

## 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>	Roshan Sherchan
<b>Project title</b>	Assessing and Tackling Human Wildlife Conflict (HWC) in Langtang National Park, Rasuwa District, Nepal
<b>RSG reference</b>	14040-1
<b>Reporting period</b>	January 16, 2014-January 12, 2015
<b>Amount of grant</b>	£ 5,464
<b>Your email address</b>	Sherchan_roshan@hotmail.com
<b>Date of this report</b>	January 12, 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
Reconnaissance survey of the project site			✓	Reconnaissance survey carried out from 12th to 24th February 2014 in Syaubari BZCF followed by consultation meeting at warden office and informal meeting with SBZCF User Group. The primary objectives were: i) to inform local community about the project; and ii) carry out transect walk for identifying human wildlife conflicts, wildlife habitats and potential site for game proof fence. The survey team comprises Rufford Grantee, GIS expert, forest guard, Syaubari CF, Secretary, Syaubari User's Group, and game scout, park office. The details were submitted in preliminary progress report.
About 50-60 local people (user's group, wildlife victim, women farmers) made aware on the policy provision of Wildlife Damage Relief Support Guidelines, 2012			✓	56 local people of Laharepauwa VDC of Langtang National Park were oriented on policy provisions of Wildlife Damage Relief Support Guidelines (2012) from 27 to 28 April 2014. Assistant warden from Langtang National Park Mr Ram Dev Chaudari presented the policy provisions and facilitated the interaction with local participants. Syaubari BZCFUG members, women and farmers were participants. The information on the coverage of animals and types of loss/damages by policy and relief claim procedures highlighted. In addition, Mr Chaudari also shared the salient features of Buffer Zone Management Regulations and Directives.
HWC hotspots map of the project site produced specific to wild animals		✓		Coordinates recorded for locations where signs of wild animals observed. Map was prepared showing these signs.
Game proof fencing installed as a mitigation measure benefiting over 100 Hh			✓	Approximately 250 m of fencing (5 feet high) was erected with the support of iron pole in Syaubari BZCF. As an outcome of reconnaissance survey and discussion with Syaubari BZCFUG and warden office, the site below the Syaubari essential oil plant (N 28°00.909'; E 85°12.777') was identified

				which runs along boundary of community forest and affected crop field. The detail information is submitted in mid-term progress report and also described in brochure attached (with location depicted in map).
40 poor households supported with livestock shed improvement to reduce loss/damage			✓	40 poor farmers were supported in improving their livestock sheds as majority of sheds are poorly constructed. The supports ranged from simple repair to changing new corrugated sheet to new construction. The beneficiaries were identified by Syaubari CFUG.
Dissemination on various aspects of HWC to 500 people through brochure		✓		Brochure was prepared with information on HWC situation, workshop on policy provisions, supports to improve livestock sheds and game proof fence. It was distributed to/through warden office, BZSP project, SBZCFUG, Department of National Park and Wildlife Conservation.

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

During alignment of site for game proof fence, boundary dispute was observed. The proposed site for fence runs along the boundary of buffer zone community forest near agriculture crops. One farmer claimed that alignment should away bit away from where community has agreed. The Syaubari community discussed with the farmer and shifted the site in few places (2-3 poles). The site had not clearly demarcated and used as foot trail by village for many years. The boundary dispute delayed the project by 15-20 days however, user groups resolved it.

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

i) Though local community (prevalence 75 % households) are affected from human wildlife conflict, they were not aware about the legal provisions of Wildlife Damage Relief Support Guidelines, 2012. The villagers had no idea which problem animals are covered by law and what are the relief claim procedures. With the orientation on guidelines, 56 local people (women, poor farmers and user's group members) were made aware.

ii) Concrete mitigation measure was put in place in the form of game proof fence. Now it is up and running and protects approximately 50-65 ha of crop field from wild animals. Farmers now can cultivate agriculture crops without any fear of damage from wild animals. The will help to yield more crops to those poor farmers. In addition, human wildlife conflict hotspot map was prepared so user group can continuously monitor in days to come.

iii) Supports were provided to local farmers/livestock herders who livestock sheds were not adequately strong or needs repair. The support ranged from simple repair, changing corrugated sheet, adding sawn timber to construction in new site (safer site, close to house). In total, 40

households were supported which were identified by local users' group. Those households were given priority whose livestock were killed by wild animals in earlier years.

