

Final Evaluation Report

Your Details	
Full Name	Paulo Wilfred
Project Title	Capacity building for better conservation rules enforcement in western Tanzania
Application ID	26886-B
Grant Amount	£9,741
Email Address	paulo.wilfred@yahoo.co.uk
Date of this Report	December 2019

1. 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
<p>To develop a database—using a contemporary data collection and conservation monitoring tool—that will contain all the relevant information about illegal activity for the purpose of understanding and monitoring conservation rules enforcement.</p>				<p>Ugalla staff have managed to develop a conservation database to help monitor their patrolling activities. This is a continuing task as the database will be updated on a daily basis.</p>
<p>To develop a capacity building strategy to support conservation rule enforcers using a combination of the database in (1) above, and focus group interviews with reformed rule breakers, legal hunters, and conservation authorities. We will train rule enforcers to apply the database to understand rule-breaking and more importantly, improve rule enforcement management using an adaptive management approach.</p>				<p>We conducted 11 focus groups with resource users and conservation authorities in an around Ugalla Game Reserve, as follows: legal subsistence fishers within the reserve (one focus group discussion); trophy hunting company rangers (one); Ugalla Game Reserve rangers (one); legal subsistence hunters in the areas adjacent to the reserve (two); trophy hunting company staff (three); legal subsistence beekeepers within the reserve (one); district game officers primarily responsible for overseeing and managing legal subsistence hunting in the partially protected areas adjacent to the reserve (one); Ugalla Game Reserve officers (one).</p> <p>So far, we have been unable to get a good number of reformed rule breakers, but we are still looking for a better way to approach them. During fieldwork we realised that we must also approach the general community around Ugalla through a household survey before proposing a reliable adaptive</p>

				management approach for the area.
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------

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

Morale of some Ugalla game rangers was low, and they were somewhat reluctant to participate in the project. However, during the focus group discussions, the rangers acknowledged that our frequent visits to the field site and the fieldwork equipment we gave them (e.g. handheld GPS units, rugged smart phones, and a laptop) helped to improve participation in the project.

We faced some difficulties in approaching reformed poachers as we needed to talk to at least three groups of these from different villages within the Ugalla ecosystem. We are now looking for better ways to do this in collaboration with conservation authorities in the area. However, interviews with these groups will be conducted in the next project phase.

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

- A game officer in Ugalla, Mr Baraka Balagaye, who is actively participating in this project, is being invited to different conservation projects, institutions and meetings to share his knowledge and experience of the spatial monitoring and reporting tool with other conservationists in the country. We see this as an important outcome because our project contributes to conservation knowledge even outside our project area.
- This project has been funded by the Rufford Foundation for about 7 years now; having been working in the same area for such a long time has guaranteed objective and realistic conservation recommendations. Accordingly, our Ugalla experience is sought locally and internationally as people with first-hand knowledge of the area and the wildlife conservation context therein.
- We now have a database in place that will help Ugalla rangers monitor the effectiveness of their anti-poaching activities.

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

This project has provided a platform for different groups of local resource users around Ugalla to discuss their issues and reflect collectively on the relationship they hold to the reserve.

The project has brought together different groups of people (hunters, fishers, beekeepers) with different drivers/values/rationales that can potentially be connected to a good understanding of local law enforcement, and of governance context framing the management of Ugalla to reduce the impact of unsustainable harvest of wildlife on populations, species survival, and opportunities for local livelihoods.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes ultimately, we aim to provide the long-term data and analyses that will ensure a more effective law enforcement so to reduce impacts on wildlife populations and livelihoods of poaching in the Ugalla ecosystem of western Tanzania.

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

- A technical report that is based on this project will be submitted to Ugalla Game Reserve.
- Results of this work will be presented at scientific conferences.
- The data from this project will also be used to publish a peer-reviewed journal article on wildlife use and impacts in western Tanzania.

