sustainability of existing business and biodiversity initiatives in the CFR. Apart from Inge Kotze (BWI), Matthew Norval (Citrus), Lesley Richardon (Flower Valley) and Therese Brinkcate (WWF-SA) who could not attend the meeting, all other stakeholders were present and participated in the workshop. Input on key challenges and needs were received from Inge Kotze (BWI) and Matthew Norval (Citrus) prior to the workshop and this input was included in the prioritization process.

## Conservation Impacts

***Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.***

***Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.***

### **Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal):**

*To promote conservation of the Cape Floristic Region (CFR) critical biodiversity area, by mainstreaming business & biodiversity project guidelines into related industry's agricultural practices.*

#### *Guidelines:*

These guidelines took the form of the "Living Farms Reference", a generic guide based on environmental, social and economic principles and aligned with international good practice guidelines and audit systems, notably the Forestry Stewardship Standard. Nine sector-specific adaptations of the generic Living Farms Reference were made for on-farm use in the following sectors:

1. Sustainable Mohair Industry Production Guide (2010 and 2011 versions)
2. SAB Better Barley Guide (2011)
3. Sustainable Wool Guide (2012 draft)

(Direct adaptations of the Living Farms Reference, i.e. where partnerships were formed between industry and GreenChoice and where all relevant criteria of the Reference were included, written support from GreenChoice with the use of the Green Choice logo)

4. Woolworths Farming for Future (2010)
5. Biodiversity and Citrus Initiative Guide (2010)
6. Red Meat Producers Best Practice Code (2011)
7. Red Meat Biodiversity Initiative Guideline (2011)
8. Right Rooibos Guideline and on-farm Manual (2011)
9. The Protea Growers Manual: Sustainable Nutrition and Irrigation (2011)

(Guides were developed with reference to the Reference, written by industry with all or some criteria of Reference, reviewed by Green Choice, optional use of Green Choice logo)

The guideline was also embedded into two auditing systems for rooibos tea, namely Utz and Rainforest Alliance, where these auditing criteria were developed in a multi-stakeholder process involving Green Choice, industry and farmers.

#### *Education:*

An unintended but beneficial consequence of the Living Farms Reference and its adaptations resulted in Conservation South Africa and Stellenbosch University being able to successfully obtain funding for the project: Sustainable Agriculture in South Africa, which involves the development of a post-graduate curriculum (Masters) as well as a Further Education Training course (FET) for farmers and extension officers in sustainable agriculture. This will be the *first systems based, landscape approach* to sustainable agriculture and is anticipated to have a long-term effect on sustainability in agriculture where extension has collapsed.

#### *Policy:*

Efforts to embed the Living Farms Reference into agricultural policy were begun in 2010 by Green Choice and are now being continued by CSA's Policy and Markets Team at the level of both provincial and national government. This team is attending the governments Natural Resource Management meetings to embed the Reference into the so-called Extension Recovery Programme.

*Monitoring:*

Although not stated as an outcome in the original proposal, it soon became obvious that what all of the Business and Biodiversity Initiatives lacked in order to be consolidated, or to make their business cases, was systematic monitoring or even record keeping. Green Choice developed a monitoring framework via a Logic Model and subsequently a multi-stakeholder process. Ten indicators from the framework (yield, land use efficiency, biodiversity, alien plant removal, soil health, water quantity/quality, livelihoods, toxicity, greenhouse gas footprint, and human wildlife conflict) were developed into implementation tools, namely Record Books, the Farmer Field Book excel tool and most recently a cell phone application called iFarm. The iFarm has not been implemented with users but is in the development stage. The Farmer Field Book and iFarm concepts were introduced to the Citrus Biodiversity Initiative and to the Biodiversity and Red Meat Initiative, where data is being collected. In the case of the former, the initiative lapsed in 2011, but was re-initiated in March 2012. The first data collection from the Red Meat Initiative has been collected for 2012. The Right Rooibos Initiative made use of a software record keeping system called Simpatica, which GreenChoice helped to update with environmental and social indicators in association with Kuit Consultancy. The Right Rooibos farmers used this system but with limited continuity. We intend to re-introduce monitoring and record keeping in the simplified and easily accessible iFarm format in August 2012.

