

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	Jan van der Winden
Project title	Conservation of important wetland habitats for herons and terns in the lower Dniepr River and Delta, Ukraine
RSG reference	
Reporting period	June 2008 to January 2010
Amount of grant	£5,653
Your email address	j.van.der.winden@buwa.nl
Date of this report	10 May 2010

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
Involvement of stakeholders in management of the area		x		During two workshops local stakeholders were informed but input from local stakeholders was limited. So it is yet not very well known if proposals are acceptable in all aspects. But as a first step the project can be regarded as successful. The press gave attention to the workshops.
Collecting existing data and new data for management vision		x		Two field visits and contacts with local biologists provided new information on bird distribution and important areas. These field visits moreover added to the attention for the area and can be regarded as steps in the process.
Preparation of management vision		x		The management vision was prepared by the NGO Laguna and gives an idea of necessary steps to be taken. The national government used the information for its designation of the Dniepr Delta as a Nature Park. The national government expressed it to be very useful for this aspect.
Education local community		x		Workshops, world wetlands day and posters and flyers were produced for the local communities and distributed. This also can be regarded as a first step.

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

Foreseen time schedule could not be met due to local problems in planning and capacity. Some activities were postponed. Stakeholders were not very active in discussions at workshops. No clear proposals for management or involvement were received from the local community. The workshops focussed on presenting information to the community instead. So at this stage it is unclear e.g. if the proposed zoning will be acceptable and also if it will be sufficient.

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

1. A start of information exchange between NGO's, authorities and the local communities on bird conservation of the Dniepr Delta.
2. The preparation of a vision on future possible management of the area.

3. The use of the project results by the National government from their process of revising the status of the area as National Park.

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

The local communities have been invited at workshops and information days. But so far no direct benefit for local communities was a result of the project. Partly because the local communities did not actively join discussions for the future but partly as they were involved at a limited scale. But first steps were made and in Ukraine tradition of the involvement of local communities is very low anyway, so each step forward can be regarded as a success. This needs attention in future.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes. The establishment of the National Park will proceed and the management vision will be used in next steps for a management plan. In June 2010 workshop for future hunting management in the entire region is planned and at this workshop representatives of the Dniepr Delta have been invited.

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

Booklets and brochures have been disseminated, the project is highlighted on the website of Laguna and the management vision will be disseminated.

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

See 1 and 2

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
Site visits, workshops, wetland festival	1541	2544	-1004	More time investment needed
Management plan preparation	901	1580	-679	More time investment needed
Production of reports, posters, flyers etc	2165	1649	516	Expenses lower for printing and production
Organisation, project management, office costs	1019	1387	-368	More time investment needed
Other costs (flights, taxes, office)	665	790	-125	
Total	6292	7950	-1658	

Differences with original budget caused by changes in exchange rates (about 400 pound) and a higher time investment needed than expected.

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

To get more grips on needs and demands of the local community and prepare an integrated management plan for the area.

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, as much as possible, although it was difficult to hold control on local participating partners to include this in all products. Some products were printed already before a draft had been submitted to the project leader.

Yes, local press (TV and radio) was present at workshops and during all relevant meetings RSGF was acknowledged.

11. Any other comments?

The Rufford Grant was in this particular case used very well as catalyser /initiator in the start of a management process.