

The Rufford Small Grants Foundation

Final Report

Congratulations on the completion of your project that was supported by The Rufford Small Grants Foundation.

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work. Please be as honest as you can in answering the questions – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Please complete the form in English and be as clear and concise as you can. We will ask for further information if required. If you have any other materials produced by the project, particularly a few relevant photographs, please send these to us separately.

Please submit your final report to jane@rufford.org.

Thank you for your help.

Josh Cole, Grants Director

Grant Recipient Details	
Your name	Rubana Palhares Alves
Project title	Understanding the Relationship between Local Human Populations and Federal Marine Protected Areas of Santa Catarina – Brazil
RSG reference	11428-1
Reporting period	03/09/2011 – 03/09/2013
Amount of grant	£ 4700
Your email address	bannapalhares@yahoo.com.br
Date of this report	16/09/2013

1. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
1) Investigate local people that live in and around protected areas.			X	We accessed official government reports and also applied semi-structured interviews with local people. It is important to consider these two sources of information. Local human interactions with the environment are really dynamic and by accessing local people's knowledge and perceptions, we were able to discover recent changes in these relationships and also noted different points of view of the reality that they live in.
2) Create relationship indicators between protected areas and local populations, embodying the perspective of local populations.			X	We created indicators based upon literature review. These indicators were presented, discussed and analysed during a workshop with ethnoecologists. We also considered the opinion of the managers from the studied protected areas. This strategy showed to be effective because different contributions were put together and we did not privilege any protected area in particular. We also elaborated a 24 open and closed questions protocol for guidance during fieldwork research.
3) Evaluate proposed indicators.			X	These indicators were useful for both fieldwork and documentary research. Fieldwork showed that the interview protocol should be more objective to optimise the time of the interviews and to facilitate its use by different researchers.
4) Contrast relationships between protected areas and local populations, considering different existing populations (e.g. fishermen, farmers, artisans) and different categories of protected areas (Full Protection and Sustainable Use).		X		Classifying different existing populations into groups proved to be difficult. Several households had multiple activities and different sources of income, which made the comparisons of different profiles of populations unfeasible. The comparisons were made considering the categories of the protected areas.

2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled (if relevant).

The division of the areas for sampling procedures offered unforeseen challenges. For example, in some areas we found a great number of closed houses, used mainly during summer vacations. Thus,

we needed to adjust the sampling procedures, sometimes including people who showed themselves willing to participate of the study but were not randomly chosen at first. We also had difficulties to classify people according to their activities. We found at the same household different sources of income. Also, the activities, which contribute to the household's income, are very dynamic throughout the year. So, we did not make these classifications and comparisons, but considered the different profiles within the discussion.

3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.

1. Creation of indicators of relationship between local people and protected areas. The indicators were useful to capture the information from different sources: fieldwork and documentary research. By using them, the relationship between local people and protected areas were broadly accessed concerning these following aspects: economical, ecological, spatial, organisational and cultural. It is really important to standardise data collection to allow comparisons between areas and to make a temporal diagnosis of the protected areas' effectiveness.

2. Extensive bibliographic survey of all protected areas studied. For the first time this effort was done under a comparative and standardized perspective. This result was important to present the "state of the art" with respect to the relations between local people and protected areas and also to survey knowledge gaps.

3. Comparisons between the protected areas studied. The five study areas comprise a mosaic of protected areas, with efforts to implement a joint management to optimise the use of human and material resources. Comparisons of the studied areas pointed out some common demands as well as particular and localised demands. All this information was shared with the managers and may guide their actions. An important outcome is the incorporation of some of the results in practical actions, such as a document supporting the claims against the change in the protection category of the Marine Biological Reserve of Arvoreda (Technical opinion on the Draft Law 4198/2012 which deals with the possible re-categorisation of the Marine Biological Reserve Arvoreda). Furthermore, we identified the need to improve communication between local people and the managers of the areas, since this can support more participative decisions, which can be meaningful and effective for environmental conservation.

4. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefitted from the project (if relevant).

Our field work involved 22 communities. We contacted 728 local residents to achieve a total of 350 interviews. In many contacts and interviews we informed local people about the protected area and also clarified doubts they had about some local environmental issues. For some people, our contact was the first time they have ever heard about the protected area in which they live inside or nearby. These people were not interviewed but we usually explained about our study, answering their questions and giving useful information. In addition to this, we are finalising an educational material to be distributed to the elementary schools within the studied areas.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes. Continuing work is already in progress. We are elaborating the release of our results to the communities visited. We are also assessing the collected data in more detail, in order to fulfill local demands such as answering new issues that were identified during this research. One demand identified was to increase the knowledge about how local people use natural resources inside and nearby the Environmental Protected Area of Right Whale (EPARW). This information is extremely

important because EPARW's managers are currently elaborating their Management Plan. We earned a scholarship from the Institutional Program of Scientific Initiation Scholarships (PIBIC/CNPq – BIPI/UFSC) for one undergraduate student to attend the EPARW's demand. These news activities are being accomplished due to the partnership between the Laboratory of Human Ecology and Ethnobotany of the Santa Catarina Federal University (Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina - UFSC), the Federal Institute of Santa Catarina (Instituto Federal de Santa Catarina – IFSC) and EPARW's Management Council.

