

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	Patrick Byaruhanga Byamukama
Project title	Public awareness and participation in the conservation of Wambabya Wetlands/River in Hoima District
RSG reference	98. 08. 09
Reporting period	April 2010 to April 2011
Amount of grant	£6000
Your email address	bbmpatrick@yahoo.co.uk
Date of this report	23 rd May 2011

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
Promoting public awareness and sensitisations on the values of wetland biodiversity			Fully achieved	Several sensitisations using all forms of media including radios and use of community leaders in mobilisation; and workshops all held at various levels were conducted to promote public awareness.
Providing the public with basic knowledge and understanding of wetland biodiversity			Fully achieved	Sensitisation meetings, field tours of resource users and surrounding committees, and training of established environmental committees
Providing people with skills to identify, predict, prevent and solve wetland problems and utilising limited resources in a sustainable way		Partially achieved		Committees have been set up and trained. Plans are underway for these training to start training the rest of the communities and individuals. This is yet to be realised since a few committees established have started training others
Providing individuals and communities with opportunities to actively participate in solving wetland problems and to make decisions about biodiversity conservation		Partially achieved		A baseline survey, sensitisation meetings field tours and trainings all involved communities. Mobilisation at various levels was done using a multi-pronged approach to ensure all everyone participated and realise greater awareness within the community. However, this objective will be fully achieved when the committees complete trainings

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

- I. Sustaining local community enthusiasm from mobilisation to training was hard to achieve. However, involving their local leaders and other agencies we were able to register remarkable achievements.
- II. Mobilisation for selection of committees and their trainings coincided with the local and national political campaigns. Some meetings would fail because communities tended to pay more attention to politics than our conservation actions. We created partnership with politicians such that during their campaigns our messages were passed to the communities
- III. There was a variance in commitment among multi-stakeholders' platforms. Whereas others were duly committed, others were less concerned. A multi-stakeholders meeting was later convened aimed at explaining the project agenda and commitment
- IV. During mobilisation some resource users did not embrace and welcome the project for fear of being evicted and not providing alternative sources of livelihoods. In this case, line organisations such as NAVODA were invited to address this issue.

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

- i. The project brought on board virtually all communities to participate in the conservation.
- ii. During community field tours buffer zones (no-activity zone) were created 50 m from the wetland and these are still being adhered to.
- iii. Fully functional environmental committees were established are already creating awareness and encouraging people to participate.

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

- i. At baseline survey, communities were assessed to establish knowledge about the wetlands.
- ii. Local communities were involved in mobilisation at all levels.
- iii. Some of them were used as change agents.
- iv. In field tours local communities participated in appreciating the values, problems and solution to the wetland.
- v. Environmental committees were setup from the local communities to train other wetland users.

All in all, the capacity of local communities in environmental planning, conserving and governance was built. Having been participated it is easier to solve own wetland problems.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes, we would be willing but later after assessing their performance. These communities have been empowered to solve their own wetland/ environmental problems and hope that the established committees will create a multiplier effect to the entire local community. They have been exposed to proposal writing, search for potential funders and other possible ways to sustain themselves, which we hope will do in the near future. There other areas that need serious attention as of now.

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

- i. We are planning to hold a multi-stakeholder's workshop to share experiences regarding implementation, achievement, challenges and sustainability.
- ii. Documentation all project work highlighting the achievements is underway

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

Implementation of all project activities took 13 months and the actual months were 12

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
Baseline survey	906	835	-71	The analysis, data presentation and purchase of GIS images cost £300 instead of £371
Presentation of findings	1,912	1,065	-847	The participants expected were less in number
Mobilization	496	650	+154	Increased fuel prices affected the budget; to sustain community enthusiasm more mobilisation was done and therefore more fuel used
Sensitization and awareness	1,197	1,197	0	The venue where sensitisations were conducted was catered for by Hoima District Local Government (£857) and £340 was all used to facilitate the workshops
Partnerships and collaboration	226	200	-26	We used less airtime on communication because some partner agencies were within our reach
Formation of environmental conservation committees	226	840	+614	The exercise took longer than expected, and amount and price per litre of fuel also increased
Training Committee members	1,028	1,250	-222	This exercise was also prolonged and was affected by increased fuel prices
Messages	200	1000	+800	The demand for leaflets produced shot up and so was the number which increased the cost. An extra £800 was provided by Wetland Inspection Division to enhance awareness.
Organising concerts	570	300	-270	Only two drama plays as some groups did not prefer this learning method
Facilitating transect walks	278	334	+56	Having received more than what was budgeted for by Hoima municipality, more transect walks were made
Hiring Monitoring and Evaluation experts	714	800	+86	Because of the rise in the fuel prices the budget shot up by 86
Office rent	1,368	1,368	0	This was offered in kind by the local government and all was realised
Total	9,121	9,837	+716	

Note: The extra funding was provided for by the Wetland Inspection Division that catered for the production of brochures and other leaflets.

£1 is equivalent to Ug. Shs 3500

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

- i. Emphasis should be put on alternative livelihoods approaches that will address human concentration / settlement around the swamp and over dependence on the wetland.
- ii. Political-technical leadership difference on ecological biodiversity be addressed.

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, it was used in all correspondences including invitation letters, brochures. The Rufford Small Grants Foundation was emphasised during mobilisation, sensitisation and training as the main funder of this project.

11. Any other comments?

The actual cost was affected by the rising inflation of some items. Meanwhile, the stakeholders are extending their appreciation to the Rufford Small Grants Foundation for the grant that helped them realise and solve their environmental problems.