

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. 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. 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	Dol Raj Thanet
Project title	Community based human-tiger conflict mitigation in the western sector of the buffer zone of Chitwan National Park, Nepal
RSG reference	9224-2
Reporting period	January 2011 to March 2012
Amount of grant	£ 5880
Your email address	dolrajthanet@gmail.com , drthanet@tsbcnepal.org.np
Date of this report	June 27, 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
Raise awareness about tiger conservation and its importance				
Piloting livestock insurance and livestock development scheme				We had substituted the programme-establishment of seed fund for piloting livestock insurance mechanism by providing improved cattle shed and livestock development programme, because we had faced unforeseen difficulties during project implementation time; i.e. need of huge budget for proper and sustainable institutionalisation of livestock insurance mechanism in the Buffer User Committee (BUC) level – as it covers larger areas with diverse socio-economic complexity and public interest. Accordingly, we had provided nine small sized improved livestock shed at three BUC level as a pilot project especially to those people who are affected from wildlife damage and the poorest of affected community. During the project period, we had provided some very basic knowledge about livestock development (nutrition, sanitation and health); and also provided techniques of being safe from tigers and predation proof livestock sheds.
Empower local communities for habitat management, ensuing a win-win situation for both tiger and surrounding communities				
Enhance livelihood of local communities through tiger				Local communities were motivated and now practising agroforestry, fish farming, ecotourism, grassland development activities etc. at buffer

<p>conservation and promotion of conservation based income generating activities; e.g. agroforestry, fishery, bee keeping, ecotourism</p>				<p>zone forest as well as private land and starting to get benefit from these activities. These activities will obviously reduce human pressure over the park resources on coming days.</p>
---	--	--	--	---

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

Though it is not the difficulties but I learned from this project that diverse socioeconomic status of the local societies and allocating small budget for certain project activities, etc creates huge difference in “interest” among them. As a result, I failed to pilot the livestock insurance scheme at BUC level in the project site; and according to their interest and demand, I designed another relevant activity i.e. providing improved cattle shed and livestock development programme, which is more closely related to achieve the targeted goal of the project: minimisation of human-tiger conflict through community based approach.

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

- Conservation based awareness programme through workshops at rural areas, weekly basis FM radio programme from local community based radio station, project brochure, regular project update at TSBC Nepal’s website are key tool to disseminate project activities and outcomes covering large audience at a time.
- “Habitat management (grassland, forest, waterholes) in the buffer zone forest” from where people and wildlife both are getting benefit mutually and thereby established the good example of win-win situation.
- Providing improved predation proof cattle sheds and livestock development programme, which is more closely related to achieve the targeted goal of the project: minimisation of human-tiger conflict through community based approach.

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

Human-tiger conflict is remarkable in the project site since the establishment of Chitwan National Park. This project was designed as per the demand of local communities and also I belong from the same community. Therefore, local people were actively involved from project designing phase to its implementation. One of the prominent activities of the project is ‘habitat management (grassland, forest, waterholes) in the buffer zone forest’ from where people and wildlife both are getting benefit mutually and leading to win-win situation both for people and wildlife.

Besides, conservation based awareness programme through workshops at rural areas, weekly basis FM radio programme from local community based radio station are key tool to involve the local communities in all phases of the project and their involvement was found enthusiastic.

During the course of our workshops/training with the local farmers, we were able to inform local farmers of the better livestock development options and compensation schemes available to them. Most rural households were not aware that compensation was available if predated upon. Through our work we were able to liaise between the park authority and relevant local NGOs, CBOs.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes. As knock-on effect of our work, we will now be continuing our research and outreach programme by:

- Conservation based awareness programme through local community based FM radio programme, conservation education at schools, monitoring and support to eco-clubs.
- Community based habitat (forest, grassland, waterholes) management in the buffer zone forest through Buffer Zone Community Forestry programme, which leads win-win situation both for wildlife and people.
- Providing additional improved predation proof sheds especially to those people who are affected from wildlife damage and the poorest of the affected community in other BUCs of the same project site.
- Alternate livelihood options and capacity building programme through providing scholarships for schooling and other vocational trainings: plumbing, electrician, nature guide, etc.

