

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	Francis Moyo
Project title	Sharing Landscapes with Wildlife: The Human Cost of Conservation
RSG reference	20890-2
Reporting period	Final report
Amount of grant	£4990
Your email address	francis.moyo@daad-alumni.de
Date of this report	20 December 2017

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
Estimate wildlife damage to crops				A single manuscript that combine all four objectives is bring prepared for published
Estimate wildlife damage to livestock				
Estimate wildlife damage to humans and property				
Measure efficiency of crops protection methods				

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

Changes to rainy season: The study depended on crop/agriculture seasons (cropping and harvesting seasons) for data collection to measure the impact of wildlife on crops raids. The delay on rain season led to changes in cropping season, which in turn led to delays in starting data collection. This problem was resolved by pushing forward data collection period.

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

The most important discoveries/outcomes include:

- i) Traditional methods to combat wildlife damage to crops, livestock and humans have little impact of reducing wildlife related damages. The study show that increase in human population and changes on livelihood strategies, where those who were traditionally livestock keepers are also increasingly engaging in agriculture increase their exposure to wildlife damages as crops are more vulnerable to wildlife damage than livestock.
- ii) There is lack of clear policy guiding compensation to wildlife losses, this in turn lead state official to misuse state powers/office for personal gains, and politicians are using this situation to gain political supporting when ostensibly, helping those affecting to demand compensation. This, when compounded by state tendency to prioritise wildlife over local people and their livelihoods impels to communities to resent conservation, consequently deterring conservation efforts.
- iii) NGO efforts are more effective in preventing wildlife damage however, the knowledge used by NGOs to combat wildlife damages to crop/livestock is

not efficiently transmitted to local communities, hence sustainability issues remains in question when NGOs' project ends.

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

This was formative research. The research results provide empirical evidence to support local communities and sympathetic NGO attempts to draw state's attention to put forward a clear strategic plan to combat wildlife related damages, and/or enact compensation law. The result of this project is made available for local people to use in their attempts to draw attention of policy makers and international community, such as tourists visiting their village to highlight their suffering and sacrifice they endure to conserve wildlife.

The manuscript prepared will be published online for a global audience. The target is to use this global forum to raise awareness and solicit global level support to improve local livelihood.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

The next step is to conduct action research. The next project will focus on training local communities on the best practices to protect their crops and livestock. The project will be done in collaboration with an NGO, which is currently supporting local communities to combat wildlife damages to crops using chilly bombs. The project will focus on passing the knowledge developed by the NGO (use of chilli bombs to scare wild animals). While passing the knowledge, the project will also collect information to the effectiveness of chilly bombs and provide recommendation on the viability (social and economic) of using of chilli bombs to scare wildlife at the national and global level.

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

At the community level, the project held village meetings to give feedback to communities, and summary reports were left at the village offices.

The district level and national level, full reports and policy brief will be distributed to the district offices and at relevant ministries. The report will also be shared to journalist on mainstream media and blog owners.

The global level results will be published on academic journal, and presented in conferences. I intend to post the summary report to conservation watch Facebook page.

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 of 13 months, the intended time was 12 months.

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
Field accommodation and subsistence for lead researcher (one person).	1100	800	300	Stayed in the field for shorter period than planned
Field accommodation and subsistence for assistant researchers (two persons).	960	1200	-240	Stayed in the more than expected
Salaries for assistants: Ten assistants for six months (one assistant per village - 10 villages).	1000	1250	-250	Cost is higher than expected due decreasing value of Tanzanian currency
Car hire (To carry a team of researchers to introduce the study to villages and during dissemination of result to the villages - 4 days).	280	270	-190	Transportation cost for dissemination increased
Motorcycle hire for data collection (one vehicle for six moth).	1650	1800	-150	Fuel cost increased
Stationaries: Printing; hard boards, pen, pencils, photocopying etc.	400	450	-50	Cost for printing material for dissemination higher than expected
Total	5390	5770	-580	I use more money from my own sources.

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

The next step is write policy briefs and complete manuscript for submission to international free access scientific journal.

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: RF logo was during inception meeting and dissemination materials.

11. Any other comments?

The funds availed to me have been beneficial to both local people and for my own career growth as conservationist and lecturer. For formation gathered through this

research provide a way forward to achieve sustainability. On the other hand, the publications from this research guarantee my promotion to a senior position hence gain more opportunity to meet people in higher office who have decision-making powers. This will allow me to gain access to state actors and political leaders, and therefore, could easily use this opportunity to represent local peoples' concerns and influence conservation policies at large.

