

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	Erika Ikemoto
Project title	Agroforestry extension in protected areas of Brazilian Amazon: lessons from on-going experiences
RSG reference	9173-1
Reporting period	March 2011 – February 2012
Amount of grant	£6,000
Your email address	erika.biologia@gmail.com
Date of this report	27 February 2012

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
Identify perspectives about agroforestry's role in biodiversity conservation and in farmers' well-being among the staff of institutions involved in the agroforestry extension activities in Saracá-Taquera National Forest (STNF)			X	Cooperation and openness of protected area and extension staff in sharing their views and experiences were fundamental for the achievement of this objective.
Understand whether and how agroforestry extension is complemented by other activities developed by these institutions in STNF			X	
Identify factors influencing non-adoption, adoption and extent of adoption of the agroforestry innovations proposed in STNF		X		The extended stay of 11 months in the communities (four in total) in Saracá Taquera was very important here, as it allowed me to gain their trust, to participate in their daily livelihood activities and grasp their seasonal variation, and to deepen the data gathered with key informants regarding the history of the community (relation with previous projects and protected area, historical process of community organization). Only a small group of households (~20) is still to be interviewed to complete data collection (see item 2 for further explanation). The factors influencing adoption will demand more time than planned for analysis, due to their complexity (see also item 2).
The same three previous objectives, for Anavilhanas National Park		X		Preliminary data was gathered for Anavilhanas National Park in the first month of this project. After that, I decided to adapt the original schedule and spend 6 months (to

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
				simplify the logistics) in Saracá-Taquera before returning to Anavilhanas. But in the course of these 6 months, I realised that period would not be enough to reliably achieve my objectives in both sites. So I chose to spend my whole remaining time in Saracá-Taquera (reasons specified in the previous objective).

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

Logistics: The boat and the engine used to access the communities were borrowed from ICMBio, as previously agreed. I was also counting that a member of their staff would be available to pilot it for me, but unfortunately that was not the case. Just in the field I realised how limited they were on staff. So I was taught how to pilot it and did it myself.

Livelihoods and seasonality: February is the month when Brazil nut harvesting starts in the region, which means local people have very little time available to talk. I had to interrupt the present project before being able to complete the data collection (semi-structured interviews with approximately 20 households still remains to be done), and before being able to discuss, at the community level, the findings we collaboratively built. I will come back in June 2012, when the harvest season is over, in order to accomplish that.

Methodology and schedule: The survey (questionnaire) piloting and the interview guides refining required more time than planned. The adaptation of the schedule (from 6 to 11 months in Saracá-Taquera) was also important to accommodate that. Part of the preliminary data analysis, regarding the factors influencing farmers' decision-making, will also demand more time than planned. This became clear as the complexity of the involved factors and their interrelations were unveiled during the course of analysis. I will use the forced interruption in data collection, previously explained, for the benefit of this project – it will allow me to further the data analysis that I started in the field, and to be able to have a consistent discussion about this part of the results with the different actors.

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

I identify three main outcomes resulting from the fruitful process, involving the different actors, of sharing and discussing their experiences and views:

- Deeper understanding amongst local communities, at household level, of: what worked and what went wrong in past projects (in general and specifically in the agroforestry extension project object of the present study), what their preferences/priorities are in terms of livelihood activities and of well-being for their near future, what they want from and look for in a project (in general and specifically in the agroforestry extension project). As a result of this deeper understanding, I expect that the households are now able to discuss their views, needs and aspirations in a more systematic and articulated way with the agroforestry extension staff, and also with staff of other projects, in

order to promote the adaptations needed. A discussion of those themes at community level will be carried out in June 2012 (see item 2, for further explanation).

