

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	Caroline Bosire
Project title	Habitat fragmentation and its effect on recruitment in Plain's zebra (<i>Equus burchelli</i> Gray) and wildebeest (<i>Connochaetes taurinus</i> Burchell) in Nairobi National Park and Athi Kaputiei Plains, Kenya
RSG reference	25.12.09
Reporting period	September 2011
Amount of grant	£6000
Your email address	ckerubo@yahoo.com
Date of this report	24/10/2011

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
Establishing wildlife and livestock densities in the Kitengela Open Plains		✓		Data collection for the last month season completed in September 2011 and is currently being analysed.
Determine the degree to which land is still available for wildlife and livestock use			✓	This data was collected in 2006 and was updated in 2010 by ILRI and The Wildlife Foundation.
Integrate community participation in scientific research		✓		Having worked with some of the youth in the community by training them on data collection using the distance sampling method, there is still a need to also interact with the elders and other decision makers in the community so as to integrate their views into implementing future conservation activities.
Creating inter-organisational interaction on studies related to human-wildlife interactions in the Kitengela area.		✓		There is still a plan to bring more organisations on board. We have still not worked closely enough with the county council, the Kenya Wildlife Services and other organisations working in the area. It is envisioned that they will get involved during a meeting with the community decision makers when giving feedback on the findings of the work carried out over the past year.

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

- We were unable to start the project immediately the funds became available from Rufford Small Grants Foundation. This was due to the unavailability of matching funds from the other groups to which we had applied for funding. We then changed the data collection methods to include more of the community youth in data collection.
- Mobilising community members during the time in which we were to start the project proved to be a little difficult as most of them were dealing with issues affecting their livestock at the time, like drought, and were not available for meetings. Data collection was then scheduled to coincide with times when all the trained enumerators were available.

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

- Training and interacting with community members in highly skilled data collection techniques using such equipment as range finder and GPS.
- Realisation by community members of the actual changes going on in their landscape through participation in enumeration of wildlife within their different localities.
- A link between community monitoring and scientific wildlife studies was created as most of the work for the study was conducted by locally recruited youth who are now able to continue with the monitoring even without the presence of scientist. This allows for continuation in the conservation work being carried out in this area by various groups though a common pool of data that can be collected by the community members themselves.

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

The local community is in a very interesting zone within Kenya's semi-arid lands. They still have some tracts of open land which are of interest to conservationists and government institutions, yet they are also areas of land that attract investment due to the high demand for land to construct residential property by the residents in Nairobi.

By enabling community members to participate in the collection and initial analysis of the data, they are more in touch with the understanding of the value of their parcels of land for conservation beyond the monetary compensation for allowing wildlife onto their land. This is through observing first hand the changes affecting wildlife from a different perspective from the usual one in which there is still a belief that there is enough land for wildlife.

The youth that have been trained have become a resource pool for data collection by the various groups interested in collecting data on wildlife interactions in the area.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

There are plans to continue this work. It has become apparent that only continued monitoring of the situation on the ground will give a clear picture to the community and policy makers on what factors are affecting free movement of both livestock and wildlife in these rangelands. We also look forward to generating enough funds to recruit a larger pool of community based individuals with the skills to gather information on the trends in wildlife and livestock densities in the area. This will be through the proposed collaborations with the other groups so as to have complementarity in the work carried out on conservation.

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

We hope to be able to have community meetings within the Kitengela Open Plains and invite other interested groups to attend them and get feedback on what is going on in the area. We also hope to be able to use the expanding group of trained community members, through their continued monitoring to be an instrument in generating interest in activities being carried out and their importance to the community. The youth are fluent in the local language and known to the

communities in which they work which removes the barriers to communication often encountered when information is translated.

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

RSG was used for 12 months. The work was delayed as we waited for more funds to augment the collaring portion of the work which has delayed the communication portion of this project.

12 months is a good yard stick for wildlife data monitoring as it gives an indication of the seasonal changes that are at play in the movement and resource use by the animals. It also showed the interactions between livestock and wildlife through the pastoralist movements of livestock over the seasons.

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
Per Diem During Training	238	738.1	500.1	Field visits and follow ups took up more money than anticipated though it was still within the budget
Transport During Training	119.05	180	60.95	
Daily Subsistence During Data Collection	2666.67	3321.4	654.73	Less involvement of a vehicle and more involvement of the local youth increased the field subsistence slightly.
Transport	2666.67	1466.8	1199.87	With less visits and data collection using vehicles more money was able to be used in subsistence for data collection and training.
Camera, Bank Charges And Stationery	198.41	282.2	83.79	
Total	5888.89	5988.5		

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

- Continued monitoring of the wildlife and livestock numbers
- Follow-up assessment on fencing and land-use changes associated with the rapidly changing landscape in Kitengela Open Plains.
- Frequent interaction with community members to establish perception of ongoing measures for wildlife conservation and livelihood options.

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?

The logo was not used though the youth were informed on the source of funding for their training and subsistence during their data collection.

11. Any other comments?

The ability of the local communities to carry out monitoring has been demonstrated with the reduced amount of time spent by the technical team following up on the data collection and the quality of data that was produced. We look forward to writing a paper that compares these results over various time periods and hope to be able to facilitate the continued collection of the data by the community.