

The Rufford Foundation

Final Report

Congratulations on the completion of your project that was supported by The Rufford 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	Faith Milkah Ngugi-Muniale
Project title	Promoting Participatory Forest Management to Conserve Mau Forest Complex.
RSG reference	14065-B
Reporting period	September 2014 – December 2015
Amount of grant	£9989
Your email address	fngugi2001@gmail.com
Date of this report	August 2016

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
Community Association Forest (CFA) mobilization			√	The community was mobilised, a total of 22 self-help groups around the forest came together to form the association and were registered and given approval to partner with Kenya Forest Service in managing the forest reserve
Livelihood and Resources Assessments			√	Out of the CFA members, a Local Planning team (LPT) was selected representative of all varied interests that lead all the surveys with the project team. Livelihood and resource assessment was done with help of enumerators hired from the community. They surveyed 18villages and a total of 276 households. This data was used to characterise the CFA socio-economic status that is significant in understanding the relationship between the community and the forest
Biodiversity Assessment			√	Identification of flora and fauna was carried out by project team, LPT and relevant stakeholders including officers from wildlife service. The community helped in translating to local language and explaining how they relate with the biodiversity
Resource Mapping			√	Community mapping and expertise GIS mapping were combined. The process started with sketch mapping by community and ground truthing by project team and Kenya Forest Service mapping experts. The final maps used were processed in a GIS lab for both forest reserve and the surrounding area

Forest Zonation			√	The forest resources and the surrounding area were divided into broader zones that can have similar interventions. This was carried out by LPT, stakeholders and project team
Development of programmes			√	With the background information describing the people, the forest, flora and fauna, the current situation and the desired status of the forest resource, the stakeholders, community representatives under the guidance of project team developed prescriptive programmes that will help improve the forest and livelihoods of the people. They were detailed with associated activities, participants, time line and estimated budgets.
5 year Participatory Forest Management Plan (PFMP) documentation			√	All the information gathered in all the steps was packaged into a document by the project team. That is the participatory forest management plan. It becomes the main guide for community and the Kenya Forest Service in management of the forest resource.
Approval of PFMP			√	The developed PFMP was submitted for approval by the head quarters of Kenya Forest Service where the National Director of Forest Planning would give recommendations for amendments particularly of the proposed programmes
Forest Management Agreement and launching			√	This was beyond the scope of the project but it is the ultimate goal of developing a PFMP. The two parties, KFS and CFA now have a signed agreement and the partnership has been launched.

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

The project had a major challenge with managing timelines because it involved several government institutions that are somewhat bureaucratic in operation. The approval of the participatory forest management plan is done from one office for all the forest reserves in Kenya. Therefore it took long on the queue. Once the national office has looked through the document, some recommendations required some more field work carried out. The community members were readily available but it took more time than expected.

To have the community members participate, we had to sometimes adjust to their schedule, since they are farmers, we avoided meetings coinciding with the times that farmers are busy for example in planting season, weeding season, harvesting seasons and such. So we kept on adjusting our schedules since the community members needed to participate fully.

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

- a) The 5-year participatory forest management plan is now in place together with an agreement between the two parties (Kenya Forest Service and Kiptuget community forest association) for implementing the plan.
- b) The community forest association is in place and trained with the necessary knowledge to co-manage the forest.
- c) in the process of developing the participatory forest management plan, the project has gathered data that is now being used as the current status description of the forest reserve in terms of flora, fauna and human demographic of the community around the forest

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

The main focus of my projects is enhancing participation of the local communities in the conservation of Mau Forest Complex. A very vital ecosystem that is ecologically fragile and threatened. The project helped the community to align with current forest management policy by forming an association and registering it.

The community now has a stake in the forest reserve because they went through the required process of developing a participatory forest management plan. They will participate in decision making and most importantly they will access tangible benefits including beekeeping in the forest, grazing in the forest, and they will participate and manage the (Plantation Establishment and Livelihoods

Improvement System) PELIS programme. The members of the association will be allocated portions of land in the plantation forest zone where they will take care of the planted trees and in the meantime grow food crops. This means a lot to the community members because the forest land is very productive. They pay a small fee for it and the money goes to the association kitty. This could not be accessed before the project intervention since the community needed to be a unit i.e. an association and registered. The PELIS programme also runs under the management plan, so it has been enabled by the development of the participatory forest management plan that was developed through this project.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes. The participatory plans are reviewed every 5 years therefore it will be a continuous assessment of what has been implemented and what has changed in the course of time, is the forest status and community status improving?

