

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	Victor Kuznetsov
Project title	Creation of a model sector in the Lake Baikal World Natural Heritage Site by the design of a system of monitoring of the natural and social environment and involvement of local inhabitants in the conservation of especially valuable and specially protected areas.
RSG reference	80.04.09
Reporting period	07.08.2009 - 07.08.2010
Amount of grant	£6,000
Your email address	jennieirk@gmail.com (for correspondence in English) v.a.kuznetsov@mail.ru (for correspondence in Russian with project coordinator)
Date of this report	20 th August 2010

1. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
<p>The project's aim is conservation of a unique habitat of endemic and endangered species and lands of traditional settlement and husbandry of indigenous peoples threatened today by uncontrolled tourism development.</p>			
<p>The project was to include:</p>			
<p>1). Assessment of the present social and natural environment in the model area.</p>		<p>1). Thorough assessments of both the natural and social environments were made.</p>	<p>1) As the project began after the flowering season, the assessment of the state of the natural environment was made on the basis of materials provided by the National Park (NP) and the latest land survey. A Geographical Information System was created using these data for use by local authorities, nature conservation agencies, local citizens and NGOs. Thus, instead of the planned 7-8,000 ha we were able to cover a forested area of 47,938 ha and a 20,480 ha area of agricultural lands. In all information on 68,418 ha was fed into the GIS, completing more complex and significant work than originally planned. The socio-economic survey of the local community was undertaken by professional sociologists and the results printed in a brochure that will be made available to local authorities, nature conservation agencies, and local citizens, scientific and educational institutions. The influence of outsiders on the natural environment would have been possible if the head of the local administration had made the appropriate documents available to us. We were refused access to these documents and according to law only the local inhabitants can force the head to reveal them. In order to solve this issue and open grassroots levers of influence in the municipality, project staff designed and carried out a questionnaire to find out who in the local community is trusted by their fellows to represent their interests in</p>

			four specific areas – intellectual development of the community, business, ethical and the arts, ideological (religious, etc). The results of the questionnaire showed that a group of 47 community members were singled out. Work is continuing with this group with the aim of their empowerment – provision of the tools and knowledge necessary to take an active role in management of the territory.
2). Design of a programme for their sustainable development.	2). The essential foundations for this were laid in the course of the project.		2) [please also see 3)] Possible pathways to sustainable development (SD) are described in a brochure. However, this work was not done as a separate block of the project but as the beginning of a long process of drawing local citizens into planning and implementation of measures for the SD of the area in the long term. It became clear that simple schemes for the development of the territory, even if designed by qualified specialists, would not be practicable unless active and influential local citizens took a direct part in the process. Work continues with this group of informal community leaders and funds have been found to hold a 2-day workshop for 47 local people – ‘Planning our Common Future’. Project SD proposals will be discussed at this workshop; these will be developed in detail with concrete steps planned together with workshop participants.
3). Engagement of the community in the decision-making process.		3). A group of trusted local citizens was determined; work continues on preparing them for a planning workshop.	3) Analysis of the state of the natural environment on the basis of which planning for SD can be designed was completed. This analysis was carried on in parallel with the socio-economic survey. As far as was possible the present state of the community and its husbandry with its impact on the natural environment was determined. At present, as far as impact is concerned, there has been a considerable reduction linked with the collapse of the infrastructure of

			agricultural production. Now it is becoming restored, with an increase in animal stocks. Former agricultural land, abandoned during perestroika, is again being used. Thus, this project work on the SD of the local community comes at an important time of increased load on the natural environment.
--	--	--	---

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

The first unforeseen difficulty was a certain lack of understanding on the part of the National Park: there appeared to be the apprehension that the project could stimulate criticism of the park on the part of the local citizens. Participation of NP staff in project work clarified this situation and the park's director now gives his full support. The second unforeseen difficulty was the delayed arrival of funds which meant that the field survey of the natural environment had to be approached differently (for the solution of this question, please see above 1) in the table). The third was the refusal by the head of the Onguryon administration to make documents showing the potential or actual impact on the area by outside parties available to project staff. According to law, only local inhabitants can demand that she makes these documents available. In order to solve this issue and open levers of influence in this municipality, project staff designed a questionnaire to find out who in the community is trusted by their fellow citizens in four different spheres. Results of the questionnaire revealed 47 local informal leaders. Work is continuing with this core group to help empower them to participate in the planning and management of their territory. At present they are studying the brochure and other SD information.

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

- 1) The GIS on the basis of which it will be possible to assess the sustainability of any development, this provides a basic tool for monitoring.
- 2) Complex and detailed assessment of socio-economic and the nature and natural resource environment of the area – this gives a point of departure for plans for sustainability.
- 3) Creation of an initiative group of active and trusted community members without which it would be impossible to realise effective local involvement.

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

The project area has only one local community, in a relatively isolated part of the NP, with 409 voting [adult] members; families on average have four children. 64 adults (from different families) were involved in the three surveys – social, economic and the third concerned local informal leaders. Project staff felt that those taking part showed an interest in the project and they are now waiting for the follow-up stages. The local community now has an organisational centre – the core group of informal leaders – key to future development and participation.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

A model site for ecological-ethnological tourism development and SD of the area within the National Park has been created. This experience – the whole project as a practical example – can be repeated in other areas around the lake and in other vicinities. This is the stuff of further projects.

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

The creation of the brochure, that was not foreseen in the original project plan but the need for which became evident during the project, will make it possible to share project experience with others wishing to repeat this pattern. The NP is clearly interested in repeating this project in other areas.

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

RSG funds were used for this project over the period of a year (07.08.2009 – 07.08.2010) and it definitely established a base on which to build in future. However, work in this (geographical) area had been undertaken in a previous privately sponsored project on the creation of a GIS of part of the Onguryon territory. Thus, this project developed on and expanded the former one and will give rise to a future project for monitoring future developments as a result of community participation and in the light of the GIS. Will it work in practice at the grassroots? This is a key question. One thing is already clear: other areas of the park are being severely impacted by unplanned tourist development without the participation of local communities.

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
1 -Personnel: salaries and fees (tax incl.)	4020	4023,8	3,8	
2 - Communication (telephone and fax, mail, internet)	150	0	150	Funds taken from other sources
3 - Supplies. (Pens, paper, diskettes, cartridges, etc.)	100	169	69	Extra funds transferred from item 2
4. Travel expenses	1460	1594,5	134,5	Funds transferred from items 2 & 3
5. Other Costs (Bank charges etc.)	270	212,7	57,3	
Total	6000	6000	0	

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

- 1) Hold the workshop with the informal leaders group ‘Planning our common future’ with the participation of representatives of the National Park.

- 2) Form a packet of proposals to change the situation in the territory using the activity of the group of leaders and involve specialists and scientists in this process.
- 3) Give all possible assistance in the promotion of the local leaders' ideas and projects aimed at organising the sustainable development of the area.
- 4) Continue study of the natural environment of the model area with the aim of carrying out scientifically sound monitoring and the organisation of ecological and educational tourism with the involvement of local citizens.

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?

The RSGF logo was used on the cover of the brochure. We feel that it is still early to attract the media to the project. However, when local community members begin to implement their projects, we will definitely attract the attention of the regional media.