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

The project outcomes were briefly presented in seminar of Nepalese RUFFORD GRANTEES (Research in protected areas: Interface between researchers and managers) held in Kathmandu in January 2012. The project activities were briefed to other stakeholders, i.e. CBOs, BUCs, buffer zone community forest user groups (BZCFUGs), local media (VIJAYA Community FM Radio station), sector of the national park authority, etc. In near future, it will be published in local media/newspaper. The activities of the project will be informed to conservationists and others by putting it into website of the major partner organization; i.e. Tribal Society for Biodiversity Conservation (TSBC Nepal: www.tsbcnepal.org.np).

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

Though this second RSG project was designed covering the period from November 2010 to October 2011, but this project only approved in late December 2010 and funds were disbursed in late January 2011. As a result, project activities were implemented only from February 2012 onwards. On the other hand, actually I planned to complete this project in 12 months but it prolonged four months more due to implementing the substitute programme i.e. providing improved cattle shed and livestock development program.

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
1. Communication and Extension for the project activities: 1.1 Local FM Radio fee (for one year) 1.2 Website creation (one time) 1.3 Brochure/Pamphlets, Banners, etc. 1.4 Phone/E-mail and Internet (for one year)	300 150 200 240	300 150 200 230	0 0 0 +10	Electronic communication is being cheaper day by day
2. Group formation for escalating motivation and networking with different stakeholders (introductory workshop)	180	200	-20	Workshop cost was increased than expected
3. Awareness programmes: 3.1 Workshops, Local FM Radio, Brochures/manuals publication and distribution, etc	500	650	-150	We designed the weekly FM radio program for one year, but we continue for 18 months.
4. HTC mitigation activities and Capacity building programmes: 4.1 Training on livestock insurance scheme and livestock development, wildlife habitat management and Conservation Oriented IGAs. (L/S)	510	500	+10	
5. Conservation actions: 5.1 Regular restoration and management of wildlife habitat (grassland, waterholes, etc) and maintenance of electric fencing. 5.2 ***Establishment and mobilization of seed fund for piloting livestock insurance scheme at three Buffer zone User Committee level in the project site. 5.3 Installation of Hoarding boards, which contains conservation messages in the affected areas.	600 750 400	700 770 300	-100 -20 +100	Most of the electric fences were not functional so as to need more budget for the maintenance.
6. Stationery (L/S)	350	300	+50	Our partner organisation has supported to provide some stationary
7. Field visit (for coordination and monitoring of the project activities): Accommodation for team members	1200	1100	+100	We all team members represent the same area where project is

				implemented, which reduced the accommodation cost.
8. Equipments and materials (Training hall, computer and LCD projector on rent basis, white board, card board, masking tape, chalk, duster, banner, etc.)	300	300	0	
9. Reporting	200	200	0	
TOTAL	5880	5900	-20	

Note: *** is substituted by Providing small sized improved predation proof cattle shed and livestock development program especially to those people who are affected from wildlife damage and the poorest of affected community.

Currency had been exchanged @ 1 £ sterling = 113 Nepalese Currency (NPR)

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

Considering the results produced by the project we now hope to:

- Prioritise areas that require immediate management interventions in terms of habitat management through development of buffer zone community forestry programme, which leads win-win situation both for wildlife and people.
- To materialise the visionary and ambitious statement of the St. Petersburg summit – “to double the tiger numbers by 2022”, more action based projects are crucial such as providing additional small to medium sized improved predation proof cattle shed especially to those people who are affected from wildlife damage and the poorest of affected community in other BUCs, Alternate livelihood options and capacity building such as scholarships for schooling and other vocational trainings: plumbing, electrician, nature guide, etc to the poor and tiger victim family might be crucial to minimise the existing human-tiger conflict.
- Continuation of conservation based awareness programme through local community based FM radio programme, conservation education at schools, monitoring and support to eco-clubs looking ahead.

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. Project’s brochure and hoarding boards were produced with keeping the RSGF logo and TSBC Nepal. Also, during the workshops/trainings with local users, the banner with logo of RSGF and TSBC Nepal were used.