

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.

Thank you for your help.

Josh Cole, Grants Director

Grant Recipient Details	
Your name	Omonge Paul Omondi
Project title	Integrated Indigenous Knowledge-Based Approaches for the Conservation of Nyangores Sub-catchment of the Upper Mara River Basin.
RSG reference	15922-1
Reporting period	December 2014 – December 2015
Amount of grant	£ 4683
Your email address	Omonge.paul@gmail.com
Date of this report	24 th December 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
Identification and mapping of forest resources of Nyangores			x	Successfully completed.
Development of indigenous Knowledge base for catchment conservation.			x	Successfully Completed
Promotion of Riparian Commercial Woodlot establishment.		x		This activity was not done in the upstream area of the sub-catchment because of the land ownership and the political tensions that are still sensitive in the area from the post-election violence of 8 years ago.
Strengthening local capacity for catchment conservation.			x	Completed by training of WRUAs and through awareness and outreach activities in two of the proposed sub-catchment zones.

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

The major difficulty has been realized in the upper part of the catchment (Kiptagich and Keringet areas) where land is a very sensitive issue. It is also an area where there is a lot of deforestation as people clear forest to get land for settlements. Most of the people are squatters, not legally owning the land, and hence were not very positive in their response to suggestions of afforestation programs. Therefore, the project team only managed to do mapping of available private forests then moved downstream without doing the planned awareness activities.

Production of learning material proved much costlier than anticipated and therefore only 2 thirds of the projected number of documents was achieved with the budgeted cost.

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

- a) The Mapping of the Private Forest, this has been very important as it now delineates the areas within the catchment where concerted conservation effort is required. This conservation effort can now be easily undertaken by anyone as long as they follow the mapped-out zones since the gaps are now public knowledge.
- b) Establishment of Non-riparian Commercial woodlots – the non-riparian commercial woodlots are a necessity due to the demand for wood-fuel in the area. The project has established the nursery for commercial woodlots and hopes the community would embrace the initiative by replicating it at their villages. It is also an income earner and most people can easily plant these in the backyard to supplement their needs or those of the tea industry.
- c) The first Indigenous knowledge repository for the catchment area; The project has managed to draw out a basis upon which further knowledge can be added as far as conservation of forests and catchments in the area is concerned. The knowledge gathered. The platform for such knowledge was based upon the cultural practices and the language of the Kipsigis community. In Kenya, the community belongs to a group of tribes that also straddles two water towers, namely the Mau Forest (where Nyangores is based) and Cherangany Hills which is to the west of the country. Hence these guidelines could be useful in the management of both mega catchments.
- d) Training of local water resource users on catchment conservation (Integrated Water Resources Management, IWRM and Participatory Forest Management, PFM, skills): 15 people including representatives of WRUA were trained at the Silibwet community water services grounds. Trainers included the team leader and the local Chepalungu forest officer.

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

The local community has been involved in the project since the formulation stage. The WRUAS selected the sites for establishment of tree nursery and woodlots for commercial purposes. They also chose the groups to benefit from the established

sites. Local elders and other community representatives from the different zones of the catchment were selected and invited for indigenous knowledge forums where local conservation knowledge was gathered for the purposes of the conservation of the catchment. The tea out-growers have been specifically actively involved in the initiative to establish commercial woodlots in their farms and it is a matter of time before they start benefitting from the harvested wood. Lastly, the WRUA members had an opportunity to learn the use of certain tools such as GPS for mapping exercises. They also benefitted from basic ArcGIS knowledge necessary to create basic maps.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes, the plan is to continue the afforestation program in the areas where gaps have been identified in the sub-catchment. These gaps include areas with little or no forest cover and areas where no community groups exist to foster afforestation programs. The continued works will also reign in on the water access challenges experienced at the catchment level by emphasising on community-based approaches that complete the hydrological cycle. Such as increasing the indigenous forest cover and other soil conservation initiatives to increase infiltration and reduce run-off. As well as establishment of bamboo woodlots in and around spring water sources to clean the water commonly used for domestic purposes in the catchment.

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

The work has been shared at a stakeholder's workshop held on September 9th and 10th at the Brevan Hotel in Bomet town. Those present at the stakeholder workshop included the Minister in charge of Environment and Public Health Hon. Elizabeth Langat and members of the WRUAs. The WRUAs and schools have also been given educational and sensitization material so as to use in their mobilization campaigns among community members as well as among school pupils.

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

The grant was used in the period December 2014 to December 2015. However, the bulk of the project activities were implemented in the first three months and the last six months due to logistical inconsistencies as well calendar challenges with that of the principal implementers, the WRUAs. The anticipated length was 12 complete months of project activities, which did not tally with the actual nine months used in the project timeframe.

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.

Local exchange rate used; 1 £ sterling = 147 Kenya Shillings.

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Survey team; Transport and Snacks.	612	650	38	Two members of the survey team had to go back to re-collect a day worth of data after the GPS equipment refused to download the data gathered after the first visit.
GPS Hire	170	170	0	The WRUAs need to have own GPS to avoid this recurrent cost in the future.
Hall Hire	204	-	-	Catered for by local government administration.
Data Analysis	102	102	0	
Facilitators fee	272	270	2	
Indigenous Knowledge Forum	344	344	0	Was done within the anticipated budget.
Production of literature material	952	960	8	The production cost was found to be costlier than originally planned. Hence only two-thirds of the material was produced.
Non-riparian Woodlot establishment	143	145	2	Established at Tegat and Merigi
Mobilisation using radio personalities	217	120	97	One radio personality did not show up for the roadshow as agreed.
Strengthening local capacity for conservation.	272	250	12	The activity cost was met by a figure less than 12 Pounds.
Outreach campaign	102	102	0	Successfully done.
Administrative	204	204	0	
Project team	1225	1225	0	
Establishment of 4 tree nursery	408	-	-	Done by the Tea Industry operating in the catchment.
Establishment of one indigenous tree nursery	68	68	0	Established at Silibwet
Total	5295	4610	159	

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

The next steps for the project is to embark on an extensive conservation campaign that combines local knowledge with income generating activities such as woodlot establishments, production of plants that can be used as animal feeds as well assist is soil and water conservation. There is need to bring in a strong county government representation, the forest department to assist the WRUAs and the community to at least try and raise the forest cover for the catchment to 60%.

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 logo was used in the literature material produced and in the writing material produced for the stakeholder meeting held at Brevan Hotel, Bomet.

11. Any other comments?

The project managed to directly reach a total of 450 individuals because the upstream community was not involved in the campaigns and exchange visits as had been agreed. To compensate for their absence, more members from the downstream communities were involved. This means that the indirect number of people reached is conservatively pegged at 1800 individuals. However, the average number of people per household in the area is six individuals.