

Final Evaluation Report

| Your Details | |
|---------------------|--|
| Full Name | Rodrigo Oyanedel |
| Project Title | Assessing and Managing Compliance with Conservation Rules in Marine and Coastal Areas for Indigenous Peoples |
| Application ID | 29438-1 |
| Grant Amount | £6,000 |
| Email Address | Rodrigo.oyanedel@zoo.ox.ac.uk |
| Date of this Report | 8/6/21 |

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 |
|---|--------------|--------------------|----------------|---|
| Develop tool to assess non-compliant behaviours | | | | |
| Create a baseline of compliance for the MCAIP | | | | This was fully achieved, but we had to move the case study location due to Covid-19. |
| Results sharing workshops | | | | These have been organised and are ready to be done, once Covid-19 restrictions allow. |

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

The main unforeseen difficulty was Covid-19. Fortunately, we were able to adapt and change the location of the case study. This opened a very brief window of opportunity to do the fieldwork component of the project. Fortunately, we were able to take full advantage of that window of opportunity and now the only thing that's left is to go back to the communities to do a result sharing workshop.

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

With this project, we were able to:

- a) Characterise the current compliance landscape in the newly established Caulin MCAIP (Marine and Coastal Areas for Indigenous People) with open-ended interviews. This allowed us to have a clear idea of the myriad set of regulations and social norms currently being used in the area.
- b) Develop an easy to replicate methodology for assessing non-compliance and its drivers in MCAIP. Based on the ballot box methodology (a sensitive question survey technique, see attached report) we develop a questionnaire that was easy to respond for fishers to anonymously state their compliance levels with different regulations and the drivers behind this. Moreover, we have formatted this methodology to be broadly used in other areas.
- c) Develop a deep characterisation of the level of compliance of different regulations and the reason behind these. This characterisation is helping to draft the future plans of this MCAIP and is informing how to improve the level of compliance and participation in the management of this coastal area.

4. What do you consider to be the most significant achievement of this work?

The characterisation of a different issue to assess (non-compliance) in a context that can be very fruitful for marine and cultural conservation (MCAIP). By disentangling the different motivations to comply with some rules and not others, we have provided the local community with key insights into how they could improve the management of their designated area in the future. We think this is an important achievement because MCAIP are being implemented broadly in Chile and the lessons learned from our project can inform the sustainable development of other conservation areas along the country.

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

The local community of Caulin was a key partner in every step of the project. First, leaders of the community willingly participated in key informant interviews. Then, these leaders and other local actors helped us to organise the fieldwork component of the project. Moreover, we had a great response from the community when doing the fieldwork, with a very high rate of participation. The community of Caulin will be benefited through an extension document we shared with them in which we characterise the compliance landscape in the area, provide recommendations as to how to improve compliance levels as well as insights into how to develop new management rules.

6. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes, we hope to apply for a grant to further develop these objectives in the Caulin MCAIP. These will include a deeper analysis into the motivations for people to participate in enforcement activities (because there is also a real threat of externals coming and poaching the resources of the MCAIP); monitoring of internal levels of compliance and assistance into communicating the MCAIP management plan.

Moreover, we hope to further develop a more pragmatic area of work in which we want to design, with the community, a communal monitoring and enforcement committee. Further, we want to work with the community to help improve the management plan and develop alternative livelihood programs such as small-scale algae aquaculture.

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

Yes, besides the extension document mentioned above, we plan to do a result sharing workshop in the community once local Covid-19 restrictions are lifted. The idea would be to develop a day-long workshop to show our results and hear their feedback. As a result of the workshop, we expect to develop dissemination materials for community members to illustrate the potential improvements of the MCAIP implementation. In addition, further information and data will collect for a peer-review article. We believe by the end of the year a manuscript with data collected from this project will be submitted to an indexed journal.

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

The grant was used between November 2020 and June 2021. This is a bit shorter than the proposed length of the project because we were able to do the fieldwork component much faster and efficiently than initially thought. This was because of a change in the methodology needed to take advantage of the window of opportunity we had when the local Covid-19 restrictions were lifted.

9. 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 |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|---|
| Food | 750 | 500 | -250 | Because the fieldwork component was compress into one session (due to Covid-19), and it was shorter, we spent less funds than budgeted on these items |
| Accommodation | 750 | 500 | -250 | |
| Transportation | 1500 | 500 | -1000 | |
| Salaries | 3000 | 4500 | +1500 | Because of Covid-19, the consultant we hired had to work for a longer than expected period and therefore we had to use more funds to cover for this |
| Total | 6000 | 6000 | 0 | |

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

The key next steps are to do the results sharing workshop. This will help inform next steps, challenges, and barriers to further improving the compliance levels in the Caulin MCAIP. We also anticipate that next steps will include monitoring of the compliance levels, dissemination, and improvement of the MCAIP management plan, as well as better investigating the drivers for people to participate in enforcement activities.

Moreover, a key next step is to develop, with the community, a monitoring and enforcement committee. The interest from the community to create this was a key result of our analysis. We found that there was willingness to participate in such a programme and the capacities needed. This can be a game changer to reach the bio-cultural objectives of this MCAIP, ensure compliance and proper governance in the future.

11. 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 have not used The Rufford Foundation logo. We envision using it during the results sharing workshop. We did not receive publicity of our work.

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

Matias Domeyko (Independent Consultant): Matias was key in co-leading the design of the methodology. He also did and analyzed the key informant interviews at the beginning of the project. Moreover, he organized and performed the fieldwork component of the project, co-led the analysis of the results and led the writing of the attached report, and the extension material shared with the community. Finally, he will lead the results sharing workshop once we can do it.

Luciano Hiriart-Bertrand (Costa Humboldt): Luciano assisted in the design of the project, the methodology development, and the final report analyses. He was also key in helping to communicate with the Caulin community with his network and contacts.

13. Any other comments?

We very much appreciate the support by The Rufford Foundation, and their flexibility when the Covid-19 situation got to scale. We always felt supported by the foundation's staff in those complicated days, so we wanted to mention that.