

*Institutionalising Participatory Forest Bio-diversity Management in Nepal*

*PFBM Nepal - Participatory Action Research Project*

*Website: [www.uea.ac.uk/dev/odg/pfbm/](http://www.uea.ac.uk/dev/odg/pfbm/)*

*Annual Report 2004-2005*



*This research project has been funded by Darwin Initiative for Conservation of the Species, through the Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) UK Government. It is coordinated by the Overseas Development Group, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK. Tel: (+44) 01603 592883*



## **Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species**

### **Annual Report 2003-04**

#### **1. Darwin Project Information**

Project Ref. Number	11-021
Project Title	<b><i>Institutionalising Participatory Integrated Forest Management in Nepal – reconciling Biodiversity Management with Local Livelihoods’ (formerly Institutionalising Participatory Forest Biodiversity Management in Nepal)</i></b>
Country(ies)	<i>Nepal</i>
UK Contractor	<i>Overseas Development Group, University of East Anglia</i>
Partner Organisation(s)	<i>Institute of Forestry Pokhara</i>
Darwin Grant Value	<i>£178,447</i>
Start/End dates	<i>1<sup>st</sup> October 2002 – 30<sup>th</sup> September 2005</i>
Reporting period and report number (1,2,3..)	<i>(1 Apr 2003 to 31 Mar 2004)</i>
Project website	<i><a href="http://www.uea.ac.uk/dev/odg/pfbm/">http://www.uea.ac.uk/dev/odg/pfbm/</a></i>
Author(s), date	<i>Oliver Springate-Baginski, 21/6/04</i>

#### **2. Project Background**

The Government of Nepal (HMGN) has made significant initial progress in implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity, through forming a network of protected areas covering almost 15% of the country. The National Report on Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (1997) states 'the goal is to integrate biodiversity conservation with socio-economic development'. The Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation (MoFSC) is also an internationally recognized leader in implementing Community Forestry – handing responsibility for forest management across the middle hills in particular to local rural communities (over 12,000 FUGs formed managing over 18% of Nepal's forest land. In the recent Nepal Biodiversity Action Plan the Community Forestry programme is cited as being a success in reversing forest habitat degradation. However beyond rhetorical endorsement there has been no concerted policy programme to promote biodiversity management in Forest User Group. Other policy initiatives (for instance seeking to introduce biodiversity 'corridors' outside of protected areas) even indicate a de-legitimation of FUG biodiversity management role. At present Forest User Groups (FUGs) feel excluded from the biodiversity management process (Shrestha, NK: 2001). Identification and piloting of inclusive, participatory and equitable modes of biodiversity conservation is urgently needed. Both senior figures in the Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation and in Federation of Forest User Groups (FECOFUN) have agreed to be involved in and actively support this policy-oriented project.

#### **3. Project Purpose and Outputs**

- *State the purpose and outputs of the project. Please include your project logical framework as an appendix and report achievements and progress against it (or, if applicable, against the latest version of the logframe).*
- *Have the outputs or proposed operational plan been modified over the last year, for what reason, and have these changes been approved by the Darwin Secretariat? (Please note that any intended modifications should be discussed with the Secretariat directly rather than making suggestions in this report).*

Project purpose: To institutionalize Biodiversity Action Planning processes in the forests of Nepal, at both District and Forest User Group levels, to ensure biodiversity is identified, protected, and where appropriate utilised on a sustainable basis to help alleviation of rural poverty.

The project aims to institutionalize participatory assessment, conservation and sustainable utilisation of biodiversity across the middle hills of Nepal. This will be achieved through supporting FUGs to incorporate biodiversity consideration in their Operational Plans (OP) for forest management, product extraction, processing and marketing. New ways of coordinating biodiversity conservation between the stakeholders at national, district and local levels be identified and implemented, through facilitation of District Biodiversity Action Planning. (Stakeholders include District Forest Officer (Dept. of Forest), Wildlife Warden (Dept. of Wildlife), Regional Director (MoFSC).

The planned outputs of the project for the '04-05 period are listed in the log-frame presented in Annex 1 and table C), Outputs have not been changed over the year

#### 4. Progress

- *Please provide a brief history of the project to the beginning of this reporting period. (1 para)*

The project began on 1st October 2002, and so has completed 18 months at the stage of reporting.

