

Final Evaluation Report

Your Details	
Full Name	Paul Mboya Tuda
Project Title	Adapting community-based approaches in the assessment of fisheries for improved management of artisanal fisheries in Kenya
Application ID	23204-2
Grant Amount	£5,000
Email Address	ptuda@yahoo.com
Date of this Report	18/02/2022

1. 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
Review of the current impacts of fishing methods in use by catch, and sustainable deployment techniques assessed.				This exercise took most of the project time as it became necessary to continue with the data collection exercise initially started in the first phase.
Develop the capacity of the fishers for resource and ecological monitoring, and for the use of this information for fisheries management.				
Workshop held to present findings, distribute fisheries guide and educational materials and develop a participatory action plan for follow-up.				Due to the delay of the project implementation, the last phase of the project overlapped with the COVID period and as such we could not have a big final workshop but rather had smaller targeted meetings at landing sites to discuss the results.

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

The only unforeseen challenge was the need to extend the project beyond the initial 1 year. At the project inception, the fishers expressed their displeasure at short term projects but reiterated that they would like to engage longer, particularly with the data collection exercise. The main point behind this reasoning was that trends in the fish catch cannot be seen in a year but over a long period of time. To include their views, we reorganised the project timeline and extended the length of some of the activities to match their expectations.

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

- The fisher's willingness and participation in data collection has taken a positive turn and they are now more open to allowing their fish to be measured and information of their fishing operations recorded.
- Having competent community data collectors with an understanding of the fishery and the data requirements and the ability to collect scientifically sound fisheries data.

- Fisher community recognition of the changes in the fishery and the need to consider and negotiate management interventions such as closed areas locally managed by the community to allow for fish stock recovery (in the short run).
- Having women involved in fisheries data collection and discussion on fisheries despite the cultural biases.
- Completion of [a manuscript](#), which was initiated in the first grant award and published in 2018.

4. What do you consider to be the most significant achievement of this work?

- Having the inception meeting and getting the community approval to proceed with the project.
- Having both fishers and fish traders getting involved in the indicators workshop and giving their views on the state of the fisheries.
- Collecting fisheries data for 3 years despite the pandemic challenges and getting fishers to participate in the data collection.
- The desire to continue collaborating and seek an additional project for community-based data collection.
- Drafting two manuscripts from the project.
- Because of my role working with fishers' community, I got nominated for the Pew fellow award.

5. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefited from the project.

- The community was involved in all the stages of the project right from the inception workshop to the fisheries indicator's identification session.
- Selecting of the community data collectors.
- Participants in the data collection, allowing their fish to be measured and records taken.
- Directly interviewed to assess the changes in the fisheries trends using interview guide.
- Final project closure workshop.

6. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Through this work, I am jointly developing a larger project with a 5 year timeline with the goal to strengthen the historical ecology approach in fisheries. A lot of the anecdotal information is being lost and trends in fisheries are unclear due to the lack of historical catch records. Fishers possess an invaluable insight on historical trends and have a vivid memory of some of the species that have disappeared. However, with the change in the fisher's generation, some of this information can be lost. Hence the goal is to develop a database and document these findings to make them publicly available like what has been done in the Pacific.

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

Currently working on two manuscripts to be submitted to the Ocean and Coast journal and marine policy. Further, I am submitting an abstract to the forthcoming WIOMSA symposium to be held in South Africa. I am still working on posters that will be translated into local languages and shared with the communities at the landing sites.

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

The grant was initially planned to be used for a period of 1 year but was extended to three years to cover a protracted collection of fisheries data from 2018-2021. Compared to the 1-year plan in the project document, having the project extend by 2 years had the advantage of ensuring that we had sufficient data collected to analyse the changes in terms of short-term trends and build trust with the communities to avoid the misconception that it was only geared towards data collection and setting restrictive management rules to restrict fishing activities.

9. Budget: 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. It is important that you retain the management accounts and all paid invoices relating to the project for at least 2 years as these may be required for inspection at our discretion.

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Local Travel	300	700	+400	In every meeting, we had a cap on the number of participants invited but more always turned up and we could not turn them away
Stationery	200	100	-100	
Communication	100	150	+50	Had to include internet costs to communicate with the project team while away from the site.

Equipment, material and travel	700	1200	+500	
Sensitization and awareness seminars	1200	1200		
Consultative workshops	700	900	+200	More participants than anticipated turned to the workshops.
Fisheries guides and posters	250	100	-150	
Dissemination workshop	1200	900	-300	
Facilitation of stakeholder's workshop	350	150	-200	
Sub-total	5000	5400	+400	
Data collection exercise		3000	3000	Data collection was not initially planned but was included due to the interest to track the changes in trends. This was done twice a week for three years.
Total	5,000	8400	+3400	

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

I am currently working on a larger project to continue with the work and to sustain the work of the data collectors. Further, there are plans to have annual refresher training for fishers and data collectors on the importance of data collection and have dissemination sessions here the results from the research are presented back to the communities.

11. Did you use The Rufford Foundation logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the Foundation receive any publicity during the course of your work?

- Acknowledgement of the Rufford funding in a journal article.
- Community sensitisation workshop, the logo was used for the flyers.
- I completed my PhD and, in the acknowledgement, recognised the role of the funding.

12. Please provide a full list of all the members of your team and briefly what was their role in the project.

Clay Obota – community sensitization and training

Randal Mabwa – Communication and training

Victor Mwakha – Research design

Joshua Omweri – Data collection

13. Any other comments?

Communities are increasingly being wary of short-term projects and would want to be involved in long term projects with clear direct benefit. For interventions that call for community involvement in conservation, long term plans are more effective and there should be provisions from the Rufford grant to have follow-up grants within a year so as not to lose the momentum of the project. Going forward, it should be possible to merge efforts across the Rufford projects to have joint workshops and sessions and share experiences with the various communities in projects targeted at local community role in conservation. If possible, local-based community organisations should be allowed to directly apply for funding under a possible mentorship programme with the project lead providing guidance on project implementation while the community manages the funds and determines the concept of the project. The knowledge that coastal people have regarding the marine environment has often been underestimated. Most coastal communities have an awareness of, and concern for, their marine environment. The prime need may not be education but motivation and support. Part of this motivation depends on the availability of economically viable alternatives to prevent unsustainable and destructive fishing practices. The key task is to incentivise the communities to actively take the responsibility to manage their marine environment.