CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Endangered Wildlife Trust
Project Title:	Building community and national partners' capacity for sustainable conservation financing at Rugezi Marsh, Rwanda
Date of Report:	30 November 2015
Report Author (s)	Osiman Mabhachi and Kerryn Morrison
Contact Information	Endangered Wildlife Trust, Pinelands Office Park, Ardeer Road, Modderfontein, Johannesburg, South Africa, Tel: +27113723600 Email: kerrynm@ewt.org.za

CEPF Region: Africa and Madagascar

Strategic Direction: Initiate and support sustainable financing and related actions for the conservation of priority KBAs and corridors

Grant Amount: $19956

Project Dates: 01 September 2014 – 30 October 2015

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

The Albertine Rift Conservation Society (ARCOS) was our main in-country partner for the entire duration of the project. Apart from providing input during the conceptualisation of the project, the organisation was also instrumental in explaining project goal, objectives and activities to project beneficiary communities and district authorities during the inception phase. To fulfil government requirements for organisations carrying out conservation and community development projects in Rwanda, ARCOS presented project progress updates at the District Joint Development Action Forums, Open Days and Annual Evaluation Meetings organised at district level. These activities implemented by our partner were important in ensuring quick acceptance of the project by the beneficiary communities and local authorities as well as meeting legal requirements set by the national government for NGOs.

ARCOS' Biodiversity and Landscape Manager was the Project Facilitator. He organised community workshops and other stakeholder consultations to effectively engage beneficiaries during training needs assessment. He provided the necessary logistical support during the planning and implementation of skills development workshops and as well as the end-of-project evaluation. He compiled monthly updates of developments in the project area so that the project team could monitor project progress against set milestones. As an experienced ornithologist, he was allocated the task of designing and facilitating a bird identification and avitourism training course for 10 aspiring Bird Guides. He also played the role of assessor during the modern beekeeping and business management training workshops facilitated by hired consultants. In planning all field activities, the Project Facilitator worked closely with

the International Crane Foundation / Endangered Wildlife Trust's Community Projects Coordinator whose main role was to provide technical support.

ARCOS also worked together with relevant local stakeholders to spread messages about the conservation of the Grey Crowned Crane in Rwanda. Notable among these collaborative activities were the awareness workshops at Rugezi Marsh organised jointly with Dr. Olivier Nsengimana, a recipient of the Rolex Award 2014. Rwanda Development Board (RDB)'s technical staff members were also involved in the community outreach to sensitise communities about the need to curb illegal crane trade and domestication led by Dr. Nsengimana. ARCOS also showcased the capacity building activities and products (crafts and honey) produced by the Rugezi Marsh communities during Burera District Open Day.

Conservation Impacts

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

Our project added value to and consolidated ongoing community-based conservation efforts aimed at reducing pressure on Rugezi Marsh, a Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) located within the CEPF's Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hotspot. Our capacity building activities were aimed at strengthening a network of community groups that we are engaging as part of efforts to protect habitats of two species classified as Endangered on the IUCN Red Data List Rugezi Marsh, the Grey Crowned Crane *Balearica regulorum* and the Grauer's Swamp-Warbler *Bradypterus graueri.* Rugezi Marsh supports 60% of the global population of the Grauer's Swamp-Warbler and an estimated 30% of the Rwanda's population of Grey Crowned Cranes. Both species are threatened by habitat loss driven by human encroachment and unsustainable harvesting of wetland resources, key drivers of biodiversity loss cited in the CEPF Ecosystem Profile. By targeting wetland user communities and focusing on a KBA that is known to be critical for globally threatened species, the project addressed the conservation needs as defined in the CEPF Ecosystem Profile.

