

Final Evaluation Report

Your Details	
Full Name	Paulo Wanderley de Melo
Project Title	Participatory conservation of a Brazilian estuarine socioecological system: empowering artisanal fishers through community-based tourism
Application ID	30051-1
Grant Amount	£5989
Email Address	Paulowmelo03@gmail.com
Date of this Report	August 16 th , 2021

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
Study of the knowledge of the fishing community about environmental risks				In my master's research, which was submitted to the AMBIO Journal, I analysed fishers' perception of risks to local biodiversity and how they could be solved.
Articulation of Community-based tourism				With the necessary adaptations to COVID-19, we were able to articulate partnerships and take the first steps for the fishers to leverage community-based tourism.
Holding meetings with the Fishing Association, the Manager of the Protected Area and local government and partners.				Due to COVID-19, we limited our field trips. However, during the workshops and in webinars, we had the opportunity to strengthen the bonds between the community and partners (locals, government and university).
Dissemination and evaluation of results				We disseminated it through social media, webinars and, at the end, we carried out the monitoring stage with the participants by telephone. Due to COVID-19, we were unable to carry out the planned monitoring with the tourists, as the project's tours had not yet started.

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

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we had to adapt our planning. This entire process was always done in contact with the community and The Rufford Foundation in each change that was needed. First, we postponed activities in the first half of 2020. Then, we brought the dissemination stage to the beginning of the project, so that we were able to produce audio-visual content with the fishers, leaving the workshops for the second stage. We reduced the number of participants to 30% of the planned (eight fishers) and the frequency of field trips, limited to twice a month. All these changes were carried out organically with the fishers and The Rufford Foundation, without compromising the expected results of the project.

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

We identified three main outcomes: i) community participation and co-production of materials; ii) creation of partnerships; iii) structuring of community based tourism. As for community participation, all eight fishers participated in practically all the meetings, with one or two meetings missing due to work or health reasons. Fishers actively participated in the elaboration of all products, from the dissemination videos to the mapping of tourist attractions and ecological boards. The partnerships created during the project were very well executed. Generating an atmosphere of dialogue and tools for fishers to continue the project, even after its completion. The partnership with Prof Dr Vanice Selva, the Protected Area of Guadalupe manager and with a local owner that aims to develop ecological tourism in the region, was essential to the development of our project. All these actors were able to participate in our project's workshops and could start discussions with fishers about future partnerships. Finally, our project, as we will in our monitoring phase (see Results and Monitoring at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353558924_Participatory_Conservation_of_a_Brazilian_Estuarine_Socioecological_System_Empowering_Artisanal_Fishers_through_Community-Based_Tourism), was able to provide an unprecedented foundation for community-based tourism with the fishers of Rio Formoso. The potential identified in the community was answered during the project, so that we observed the development and empowerment of fishers to reinforce the practice of ecological tourism in the estuary.

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

The partnerships initiated by our project will allow its perpetuation in the coming years. Because, during the workshops and at events that we participated in to disseminate it, we were able to give visibility and create networks so that foundations and government can continue to support and encourage the project. Finally, we observed that fishers, after such difficult years, were able to identify in this project an opportunity for empowerment and a sustainable source of income that emphasises the local culture and environment.

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

Fishers actively participated in all phases of the project. We consider it essential that the community participate since the project designing and planning stages. In this way, we increase the efficiency in carrying out the activities, as the community will be empowered and protagonist. Participants had good attendance during the workshops, with the majority actively participating in all of them. As is clear from the fishers' statements in the evaluation of the results and monitoring that we carried out, their participation in our project made them develop skills and structuring the execution of community-based tourism. With that, they will be able to generate an alternative source of income to the fishing activity that will be sustainable and will value their traditional culture.

6. Are there any plans to continue this work?

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

The results of our project were already disseminated during its execution. We publicised the videos and the workshops on social media during the project, showing the importance of The Rufford Foundation support and the creation of partnerships for the project execution. We were also able to participate in a *live* on Instagram, in which we disseminated the project's activities and its future potential. We also participated in a webinar, at the invitation of the Department of Environment and Sustainability of the government of the state of Pernambuco (Brazil). On this occasion, we disseminated the results of our project and its importance for the Rio Formoso estuary conservation. Finally, our results were also submitted to AMBIO Journal and published on ResearchGate (<https://www.researchgate.net/project/Participatory-Conservation-of-a-Brazilian-Estuarine-Socioecological-System-Empowering-Artisanal-Fishers-through-Community-Based-Tourism>). Even after the project completion, we will continue to accompany the community, assisting in the production of banners and audiovisual dissemination strategies to reach tourists and supporters.

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

We planned to run the project during January and December 2020. Due to all the adaptations to COVID-19, the project was extended an additional 8 months, ending in August 2021. All these changes are documented in letters sent by email to The Rufford Foundation during the project period.

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.