The project began with a inception planning workshop held in Kathmandu. Planning, and subsequently National stakeholders reviewed the programme and suggested revisions. Subsequently a field Biodiversity Action Planning process was developed, and trialled in one Community Forest User Group in Kaski district in Jan 2003.

- *Progress over the last year against the agreed baseline timetable for the period and the logical framework (complete Annex 1). Explain differences including any slippage or additional outputs and activities.*

The main work for the last year has been the 1) further development and adaptation of the field tools, 2) the implementation of village level and district biodiversity assessment, and 3) the development of the specific research strands.

1) The tools and processes developed and adapted through the initial field testing in Banpalle have been further adapted and revised through the scaling up of the FUG level action planning process. They remain under development, with the focus on the resource assessment methodology. This is quite controversial because the Ministry of Environment and Forests stipulate guidelines for Forest Inventory for Forest User Groups, yet the guidelines are flawed in a number of ways. Prof. Dutta of the Institute of Forestry is leading the inventory area of work. We are trying to develop user-friendly methods which will be acceptable to the Ministry of Environment and Forests. This is proving to be a substantial process. A draft version has been circulated to stakeholders.

2) In conjunction with National stakeholders 5 Districts have been selected for field implementation of the methodology (Doti, Dang, Mayagdi, Sarlahi and Sankhuwasaba).. On the basis of this, 3-4 CFUGs have been selected in each district during district-level stakeholder meetings, part of the initiation of the district level Biodiversity Action Planning process.

The field implementation process has been delayed in most areas by the extreme political unrest caused by the *Maobadi* conflict. This has made extended field visits very difficult in most areas, both in terms of organising logistics and transport (due to general strikes) and to manage group activities and planning meetings under conditions of heightened tension (due to military imposing restrictions on group meetings).

The project has dealt with the challenge of working under conflict situation by shifting emphasis to the district-level process, and developing stakeholder planning processes.

6 VCFUG-level Biodiversity Action Planning processes have been completed. Because the political situation has been so unsettled it has not been possible to conclude the action planning processes in single visits, and repeat visits have been necessary lengthened the planning process and demanding more time inputs from team members. However they are having the spin-off benefit of deepening the rapport with the FUGs. Therefore documentation has been delayed.

3) Specific research strands relevant to the overall project have been identified by each team member, and research work on these is being conducted in parallel to the field biodiversity action planning processes.

- *Provide an account of the project's achievements during the last year. This should include concise discussion on methodologies and approaches by the project (e.g. research, training, planning, assessment, monitoring) and their consequences and impacts as well as results. Please **summarise** content on methodologies and approaches, and, if necessary, provide more detailed information in appendices (this may include cross-references to attached publications).*

6 Village biodiversity planning processes have been conducted.

5 District level action planning processes have been initiated

The field methodology has been further refined. The Biodiversity Action Planning methodology seeks to integrate forest biodiversity management considerations into FUG forest management plans.

The national PIFM workshop was held in Kathmandu in February 2004. The overall project, and initial findings were presented to the learning group and other stakeholders, and feedback was received.

- *Discuss any significant difficulties encountered during the year and steps taken to overcome them.*

The overriding problem has been the extreme civil disorder prevailing in Nepal due to the *Maobadi* crisis. This has affected the project in a number of ways. Frequent general strikes have made logistical planning for fieldwork difficult. Maoist strikes on district headquarters in one case threatened the safety of research team members. Conflict in some areas has also inhibited the field programme from proceeding.

- *Has the design of the project been enhanced over the last year, e.g. refining methods, indicators for measuring achievements, exit strategy?*

The original design has been elaborated by developing the specific research strands and tasks required within these.

One research team member has had to stop her involvement in the project, S. Thapa, due to changed workload at Kathmandu University. Her role has been filled by other team members adopting her responsibilities.

AJ Karna has also become involved in the project, to support the fieldwork. Karna has extensive experience as a District Forest Officer, and has recently been involved in the SNV-supported 'Biodiversity Sector Programme for Siwalik and Tarai'.

A mature student from the University of East Anglia, School of Development studies, Dan Gordon-Lee joined the team for 3 months, to support research on sustainable Non Timber Forest Product Marketing. He has written up a paper on the basis of his work which is shortly to be published and disseminated.

A part of the project's national level network support, the opportunity arose to support the wider dissemination of biodiversity-related materials. Small funds have been made available from the project to support translation and circulation of 2 films by the Nepal Forum for Environmental Journalists: 'Environmental Justice' and 'Environmental Justice for Farmers'. Funds are now being sought for one or more further films directly about the project process and activities.