The CEPF Ecosystem Profile stresses the need to develop conservation actions taking into consideration the linkages between conservation and development. Recognising this requirement, we adopted an approach that would ultimately contribute to attainment of conservation goals by providing the necessary training to help communities, whose activities were impacting negatively on Rugezi Marsh, to switch from unsustainable and extractive practices. These field conservation approaches which recognise the linkages between rural livelihoods and biodiversity conservation, as well as the use of local values attached to ecosystem services, are key elements of the CEPF's investment strategy. Though our project was primarily designed to improve the knowledge and technical skills of cooperative beekeepers and bird guides, it provided a platform to re-emphasise their role and increase their sphere of influence in conservation matters in the broader catchment. This was in fulfilment of the need to connect the social and ecological components of an ecosystem as stated in the CEPF Ecosystem Profile. We also fulfilled this CEPF requirement by increasing community capacity to address socio-economic drivers of wetland degradation across various sections of Rugezi Marsh. As a way of consolidating the work we undertook under this project, we are now facilitating the process of integrating the seven beekeeping cooperatives into one umbrella organisation to strengthen the social connections between the different communities.

Our vision for sustainable conservation finance is part of a broader ecotourism plan for Rugezi Marsh and surrounding areas. This plan is currently being promoted by the Rwanda Development Board. Ecotourism is listed in the CEPF Ecosystem Profile as one of the viable livelihood options that have a potential to generate tangible socio-economic benefits and create resource utilisation systems that lead to reduced degradation of threatened ecosystems such as wetlands. Maintenance of ecosystem functions and services is not only important for local communities and biodiversity but is critical for the Rwandan economy as water from the wetland drains into dam sites where 45% of the country's hydroelectric power is generated. In implementing the project, we recognised diverse ecosystem services (honey production and birding potential) that presented opportunities for introducing community-based conservation finance mechanisms to sustain wetland conservation efforts. Acknowledgement of the ecosystem services as a strategy for planning and implementing sustainable conservation projects is one of recommended approaches in the CEPF Ecosystem Profile.

We are using our conservation project at Rugezi Marsh to learn and generate insights on how to improve community engagement approaches for effective conservation for KBAs and other sites threatened by high utilisation pressure linked to high human population densities. We aim to use our project experiences and outcomes to provide policy insights on how to balance resource utilisation and conservation at KBAs in Rwanda and other areas falling under CEPF's Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hotspot. Through this project, we have already identified lessons (explained in detail in the section below) on key issues that facilitators have to consider when implementing community capacity building, including post-project considerations. These lessons, in the form of methodological guidelines, will be useful in the work that we are implementing to consolidate conservation impacts over the next two years and will also be useful for other practitioners working to conserve species and habitats at KBAs.

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

Expected results /impacts as per approved proposal	***Achievements (results during and outcomes after project)***
1) Improved technical and management skills enabling community groups to run viable alternative livelihood projects	Findings from an integrated situation analysis and training needs assessment we undertook improved our understanding of knowledge and skills (technical and financial management) of seven cooperative beekeepers operating different sectors of the Rugezi Marsh catchment. A major finding from the assessment was that honey was mostly produced through the use of traditional straw and mud beehives. The beekeepers used knowledge and skills passed over generations through family ties and interaction among neighbours. We also discovered that beekeeping enterprises were not managed as business enterprises as the cooperatives had not trained to incorporate business management aspects in their operations. We used our findings from the assessment to develop a skills development programme, with a focus on introducing modern beekeeping techniques and introducing business management principles to the cooperatives' management system. We also made a major breakthrough as information collected during the assessment is now being used as a baseline that we will refer to as we continue to implement other capacity building activities. Each of the seven cooperatives selected one member to be trained in modern beekeeping and business management with a view that the trained individuals would later train other cooperative members, following the Training of Trainers Model. Working in partnership with hired consultants, modern beekeeping and business management training curricula was successfully developed, taking into the cooperatives' training needs and pre-existing knowledge and skills. The modern beekeeping training covered the basics of modern beekeeping, setting up an apiary, management of bees, harvesting techniques and post-harvesting storage. The business management course covered aspects related to honey cooperative management, honey marketing techniques, financial record keeping and basic analysis of profits. Trained individuals organised meetings to provide feedback to other group members within a month of completion of the trainings. We succeeded in fulfilling a capacity building requirement for greater involvement of youths in the ecotourism industry by identifying 10 individuals who were then trained as Bird Guides. The training covered field bird identification techniques and the basics of working with birders who visit the area as tourists. Assessment of uptake of skills is ongoing under our new project funded by MacArthur Foundation (Project Number 14-106522-000-INP).