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

Local beneficiaries of this project have been living in the buffer zone of Langtang National Park, one of the most important mountain national parks of Nepal. Majority of population are Tamang, highly marginalised indigenous community of mountain. As Syaubari BZCFUG has been active in these villages, I first met with representatives of user's group and informed them about the project, its objectives and how user's group could help to achieve its objectives. As a result, users group released secretary and forest guard for a reconnaissance survey.

I requested user's group to identify the participants in roll-out workshop and livestock herders for shed improvement, but I gave criteria which they need to fulfil while selecting participants/beneficiaries. The primary criteria are: i) priority for those households who lost their livestock in earlier years; ii) those household who live to close proximity to forest; and iii) poor households with priority to single women. I also visited district headquarter and discussed with the warden of the Langtang National Park. Warden supported a project by issuing a letter to user group and in addition, released an assistant warden as a resource person for orientation workshop.

I stayed in the village, visited many farm households, and did an observation of the villages and forests- which all helped me to build a rapport with the villagers/communities for implementing this project.

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

Yes, there are other buffer zone communities which are also affected but not supported by any institutions. Due to the limited resources of government, mitigation of human wildlife conflict didn't get priority and therefore, similar intervention with more advanced game proof fencing (fencing equipped with solar backed up twinkling flash light currently piloted in Mustang of Annapurna Region) might be more effective.

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

**There will be primarily two methods to share the result of the project works:**

- i) Informal discussion with warden and buffer zone support office (currently funded by WWF Nepal) during annual assembly of buffer zone management committee.
- ii) Through distribution of brochure which has been already done and still ongoing (particularly to those concerned institution such as Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation, Warden Office, Buffer Zone Support Office, Buffer Zone Management Committee, Tourist Information Check post).

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

In February 2014, part of grant was spent on GPS purchase and reconnaissance survey which includes the forest transect walk and discussion with user's group and local community. April to May witnessed the spending on roll out of wildlife damage relief guidelines. However, the major chunk of the grant was spent in June and July for purchasing the materials for fencing materials and September and October for transportation, labour charges and supporting for the improved livestock shed. Not much variation was observed between anticipated and actual length of the project.

**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
Reconnaissance survey for Syaubari BZ Community Forest (8 days)	310	320	-10	Local exchange rate 1 £= NPR 163
Subsistence allowance for principle Investigator for field works (15 days)	697	700	-3	1 £= NPR 163
Subsistence allowance for GIS expert for field works (15 days)	581	570	11	1 £= NPR 163
Consultation/meeting refreshment at communities- 5 sites	194	195	-1	1 £= NPR 163
Transportation (vehicle rent 2 times @ 2 ways)	310	290	20	Depending on the fluctuation of oil price, rent price fluctuates slightly
Roll out of Wildlife Damage Relief Guidelines, 2012 to local users -50-60 local people	155	<b>150</b>	5	1 £= NPR 160
IEC material- brochure: an overview on effort to address HWC in green way- 500 copies	194	<b>180</b>	14	The approved budget is the estimation. 1 £= NPR 155
Material purchase, transportation and developing game proof fencing as a mitigation measure in problematic area benefiting over 100 HHs	1,938	<b>1940</b>	-2	1 £= NPR 159
Support to livestock shed improvement - 40 HHs	775	<b>785</b>	-10	1 £= NPR 155
GPS purchase	194	<b>200</b>	-6	1 £= NPR 163
Report Production (printing/binding/photocopying)	116	<b>90</b>	16	1 £= NPR 155
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,464.00</b>	<b>5,420.00</b>	44	

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

I will keep record of those farmers's yield (how much yield they harvest after the fencing and compare against earlier years- that gives me in totality, how much worth of crops have been protected by these measures per year.

Another possibility is the replication of these activities in other similar places (where loss is high) with more advanced game proof fencing (as of piloted in Mustang) along with alternative cash crops (which wild animals don't prefer) will be very useful.

**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, The Rufford Foundation logo was used in the banner in roll out of wildlife relief guidelines, brochure and short project documentary. Similarly, RSGF received the publicity during consultation meeting with warden office, buffer zone support office and Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation (DNPWC).