**Targeted Outcomes:** *Biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed into five key industries within the Cape Floristic region. - Biodiversity corridor establishment is aligned and supported through industry level minimisation of impacts on ecological process, pattern and connectivity in a productive, fragmented landscape. - Awareness is raised and capacity built amongst industry, retailers, consumers and conservation organisations, around biodiversity-friendly production & procurement.*

**Actual Progress Towards Long-term Impacts at Completion:**

Biodiversity conservation was mainstreamed into the wine and rooibos industries, where the project resulted in holistic guidelines being fully integrated into industry portfolios (Integrated Production of Wine, and South African Rooibos Council, respectively) and auditing. Project managers for the rooibos initiative has been funded by the industry while the project manager in wine remains funded by WWF-South Africa. Although not a focal group in the proposal, this is also the case for the Ostrich Biodiversity Initiative (Ostrich Business Chamber). In the case of flowers, biodiversity conservation was already a large part of the initiative but has been increased by the development of flower harvesting guides, vulnerability indices for different species of plants and an online auditing system by the Flower Valley Conservation Trust. The Citrus Biodiversity Initiative was already audited by GlobalGap and the project has had little influence on practices to date. The latter initiative has suffered from lack of funding for a project manager, but with some commitment for this to change in 2012 (Southern Fruit Growers). The potato initiative resulted in good practice guidelines being integrated into industry (Potatoes SA) but beyond initial audits of some farmers, this initiative has

lapsed with no funding forthcoming from Potatoes SA for a project manager. Progress has been made incorporating guidelines into other industries (see above) where uptake of these guidelines has been good except in the case of the Red Meat Producers Best Practice Code (Red Meat Producers Organization, pers comm).

**Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal):**

*To sustain and consolidate the early successes of the Cape Floristic Region business & biodiversity initiatives in protecting critical biodiversity and ecosystems and ensuring their sustainability, specifically by leading producer, industry and initiative's engagements.*

**Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:**

A communication platform was maintained throughout the project via webpages ([www.capeaction.org](http://www.capeaction.org); [www.wwf.org.za](http://www.wwf.org.za); [www.conservation.org/southafrica](http://www.conservation.org/southafrica)) where most recently Green Choice is no longer presented on the WWF page. Members of initiatives were exposed to lessons learnt via regular meetings, as well as learning exchanges, with special workshops on particular topics such as monitoring or mapping. Throughout the project, contact was maintained with retailers and industry bodies, which were most played an active role in initiatives, especially in the case of rooibos tea and wine.

**Please provide the following information where relevant:**

**Hectares Protected:** 412 011 ha (under potentially better land management, of which 26 297 ha are under formal land stewardship agreements, Table 1).

**Species Conserved:** not applicable.

**Corridors Created:** Namaqualand Wilderness Initiative (as part of another project but relating to the Red Meat Biodiversity Initiative)

***Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.***

The lack of monitoring systems as part of the Business and Biodiversity Initiatives from the outset made the 'retro-fitting' of monitoring difficult. (Monitoring was the main focus of the CEPF sub-grant use). One aspect of this difficulty was that Green Choice encountered resistance to a new activity which was not mandatory at project outset. In newly formed projects, e.g. the Biodiversity Red Meat Initiative, which CSA initiated, uptake was good. Despite success in monitoring biodiversity through primary GIS research, poor participatory data gathering made it difficult to make a proper business case for the BBIs and thus difficult to completely consolidate socioeconomic and ecosystem service gains.

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

Unexpected positive impacts included the interest from the media and education regarding the tools provided by Green Choice (guidelines and monitoring tools), which took the form of the NICHE-funded Sustainable Agriculture curriculum project in collaboration with the Stellenbosch University in the Western Cape of SA, and Wageningen University of the Netherlands.

**Table 1.** Summary of progress towards Green Choice’s conservation targets, per Business and Biodiversity Initiative in the Cape Floristic Region, and collectively.