2) Business plans for eco-tourism, beekeeping and craft making projects developed with input from community groups and extension officers	During the inception phase of the project, we discovered that for effective planning we needed to collect background information about beekeeping enterprises and ecotourism potential of the area. We succeeded in collecting and analysing information on pre-existing knowledge and technical skills, opportunities for improving production levels and incomes, current challenges to livelihood projects and baseline information about production levels, existing infrastructure and other external factors aiding and hindering the viability of the livelihood options. Though our initial target was to engage consultants to develop business plans for ecotourism and beekeeping, we made a decision to focus primarily on addressing training needs under this project with a view that development of detailed business plans for ecotourism and other livelihood options would be done under our new project funded by MacArthur Foundation. This project started in October 2015. This was one of the major adaptation of the original project plan we made when we discovered that consultancy fees charged by business management experts was too high and could not be covered with funding from the CEPF project. We are already in the process of identifying an expert who will carry out this task so that it can be completed during the first quarter of 2016.
3) Change in environmental attitudes and behaviour towards the wetland and species of conservation importance (e.g. Grey Crowned Crane)	During the final project evaluation exercise, we documented evidence of community knowledge of location of Grey Crowned Crane breeding sites, breeding events and movements. This knowledge is attributable to our crane and wetland outreach activities through which we highlighted the importance of community participation in protecting cranes to reduce incidents of capture of crane chicks for illegal trade and domestication. The direct attribution of community environmental knowledge to our outreach was confirmed through references made by community members consulted during the final project evaluation. We also documented evidence of positive attitudes towards cranes through reports of breeding events forwarded to the Community Ranger during the duration of the project. These reports confirm the uptake of conservation messages disseminated during this project and the previous project we implemented between 2012 and 2014. Despite the anecdotal evidence of positive attitudes, encroachment into the wetland to harvest grass for livestock is still a major cause for concern. We managed to identify some of barriers to enforcement, positive attitudes and favourable behaviour towards cranes and wetlands. These include; 1) absence of viable alternatives to current practices that degrade the wetland (e.g. harvesting of fodder grass from the wetland) 2) an expansive wetland area that makes it difficult for community members to effectively monitor and police practices affecting cranes and wetlands, 3) limited visibility of officers from the relevant wildlife and wetland conservation agencies at community level,

	4) occasional encroachment for hunting purposes onto the wetland by non-citizens (from Uganda) that escape into their country and cannot be prosecuted in Rwanda, 5) lack of motivation on the part of some Community Rangers trained by the Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA), and 6) lack of appreciation of conservation efforts by households that have not benefitted from livelihood projects. From our experiences, we noted that trends in behaviour change will only be clear after a period longer than the project one-year duration. In this vein, we will be collecting data on incidents and behaviour that has an impact on the wetland and crane breeding success under the second phase of the MacArthur Foundation-funded project.
4) Local and regional markets for ecotourism, beekeeping and craft making businesses identified	Local (community-level and district) markets for honey produced by the seven cooperatives were identified. These include beekeepers neighbouring, households from neighbouring villages and local traders that buy honey and sell it at local business centres. Information on the quantities bought, prices, packaging preferences and how the transactions take place was collected. Our partner, ARCOS, exhibited honey produced by the cooperatives and crafts produced by community members during Open Days, events organised at district level in Burera and Gicumbi. These events were attended by local communities, business operators and other NGOs, who are all potential buyers and promoters of the beekeeping and craft products. Information on livelihood projects were included on posters and fact sheets that the organisation distributed under its conservation programme in the Albertine Rift region. As noted in (2), regional and international markets for ecotourism will be identified and characterised by an ecotourism expert hired under the ongoing project.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: The project complemented ongoing community-focused efforts to reduce encroachment onto the 6735-hectare Rugezi Marsh by enhancing the technical capacity of seven cooperatives so that they could adopt livelihood options that are non-extractive and less detrimental to wetland resources.

Species Conserved: Though project activities were directly targeted at the target species (Grey Crowned Cranes), community engagement during conservation awareness was geared towards highlighting the need for local communities to avoid practices that are detrimental to the species (e.g., capture of chicks for trade and domestication and disturbance to breeding pairs).