- Deeper understanding, amongst UFF (Fluminense Federal University) agroforestry extension staff, of the factors influencing farmer decision making. Some of the factors found to influence participation comprise: initiative in trying new livelihood options, previous interest in fruit tree planting, and trust that the extension staff will make marketing feasible are some of the factors influencing participation. On the other side, factors affecting non-participation include: fear and distrust motivated by negative views and experiences regarding actors such as protected area staff and commercial loggers, and influential community leader's position against the agroforestry project. These and other most relevant factors were discussed with the UFF staff, which they will be able to consider in the planning of their activities for 2012. A more complete array of the interacting factors explored in this project will be discussed with them in June 2012 (see item 2, for further explanation).

- Deeper understanding, amongst protected area (PA) (Saracá-Taquera) staff, of lessons learned from a previous agroforestry project. A few years ago, the PA staff assisted a community in the implementation of a collective agroforestry area. According to the PA staff, the initial successful commercialisation of vegetables and fruits was not sustained for very long, due to, among other factors, uneven commitment of the different members of the local cooperative. Problems in the management of financial resources by the cooperative and inappropriateness of the 'cooperative model' of organization were cited as some of the possible reasons. Most of the highly biodiverse agroforestry plots, with several native species, are now abandoned. As part of the present project, those lessons were shared with the UFF staff, and it was recommended that they further that discussion with the PA staff, and also with the community involved in that previous agroforestry project. The information on the initial good experience and later difficulties in collective commercialisation of that past project can be valuable for the future commercialization of the products of the UFF project.

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

I was positively surprised by the widespread willingness of the local communities in collaborating with this project. Each of the participating households was informed about the objectives of this study, and gave their prior informed consent for the data collection. They participated by sharing the history of their community, their past individual experiences, their perceptions, and also some of their demographic attributes (see also the first outcome listed above). By encouraging them to expose their thoughts, I witnessed them recall, reflect, aspire, criticise, praise.

As results of this project, I expect that local communities and extension staff are better informed (see also the first and second outcomes above), which can contribute to an agroforestry extension (and other kind of projects) that better attends the needs and aspirations of the local communities.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

There are interesting potential follow-ups for this project, such as: exploring in more detail one or some of the factors found to influence farmers' decision making; investigate their decision making in a few years time, when the fruit trees start producing; undertake a similar project in another site and compare the lessons learned. I would be very interested to implement any of these options if I have the chance.

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

By contributing in the implementation of training courses aimed at my colleagues in my home institution in Brazil, by participating in non-academic conferences aimed at conservation organizations.

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

Over 1 year, as initially planned.

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
Flight ticket London – Rio de Janeiro – London	1,100.00	1,500.00	-400.00	Price fluctuation
Flight ticket Rio de Janeiro – Belém	150.00	82.58	67.42	Price fluctuation
Flight ticket Belém - Manaus	100.00	111.31	-11.31	Price fluctuation
Flight ticket Manaus – Porto Trombetas	300.00	345.93	-45.93	Despite buying 1 ticket less than planned due to schedule adaptation (see comment on objective partially achieved), there was price fluctuation
Flight ticket Porto Trombetas – Manaus	200.00	101.24	98.76	1 ticket less than planned due to schedule adaptation (see comment on objective partially achieved)
Flight ticket Porto Trombetas – Manaus	200.00	101.95	98.05	Price fluctuation
Flight ticket Manaus – Rio de Janeiro	150.00	219.30	-69.30	Price fluctuation
Gasoline	2,744.00	3,247.85	-503,85	More gasoline than initially thought was needed for the monthly trip to the nearest city
Field assistant	192.00	192.00	0	

Accommodation	864.00	97.84	766.16	Paid accommodation was only needed in Manaus.
Total	6,000.00	6,000,00		

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

Discuss preliminary results with the local people, at community level (June 2012); complement the discussion of preliminary results with protected area and extension staff (June 2012); discuss the final results with protected area and extension staff, and communities (March 2013); dissemination of results at non-academic conferences and my home institution (2012-2014).

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, in the preliminary reports sent to the PA and extension staff.

11. Any other comments?

Thank you so much, RSGF, without your support this project would not have been possible.