Focusing on the bigger Mau Forest Ecosystem, there are several forest reserves, this project focused on one. Most of them have already development participatory forest management plans for their respective forest reserves. I would like to see all of them develop a management plan, and in future help these associations to get united through one umbrella body and together take an ecosystem approach to the conservation and management of Mau Forest Complex.

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

Already the plan document is now in public domain, once it has been approved by Kenya Forest Service, it becomes a public document co-owned by the community association and the forest service and can be accessed at will by anyone else. Besides that, we have developed simple brochures summarising the document and are circulated in the community since all members may not read the comprehensive document. The association which has a complete leadership structure continue to meet and discuss about the implementation of the plan together with the stakeholders.

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

The grant from Rufford Foundation was used for 18 months. The initial plan was to take 12 months but the activities took slightly longer at every level. It was necessary to take this pace to ensure full community participation.

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
Transport: return trip to project area is Approximately 80 km. One round trip cost £72 about four trips in 10 months estimated	2880	3168	288	We planned to go to the field for 10 months but we were in the field for 12 months. The field trips increased by four from 40. The additional cost was funded by savings from publicity materials budgets and equipment, and ERMIS topped up with about another £100.
Mobilization: one forum in each of the five villages to introduce and launch the project @ £80 each	400	400	0	There was more villages but they are near to each other and therefore combined them to form five blocks so the budget remained as planned
Livelihood and Resources Assessments: Household survey by 10 hired enumerators. cost of training, questionnaires, and actual survey	800	800	0	There were many community members involved in supervision of the enumerators but most of the work was voluntary.
Biodiversity Assessment: 2days Consultative meetings with CFA and stakeholders	1350	2025	(+)675	The work was more than expected because of translation to vernacular languages. The additional funds was transferred from zonation activity that took less days than planned
Resource Mapping: Village meetings	400	400	0	The village meetings worked as planned. The

				rest of mapping working was by project team.
Forest Zonation: 2 day consultative meetings with CFA and stakeholders	1350	675	(-)675	Since the team had participated in forest assessment and mapping, it was easier to arrange the reserve to broad zones so it took 1 day instead of the planned two days
Development of programmes: 3-day consultative meetings with CFA and stakeholders	2025	2025	0	The budget was not affected but the arrangement of the work changed and took more days although with fewer different people everyday focusing on specific program. Stakeholders attended according to their expertise so did not need to attend every day.
Subsistence: for technical project team during field works for biodiversity assessment, forest zonation and resources mapping	288	346	(+)58	The field work took longer by 2 months hence the additional subsistence cost. This was got from the money saved from the publicity materials budget line.
Equipment: Camera and projector	800	720	(-)80	By the time of buying, equipment price was lower than the quoted price. The quality was not compromised. The CFA borrows them whenever they have an activity in the forest that would require the equipment.
Publicity materials: designing and printing	500	334	(-)166	All the planned publicity materials were produced but in less numbers since

project posters, brochures and t-shirts				only the community representatives were provided with t-shirts for instance.
Administration cost and bank charges. 5% of project cost	476	476	0	
Total	11269	11369	100	It was planned from the beginning that 1280 pounds would be subsidised by using the organisations vehicle instead of hiring transport at market rate. Rufford funded £9989 of the budget and the extra £1380 as a subsidy from ERMIS Africa through transport to the field.

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

Participatory forest management concept in Kenya finally working after 10 years since the policy was enacted. However all forest reserves and community associations are not moving at the same pace, some have not started while some are about to review their plan after 5 years. Therefore it is a continuous process and it is important to keep track of the plans and particularly follow through the impact on forest conservation and livelihoods.

It is also important to keep the associations reminded of the main focus of participating in forest conservation and therefore walk them through the journey as they grow as a functioning community unit. They will need to fund raise to implement some of the proposed programmes where I and the project team can technically support.

10. Did you use The Rufford Foundation logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the RSGF receive any publicity during the course of your work?

Yes. The main output of this project is the participatory forest management plan a document that was approved and adopted by the government. It has the Rufford



Foundation logo on the cover page and is gratefully recognised as the funding partner.

The logo was also published on the brochures and t-shirts that were produced for the project.

11. Any other comments?

I would like to thank Rufford Foundation for generously financing the project. Many communities in Kenya have not yet started the process of complying to the participatory forest management policy because they have to fund the activities. This is only possible through well wishers.

Generally all work involving general community members, the government and other players in the field of natural resources management is usually an unclear path. On the other hand, with policy guidelines, it is possible to benchmark. Therefore I would like to encourage all the agents promoting community conservation to keep moving even if the progress is slow because positive change will come gradually.