Corridors Created: Not applicable

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

Our envisaged long-term objective was to maintain the ecological integrity of Rugezi Marsh through community-based conservation activities sustained through funds generated from conservation finance mechanisms (ecotourism, beekeeping and craft making) managed by local community groups. At the end of the project, notable successes and challenges to the attainment of this long-term objective are presented in the table below:

Successes	**Challenges**
Our ultimate goal is a scenario whereby the group-based livelihood projects are managed by community groups (cooperatives) with minimal technical support from external facilitators. We succeeded in providing the technical and business management training that was highlighted as being critical during the training needs analysis. This is the first step towards developing the necessary skills required for the groups to achieve our ultimate goal. By adopting a Training of Trainers approach, we imparted new knowledge and skills to individuals who will act as resource persons/trainers for the next 3 years.	Beekeeping cooperatives informally committed themselves to putting beekeeping infrastructure (beehives) in the wetland buffer zone to avoid incidents of encroachment into the wetland. Though this has generally been accepted by the community in various sections of the wetland's catchment, there is need for formalised agreements for enforceable commitment from the community to adhere to defined conservation actions that can be monitored over time. A framework for these formal commitments or conservation agreements does not exist currently.
By introducing of bird guiding as an employment opportunity, we succeeded in adding one more non-extractive livelihood option that community members can adopt to reduce pressure on the wetland. This diversification of livelihood options is a critical step towards building a network of projects linked to wetland conservation in various sections of the wetland.	Our vision for sustainable conservation finance is based on the successful implementation of a broader ecotourism plan for the area in which Rugezi Marsh is located. The process of putting in place the necessary infrastructure that will make ecotourism viable is driven by the Rwanda Development Board. Though work is currently underway to set up the necessary structures, attainment of our vision is dependent on successful channelling of financial, material human resources towards full implementation of the plan by the national

	government.
Our community engagement activities improved a sense of community commitment to wetland monitoring and conservation action. During the final project evaluation, we documented evidence of beekeeping cooperative members that were informally monitoring the condition of the wetland sections adjacent to their project sites. This is a step towards promoting long-term stewardship among community members.	The number of households benefitting from the livelihood projects we are promoting as a proportion of the total number of households in the whole catchment area, is very low. Funding to expand the livelihood projects so that our interventions are spread over a broader catchment is currently not available. If the livelihood projects are not expanded, our conservation impacts in the long term will be patchy.

Our short term impact objectives were:

1. To reduce both human disturbance to Grey Crowned Crane breeding pairs and illegal capture of chicks leading to a 30 % increase in breeding success by December 2016
2. To increase (by 5%) the extent of vegetation cover that is crucial for maintenance of habitat conditions for waterbirds at Rugezi Marsh through restoration activities and reduced encroachment by December 2016

Notable successes and challenges to the short-term impact objectives, based on our experiences to date, are presented in the table below.

Successes	**Challenges**
Data collected during field visits and consultation of community members and other stakeholders contributed significantly to a better understanding of where cranes are captured and the market chains involved in illegal crane trade. To a greater extent, this was made possible through our collaboration with Dr. Olivier Nsengimana, a winner of the Rolex Award, who was also carrying out a research and sensitisation project on the problem of illegal crane trade in Rwanda.	Our efforts to provide viable alternatives to reduce cases of encroaching into the wetland by local communities to harvest grass still need to be expanded. Since the scale of our project was small and short term, more work still needs to be done to ensure that disturbance to cranes is reduced significantly across all sections of the wetland.
Our protracted awareness activities appear to be generating interest in crane protection and positive attitude change among community members. During our final evaluation exercise, we documented two cases of community members who monitored crane pairs and reporting incidents of disturbance and breeding events to the Community Ranger between 2013 and 2015. We will continue to support these emerging champions and work towards ensuring there are other individuals willing to be resource stewards in other sections of the Rugezi Marsh catchment.	Monitoring of cranes and habitat conditions covering a large wetland system such as Rugezi is a challenge. We did not have a site-based Field Assistant and as a result, we could not closely and consistently track developments (e.g. crane breeding events and disturbance factors) at the site. The data we have therefore only provides a snapshot of breeding events of cranes.
	Knowledge gaps on what cranes require (in the context of Rugezi Marsh) to breed successfully still exist. Lack of such breeding requirements for the species makes it difficult to quantify the level and impacts of disturbance

	on cranes.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

None

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.

