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	Nedim Kemer
Project title	A fish filter and "scare-fish" project for irrigating responsibly to sustain the reproduction cycle of endemic fish and to conserve their spawning habitat in cooperation with locals; in the Köprülü Kanyon National Park, Türkiye
RSG reference	07.04.08
Reporting period	07.31.08 through 09.24.09
Amount of grant	£ 6,000
Your email address	nedkem@yahoo.com
Date of this report	09.24.09

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
Collaborating with locals			YES	Collaborating with locals was the essence of this project and was greatly achieved. The fish filtering device was ultimately owned by the local villagers and the village headman. This is particularly critical since it clearly demonstrates a strong stewardship notion.
Collaborating with the National Park's managers		YES		This objective was partially accomplished. Although the necessary permits were obtained from the national park management both from the General Directorate in Ankara and the Regional Office in Antalya their collaboration was minimal. This is due to the past conflicts between the locals and the park management. Our project was always presented as an RSGF funded project at every occasion in order to be disassociate with the Turkish National Parks management so that the locals could participate, collaborate and eventually support.
Designing developing and executing the filtering device			YES	This is a unique device of its kind. It was never tested before. Therefore the design and the development were the essentially integral elements of the execution process. Considering such a dynamic challenge the device was executed successfully.
Scare Fish Device	X			The Scare-Fish was a secondary dimension of the bio-physical aspect of this project which was entirely omitted due to the security reasons in the field because it was designed as a floating and mobile device.
Implementing the Filtering Device in the Field			YES	The filtering device was satisfactorily executed and installed in the field
Monitoring the Result and Maintaining the Device			YES	The performance of the device monitored and maintained on a daily basis by a local villager and on a monthly basis by the project coordinator during the summer months (the fish migration season).

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

Although they were not unforeseen, three main difficulties challenged the project. The first was the past conflicts between the local communities and the national park management that could risk the project. Long, patient and sometimes painstakingly repetitive explanations about the Rufford Small Grants Foundation's support and the demonstrations of the device with public speeches in the village squares and in front of the mosques were very helpful to convince the local people on the fact that this was not a national park project. Also, the sticker with the logo of RSGF on the device with a clear explanation in Turkish cleared many gray areas. The second challenge was not being able to communicate with the female members of the villagers since the Beskonak village is a relatively closed Muslim society. Thirdly, although it was minor, the project also suffered from an internal conflict among the villagers. In one occasion two misbelieved young men from the village approached the site in an attempt to remove the filtering device thinking that it was installed by a treaty between the village headman and the national park. In another occasion especially during a heavy fish migration period some vandals damaged the filters by slashing the polyurethane screens with a knife. In both occasions a local villager (Ramazan Akis) who lives in an immediate location to the project site prevented and remedied the assaults. Ramazan Akis voluntarily guards and maintains the filtering device he also took critical part during the installation of the project. Later, the screens were renewed.

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

The villagers of the Beskonak Village are known to be notorious because they are extremely sceptical and uncooperative with the outsiders. This is due to some political and administrative mistakes that took place in the past. Today no employees or any managers of the national park cannot even begin to negotiate any project with these villagers. Considering this social mishap the success of our project presents itself as grandiose. This project has proven the fact that even the villagers of the Beskonak Village can be cooperative and supportive when it was done consciously and scientifically.
Secondly, millions of fish were saved.

Thirdly, the locals observed the result and thanked me for my efforts while they were expressing their gratitude with their prayers.

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

Local villagers were not only the biggest asset of this project but also the target. From the insemination of the idea to the installation they were essential components. They generously provided critical information about the way how and when the fish migrate and how their agricultural activities coincide with it. They gave their input to the designing and the development of the device which also provided valuable confirmation. They actively and physically collaborated with the transportation and the installation of the device to the site. Eventually they owned the project and are still using and maintaining the filtering device in their irrigation channel.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

I would like to generalize the outcome of this project to other irrigation channels with similar conflicts not only in the same location but also in the broader region. Meanwhile I am working on the device to improve it to perform in various field conditions with minimal maintenance. I am not entirely abandoned the Scare-Fish idea yet. This is an important dimension of the project. I am also planning on integrating the Scare-Fish with the filtering device so it would be much less vulnerable to the environmental conditions and potential vandalism.

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

I am planning on publishing this project from the insemination of the idea, through obtaining the support and to the accomplishment in a scholarly journal.

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

It was mainly used in two summers (2008 and 2009). During the first summer period the official permits and most importantly the support of the locals were obtained; and the fish filter device was built and stored. During the second summer the filter was installed in the field prior to the fish migration and collaboration with the local people was continued.

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
Research & Design Development	£ 120	£ 80	+ £ 40	Most of the design work was done prior to the application
Execution & Implementation of the Filtering Device	£ 3,740	£ 2,800	+ £ 940	Locals were significantly helpful and supportive to reduce the cost
Collaboration	£ 590	£ 610	- £ 20	
Accommodation & Transportation	£ 1,294	£ 1,050	+ £ 244	Locals were significantly helpful and supportive to reduce the cost
Monitoring & Maintenance	£ 100	£ 610	- £ 510	Maintenance has become an unexpected expense
Miscellaneous	£ 156	£ 280	- £ 124	Phone expense was underestimated
TOTAL	£ 6,000	£ 5430	- £ 570 This excess amount will be used towards further maintenance	

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

This was a unique opportunity to experience in a socially challenging site and environmental condition. I would like to be able to use this experience with similar projects in broader regions; even globally. However the next step is to publish and improve the device.

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?

I used the logo of the RSGF at every opportunity including my own web site. Since there is no scholarly publication about this project yet there is no publicity received for the RSGF so far.

11. Any other comments?

I am very thankful for the support the RSGF graciously granted. I will also take the freedom to express gratitude on behalf of the residents of the Beskonak Village.