
Final Project Evaluation Report

We ask all grant recipients to complete a project evaluation that helps us to gauge the success of your project. This must be sent in **MS Word and not PDF format**. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Complete the form in English and be as concise as you can. Note that the information may be edited before posting on our website.

Please email this report to jane@rufford.org.

Your Details	
Full Name	Shankar Datt
Project Title	Biodiversity conservation (Tor putitora or Golden fish) : A case for indigenous community-centric buffer zone management program follow- up and scale-up
Application ID	19926-2
Grant Amount	£5000
Email Address	dattshankar@gmail.com
Date of this Report	2018.04.20

1. Indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
First small grant review workshop				Shared and reviewed our learning with local community. About 100 people participated in the workshop.
Information dissemination walk				7 day message dissemination walk was organised in 15 villages. It was peak time of agriculture work so Could not get expected participation from local youth.
10-day volunteers training programme				Capacity building activities for local volunteers. 3 day classroom and 4 day field training was done. Sixteen volunteers from 10 villages participated in the training
Essay and drawing competition				Awareness generation activities among students. 500 students from 11 schools participated in the activities.
Field training of villagers by trained volunteers				Selected villagers didn't agree to do day long learning exercise. Therefore we had to cancel the training.
Exposure visits of fishermen to fishery department				3 day exposure visit (3rd to 6th August 2017) of 11 local people to the cold water fisheries research center, Bhimtal and Pantnagar
International biodiversity day celebration				We combined the events, started biodiversity conservation awareness campaign with students on 22nd May and conclude the campaign with poster presentation, plays and cultural activities on 5th June 2017.
The best idea of conservation of the golden fish and the "Best performance awards" to community based institution				Successfully done. However best performance awards will be given in this year (2018) on international biodiversity day.

Baseline survey and identification of 10 deep water zones in 20 kilometres stretch of the river				Successfully done
Demarcation and social fencing				Successfully done
Monitoring and theme-based learning activities to sustain social fencing				Successfully done
Seed ranching [2000 fingerlings of golden fish]				About 8000 fingerlings were transferred from small ponds to the river
Monograph and short films				Successfully done
Participatory Impact assessment of deep water zone conservation and seed ranching of golden fish population				Participatory Impact assessment is going on. Seed ranching outcomes need to access in May (six months after seed ranching). Therefore the assessment haven't completed yet.
Convergence and the programme scale-up				Dialogue is being done with State biodiversity board Fishery department Uttarakhand government

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

Engagements of local community

The local villagers, specifically women are over burden with domestic and agriculture work. Programme activities are extra workload upon them. Even though, we make a participatory activities calendar with the local community; nevertheless, the programme activities obstructs people daily work. Last year we had to cancel our training programme due to local people's time constraint. To tackle the situation in the future we made a season wise (monthly) daily routine chart of villagers and altered our programme activities according to local people's free time. It was quite a difficult exercise for us but it was important to get people's active participation in the programme.

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

Prevented uncontrolled fishing

Uncontrolled fishing is one of the biggest threats to golden mahasheer fish in the Ramganga River. Blasting, electric current, chemical, traditional trap, water diversion are commonly used fishing methods. These uncontrolled fishing methods not only kill a large population of fishes but also disturb entire ecosystem of the area. The one of the measurable outcome of our project is that not a single incident was reported of

uncontrolled fishing in our project area for last one year. In 2015-16 it was more than 25 incidences in a year.

Developed community-based institutions and documented traditional knowledge

It is our observation that if the local community does not own the programme, the programme activities may not sustain beyond the project age. Therefore it is good to have an organised community at the grassroots level to continue conservation activities even after programme support end. We have well established community-based institutions in all the proposed villages. In addition, we have developed a good document on traditional knowledge and good practices of biodiversity conservation.

Convergence and scale-up plan

It is very important for us to scale-up the programme for broader and long-term impact. Therefore we are making efforts to converge the programme's activities with government and non-government agencies to support the programme right from the beginning. We have got significant success to link our programme with fishery department government of Uttarakhand and regional university. Apparently, we will able to link our programme with few national and international organisations in this year.

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

The entire programme plan was develop by local community in phase I. local community is integral part of the programme. We just facilitated the programme process; the major decision of programme planning and implementation was done by local community. Few Community members' views about programme are as follows

Community-based organization member

'I am very happy to be part of the programme. First I participated in the programme planning; now we are implementing the plan. So I involved in the project right from the beginning. I and my group members are well aware about the project. We know how much money has involved in the programme; who is giving the money; time of the activities etc. We will definitely participate in the programme activities in the future'

Devki Devi (secretary Aman Shakti self-help group)

Local youth (volunteers)

I have been working with Shankar Datt in this programme for last 3 years. Honestly speaking, initially I want to join the programme for money only.

However the skills and wisdom I acquired in the past three years were priceless. Although my educational background is not a conservation science or biological science, now I have learnt and experienced a lot about it. Now I am able to tell my people that why and how we can conserve our natural heritage. I am very thankful of the programme and entire team to give a right direction and platform.

Vijay Dhyani, Village Thala

Local fisherman (a beneficiary of fish pond)

I know the importance of fish; fishing is one of the livelihoods options of my family.

In beginning, I was the first person in my village to oppose the programme because I thought the programme activities would hamper our fishing activities.

One day, Mr. Ravindra Kumar from Fishery department Uttarakhand government briefed about the programme. After that, I went for education visit with programme volunteers, and then I realized that the programme is good for our river ecosystem and the program's efforts will give us sustainable food from the river. Now I am an active volunteer for the programme and beneficiary of a fish pond.

Sunil Kumar, Village Matwas

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes, we want to continue the programme. We have targeted 80 km length of the river which flows in the buffer zone of Corbett National Park and it is the hilly area. We have been working in 20 km length of the river for last 3 years. We are targeting another 30 km for next 18 month.

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

To share our finding and learning among local people we do street show, slogan writing, leaflet distribution and workshops in school and collages; for district and state level audiences I presented my work in the state science congress. At the national level I participated in conferences and workshops to share our experiences including Rufford Foundation India workshop, Kinship conservation workshop India 2018 etc. In addition we have developed a video documentary and monograph on our work and learning which we will share on web base application for all. Furthermore we are writing a paper for journals to share our learning.

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

The proposed programme was for 15 months from January 2017 to March 2018. We have completed almost all purposed activities in a given timescale. However, we still need to complete a section of impact assessment; because the subject matter expert suggested us to wait till May-June to do impact assessment of social fencing and seed ranching.

8. Budget: Provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used. It is important that you retain the management accounts and all paid invoices relating to the project for at least 2 years as these may be required for inspection at our discretion.

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
First small grant programme review workshop	100£	80£	+20£	We got a contribution for food and accommodation from local community. So expenses were less.
	9,300₹	7,400₹	+1,860₹	
Information dissemination walks in 10 villages	200£	250£	-50£	Had to increase villages on local people's demand (proposed villages were 10 activities done in 15 villages) therefore expenses were increased
	18,600₹	23,250₹	-4,650₹	
10-days volunteers training programme	400£	400£	0£	Actual
	37,200₹	37,200₹	0₹	
Essay and drawing competition in 7 schools	200£	300£	-100£	We Had to increase the number of schools on local people's demand (proposed schools were 7 activities done in 11 schools) therefore expenses were increased. Matching budget was given by school administration.
	18,600₹	27,900₹	-9,300₹	
Field training of villagers by trained volunteers	100£	0£	+100£	Selected Villagers didn't agree to do day long learning exercise. Therefore we had to cancel the training.
	9,300₹	0₹	9,300₹	
Exposure visits of fishermen to fishery department	200£	250£	-50£	Accommodation and travel cost increased
	18,600₹	23,250₹	-4,650₹	
International biodiversity day celebration	100£	200£	-100£	We did combine celebration of international biodiversity day and environment day. Therefore cost increased. SPECS a Dehradun Uttarakhand, India based organization support the entire programme.
	9,300₹	18,600₹	-9,300₹	
Baseline survey and identification of 10 deep water zones in 20	300£	300£	0£	Actual
	27,900₹	27,900₹	0₹	

kilometres stretch of the river.				
Demarcation and social fencing of identified zones	200£	160£	+40£	Proposed site were 10. Actual selection were 7. Therefore cost was less.
	18,600₹	14,880₹	+3,720₹	
Monitoring and theme based learning activities to sustain social fencing	100£	100£	0£	Actual
	9,300₹	9,300₹	0₹	
Seed ranching [2000 fingerlings of golden fish] in the 10 deep water zones, in 20 kilometres of the river	300£	450£	-150£	Numbers of fingerlings increased. Fishery department government of Uttarakhand supported the activities.
	27,900₹	41,850₹	-13,950₹	
Construction of two fish ponds	2000£	2500£	-500£	Construction cost increased. Fishery department government of Uttarakhand supported the activities.
	1,86,000₹	2,32,500₹	-46,500₹	
Camera and voice recorder for Monograph development and other documentation	400£	355£	+45£	Did not buy voice recorder.
	37,200₹	33,000₹	+4185₹	
Participatory Impact assessment of deep water zone; conservation and seed ranching of golden fish population	300£	300£	0£	Actual
	27,900₹	27,900₹	0₹	
Convergence and the programme scale-up	300£	300£	0£	Actual
	27,900₹	27,900₹	0₹	
Honorarium for one full time project leader	1000£	1000£	0£	Actual
	93,000₹	93,000₹	0₹	
Stipend for part time project associates and volunteers	1200£	1200£	0£	Actual
	111600₹	111600₹	0₹	
Community	200£	200£	0£	

resource center for project field staff, common meeting point	18,600₹	18,600₹	0₹	Actual
Travel and Communication expenses	400£	600£	-200£	Travel cost increased
	37,200₹	55,800₹	18,600₹	
Total	8,000£	8945£	-945£	

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

Local level:

- ✚ Strengthen community based organization for biodiversity conservation.
- ✚ Increase volunteer base and support self-motivated volunteers.
- ✚ Documentation of traditional knowledge.
- ✚ Ensure people's active participation.

Research and academic level:

- ✚ More research needs to be done on Himalayan river biodiversity.
- ✚ Endangered species must be kept in a priority for government's action research programme.
- ✚ Research work and finding must reach at grassroots level.

Policy level:

- ✚ Wild life protection act should be more strong for fragile Himalayan ecosystem
- ✚ Golden mahasheer fish should be kept under schedule A species

10. Did you use The Rufford Foundation logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the Foundation receive any publicity during the course of your work?

1. We used Rufford Foundation logo in the program banner, handouts, monograph, presentations, wall painting etc.
2. We always gave a small introduction of the Rufford Foundation and its contribution towards conservation in developing country (presentation with the government department, conferences and workshops, during awareness programme in school and colleges).
3. A regional and a national newspaper published our conservation programme journey; they wrote about Rufford foundation's role in our programme.

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

Involvement	Name	Role
Full time	Shankar Datt	Lead and facilitate the programme
	Prakesh Kandpal	Coordination
	Geeta Caudhary	Convergence and Human resource management
	Deepika Kulyal	Community mobilization and assist to volunteers and interns
Part time	Surendra Singh	Programe support team
	Devki Devi	
Volunteers	Sunil Prakash	Programe support team
	Vijay Dhyani	
	Prayag Sundriyal	
	Disha	
Intern	Chandra Koli	Participatory Impact assessment of the programme
	Vikram Singh	
	Vinay Vidhyarthi	
	Aasna Bhatt	Seed ranching and documentation
	Gunjan Kandpal	
	Harish	
	Devendra Tripathai	
	Ajay	
Actively involved community based organization's member	Dhana Devi	Community mobilization and gave their active support to execute the activities.
	Champa Devi	
	Kamala Devi	
	Laxmi Devi	
	Sheela Devi	
	Joyti	
	Bhagwati Devi	
	Malti Devi	
	Anita Devi	
	Madhu Devi	
Member from fishery department Uttarakhand	Ravindra Kumar	Developed handouts for volunteers training
		Technical support to identified the sites for fish pond
		Technical support for seed ranching activities

		Active support to develop monograph on golden mahasheer fish
--	--	--

Thank you for your continue support to save **golden mahasheer fish!!!**