General lessons from the project design process:

Following the CEPF proposal design process and using associated templates helped our project team gain new technical skills and better insights into how to design projects for improved performance and conservation impacts.

The theme for the CEPF call for proposals we responded to was Conservation Finance. Though previously our projects had some elements of Conservation Finance, in the form of strengthening economic values and motivations for sustainable management of landscapes and associated resources through business enterprises run by local communities, the concept was not well integrated into our project plans. Development of the proposal for this project resulted in us exploring the concept further and it is now a major topic for discussion in project planning for our community-based conservation projects in Rwanda and other East African countries. As an organization, we have therefore learnt that new approaches for improving sustainability of projects can be stimulated and evolve through participation in project design processes driven by funding agencies.

The CEPF proposal design process also helped the project team to learn more about how to connect various components of integrated conservation and livelihood projects. In responding to questions in proposal template, we went through a process of connecting project site contextual factors, outcomes of previous projects, current community needs, and gaps in conservation actions. This helped us to better perspective of entry strategies, opportunities for making greater impact and constraints that we could encounter. We found this to be a very holistic way of designing a new project for maximum impact while taking into consideration risks. This process will be useful in future project planning for our work in Rwanda and elsewhere.

The templates used in formulating budgets and identifying human and material resources required also helped our team to improve their analytical skills. As required, we undertook calculations to quantify the in-kind contributions expected from our in-country partner and also explicitly split budget lines to come up with accurate figures for expected expenditure. This was an invaluable learning process as funders are increasingly requesting such details in applications.

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

We made a strategic decision by targeting beekeeping cooperatives as they a stakeholder group whose role in protecting Rugezi Marsh was already recognised by district authorities. By targeting them, we were building on a process that we initiated during an earlier project to enhance value attached to wetland and its buffers. Since we had worked with the groups previously and were familiar with our conservation agenda, introducing the project took us less time than we would have needed if we had not worked with them previously. The shortcoming of focusing on the cooperatives was that other community members who were not directly involved in beekeeping would inherently not directly benefit from the capacity building activities.

Acknowledging that we needed specialist input from consultants (beekeeping expert and a business management trainer) was also a strategic decision. The consultants provided the skills that were lacking within project team. The downside of engaging consultants was that the fees they were asking for to perform the tasks assigned were too high. We had to negotiate for a reduction of fees and also narrowed down the tasks they had to perform. This meant adapting our project plan and acknowledging we would not be able to attain one expect output (development of business plans for livelihood projects). The other challenge was that there were few Rwandan experts with the appropriate qualifications and relevant practical experience we sought. Looking for experts regionally would mean an increased cost.

When designing the project, we realised we would not be able to comprehensively cover all capacity building needs of the Rugezi communities. We therefore planned the project taking into consideration some of the pending funding applications we had submitted to other funders (e.g. application to MacArthur Foundation for continuation funding). We therefore focused our attention on smaller components of the bigger capacity building plan (i.e., improving skills for beekeeping cooperatives and training bird guides). If we had chosen to focus on all aspects of the Rugezi ecotourism plan, our efforts would have been thinly spread over a wide range of issues, which would have reduced our efficiency and effectiveness.

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

Before conducting the training activities for the beekeepers and Bird Guides, we realised that we needed to undertake extensive consultations to get a better understanding of the training needs of the target communities. We also noted that to develop an effective training plan, we had to learn about previous training projects implemented in the area. By consulting the target communities, we were able to understand gaps in training and what was required to ensure continuity after the training. We used the information provided by the communities to design the training curriculum, working together with hired consultants. We also asked the cooperative members and community leaders to identify the right individuals to be trained. This was a way of empowering them by helping them choose individuals who were competent and who they knew would be accountable to the community. Findings from the training needs assessment will be useful in all our future activities.

