

## CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP)
<b>Project Title:</b>	Strengthening local institutions in the Albertine Rift for community development and conservation of the mountain gorilla
<b>Date of Report:</b>	31 <sup>st</sup> January 2015
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Anna B. Masozera – IGCP Director abehm@igcp.org

### CEPF Region:

Eastern Afrotropical Biodiversity Hotspot, Greater Virunga - Murchison Landscape: Bwindi Impenetrable National Park Uganda (KBA 30) and Volcanoes National Park Rwanda (KBA 251)

### Strategic Direction:

Strategic Direction 3. Initiate and support sustainable financing and related actions for the conservation of priority KBAs and corridors.

Investment Priority 3.3. Support training for civil society organizations in fund-raising and project management, especially training such organizations at all levels with respect to emerging opportunities for sustainable financing for KBAs in Africa.

**Grant Amount: 19,987 USD**

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

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

### Conservation Impacts

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

This project built the capacity through active involvement of the beneficiaries of local CBOs around the mountain gorilla parks in Rwanda and Uganda in identifying and prioritizing viable projects that respond to their needs. Beneficiaries developed projects that could receive funding from various sources including tourism revenue sharing schemes. The village profiling methodology was adopted to build capacity for sustainable financing of projects that address critical needs in front-line communities.

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

These results were in line with the original intended impact based on the proposal submitted:

1. Community institutions were strengthened by providing them with the technical skills required to develop project proposals, engage in fundraising and participate effectively in local development and natural resource management;
2. Lower Local Governments (LLGs) capacity was improved to promote and facilitate community based planning and monitoring in order to achieve broad-based equitable, self-reliant and sustainable development; and

3. The capacity of two CBOs (NCCDF and SACOLA) and four Lower Local Governments were strengthened to manage harmonized participatory planning processes using village and parish plans as building blocks.

Specifically, impacts were most notably realized within the CBOs present in these localities, most notably NCCDF and SACOLA, as well as at the grassroots level:

1. CBOs gained a better understanding of participatory planning at the village level in order to address the real issues from the village perspective. CBOs were involved in all village profiling, problem analysis and project proposals. Consequently the CBOs were willing to fund some of the projects using funds available from revenue generated from tourism enterprise.
2. Communities were able to develop proposals based on the problems for the village identified as part of the village profiles and consequently community members had a better understanding of their situation and ways that they could take their own measures with resources at hand to improve the situation toward their collective vision.
3. The bottom-up approach starting with village profiles - completed by community members themselves - was very well received with all participants as individuals and institutions.

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

**Hectares Protected:** 494 km<sup>2</sup> (Volcanoes National Park, Rwanda, and Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Uganda)

**Species Conserved:** Mountain Gorillas

**Corridors Created:** N/A

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

Success toward achieving short-term and long-term impact objectives:

1. Long term objective: "By 2020, mountain gorilla tourism poses minimal risk to the gorillas and provides direct and equitable benefits to communities living around the Protected Areas."

The project contributed towards achieving the IGCP long term objective 3 stated above. The village planning process through village profiling were conducted in 4 villages bordering the Parks (two in Rwanda: Muhabura and Nyabigoma and two in Uganda: Nteko and Rubuguri). The profiling captured issues that villages are facing and needed to be addressed. By identifying issues that might be addressed by various schemes including the revenue sharing scheme it is also ensuring equitable and direct benefits to communities living around the park.

The project built the capacity through active involvement of the beneficiaries of local CBOs around the mountain gorilla parks in Rwanda and Uganda in identifying and prioritizing viable projects that respond to their needs. Consequently, beneficiaries developed projects that could receive funding from various sources including revenue sharing schemes. Furthermore, CBOs understood the need to have participatory planning at the village level in order to address the real issues from the village perspective and willing to fund some of the projects. The bottom up approach used by starting with village profiles and done by village members themselves helped in raising awareness of their problems and opportunities that they have. It helped into visioning the future of their villages. They recommended continuing using the methodology since it involves them directly in their own living, become aware of problems they are facing. Therefore, CBOs has endorsed the methodology of financing community projects based on the village profiling. Based on the understanding of their own problems/issues the communities around the parks will benefit more from all funding schemes that will address their issues consequently their attitude towards the parks will change and will protect more the parks.