6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?

This work is related to my Masters' research and also to two undergraduate researches. The undergraduate students prepared a scholarship report to UFSC and they will present a poster related at the 23th Seminary of Scientific Initiation of UFSC (October 2013). One of these reports was selected to be presented orally as well. I made an oral presentation at the public defense of my thesis at the Ecology Graduate Program – UFSC (April 2013). This was a really important moment because I shared the results with the academic community (professors, undergraduate and graduate students) and also with protected areas' managers. We also presented three posters at the IX Brazilian Symposium of Ethnobiology and Ethnoecology (November 2012). Academically, we aim to publish two papers: one in "Ambiente e Sociedade", a Brazilian journal, and the other in an International Journal (Ocean & Coastal Management or Environmental Conservation). Now we are working on the sharing of the results to the Protected Areas Management Council's members and/or other stakeholders as well as to the communities accessed. We will make a presentation of the main results at the Management Councils, according to their agendas (from October to December 2013). For the 22 communities accessed we are preparing an educational material (booklet, teacher's guide and other printed materials) to be distributed at least to one local elementary school at each community. We intend to have the whole material ready and distributed until the end of 2013, so the teachers can use it at the next school year (starting in February in Brazil).

7. Timescale: Over what period was the RSG used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?

The RSG became part of the project 14 months after we started it. Before the partnership, we had elaborated the project itself, discussed and created the indicators of relationships between local people and Protected Areas, and conducted the literature surveys. When the partnership started, we were in the stage of fieldwork research. We intend that the project will extend at least until August 2014, while we will be continuing to work on the local demands, especially supporting the use of the printed material in the elementary schools and drawing specific actions to be further developed with the aim of shortening the distance between local peoples and managers.

8. Budget: Please provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used.

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Food (main meals: breakfast, lunch and dinner) for three/four people during 45 days of field activities	2080	1656	-424	In some communities we had meals at local people's houses for free. These invitations were a kind of friendship gesture.

Car rental (referring to 30 days, some places will be accessed by bus)	610	552	-58	
Fuel (average 40 liters per field trip, considering six trips)	190	169	-21	
Hotel/ hostel (for three people for 25 days)	1290	690	-600	In some communities we were hosted at local people's houses for free.
Folders or other materials for sharing the results	530	1687	+1157	The amount not used in the other items was relocated to this one. RSGF support paid the art and layout work of the printed materials and also the booklet impressions.
TOTAL	4700	4755	+55	The remaining difference will be covered by other grants of the Laboratory of Human Ecology and Ethnobotany (UFSC).

Assumed exchange rate (at 12 September 2012 – when conversion was performed): £ 1.00 equals US\$1.56 or R\$ 3.27.

9. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

- A) Release and share the results with the communities accessed and with the Managers Councils and other stakeholders.
- B) Continued actions towards the EPARW's demands.
- C) Involve more undergraduate and graduate students and other institutions in the project in order to meet other local needs identified.
- D) Continued participation in the reunions of the Management's Councils representing UFSC to improve this dialogue spaces, sharing the academic experiences and trying to attend the local demands.

10. Did you use the RSGF logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the RSGF receive any publicity during the course of your work?

Yes. RSGF name and logo were used in some materials and events. It was used in three posters presented at the IX Brazilian Symposium of Ethnobiology and Ethnoecology (November 2012); an oral presentation at the public defense of my thesis at the Ecology Graduate Program – UFSC (April 2013). We also will use the RSGF logo at the released materials (booklet, teacher's guide and other printed materials – in preparation) that we will distribute to at least one elementary school of each community we accessed, until the end of this year; five oral presentations at the Management Councils and for the other stakeholders of the studied Protected Areas (from October to December 2013); two posters of undergraduate students reports at the 23th Seminary of Scientific Initiation of UFSC (October 2013); one poster related to the results of the fieldwork at the 14th Congress of the International Society of Ethnobiology in Bhutan (June 2014); one poster of an undergraduate student report at the 24th Seminary of Scientific Initiation of UFSC (August 2014).

11. Any other comments?

The RSGF support was crucial to the completion of fieldwork activities. I am very grateful to for the trust and support granted. I hope to have RSGF as a partner more times!