The project provided an opportunity for our team to test the Training of Trainers (ToT) approach. The ToT approach involves designing a training course aimed at equipping individuals (mostly individuals showing good leadership skills and willingness to assist others) with knowledge and technical skills with a view that they will then train fellow community members. This was our first opportunity to use it in Rwanda. During our final project evaluation, we were encouraged to note representatives of the seven beekeeping cooperatives that underwent the ToT process were already acting as expected by providing

the necessary expertise to the other group members and playing leadership roles. Though we will learn more about the impact of the approach, we have noted that ToT is an approach we can use when funding for community capacity building is limited.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

Our experiences during project implementation also helped us learn about the feasibility and limitations of training and capacity building activities in the context of the Rugezi community and Rwanda in general. Our training needs assessment showed that there are various cognitive, cultural, policy, economic, social and environmental factors that may aid or constraint community capacity building. Though we succeeded in imparting knowledge and technical skills (to address the cognitive aspects), there are various other external factors that we identified that will have a bearing on the long term impacts of our project (e.g. support from government agencies and district authorities to have cooperatives registered at national level). The lesson we learnt is that in working with local communities to improve their capacity, there are many other factors that external facilitators need to follow up on in the post-training period. During our discussions with beneficiaries as part of the final project evaluation, we identified that some of the assumptions and expectations that conservation and development organisations have are not supported by evidence on the ground. Limited funding and human resources from national government agencies at district level means that the support that communities need after initial training and capacity building through short term projects is not always available. A major lesson from this discovery is that community capacity building involves more than just provision of specialised training but should encompass plans to connect a web of factors that affect the target communities at local, district and national levels. Poor understanding of the broader context can lead to inadequate support for sustaining impacts of capacity building projects. We will be working to address the issues we noted during our evaluation under a new project funded by the MacArthur Foundation.

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
MacArthur Foundation	A	$425000	We secured funding for a project that complemented work done under the CEPF project. The project started in 2015 and will end in 2017 (3 years).

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

When designing the project, we acknowledged the key role of the Rwanda Development Board (RDB) and Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA). A positive development that we noted during the project implementation period that will effectively contribute to sustainability of project results is the development of tourism plan for the Twin Lakes, a tourist attraction located less than 10km from Rugezi Marsh. Identification of actual sites for trails and other ecotourism infrastructure was done during the last quarter of 2015. This is in line with our vision for linking our livelihood projects to the broader ecotourism plan for the area. A potential challenge to this positive development is that funding and human resources to ensure the full implementation of the tourism plan may not be immediately available. All the same, we plan to also set up an ecotourism facility under our project currently being implemented, funded by MacArthur Foundation.

Through our networking activities between 2014 and 2015, we were connected with Conservation International. Conservation International has developed model projects for mainstreaming Payment for Ecosystem Services into national policies and has also developed a network of projects where local communities have made formal commitments to protect sites and species through Conservation Agreements. Under our new project at Rugezi Marsh, Conservation International will be our key partner. Experts from the organisation will provide technical support to our project team as we introduce Conservation Agreements. Conservation International is also developing a national framework for Payment for Ecosystem Services in Rwanda. Their efforts will therefore directly complement the work we started at Rugezi Marsh.

We acknowledge that the long term sustainability of the project depends on effective training and technical support to individuals involved in field activities and project coordination. The International Crane Foundation / Endangered Wildlife Trust Partnership has already provided skills development opportunities for the coordinator of the second phase of the project funded by MacArthur Foundation, Dr Olivier Nsengimana Over the next two years, Dr Nsengimana will participate in training and capacity building activities in South Africa and in USA. Part of the capacity building includes a visit to one of the most successful project involving Conservation Agreements, the Socio-Bosque Project in Ecuador.

The social issues to be addressed at Rugezi Marsh are numerous and broad. We recognised that we do not have the capacity to address all the issues and that some of the issues are outside our environmental focus and mandate. We have already started engaging other organisations and funders so that they can be our partners in addressing issues that have a bearing on the conservation of the wetland. A notable example is our communication with the Population and Sustainability Network (PSN) to explore the possibility of PSN tackling reproductive health and nutrition issues. We are also in contact with Conservation Heritage so that they can complement our environmental education and awareness programme in schools.