The amount budgeted for the project was made based on the rate of conversion of £1 = R\$6.28 (as of June 8th, 2020). When the amount was received by the Bank and allocated to FADURPE, the exchange rate was £1 = R\$6.78. Thus, as all procedures during the project to transfer values between items (previously agreed and documented in emails to the Rufford Foundation) were based on the fee of £1 = R\$6.28, there will be differences that have been reported in the comments in the table below.

Thus, the amount received (**£5.989**), corresponding to R\$37,610 (£1 = R\$6.28), was **R\$40,605** (£1 = R\$6.78). We detail below the differences and clarifications, as well as the amount that will be returned to the Rufford Foundation.

The “Budgeted Amount” is on £1 = R\$6.28. The “Actual Amount” is on £1 = R\$6.78. All the arrangements and changes we made during the past months, are documented on email, with the Trustees agreement.

The "Budgeted Amount" is the one we have communicated to the Rufford Foundation on June 8th, 2020, by email. At the time, we had added the adjustments regarding the Bank extra charges and the adaptations on the other items in order to accomplish this demand.

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Administrative services (FADURPE)	600	593	-7	
Bank extra charge (£12,24/month/14)	180	108	-72	Fee charged by the Bank was lower than budgeted, being £7.7/month for 12 months (£1 = R\$6.78)
Material for fishers	462	442	-20	
Material for workshops	29	26	-3	
Ecological boards (£4,60/unit/40)	184	1351	+1167	At the end of the project, we agreed with Rufford to reallocate amounts of other items that were not being used, to increase the production of Ecological boards.
Multimedia projector	384	331	-53	
Projection screen	77	72	-5	
Printer paper (£4/unit/4)	16	13	-3	
Cartridges (£12,30/unit/2)	25	24	-1	
Printer	153	156	+3	
Personal computer	998	782	-216	
Lavalier microphone	39	40	-1	
Condenser microphone	85	46	-39	
Camera	329	516	+187	Due to the increase in prices caused by the Pandemic, we required Rufford to reallocate the value of other items to purchase Camera.
Battery and memory card		51	+51	Due to the change in activities, we inserted this item to carry out the production of audiovisual content with the Fishers.
Portable charger		28	+28	Same as above
Led selfie light		25	+25	Same as above
Camera tripod		53	-53	Same as above

Design services	Material	338	334	-4	
Boatman services (£38,50/trip/4)		154	89	-65	
Feeding – Meetings and Workshops		858	131	-727	The amount used was below budgeted, due to the reduction in the number of participants and field trips. It was reallocated to other items.
Feeding - Data Sampling		60		-60	Not used due to Pandemic.
Local field assistance – Data Sampling (£3,00/day/15)		45		-45	Same as above.
Fuel (gasoline) – Community-based tourism		389	125	-264	We reduced the budgeted amount due to the reduction in field trips.
Fuel (gasoline) – Data Sampling (£10,50/week/2)		21	21		Not used due to Pandemic.
Car Rental (£9,20/day/61)		563	226	-337	We reduced the budgeted amount due to the diminution in field trips.
Urban transport - UBER			22	+22	Item inserted to assist the safety of the project coordinator born in the field.
TOTAL		5989	5505	-482	

During the time it was deposited in the Bank account, the amount had monthly income. The amount of £173 was added by the Bank, referring to the fees for receiving and transferring the funds. From that, £74 was for the collection fee in July (2020) (£1 = R\$6.78) and £99 was for the transfer fee of funds to the Rufford Foundation in August (2021) (£1 = R\$7.35). Thus, the unused amount of £258 (£1 = R\$7.35) was transferred back to the Rufford Foundation on August 16th, 2021.

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

The development of visual identity and articulation between the fishers and their partners were well executed during the project. This opened doors of support from other institutions and the government. The next steps should be the dissemination and execution of tours, to give more visibility to this activity. It is also necessary the support of the local government and environmental institutions, such as the protected area. In the events we participated in, we noticed the interest in this support, and we believe that it can be implemented in the coming months to continue the project that has started.

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?

Yes. In all dissemination, whether through social media or in webinars presentations, we have used The Rufford Foundation logo and mentioned the importance of its

support for the project success. Also, on all generated products (such as the "ecological boards") we have stamped the Rufford Foundation logo visibly on the material.

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

Paulo Wanderley de Melo: Project coordinator, carried out the master's research, idealization and execution of community-based tourism project activities.

María Elisabeth de Araújo: Participated in the idealization and planning of the research and community-based tourism phasis and helped to publicize the project.

José da Silva Mourão: Participated in the idealization of the research and community-based tourism phasis and helped in the project dissemination.

13. Any other comments?

We are grateful for The Rufford Foundation's understanding of all the changes that occurred during the project. With all the difficulties that arose due to COVID-19, we thank you for your understanding and prompt response to our considerations and demands.