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

The actual length of the project was 10 months, a substantial amount of the grant was used during the first months of fieldwork because we had to buy some equipment and train game rangers. So, there were a lot of activities in the first 6 months of the fieldwork, and the following 2 months of focus group interviews. In general, the grant enabled us to accomplish the proposed activities within the budget and timeframe of the proposal.

8. Budget: 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. It is important that you retain the management accounts and all paid invoices relating to the project for at least 2 years as these may be required for inspection at our discretion.

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Focus group interviews: initially we planned to do 6 focus groups, but we had 11 focus group discussions	1320	2200	+880	We conducted focus groups for about 50 days. We were 4 researchers during this exercise (2 more than previously planned)
Field data collection costs: patrol expenses for a total of 14 game rangers involved in patrols each month.	4800	5040	+240	We changed the approach here; instead of spending money on fuel only we decided to pay part of the common monthly expenses incurred for law enforcement patrols. Each

				patrol trip was followed by a data collector who focussed on recording what is happening during the patrol without interfering with patrolling activities
Practice (pilot) patrol	400	525	+125	This was just a pilot, so we mainly paid for fuel and meals
Flipchart easel	100		-100	We did not need a flipchart easel because we were moving around a lot during focus groups
Laptop	600	820	+220	We needed a high spec laptop to run GIS, with a hard drive that can hold backup data
Rugged smartphones	850	804	-46	We bought 5 smartphones for data collection
Digital HD projector	270		-270	We used a projector from the University of Dar es Salaam
Handheld GPS unit	950		-950	We did not buy new GPS units. We used the ones in Ugalla which were purchased by one of our previous projects
Olympus Binocular	300		-300	We did not use binoculars in this project
Flip chart pads	20	40	+20	
Photocopying, printing, and stationery	131	83	-48	
Administrative costs: 3% of the total grant was paid to the Open University of Tanzania as institutional cost		292	+292	
Total	9741	9804	+63	The institutional fee (£292.23) somewhat affected the original budget. Therefore, the difference (£62.3) was paid by the researchers themselves. Note: £1 = TZS 2,800

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

We feel that the following are the important next steps:

- Focus group discussions with reformed rule breakers.
- Focus group discussions with selected members of the general population.

- Household surveys to quantify the levels and drivers of bushmeat consumption (poaching).
- Ecological surveys to understand how species densities vary with hunting intensity, and resource use drivers.
- To gain an understanding of the governance context for wildlife and other natural resource management in western Tanzania (Ugalla ecosystem), in terms of laws, policies, institutions and the difficult realities of management when resources are so short, and when practical difficulties for patrols to curb illegal resource use are substantial in order to inform conservation interventions.

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

We aim to use the logo when we present at scientific conferences. Presently we are working on the data, and we'll need additional data from focus groups (reformed poachers and general public) and household surveys before we can get a meaningful end product worthy of presentation at a scientific conference. Furthermore, the Rufford Foundation is already receiving publicity through our long-term work in Ugalla as evidenced in our previous peer reviewed journal articles: doi:10.1017/S0030605317000862; DOI 10.1007/s10344-017-1116-3

11. Please provide a full list of all the members of your team and briefly what was their role in the project.

Mr Heri Kayeye (Sokoine University of Agriculture): he is dealing with GIS and Remote Sensing stuff in the project.

Dr Flora J. Magige (University of Dar es Salaam): supervision of patrol follows; training game rangers; focus group and household interviews.

Dr Alex Wilbard Kisingo (College of African Wildlife Management-Mweka): SMART database management; supervision of patrol follows; conservation governance; training game rangers on data collection and field equipment.

Dr Paulo Wilfred (Open University of Tanzania): coordination of all project activities; focus group and household interviews; data analyses; writing progress and final reports.

12. Any other comments?

We greatly appreciate substantial support from The Rufford Foundation, without which our long-term conservation-focused research project in western Tanzania could have collapsed.