

## The Rufford Foundation

### Final Report

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

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. The Final Report must be sent in **word format** and not PDF format or any other format. 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. Please note that the information may be edited for clarity. 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](mailto:jane@rufford.org).

Thank you for your help.

Josh Cole, Grants Director

Grant Recipient Details	
<b>Your name</b>	Kanchan Thapa
<b>Project title</b>	Buffer Zone Community perception, attitude and belief towards newly establish protected area: A Case Study from Banke National Park.
<b>RSG reference</b>	12813-2
<b>Reporting period</b>	August 2013- July 2015
<b>Amount of grant</b>	£5747
<b>Your email address</b>	Kanchan1@vt.edu
<b>Date of this report</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> July 2015

**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
To generate the demographic pattern of the Buffer zone communities			X	Survey was carried out in three user committees in Banke National Park and data was also generated in Chitwan National Park for the comparison. This serves as the baseline for the post hoc analysis in the future in the same area.
To assess the community’s perception and attitude towards the protected areas and their management.			X	Survey was carried out in 321 hh across three buffer zone user committee in Banke National Park and for comparison survey was also conducted in 203 hh in Chitwan National Park. 524 hh information were quantified to assess the objectives
Generating awareness among local people across the buffer zone and the nearby hotspots (cities) though awareness campaign: “Forest for life: Hug the Tree”.			X	We conducted the campaign in and around the Banke National Park focusing on the hotel business with our campaign material (posters and fliers: Bookmark). We also did it in other major protected areas in Terai: Bardia, Suklaphanta, Chitwan and Parsa Wildlife Reserve. We also targeted the schools in the capital city as well. Bagh Bahadur character was the face of the campaign.

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

For few days it was Nepal Band due to political reason. It increase the effective working day during the questionnaire survey in Chitwan. It was usual scenario but did not affect much to the project

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

1. Baseline on socio-economic condition on the buffer zone communities in Banke National Park.
2. Perception of the buffer zone communities towards the conservation, protected area establishment in Banke National Park and their comparison with Chitwan National Park to highlight importance of Buffer Zone in maintain the cordial relationship between national park and buffer zone communities. Banke National Park communities are less favourable than the Chitwan National Park. Few of the strategic improvements and interventions are need in Livelihood improvement and Alternative energy to build the relationship with buffer zone communities. Please refer to the final report (attached) for the details.

3. Using the non-economic values (aesthetic, value of forest) in raising the awareness among the buffer zone communities especially focussing on hoteliers.

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

Firstly, we hired six enumerator from the buffer zone communities for collecting the household information through questionnaire survey. Secondly, survey was carried out among the local communities (who had a lots of grudges) about the protected areas establishment in their surroundings. I believed their voices were quantified in the survey and presented in a logical manner and taken to relevant decision makers: protected areas wardens and buffer zone council members etc.

**5. Are there any plans to continue this work?**

This work is a continuous of our previous with Rufford. In the future I would like to assess the how the buffer zone programme is flourishing within the Banke National Park. How their perception is changing over time. Since we have now the baseline and future survey in same area would help to assess the effect of our buffer zone program in changing the behaviour of the buffer zone communities.

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

Firstly, report will be shared with Banke National Park office, buffer zone management council and Department of National Park. Key results will be shared with WWF/TAL office for their information and possible role they can played in it for strategic intervention (for example, promoting the livelihood opportunities and alternative energy schemes like biogas, etc.). I would draft the paper for possible publication in peer review journal for wider audience.

**7. Timescale: Over what period was The Rufford Foundation grant used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?**

Rufford Grant was used during the project period as per the proposed. All the field survey and campaign was done as per the time line. Extension of the project was requested at the no cost.

**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
Researcher Cost	1320	1320	0	
Domestic Airfare to Project Site	151	135	+16	Surplus was adjusted in above line items.
Local Travel and Vehicle Hire	200	231.20	-31.20	
Researcher Daily Cost	471	470.5	+0.5	
Food and Lodging for Field Assistants	1413	1416	-3.00	We used total of eight enumerators for collecting the data.

Hiring Field Assistant	565	609	-44	
Forest for Life Campaign	1114	1123.5724	-9.57	
Communication and Stationary	100	84.42	15.57	Surplus was adjusted in above line items
Miscellaneous	50	50.04	-0.04	
Equipment (Camera-1)	363	378	-15	
Total	5747	5802.732	-70.74	My total grant from Rufford Foundation was £45747, I spend extra £71 more for the project from my personal sources.

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

- Sharing the information is the foremost important. Field conservation office must be aware what is happening with the buffer zone communities and few of the data might be important for them as they were quantified with good sample size from the communities.
- Use the Bagh Bahadur Club for the future campaign as people listen to these characters.

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

Yes: I used the logo in the campaign material (posters and fliers) during Hug the tree: Save the forest campaign. Also the Facebook page has been used to launch our campaign.

**11. Any other comments?**

The project has been successfully implemented.