- *Present a timetable (workplan) for the next reporting period.*

**Table 1: Timetable for next reporting period**

<b>Sept. 04</b>	14A	<i>National Workshop held</i>
<b>Sept-Mar 03</b>	8	<i>OSB - 4-8 weeks in country supporting fieldwork &amp; analysis</i>
<b>Mar 05</b>	9	<i>6 further local FUG level BA/BAPs produced, 3 District level BA/BAPs produced</i>
-“-	7 / 10	<i>Tools manual for participatory BA/BAP produced at local and District level in English and Nepali</i>
-“-	7	<i>Bulletins, posters and leaflets summarising tools &amp; processes produced at local and District level in English and Nepali</i>
-“-	15A/B	<i>3 local and 3 national press releases in Nepal</i>
-“-	15C/D	<i>1 National and 1 local press release in UK</i>
-“-	19A	<i>1 National radio feature on Nepali Community Forestry show</i>

**5. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)**

- *Have you responded to issues raised in the review of your last year’s annual report? Have you discussed the review with your collaborators? Briefly describe what actions have been taken as a result of recommendations from last year’s review.*

<b>Review Point requiring actions:</b>	<b>Response</b>
1 <i>Relationships between partners and stakeholders should be more fully discussed</i>	The relationships between partners and stakeholders are complex, and are evolving. Generally we find that the issues are of interest to all of the stakeholders but often for opposite reasons, and we are trying to find a middle ground between the livelihood related priorities of the FUG members and FECOFUN, and the resource protection priorities of the Ministry. Because the situation is so difficult in many districts relationships have remained somewhat abstract until recently , when real issues over proposed revisions to Operational management plans have started to emerge, and test the commitment of the District Forest Officers. Relationships remain cordial, although some issues of policy relevance may need to be resolved at national level, particularly relating to the legal aspects of the forest inventory process. We will pay further attention to this issue in the project..
2. <i>Need for key stakeholders to verify their position, regarding biodiversity planning process.</i>  <i>Importance of taking sufficient time to develop the process, and resisting temptation to role out pseudo-participatory approach to fit within project timeframe</i>	Verification of stakeholders positions is being emphasised in District level and National level workshops.  The later comment is very much welcomed and reflects an understanding of the 'process' nature of the work, fitting within and contributing to wider institutional change processes, processes which don't obey schedules! The team is taking extra time to ensure the action-planning process actually involves district and local stakeholders, and talks account of their different views needs and wishes. This has reflected on the time taken to finalise the tools.
<i>Field staff should be fully conversant with basics of institutional analysis and good practice in facilitating institutional change processes</i>	Institutional analysis is emphasised in the District and national level activities. Conceptual clarification and training is being incorporated.
3. <i>Institutional home of computer equipment</i>	All computer equipment will be distributed on equitable basis to the project partners on completion: Federation of Forest User Groups, Biodiversity Division of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, and the Institute of Forestry.
4. <i>Log frame requires refinement</i>	Log-frame language has been clarified (attached)

## 6. Partnerships

- *Describe collaboration between UK and host country partner(s) over the last year. Are there difficulties or unforeseen problems or advantages of these relationships?*

The main partner organisations are the Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation, the Federation of Forest User Groups of Nepal and the Institute of Forestry. Relationships continue to be positive and constructive, even though the direct public relationship between the two partners is generally very difficult. Project meetings have a benefit for their partners of provide a private forum to sit together an 'build bridges'. Interaction over particularly controversial issues (such as unilaterally imposed taxation on Forest User Group revenues) can proceed in a non-confrontational atmosphere.

Both partners continue to be committed to the work and to the issues emerging. They have continued to support the work programme and take an interest in its development and policy relevant findings.

- *Has the project been able to collaborate with similar projects (Darwin or other) in the host country or other regions, or establish new links with / between local or international organisations involved in biodiversity conservation?*

We have maintained links with the WCMC Nepal project led by Dr. Bubb. Because fieldwork is at the initial implementation stage we have been more pre-occupied with this than with building wider relationships at the national level.