2. Short term objectives:

- By September 2014 community institutions will be strengthened by providing them with the technical skills required to develop project proposals, engage in fundraising and participate effectively in local development and natural resource management

In Rwanda: 42 (M: 32 F: 10) in Uganda: Rubuguri 38 people trained (M: 25 F: 13) Nteko: 31 people trained (M: 23 F: 8) in project writing proposals and all were involved in writing the selected proposals.

All people trained for project proposals writing participated in developing the list of community projects based on the village profiles. Discussion workshops/meetings were organized to conduct problem analysis and resources assessment based on the village profiles.

From the problem analysis and resources assessment list of projects were developed. In total 12 project proposals were developed and two are already under discussions for financing by SACOLA and two will be financed by NCCDF in Uganda.

The selected projects will also be shared with the local authorities at the Local Government level. The proposals will be used for fundraising and tabled at local government planning councils.

In Rwanda, 4 project proposals were written:

- i. Improve selected Irish potatoes seeds
- ii. Provide/support communities to get toilet facilities in Muhabura
- iii. Livestock/goat rearing
- iv. Facilitate access to clean water.

In Uganda, Rubuguri group selected the following:

- i. Heifer ( Zero grazing/ Improved exotic cows) project
- ii. Improved Access to safe water supply project with in communities around Rubuguri Parish (Communities that need extension of piped water are Kafuga, Rushaga, Nombe and Kanyamahene Villages while Kanshana, Nyabikyekye, Rushabarara, Omumitoma, Nyabaremura, Higabiro ,Kashija and Igabiro are for construction of Household Safe water harvesting Jags (Extension of piped water and construction of Household Harvesting water jags of 500lts-1000lts)
- iii. Poultry farming project in communities of Rubuguri Parish.
- iv. Raising awareness on HIV/AIDs amongst community members in Rubuguri Parish.

In Uganda, Nteko group selected the following:

- i. Improved Access to safe Water supply in the communities neighbouring Bwindi Park ( Mostly the following Villages with no water who entirely depend on water from the park that has caused Liver blindness: Kahurire, Kikomo, Kikobero, Nteko, Suma, Kabaya, Mugombwa, Bikokora , Nyamikumbu and Murore Villages all these neighbor Bwindi National Park and the community members are faced with the disease Liver blindness mostly young children and pregnant women)
- ii. Sheep Rearing Project in Nteko Parish
- iii. Create awareness on young child Education in Primary Schools in Nteko Parish
- iv. Awareness of growing Nutrition crops (Sweet Orange Potato with Vitamin A multiplication amongst farmers) in Nteko parish.

Trainings were conducted and projects were selected however, since the project missed the planning process of FY14, it is now targeted for the planning process of FY15 which starts in January 2015.

- By September 2014, Lower Local Governments (LLGs) capacity will be improved to promote and facilitate community based planning and monitoring in order to achieve broad-based equitable, self-reliant and sustainable development

The guidelines for Community Based Planning & Monitoring profiling and development planning tool was adapted to the LLG planning tool and processes in order to have elements that will facilitate the integration of village planning (Participants lists from training programmes; LLG planning tools)

As a result of the guidelines and the training, two teams of LLG staff one from Rwanda and the other from Uganda as well as the two CBOs (SACOLA and NCCDF) facilitated selection and training of village profilers, consequently they gave technical support and were able to give an oversight on village profiling.

- By September 2014, the capacity of two CBOs (NCCDF and SACOLA) and four Lower Local Governments will be strengthened to manage harmonized participatory planning processes using village and parish plans as building blocks.

The planning cycle processes for the two CBOs (SACOLA and NCCDF) normally starts around August/September of every year ends with the budgets conferences in December during the general assemblies; by that time the village plans including written proposals and plans will be developed and tabled for consideration for funding by the relevant committees such as budget and project committees which in turn will submit the selected proposals to the board for budgeting and forwarded to the general assemblies for approval and confirmation. (Sub-county/sector and CBO (SACOLA and NCCDF) plans incorporate village level plans).

Written proposals and plans were developed and will be tabled for funding consideration by SACOLA and NCCDF relevant committees such as budget and project committees which in turn will submit the selected proposals to the board for budgeting and forwarded to the general assemblies for approval and confirmation. The planning processes of SACOLA and NCCDF will be starting soon but in Rwanda, the access to clean water and support to get toilet facilities projects are already under discussions within SACOLA for possible funding. In Uganda, the proposals are all under discussions while waiting for the board meeting to be conducted and the financing will be subject to the availability of funds.

Community Based Planning & Monitoring profiling and development planning tools was developed in the two countries, reviewed and harmonized with current development planning practices within LLGs (parish /cell level) and two CBOs (SACOLA and NCCDF). The tool was adapted for the Rwanda side and translated into Kinyarwanda (local language) to help in facilitating the data collection. In Rwanda, all the information/data were summarized and entered into the cells planning registers to be incorporated or considered during the planning process at sector levels. In Uganda, the guidelines tool was also translated in Kifumbira.

In Rwanda: two (2) people from each the village council were selected for village profiling training and participated/ represented the village (community) to the cell development planning in order to emphasize the summarized information/needs from the cells registers. The same process was followed in Uganda.

In Rwanda: Local leaders (Cell Executive secretaries from the two selected cells (2), people responsible for all the cooperatives at the sector level (4), SACOLA executive committee (8) and RDB (2), a total of 18 people, were sensitized and explained the objectives and the purposes of Community based planning. In Uganda, Local Council (LC) of villages (26), Chief parish chiefs (2), Local Council 2 (2), NCCDF (9), Sub county Chiefs (2) and Community Development officer (CDO) 2- and National Agriculture Advisory Services - NAADS (2), District Level staff i.e. District Community development officer and District Planner (2) were sensitized and explained the

objectives of the community based planning; thus the total number of people sensitized in the two countries is 65.

In Rwanda: Forty (40) people including technical staff of SACOLA and six (6) local government agents trained in techniques for community organization for village / cell profiling and planning.

In Uganda: Forty (40) selected people and local council II (6) were trained in techniques for community organization for village/parish profiling.

In Rwanda: Nineteen (19) village profiles were developed and summarized into the cell development planning registers while twenty-three (23) village profiles in Uganda (socio economic data captured in the registers for planning). Therefore a total of 42 village profiles were developed in Rwanda and Uganda.

In Uganda: One meeting conducted at the sector level to introduce the project and explain the need of community based planning as well as village profiling. A second meeting at the sector level as follow up and defining the roles and responsibilities of each institution. The sector endorsed the project. At cell level, one meeting conducted to introduce the project and the need of community based planning as a way of developing plans from the village level to the cell level. The second meeting was conducted to harmonize the methodologies of village profiling and define the roles and responsibilities. In Uganda the same process was followed. (Conduct consultative meetings with the local government of Kisoro)

In Uganda: The Village Planning and monitoring Facilitators' guide was developed, discussed and adopted. It was intended to assist Village Planning and Monitoring Facilitators, Parish Development Committees, Partner CBOS and the sub-county planning core teams while guiding the community based planning. It specifically aimed at the following objectives: to make members of the local community understand the social, economic, political and cultural structures, systems and management practices that keep them in poverty; Train Village Planning Facilitators,

In Uganda: Parish/Cell Development Committees on village profiling and participatory planning exercises so that they were able to:

- a) To produce village development profiles that will form a basis for formulation of development plans at Village and parish levels;
- b) To produce village and parish development plans that will become the foundation of communities' collective efforts towards their emancipation from poverty, as well as first-level building blocks for preparation of sub-county and District Development Plans. (Develop village and parish/ cell profiling and planning guidelines ensuring harmonization with current LLG planning practices)

In Rwanda, data collectors were trained by IGCP and Rwanda Development Board/Volcanoes National Park community conservation wardens. Before the proper training the participants on this training were informed about this activity and relationship between CEPF activity and SACOLA intervention, why community planning is very important in community development, how SACOLA fund can support small projects elaborated by villages development team etc.

The topic of training was village profiling data collection tool. Facilitators explain to data collectors, all aspect of this tools many questions were asked by them.

In Rwanda: Village profiling data collected by different profilers were compiled and errors corrected. 8 profilers were chosen to conduct the exercise of compiling and correcting errors. In Uganda, village profiling data were collected and compiled into registers that were kept at the office of the Local Council chairman II. (LCII)

Workshops/meetings were organized to conduct problem analysis and resources assessment based on data collected for village profiles. From the village profiles and problem analysis/resource assessment the groups made a vision on how they want their villages to look

like within two to three years. A simple strategic and action plans were developed and served as the basis of selecting priority projects.