The work that we initiated at Rugezi Marsh is set to be replicated at two new sites, Akanyaru and Nyabarongo, two other wetland systems known to support crane populations. As part of second phase of a project funded by MacArthur Foundation, we will carry out a detailed analysis of current land use, biophysical attributes, threats, biodiversity status and overall extent of the wetlands. We will identify challenges that may hinder wetland conservation success as well as opportunities (legislative and

community-based) to secure unconverted wetland sections, facilitate recovery of degraded patches and curb further encroachment. Ultimately, the plan is to set up projects that will enhance values attached to the wetlands for long term conservation success and sustainability.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

Additional Comments/Recommendations

This project helped us ensure continuity of community engagement and wetland conservation awareness at Rugezi Marsh after our previous project funded by MacArthur Foundation ended in August 2014. Without the project, we would not have been able to maintain contact with the community, district authorities and government agencies that play a key role in wetland and biodiversity conservation. This project also provided an opportunity for our field team to informally monitor the legacy of the MacArthur Foundation-funded project as we waited for the outcome of our application for continuation funding from the same organisation. The funding we received was therefore a stop-gap measure.

As noted in the lessons learnt section, we are now in putting in place the necessary post-training measures by providing mentorship to the beekeeping cooperatives and trained bird guides under the second phase of the project funded by MacArthur Foundation. This project started in October 2015. The work we plan to undertake includes provision of improved beekeeping equipment (honey processing and packaging), facilitating the registration of cooperatives at national level (forming one umbrella organisation) and connecting the bird guides to private tour operators. We are also planning to introduce the concept of conservation agreements to secure commitment from community groups to take conservation action as part of the expanded livelihood projects. We are working together with Conservation International on this since the organisation has successfully introduced the concept in other parts of the world. Through our experiences in this project, we have noted that our presence in the project area to maintain contact with the community and document developments (social, ecological) is critical for adaptive management. We have therefore employed a full-time Field Assistant to facilitate all site-level activities under the supervision of a national project coordinator. We are also using our experiences from the CEPF project to improve our monitoring and evaluation strategies. This involves refining our targets and indicators for tracking our impacts (e.g. changes in breeding success of cranes, change in vegetation cover, honey production levels, uptake of skills imparted during training). All in all, the CEPF provided opportunities to apply adaptive management and ensure a smooth transition between funding streams/project phases.

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, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Kerryn Morrison
Organization name: Endangered Wildlife Trust
Mailing address: Pinelands Office Park, Ardeer Road, Modderfontein, Johannesburg, South Africa
Tel: +27113723600
Fax: +27116084682
E-mail: kerrynm@ewt.org.za

*****please complete the tables on the following pages*****

Performance Tracking Report Addendum			
Project Results	**Is this question relevant?**	**If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved for project from inception of CEPF support to date**	**Describe the principal results achieved during project period (Attach annexes if necessary)**
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	Not applicable		Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	Not applicable		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	The target of our conservation efforts was on the 6735-hectare Rugezi Marsh, a KBA in the Albertine Rift eco-region	We subdivided Rugezi Marsh into three zones and the engaged seven beekeeping cooperatives whose areas of operation and sphere of influence overlaps the three zones. Bird Guides that were trained were also selected from administrative sectors that transcend the three zones.
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	Yes	The project strengthened a wetland resource management system characterised by non-extractive practices (beekeeping and bird guiding) for reduced encroachment into the 6735-hectare Rugezi Marsh by local communities.	Through training workshops designed to improve skills in beekeeping, we imparted skills required for a network of seven beekeeping cooperatives to play the role of stewards in curbing encroachment into the wetland and protect Grey Crowned Crane breeding pairs.
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1below.	Yes		

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

Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics								Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit												
									Increased Income due to:												
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic minority	Pastoralists/nomadic people	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	sustainable natural resources management	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services	due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural	More secure access to water resources	improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction	disasters (fires, landslides, flooding,	More secure sources of energy	public services, such as education, health, or	traditional knowledge for environmental	decision-making due to strengthened civil	Other (New technical skills)
Beekeeping cooperatives, namely Abanyaruyuki, Terimberemuvunvu, Dutezimbereubuvunvu, Ubukibwiza, Twetezimbererukiniro, Tumenyinzuki, Urumuri		X							X												X
Total																					

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit: