

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

| | |
|--|--|
| Organization Legal Name: | Save Tanzanian Forests (SATAFO) |
| Project Title: | Promoting Sustainable Livelihoods for Improved Forest Conservation |
| Date of Report: | 04/02/2016 |
| Report Author and Contact Information | Dominico Benedicto Kilemo dbkilemo@yahoo.com |

CEPF Region: Njombe Forests, Tanzania (Kigoma and Limapanga Forest reserves)

Strategic Direction: Mainstream biodiversity into wider development policies, plans and projects to deliver the co-benefits of biodiversity conservation, improved local livelihoods and economic development in priority corridors

Grant Amount: USD 20,000

Project Dates: August 2014- Feb 2016 (18 months)

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

The project was solely implemented by the indigenous people under facilitation of SATAFO. The project was implemented in two villages namely Mtapu and Mambegu whereby 40 households from each village participated in the project, making a total of 80 households for the entire project. The households chose beekeeping and poultry as the main livelihood activities with which SATAFO should provide technical and logistical assistance. SATAFO provided training and supplied the necessary materials to enable the households undertake their livelihood activities. Moreover, village administration provided a fundamental role because their approval of the project built trust and people had good attitude towards the project

Conservation Impacts

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

The project has contributed in the protection of the ecosystem through provision of conservation education to the indigenous community and supporting sustainable livelihood activities which improve household income, thus reducing destructive activities in the forests.

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

Awareness on Forest Conservation and Sustainable Livelihoods increased by 50%:

Although we have not measured this quantitatively due to budgetary constraints (this was supposed to be done by an independent evaluator to avoid bias), it is evident that the level of awareness on forest conservation among community members has increased as a result of this project. This could be witnessed in our awareness meetings whereby the number of participants increased from time to time.

The capacity of Local leaders to manage forests built : The project has strengthened the village environmental committees(VECs), they regularly hold meetings and undertake forest patrols. They now conduct forest patrols at least twice a week.

Value chains for Sustainable Livelihood-based enterprises developed:

We conducted value chain analysis for honey (beekeeping) and poultry. We identified profitable markets and the strategic levels of the value chain where the producers can benefit. The value chain analysis has indicated that in order for the poultry producers to have a reasonable profit margin they have to bypass the middle men and sell directly to buyers who offer good price especially in restaurants and urban market places. Moreover, the demand for honey seems to be low locally but higher in big cities such as Dar es Salaam. The honey processing factory in Kibaha offers a market opportunity for honey from the project area

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: 810 ha

Species Conserved: Mainly miombo woodland and associated species

Corridors Created: No corridor was created

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

The project's interventions have contributed in achieving the overall (long-term) objective of the project which is conservation of the Kigoma and Limapanga forests. The project has built the capacity of VECs to manage the forests. Illegal activities in the forests have reduced significantly. When we started the project there were reported cases of uncontrolled livestock grazing, wildfires and illegal tree cutting. Such cases remain at very minimal level. However, more technical and logistical support (protective gears) are needed so as to enable the VECs monitor the forests smoothly and ensure sustainable utilization. It was learned that the villages offer forest harvesting permits to individuals who want to harvest trees. But such permits are given haphazardly without proper knowledge of the available forest stock and permitted zones. Although forest zonation is stipulated in the developed forest management plan. The implementation of the plan will require some technical backstopping.

The short-term objectives of the project were (1) development of village land use plans (2) implementation of sustainable livelihood activities and (3) development of forest management plan for each forest. Number 1 was not done because we learnt that conducting a formal and legally binding land use planning operation is very expensive and thus beyond the budget framework of this project. However, we facilitated the formulation of bylaws which if obeyed will reduce resource conflicts and thus contributing to sustainable forest management. For number 2, the number of households involved in the supported livelihood activities reached about 80%. The supported livelihood activities are envisaged to increase household income thus reduce illegal use of the forest. Some households have started to harvest honey which when sold will improve their income stream. Looking at the timeframe of this project (18 months) it is premature to assess whether the improved household income would lead to reduced illegal forest use or not. For number 3, Forest management plan for each forest has been formulated. The plans are still waiting for approval from district authorities. The challenge here is the fact that it takes long time for the district council to consider putting the forest management plan on their meeting agenda.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

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)

Involvement of project beneficiaries and relevant government authorities in all stages of the project design contributed to its success.

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

Allowing the beneficiaries to decide what they want the project do for the them and what they can do for the project. This contributed to the success in project implementation. Coming with a completely new intervention package may be risky. For example during the project design process, SATAFO came with an idea of mushroom farming hoping it to be adopted by the beneficiaries. Although it was accepted in the design process, later during implementation the beneficiaries changed their mind and lost interest in it. This led to cancellation of this livelihood activities and reallocation of the funds to other activities.

A formal land use planning was underestimated for this project because it is long process requiring many resources. The established livelihood activities would have more positive impact if the project support is extended to 1-2 years more.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

If the local communities are not assured of livelihood related benefits, their participation and cooperation in ecosystem conservation and protection activities are not fully effected.

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 |
|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| None | None | None | None |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

***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.

The supported livelihood activities were replicated by other households which were not project beneficiaries. Due to the fact that these activities are already known to the entire community, there is a great assurance that even after termination of the project; the beneficiaries will continue to implement the project-supported livelihood activities. The project has created an enabling environment for future conservation projects

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

None

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

The project observed the environmental and social safeguard policies. The project did not cause any environmental damage or impact to the ecosystem nor did it cause any adverse social impact. Prior project inception we conducted Free Prior and Informed Consultation of Indigenous Peoples (FPIC). This involved holding meetings with the village members and leaders whereby we discussed the project idea in the interactive and participatory settings while ensuring that the views of the indigenous people are taken on board and constituted the project proposal. Throughout the project period we have observed social safeguard policy. Improvement of livelihoods of the indigenous people has been the central focus of this project. In every activity we conducted there was active participation of the indigenous people. Decision making related to the project such as type of livelihood activities to be supported, distribution of beehives, formulation of forest bylaws was based on the views of the people.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Much would have been achieved if the project timeframe was larger than 18months

Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

The TBA training in Nairobi (Kenya) and Mbeya (Tanzania) on Effective management of conservation projects and exchange project visit in Malawi (MISUKU Beekeepers Association) by Ms. Pendo Niyukuli (Project Community Development Officer) had a positive impact to the project and her career in general. We also had some training in Njombe by Ms Dalphine on budgeting. Such training has improved the capacity of project staff in project management and fund raising skills.

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: Dominico Kilemo

Organization name: Save Tanzanian Forests

Mailing address: MJM 215 Mji Mwema, P.O. Box 518, NJOMBE, TANZANIA

Tel:255 754086638

Fax:

E-mail:dbkilemo@yahoo.com

*****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. | yes | 810ha | The project strengthened the capacity of village environmental committee to monitor the village forest reserves. |
| 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. | | | |

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