In Uganda, in Nteko from the village the vision and strategic plan, the profilers understood the importance of education and started mobilization of community members to facilitate their children to go to school and have savings for school fees. In addition, some women started mobilizing others and started a village savings and credits scheme to help access funds for their households. In Rwanda, from the project on supporting toilet facilities, the community members decided to bring their inkind efforts to implement the project. other actions by communities will be monitored as move forward

Challenges toward achieving short-term and long-term impact objectives:

1. Embracing the new ways of planning took longer than expected since people and stakeholders were initially reticent. It took multiple efforts (mainly at the level of local government) in explaining the objectives and the purposes of Community Based Planning; thus there was a delay in starting up the project.
2. People want to be rewarded for the time spent, presenting challenges for a self-sustaining capacity for village profiling and proposal writing. Profilers were working on volunteering basis therefore maintaining the motivation proved difficult as most of them were expecting to be paid.
3. The benefits will need to outweigh the costs in terms of time investment on the individual and institutional level to ensure that the new approach is integrated into planning and resource mobilization at individual, local government and CBO level.
4. The planning cycles of LLG and CBOs are not at the same time and follow different processes. The planning process of LLGs start around January and end towards March/April and yet for CBOs the approval of budgets and proposals/project to be funded are normally done in December. These timeframes and coupled with the processes became a challenge to the project since there was a delay in developing proposals to be funded or considered for funding. Thus all proposals developed by communities will be tabled next year although some are already under discussions.

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

An unexpected positive impact was the rate of self-motivation as a result of the village profiling exercising with the initiation - without external resources - of savings and loan schemes to help people with education expenses.

Village credit and saving scheme is an arrangement whereby an association or group of individuals that come together and contribute a certain amount on a regular basis in order to establish funds for their members. Having funds allow the members to access loans when there is an urgent from one or some members. Most the time, the cash needed is used to attend arising issues in their households. However with the recent scheme formed by women as the result of CEPF; they are still at the initial stage and IGCP is backstopping and monitoring the initiative.

### **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)***

- In order for a short term project to have long term impact, the project needs to be embedded into a long term strategy with stakeholder buy-into ensure that capacity building yields results over the long term.
- The planning cycles for local government, revenue sharing, and CBOs should be put into the timeline to ensure capacity building activities and products produced can be quickly put into the hands of those who can use them to allocate resources to them.

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

- For further development and for the project to be more successful, more empowerment programmes are needed to enhance the capacity of community leaders for improved livelihoods and sustainable development. Improving ones skill is not a one day activity. If community members' capacity to implement livelihood project must be improved, such training would be done in phases followed by refresher trainings.
- All training materials and aid kits must be prepared in advance and translated into local language to help participants to better assimilate the training contents and modules, since most beneficiaries could not benefit from materials or trainings in English or French language.
- Most of activities will need follow up even after the closure of the project i.e. the monitoring of the uptake and implementation and even just mentoring through a complete project cycle.
- Livelihood development of CBOs/CSOs through identification and selection of viable projects is sound since CBOs and CSOs are the most important factor for the development of a community's income and perhaps more importantly in creating a wider wealth distribution through having funded viable projects.
- Involvement of stakeholders such as Local Council III Councilors, all Sub County Technical staff and NCCDF Board Members in the ongoing Village profiling, and Community project design and implementation and subsequently incorporate activities within the sub county development action plans is very important and crucial for better planning and resource utilization.

***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.***

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
WWF	A	11,500	Part of the funding for IGCP come from the coalition members either directly to activities or to core funding as operations thus for the project the funding was from WWF.
WWF	B	55,000	Proposal was approved for funding, it is a direct result of CEPF project.

**\*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.**

**Success:**

1. Training modules developed and translated into local language will facilitate expanding capacity building in village profiling and proposal writing to additional communities in these areas.

**Challenge:**

1. Community based planning approaches supported by this project in four communities will need to be incorporated into local planning processes within local government as well as CBOs in order to yield the benefits over time, beyond an NGO-supported process from which people expected monetary compensation for their time.

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

### **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**

### **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: Anna Behm Masozera  
Organization name: International Gorilla Conservation Programme  
Mailing address: PO Box 931, Kigali, RWANDA



Tel:+250 252 580 465  
Fax:  
E-mail: abehm@igcp.org

**\*\*\*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.	No		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?	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.	No	494km <sup>2</sup>	
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No		
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	Yes	12 project proposals elaborated in 4 communities.	To date there are no tangible socioeconomic benefits resulting from this project. However, further monitoring will be needed once proposals receive funding and implemented, which will create tangible socioeconomic benefits to the communities listed in the following table.

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



