

## CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Wildlife Information Liaison Development Society (WILDS)
<b>Project Title:</b>	Promoting coordinated civil society action for biodiversity conservation in the Malnad-Kodagu Corridor of the Western Ghats.
<b>Date of Report:</b>	02-August-2015
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Mr. Anup B Prakash

**CEPF Region: Western Ghats (Sahyadri-Konkan corridor)**

**CEPF Strategic Direction: 1 Enable action by diverse communities and partnerships to ensure conservation of key biodiversity areas and enhance connectivity in the corridors.**

**Grant Amount: \$ 19,989.08**

**Project Dates: 1st September 2013 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2014**

**Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):**

1. National Center for Biological Sciences, Bangalore – Technical support. Including providing review of proposal and feedback on planned activities – mainly on social surveys and GIS related work.
2. Agumbe rainforest research station, Agumbe – Logistical support including subsidized stay and vehicle from Apr 2014 to Oct 2014. Helped in identifying local people involved in various capacities in conservation related activities and conducted camps in conjunction with the project. Main project partner for the project in Shimoga district.
3. Agumbe Vikas Manch – a citizen’s collective in Agumbe provided manpower throughout the project and helped in organizing and setting up workshops for the forest department and villagers.
4. Poorna Pragna School, Udupi district – Dr. Ananthram Madhyastha for guidance on local contacts and feedback on activities
5. Malathi river protection front, Teerthahalli: Organized once-in-two month meetings between local activists in Teerthahalli taluk.
6. Kodachadri Jeep drivers’ association, Hosanagara Taluk: provided free-of-cost transport to local group during ground-truthing activity and also helped in setting up non-timber forest product co-operative in village forests in Hosanagara taluk
7. Karnataka Forest Department, Kudremukha division: Subsidy support for conservation group from Hebri, Udupi district in leopard conflict mitigation for covering up open wells and creating awareness material.
8. ‘Relocation for conservation’ – a group formed near Mallandur in a critical corridor area in Someshwara Wildlife Sanctuary (Udupi and Shimoga districts)- provided supported materials and platform for conservation education in 6 remote villages and will continue doing so even after the project is done.

## **Conservation Impacts**

***Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.***

A network of local conservation practitioners, forest departments and small organizations was formed in the districts of Udupi and Shimoga. These groups were in the critical links around key-biodiversity areas. Though technological solutions weren't implemented, the project provided a platform for regularly meeting and exchanging points on threats and conservation action locally. Increase in conservation writing (press, letters to authorities etc.) in these areas occurred due to coordination between these agencies and individuals.

These groups raise funds through local tourism initiatives and gram sabha contributions to meet annually and undertake small projects of local conservation relevance.

***Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project against the expected results detailed in the approved proposal.***

1. Eco-clubs consisting of people from age group 8-45 were formed in 32 villages in the two districts.
2. Though training for forest department on scientific aspects did not happen, close involvement with the forest department was present with them being involved in all sessions on threats education including conflict mitigation, sustainable forest produce collection and conservation writing.
3. Seasonal threat assessment initiative – a bi-annual journal covering assessment of local threats by the local population on biodiversity – fish migration, invasive spread in reserve forests, Roadkill etc. was started and is in final stages of being printed.
4. Quarterly meeting with selected members of civil society and organized by a different organization every time. They are now trying to for a district level citizen forest committee (similar in structure to VFC) and network with urban science and conservation practitioners.

***Please provide the following information where relevant:***

**Hectares Protected: *NIL***

**Species Conserved: *NIL***

**Corridors Created: *NIL***

***Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.***

1. Creation of clubs and groups that regularly meet and network is a tangible success of the project. The challenge was to initially secure funding that happened through the grant and was then taken over by the clubs themselves using a combination of government and other NGO support.
2. Short time (1 year) did not allow the audit of the project for a longer period of time or expand the project to all parts of the desired areas. Also, follow-up mechanism

- cannot be instituted for a short term project such as this and other grants, institutions have to support in continuation and monitoring.
3. Most rural populace is still averse to using technology and hence on field implementation of technology solutions (apps, meeting places, e-journal) took a lot of time.
  4. Bureaucratic delays marred the progress at every step, the necessity to collect permits from different departments (anti-naxal squad, forest department, revenue department etc) caused unexpected delays.

***Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?***

1. Positive: Eco-sensitive zone education provided surprising results in some villages with local population undertaking the process of recommendation of eco-sensitive zones around protected areas that included areas more than the official designated ESZ of 100m around protected areas. This was the case around villages such as Hosagadde and Kesarakonda.
2. Negative: Equating of any conservation action as a measure to forcefully implement Kasturirangan report and hence blocking of any conservation action, especially in the villages bordering legally designated protected areas.

## **Lessons Learned**

***Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.***

***Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings)***

1. Project must be initially designed at a very small scale and only tested procedures should be broadly implemented. Attempts by newly formed clubs to perform any new activity were met with skepticism for a while especially in the Udupi district.
2. Citizen generation data validation (peer-review, forest department) must be built in rather than falling back on a need to go back to verify the data.

***Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)***

1. Measures designed to be implemented by local people worked the most. Eg: Ground truthing data on encroachments was received most by forest department personnel from their respective regions. Kabbinaale Nature Club completed the exercise of covering of open wells when undertaken by folk from the immediate area rather than when it was first implemented by DCF office situated 70 km away.
2. Implementing new technology must be undertaken after careful analysis as it will most possibly be rejected by rural folk unless it helps them monetarily

3. Basing any capacity building or action on already undertaken government policy will be accepted most easily. Eg: Swachh Bharat Mission was invoked to organize cleanliness drives around Hosanagar and Thirthahalli taluks in sensitive trekking spots.
4. Any clubs created met regularly when they were registered on paper and with a board etc. formed.
5. Validation of citizen generated data is an extremely difficult thing to do. Making it peer-reviewed helped to make it accountable to some level.

**Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:**

**ADDITIONAL FUNDING**

**Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.**

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

**\*Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

- A** Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)
- B** Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)
- C** Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)

**Sustainability/Replicability**

**Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.**

Most clubs created and forest department personnel who have picked up skills are continuing the activities that they have managed to broadly incorporate into their profession (patrolling, ground-truthing) or day-to-day culture (appointment of local naturalists by home-stays, street-plays with a conservation message in cultural festivals etc)

The biggest challenge was to not incentivize the people involved in any monetary way so as to sustain it beyond the end date of the project. This was only achieved in areas that was not heavily tourism oriented (Areas in Sharavathi WLS, Seethanadi etc)

**Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.**

Agumbe Range saw a combination of existing proactive field station (ARRS) and a proactive forest department (RFO) and installed steps to continue activities beyond the scope of the project.

### **Safeguard Policy Assessment**

*Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.*

NIL

**Performance Tracking Report Addendum**

**CEPF Global Targets**

**(Enter Grant Term)**

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.  
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

<b>Project Results</b>	<b>Is this question relevant?</b>	<b>If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.</b>	<b>Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.</b>	<b>Describe the principal results achieved from 1st September 2013 to 31st December 2014 (Attach annexes if necessary)</b>
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	Yes	40 ha	40 ha	Someshwara Wildlife Sanctuary (40 hectares in Shimoga was in principle approved by village committee to be included in ESZ)
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	No			Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	Yes	40000 ha	40000 ha	Cannot be measured in hectares but total areas of reserve forests that saw conservation action was about 40000 hectares (400 sq.km)
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	Yes	2000 ha	2000 ha	18 villages totaling about 2000 hectares of village forests saw conservation action by the clubs created
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	No			

**If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table.**



### **Additional Comments/Recommendations**

I have not seen a more patient team in managing such a big project. Any of the achieved successes would not have been possible without the support of CEPF ATREE team.

### **Information Sharing and CEPF Policy**

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

**Please include your full contact details below:**

Name: Anup B Prakash

Organization name: WILDS

Mailing address: No 6, Sneha Apartments, 3<sup>rd</sup> Cross, SVG Nagar, Bangalore - 72

Tel: 9480334613

Fax:

E-mail: [anup.bp@gmail.com](mailto:anup.bp@gmail.com)

Appendix 1. Map and table of places where clubs were formed, meetings held and conservation activities undertaken