

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	Alfan Rija
Project title	Improving efficiency of ranger patrols in detecting and preventing poaching in Serengeti National park and adjacent reserves
RSG reference	17569-2
Reporting period	September 2015 to December 2016
Amount of grant	£4998
Your email address	al.rija10@gmail.com
Date of this report	30/12/2016

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
(i) Assessment of the levels of illegal activities in the Serengeti ecosystem.				We received additional support from other organisations, thus were able to survey all the target four protected areas in the ecosystem.
(ii) Generate understanding of the factors associated with high poaching levels				This objective has been achieved using data collected in (i) above.
(iii) Train rangers in field methods for monitoring of illegal activities in protected areas				Only a quarter (n=46) of the total number intended was reached due to limited funds and logistical constraints of bringing together all rangers from different protected areas.
(iv) Produce recommendations for improvement of existing ranger resources				Due to inadequate funds, we were unable to collect enough data that would allow building of complete spatially explicit models to explore various scenarios for improving anti-poaching activities.
(v) Disseminate results to conservation managers and policy makers to enhance conservation of protected areas				The project only managed to communicate preliminary findings during brief meetings with the protected area managers. Detailed results will be made available and presented at conferences when full detailed reports are completed.

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

The two things that came up were increased costs of field assistance that was beyond the planned budget and expiry of our research permit before completion of the fieldwork. We resolved these by seeking support from other organisations to help pay for field assistance and applying for a new research permit, respectively. These circumstances as a result, pushed the project time beyond the initial expected completion date.

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

(i) Improved knowledge of the magnitude and extent of illegal activities in the study areas. We found four types of illegal activities (poaching of animals, cattle grazing, plant extractions and trespassing by poachers) within the study areas. Poaching of animals exhibited a wide distribution than other illegal activities. Extraction of plant and cattle incursions was distributed within 10 km interior of the protected area borders. These results suggest that illegal activities occur in high abundance within all protected areas regardless of the level of protection they receive. This finding provides useful insights into which ranger patrols could be planned appropriately.

(ii) Improved understanding of the geographic and ecological factors associated with the high levels of poaching. We found that high poaching levels occurred mostly in areas with high food availability (i.e. high net primary productivity), near water bodies, in relatively open and high elevation sites, and in areas that support high numbers of animals. These results suggest that poachers are not bound by distances from the villages of residence. They travel to access any site to hunt animals as long as such areas show high promise for hunting success.

(iii) Improved conservation skills among park rangers on conservation monitoring of illegal activities in these areas. Our project trained and worked in collaboration with 46 rangers working in the study protected areas. These rangers were able to practice on the conservation monitoring methods that will be useful for the long-term conservation effectiveness in their protected areas.

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

N/A

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

YES. This work has broadened our understanding of the magnitude of the threats faced by the species in the ecosystem and suggests that more effort towards preventing the threats is urgent. In future, we envisage a project that target species already critically endangered to help prevent imminent species extinction.

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

The project results will be shared through two main channels;

- (i) Handling of project report and conservation recommendations in person to the authorities managing the study protected areas in Tanzania and the government in order to inform conservation policies.
- (ii) Communication at scientific conferences. We are targeting three conferences in 2017 which will reach various audiences. The Rufford conference in Tanzania in February will enable us communicate results to colleagues and fellow Rufford grants beneficiaries, The Cambridge Student Conservation Science Conference in March in the UK and the Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute (TAWIRI) conference in Arusha Tanzania in December. Finally results will be published in peer reviewed scientific journals.

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 project spanned over 15 months beyond the anticipated 12-month period set during project planning. The delay was caused by the reasons in (2) above.

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
Bust transportation during fieldwork	380	300	+80	This balance was used with other funds to purchase project equipment (i.e. one hand held GPS to replace the damaged one)

Fuel for field car during data collection	1454	1473	-19	We surveyed more areas to increase sample size and to improve data robustness
Training of rangers on field conservation monitoring methods	185	185	0	Used for the planned activity
Field vehicle maintenance during research fieldwork	300	398	-98	Our car needed extra repairs due to extensive off road drive during research fieldwork
Stationeries and internet costs	300	300	0	Used to buy project items as planned
Purchase of one hand held GPS unit for mapping illegal activity occurrence	0	280	-280	We purchased one GPS unit to replace one that was available but malfunctioned during project fieldwork.
Field allowances for two field assistants	0	950	-950	Combined with the balance from meals (below), this amount solicited from other donors was used to pay for allowances for the field assistants.
Meals during research field work for one researcher and four field assistants	1326	1055	+271	This balance was used to pay for allowances of two field assistants during data collection as its budget was overlooked during the project planning
Accommodation in the field and hotels enroute (one researcher)	453	451	0	Used as planned
Hire security ranger during fieldwork	300	300	0	Used as planned
Report production costs and result dissemination	300	150	+150	We have only used half of this budget during feedback meetings with the managers in the study protected areas. The remainder is currently being used to prepare reports for dissemination of project results in the forthcoming conferences.
Total	4998	5842	-846	

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

Based on the data we have collected and the levels of poaching faced by species, we think an important next step is to actively engage in conservation campaigns that will help reduce impact of these threats on the species. A conservation project or program that target on saving species already critically endangered such as the White-backed vulture and other scavenger birds threatened with poisoning and illegal trade in their body parts would greatly solve their conservation plight and improve the ecosystem health.

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?

NO, we have had no opportunity to publicise the project during the data collection period. The Rufford logo and full acknowledgement for the funding support will be made on the conference talks and on any publication materials resulting from this work and will be communicated to the project sponsors.

11. Any other comments?

We would like to thank the Rufford Small Grants organization for the funding support which enabled us collect important information that will help champion effective anti-poaching plans in the study protected areas.