No.	Conservation Target	Flower	Potato	Rooibos	Wine	Total (ha)
1	300,000 ha under better land management/reduced threat	30,597	82,776	94,148	204,490	<b>412,011</b>
2	80,000 ha critical biodiversity areas under better land management/reduced threat	20,031	25,141	22,810	59,309	<b>127,292</b>
3	30,000 ha conserved through stewardship agreements	950	2,049	3,405	19,894	<b>26,297</b>
4	50% of sector footprint join sustainable farming initiatives	-	24%	31%	13%	<b>23%</b> (average)
4a	(BBI crop footprint)	-	10,998	24,363	22,522	<b>57,883</b>
4b	(Total estimated industry footprint)	-	44,945	79,118	173,703	<b>297,766</b>

### Project Components

**Project Components:** *Please report on results by project component. Reporting should reference specific products/deliverables from the approved project design and other relevant information.*

**Component 1 Planned:**

Existing biodiversity and agricultural initiatives in the CFR region are supported to consolidate conservation outcomes.

**Component 1 Actual at Completion:**

Biodiversity gains of the existing biodiversity and agricultural initiatives in the CFR were consolidated (see the three reports: “Contribution of C.A.P.E. Business and Biodiversity Initiatives to conservation of critical biodiversity, landscape connectivity and ecological support areas:

2010 Baseline report; Contribution of C.A.P.E. Business and Biodiversity Initiatives to conservation of critical biodiversity, landscape connectivity and ecological support areas: Groundtruthing of the 2010 baseline report; Contribution of C.A.P.E. Business and Biodiversity Initiatives to conservation of critical biodiversity, landscape connectivity and ecological support areas: Assessment of 2010 Conditions).

**Component 2 Planned:**

There is measurable growth in biodiversity-friendly food production and sustainable natural resource harvesting practices in the CFR

**Component 2 Actual at Completion:**

Market ready products at project completion included wine, rooibos tea, citrus, flowers as well as honey, seafood, and red meat.

**Component 3 Planned:**

Institutional consistency is maintained in organizations participating in Green Choice is maintained to ensure effective project management

**Component 3 Actual at Completion:**

The Secretariat within Conservation International (now Conservation South Africa) and WWF-South Africa maintained weekly contact and held Steering Committee meetings every three to four months.

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

There were no components unrealized relative to the original proposal. However, the sub-grant focus was largely on monitoring, which was successful in terms of tool development but met with limited success in implementation, thus impacting on the degree to which we can make the business case for these initiatives. Clearly the initiatives represent biodiversity gains and we were able to measure these, however we lack sufficient data on socioeconomic and ecosystem service gains to date. We realized that behavior change usually takes >5 years. Thus we are satisfied with the quality of the tools /products we have produced for monitoring and aim to improve uptake in the future. Indeed these products have been mainstreamed into our parent body's organization (Conservation International) and by our national biodiversity institute (South African National Biodiversity Institute), including the innovation to make monitoring and farm management more accessible by using cell phone technology and web-based databases.

***Please describe and submit (electronically if possible) any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.***

The following products<sup>1</sup> have been placed electronically into a 'Dropbox', for which CEPF will receive an invitation:

1. The Living Farms Reference
2. Nine adaptations of 1. into sector-specific guidelines
3. The Living Farms poster (English and Afrikaans)
4. DVD: Business and Biodiversity in the CFR
5. Brochure: Green Choice
6. Agriculture: Facts and Trends in South Africa
7. Lessons and Principles: Business and Biodiversity Insights
8. Various factsheets for Business and Biodiversity Initiatives
9. The Green Choice Monitoring Framework
10. The Green Choice Farmer Field Book
11. The Green Choice Record Keeping Book (English and Afrikaans)

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that the Woolworths Farming for the Future guide could not be included here due to confidentiality. Some items such as the DVD and some professionally produced guides will be posted due to size constraints.

12. The iFarm record keeping system
13. Social survey of Green Choice Alliance members
14. Rooibos farming practices and their effects on ecosystem functioning, ecosystem services and rooibos production (Masters thesis)
15. Conservation to market-led development: A rooibos case study (Masters internship study)
16. Assessment of conservation opportunity among communal livestock farmers in the Leliefontein region, South Africa (BSc Agri project)

## Lessons Learned

***Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.***

See item no. 7 above “Lessons and Principles: Business and Biodiversity Insights”

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

*Shortcomings:* The project design did not include a comprehensive logical framework besides the one provided by CEPF, which limited the monitoring of project effectiveness initially. Fortunately the initial period was used to make the many contacts between BBIs, which was a necessary enabling activity for subsequent implementation activities.

