

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. 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	Marina Londres
Project title	Researching sustainability of harvests jointly with local stakeholders in Amazonian flooded forests: linking science with action
RSG reference	05.05.09
Reporting period	September 2009 through October 2010
Amount of grant	£6,000
Your email address	mlondres@ufl.edu
Date of this report	May 18 th 2011

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
Participatory monitoring of Andiroba fruit production and population dynamics			✓	The fruit production monitoring and population dynamics measurements were completed for the timeframe predicted within project activities.
Quantify densities and population structures of 27 other key forest species			✓	This information was collected in a period prior to the 2 nd Rufford Small Grant timeframe but represent an essential part for the overall project outcomes.
Collect growth and mortality data to examine basic population parameters for a subset of these species		✓		Due to time and logistics constraints, we were able to gather growth and mortality data solely for the community selected priority species – Andiroba (<i>Carapa guianensis</i>), from which results serve as parameters for drawing management recommendations for other timber and non-timber species.
Facilitate assessment of the sustainability of current extraction			✓	Fortunately, we were able to assess sustainability of current extraction for all the forest species selected by the community as crucial for their livelihoods.
Inform community decision-making			✓	The ecological information that was collected, analysed and interpreted jointly with community members was amply shared and discussed with the broader community in different ways and at different points in time. This process was an effective way of informing community decision making in a bottom-up basis.
Develop recommendations for adapting Brazilian forest legislation to local realities and ecological constraints	✓			Unfortunately, we were not able to influence policy at the regional and national levels.
Scale up the capacity building programme through delivery of		✓		We were able to scale up our well established capacity building programme for the outside community

ecology classes and research findings interpretation, validation and dissemination				boundaries to a certain extent, but not for the extent envisioned at the design of this grant project. We delivered ecology classes and presented research results throughout neighbouring communities, among Rural Workers Union and community political leaders and at Rural Family schools, but only within the Gurupá municipality. We were not able to extend this initiative to other municipalities throughout the Amazon estuary region.
Consolidate a locally-based strategy in which local managers are prepared and empowered to disseminate results throughout the region		✓		Extraordinary investment was dedicated towards this goal and in fact quite notable outcomes were observed: while I was there, local researchers were able to present all research rationale, results and implications for quite broad audiences. However, despite this success and the fact that I had left with them the equipment and information materials so that they could continue dissemination in my absence, they still lack confidence as well as organisational skills necessary to disseminate ecological and management information on their own.

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

By the time of this 2nd Rufford Small Grant activities started, a major shift on institutional contexts and priorities were taking place at the region. The broader project with which I had established a solid collaboration for many years ended at that time and the institution decided to close the ecology and management programme to invest on other issues (such as climate change), so all the logistics and staff that I used to count upon also ended. In addition other smaller institutions that were key partners of this project had to close their offices due to lack of sufficient funding. These changes represented a real challenge for the continuity of project activities since the lack of institutional support and logistics make it much more complicated to coordinate project activities from abroad (since I am a student at the University of Florida, there are just a limited number of months a year that I can be on the field). Despite these difficulties, we were able to complete project activities, mainly with the help of local leaders and some former partners who volunteered to help with the regular communication with the community to report to me progresses and problems to be addressed during my absence. It was necessary to buy a small motor boat to allow mobilisation within the community for conducting activities.

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

Within a strong participatory basis, we were able to: (1) generate, interpret and communicate ecological and management knowledge of Amazonian flooded forests; (2) increase local capacity and help community members develop sustainability awareness; (3) lead community members to invest in mobilisation activities, engage in knowledge oriented decision-making process; (4) change their management practices in a way of preserving forests and improving local livelihoods; and (5) research results and repercussion outcomes were amply disseminated across communities and institutions of the Gurupá municipality.

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

The most remarkable aspect of this project is probably the level and quality of community involvement. Participation and inclusion took place since the early stages of project implementation and increased along the process. Community members were engaged at all stages of the research and training program: setting research priorities, selecting research species (in which the seed-oil producing species Andiroba -*Carapa guianensis* was most important), and mapping forest types and species distributions. A subset of the community (local monitors) had greater participation, acting as volunteers to collect data, participating in research skill building activities, and disseminating results to their community. Community engagement permitted a much larger sample size of trees and continued high quality data collection throughout the year. Activities and participation evolved through gradual stages of learning, leading to unexpected outcomes. Philosophy of inclusion resulted in an authentic democratization of the research process. In addition, community interest increased over time, together with trust and sense of common purpose. Finally, as a result of genuine community involvement, ecological study of key forest species stimulated broad reflection about sustainability and resource use strategies, serving to empower local managers to transform their reality and improve both livelihoods and conservation.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

I am currently pursuing a PhD at the University of Florida. The collaboration developed with the local community in question endured for almost 6 years (Rufford Small Grant supported the project last 2 years) and the insights and questions that arose from that experience (in terms of community based conservation and development) go far beyond the discipline of tree species population ecology adopted for my master's. For that reason and as a means to invest in a more interdisciplinary approach for my research (and education), I decided to change the direction of my PhD project, and focus on other aspects of community conservation and development issues. With that in mind, during the last summer, I was able to initiate a collaboration with the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), in which I will draw on part of their Poverty and Environment Network (PEN) database for a comparative study among different groups of forest users, and answer questions related to the factors that lead to different levels of forest dependency, as well as the implication of these for the impacts of alternative policies.

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

I have been disseminating this project extensively throughout the different environments where I conduct my work. Over the past three years, I conducted over 50 events in the study region,

including small and large workshops, presentations, classes and seminars. I also presented research outcomes throughout a wide range of institutions in Belem, including seminars and working groups. At the University of Florida, I was invited to present this research as a guest lecturer in at least 10 different classes (mainly for graduate level), two interdisciplinary seminars, and three international conferences. I have submitted one scientific article on the ecology of Andiroba (*Carapa guianensis*), and will work on future publications. I will continue to present research results whenever possible.

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

The RSG was used from September 2009 through October 2010. Initially, activities were planned to be conducted from June 2009 through June 2010.

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
Between-country transportation	1224.5	1108.9	-115.65	
In country transportation	1020.42	1097.3	76.87	
Payment for room, rental & meals	612.25	598.6	-13.61	
Payment for local monitors	1632.67	1483	-149.66	
DBH Tape, Metric Tape, Flagging, compass, waterproof paper, etc	136.06	816.3	680.28	We had an extra expenditure with a small motor boat, given the withdrawal of institutional supports
workshops and forums	1102	734.7	-367.3	
workshops	272.11	217.7	-54.42	
Total	6000	6056.5	-56.51	

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

During the next two years I will be engaged at my PhD research in which one of the sites is located at the Amazon estuary region. The lessons learned with the project supported by RSG are vast and will likely be applied not only on my PhD research but also throughout my career. After I complete my PhD, I plan to move back to Brazil and use the information generated to influence policy regarding community forest management.

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, the RSGF logo was used at all my presentations including classes, seminars and conferences, both in Brazil (at cities of Belem and Rio de Janeiro, and across rural areas of the Amazonian estuary region) and the United States (University of Florida).

11. Any other comments?

I am very thankful for receiving the Second RSG. Given the end of other parallel projects it was extremely important for carrying out this crucial last year of the project. It has been challenging but very rewarding and I hope to be able to work with RSG again sometime in the future.