

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	Vodouhe Fifanou
Project title	Assessment of optional land uses as alternative strategy for biodiversity conservation in Pendjari Biosphere Reserve in Benin (West Africa)
RSG reference	11.03.08
Reporting period	November 2008 to November 2009
Amount of grant	£5946
Your email address	vodouhefifanou@yahoo.fr
Date of this report	June 24, 2010

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
Assess Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFP) economical values			The Net Present Value of NTFPs was estimated to be £2,463 ha ⁻¹	Today, people and those responsible for the park are informed about NTFP value in the park's economic valuation.
Analyze economic importance of firewood harvesting		There are very few persons in study area who undertake firewood collection		During field data collection, we remarked that firewood harvesting is the first stage of land conversion to agriculture. Therefore, we preferred comparison between NTFPs collection and agriculture, considering agriculture as final stage of vegetation destruction.
Evaluate economic importance of cotton production			The Net Present Value of cotton production was £1,416 ha ⁻¹	We considered cotton production in the research because cotton in the area is the main exportation crop and farmers are motivated to produce and get income.
Compare these three land use options for decision making by local people.			NTFPs collection is 1.74 times more profitable than cotton production around National Park of Pendjari.	Henceforth people are informed and can make informed choice between NTFPs collection and cotton production.

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

We faced a serious difficulty during data collection. Indeed, two members of the project team were involved in PhD programmes and had less time to be involved in project activities. To tackle this situation, we were obliged to involve other colleagues but this took time before they were integrated into the project objectives. This situation affected project activity implementation and explained in large part the delay observed.

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

- The economic importance of Non-timber Forest Products is known. Indeed, the Net Annual Market Value of the Pendjari National Park savannah formation in NTFPs was estimated to be £ 246 ha⁻¹ while their Net Present Value was estimated to be £ 2,463 ha⁻¹

- Local communities and those responsible for the park are informed that sustainable NTFPs harvesting provide more revenue than agriculture, especially cotton production
- In view of the disproportionately low return from land use to produce cotton and current adverse criticism on environmental impact of park land conversion for agriculture, a NTFP-focused management system can be considered economically viable management option

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

Local communities were involved at each stage of the project. For data collection 10 farmers (ranging from 20 to 60 years old) known for their knowledge of NTFPs and familiarity with harvesting methods were involved in the research team. To have species use validated by the entire community, we used the sample of species identified within the plots and asked participants during focus groups discussion on their knowledge about the species. In total, we organized about 60 focus group discussions and about 20 men and women participated in each focus group discussion. Research results were shared with local people during workshop.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

In collaboration with the school responsible in study area, we are thinking to train teachers based on the study results in order to do schoolchildren education/awareness. We also plan to replicate this work in other protected areas where the land pressure is high.

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

The study results were shared with local communities through a workshop in the study area and many group discussions. We also planned to produce some posters which will be given to those responsible for the park to improve their sensitization about biodiversity conservation. We are also writing one paper to share the results with scientific communities. The manuscript of this paper is already and will be submitted to peer review journal. A part of these results were presented during the last Meeting of Sciences, Culture and Technologies of Abomey-Calavi University in Benin and regional workshop on the potential role of local fruit trees and other food tree species for nutrition, poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation in Sub-Saharan Africa in Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso).

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

For the National Park of Pendjari savannah formation valuation we needed to assess tree species valuation and this needs more than 1 year due to the fact that all species don't produce each year. Moreover the collection of data through more than 1 year provided multiple estimations of the production from each tree and makes us comfortable for results generalization. Therefore the actual time scale of 12 months was not sufficient for completion of the project to the exact level and explains in part our delay in report submission.

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
Laptop Pentium Dual-Core (120Go, 1Go RAM)	500	420	+80	The laptop was cheaper than we expected
Garmin GPS Receivers 60 Series GPS	150	150		Ok
Precision balances (300g and 1000g)	40	40		Ok
Model 283D/10M Diameter Tape	40	40		Ok
Suunto KB-14 Compass	116	116		Ok
Tent (Pinnacle Pass 2XTA/3XTA)	170	170		Ok
Local transportation	2000	2300	-300	We have an cost overrun due to the increase of petrol cost
Field assistants	1500	1500		Ok
Digital Camera 12 Megapixel	230	230		Ok
Workshop and meetings	1200	1000	+200	Due to the budget and space limit, we reduced the number of participants
TOTAL	5,946	5,966	-20	We completed about £20 to end the project activities

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

The main activity needed is to continuous to sensitize local communities about the conservation of biodiversity using the results found during this project. Our experience in the study area show that people are very much concerned with regard to results but they are faced many difficulties. Among these are lack of information on potential market and marketing channels, the fragmented nature of NTFP markets, the unpredictability of the production cycles, resulting. There is a need to analyze these aspects to increase people awareness about sustainable forest resources use.

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?

We used the RSGF on posters presented at regional conferences