*Success:* The project functioned as a multi-stakeholder process, which resulted in robust products. Also the sub-grant allowed us the flexibility to review goals mid-project, and allocate funds to monitoring.

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

*Shortcomings:* The project included knowledge gathering and monitoring, but no little capacity building. This created a gap between e.g. farm guidelines and farm management on-farm. GreenChoice provided expertise where possible but budget did not allow for post-hoc appointment of agriculturalists and ecologists who could have assisted in conveying concepts in the guidelines.

*Success:* The project functioned as a multi-stakeholder process, which resulted in robust products. The recognition that BBI success depended heavily on having a person appointed to provide extension and management was crucial to success. The communication platform and learning exchanges, along with the extension support and the spillover effects into education (the curriculum development) were viewed as the most valuable aspects of the project by BBI members (Green Choice Social Survey 2012).

***Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:***

See item no. 7 above “Lessons and Principles: Business and Biodiversity Insights”

### Additional Funding

*Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of the CEPF investment in this project.*

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Conservation South Africa	A	ca. \$33 000	Salary for Green Choice Manager post extension of project in June 2011
McDonalds & Rooibos Council of South Africa	C	\$16 000	Bursary for a Masters (Rooibos farming practices and their effects on ecosystem functioning, ecosystem services and rooibos production).
Woolworths	C	\$2 600	Bursary for BSC Agri student to study willingness of communal livestock farmers to green brand meat in Namaqualand.
Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs	A	\$91 000	Support for monitoring BBIs and scaling-up in the red meat initiative
Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs	A	\$12 500	As part of funding initially given to our partner WWF-SA, for development of guidelines and promotion thereof
Netherlands Initiative for Capacity Building in Higher Education (NICHE)	C	\$1300 000	Sustainable Agriculture in South Africa project

*\*Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:*

- A Project co-financing (Other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project.)*
- C Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

### Sustainability/Replicability

**Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.**

Maintaining of the Green Choice platform of communication is highly valued among BBI members but funding for this, including a dedicated Communications expert, has yet to be obtained. Lessons learnt in this project have enabled project proposals around scaling up to other landscapes in the Succulent Karoo and Maputoland Pondoland Albany hotspots.

**Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.**

**Safeguard Policy Assessment**

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

n/a

**Additional Comments/Recommendations**

**Information Sharing and CEPF Policy**

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

**Please include your full contact details below:**

Name: Heidi-Jayne Hawkins  
Organization name: Conservation South Africa  
Mailing address:  
Conservation South Africa  
Office 26, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Centre for Biodiversity Conservation  
Kirstenbosch National Botanical Gardens  
Private Bag X7, 7735, Claremont, SA

Tel: +27 21 799 8708 (*note change of number*)  
Fax: +27 21 762 6838  
E-mail: [hhawkins@conservation.org](mailto:hhawkins@conservation.org)

**\*\*\*If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages\*\*\***

**Performance Tracking Report Addendum**

**CEPF Global Targets**

**(1 July 2008 – Dec 2011)**

**Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.  
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.**

<b>Project Results</b>	<b>Is this question relevant ?</b>	<b>If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.</b>	<b>Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.</b>	<b>(See Biodiversity Metric Reports)</b>
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	No			Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	Yes	12 546ha	26 297ha	Within wine, potatoes, rooibos and flower initiatives
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	Yes	113 541 ha	127 292 ha	Within wine, potatoes, rooibos and flower initiatives
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	Yes	12 011 ha	412 011 ha	Within wine, potatoes, rooibos and flower initiatives
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	Yes	5	6	Within wine, rooibos, flower and recently meat initiatives

**If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table**

**Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities**

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics							Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit																	
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Increased Income due to:																
									sustainable natural resources management	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services	Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonialization etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	Increased participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and leadership	Other					
Heiveld Cooperative (rooibos)	x	x	X									X													
Agulhas Plain communities (flowers)		X	x									X											X		
Wine farm workers (wine)			X																						
Leliefontein community (red meat)	x	x	x																						
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>						<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit: Access to improved water resources via installation of hand water pumps; also improved livestock condition due to access to fodder during winter (provided as incentives by Conservation South Africa in exchange for adherence to Biodiversity and Red Meat Guidelines including land stewardship)