## 7. Impact and Sustainability

- *Discuss the profile of the project within the country and what efforts have been made during the year to promote the work. What evidence is there for increasing interest and capacity for biodiversity resulting from the project? Is there a satisfactory exit strategy for the project in place?*

Biodiversity aspects of forest management are achieving increasing attention, partly through our project efforts. The Nepal Biodiversity Action Plan indicated that Community Forestry in the middle hills had a role to play in biodiversity management. The recent implementation strategy has strongly prioritised that biodiversity management must be incorporated into Community Forestry, yet still the methods and modalities are not specified. This project is addressing this crucial issue directly, and as such has aroused a good deal of interest, as it has anticipated this issue and promises to answer it.

Our 'exit strategy' is to ensure the issue of integrated biodiversity management into forest management has gathered sufficient institutional momentum within the partner organisations and across the wider population that it will continue to develop. In practice this translates into: 1) developing the appropriate tools, 2) institutionalising the use of the tools at local, district and National level, and 3) ensuring the achievements of the use of the tools are understood, recognised and valued, such that they are incorporated into wider policy and practice.

## 8. Post-Project Follow up Activities (max 300 words)

*This section should be completed ONLY if your project is nearing completion (penultimate or final year) and you wish to be considered to be invited to apply for Post Project Funding. Each year, a small number of Darwin projects will be invited to apply for funding. Selection of these projects will be based on promising project work, reviews to date, and your suggestions within this section. Further information on this scheme introduced in 2003 is available from the Darwin website.*

- *From project progress so far, what follow-up activities would help to embed or consolidate the results of your project, and why would you consider these as suitable for Darwin Post Project Funding?*
- *What evidence is there of strong commitment and capacity by host country partners to enable them to play a major role in follow-up activities?*

## 9. Outputs, Outcomes and Dissemination

- *Explain differences in actual outputs against those agreed in the initial 'Project Implementation Timetable' and the 'Project Outputs Schedule', i.e. what outputs were not or only partly achieved? Were additional outputs achieved?*

<i>BAP process 'scaled-up' across 6 FUGs in 3 Districts in 3 Development Regions (including biod. assessment over 3 seasons with local facilitator)</i>	<i>Completed</i>
<i>Tools &amp; method &amp; 6FUGs process documented (to website)</i>	<i>Still under development – primarily due to legal / political issues over inventory.</i>
<i>Annual process reflection workshop &amp; coming year planning</i>	<i>Held</i>
<i>FUG Biodiversity Action plans reviewed in each existing site</i>	<i>Yes</i>

- *Provide details of dissemination activities in the host country during the year, including information on target audiences. Will dissemination activities be continued by the host country when the project finishes, and how will this be funded and implemented?*

This year the main emphasis has not been on dissemination, but on getting the process established under the very adverse political situation. If and when the political situation calms we will be able to raise the profile of the project through more active dissemination activities.

- Please expand and complete Table 1. **Quantify** project outputs over the last year using the coding and format from the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures (see website for details) and give a brief description. Please list and report on appropriate Code Nos. only. The level of detail required is specified in the Guidance notes on Output Definitions, which accompanies the List of Standard Output Measures

**Table 1. Project Outputs (According to Standard Output Measures)**

Code No.	Quantity	Description
8	4-8 weeks	OSB - in country supporting fieldwork & analysis
9	6	Biodiversity assessed in 6 FUGs
7 / 10	1	Tools & processes for participatory local Biod. Action Planning refined and adapted
14A	1	National Workshop held
15A/B	1	national press releases in Nepal

- In Table 2, provide full details of all publications and material produced over the last year that can be publicly accessed, e.g. title, name of publisher, contact details, cost. Details will be recorded on the Darwin Monitoring Website Publications Database. Mark (\*) all publications and other material that you have included with this report.

**Table 2: Publications**

Type *	Detail	Publishers	Available from	Cost £
(e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	(title, author, year)	(name, city)	(e.g. contact address, website)	
Journal Article	<b>Dev's article</b> Dev, Om Prakash2004 (in <i>Hamro Ban Sampada</i> .Year 1, No 3. Bhadra-Mansir, 2060 (in Nepali).	Forest Action: Kathmandu		
*DVD film	' <i>Environmental Justice for Farmers – Using Local Resources and Managing Local Biodiversity</i> ' Shree Lal Shah, 2004	Nepal Federation of Environmental Journalists: Kathmandu		£5

## 10. Project Expenditure

- Please expand and complete Table 3.

**Table 3: Project expenditure during the reporting period (Defra Financial Year 01 April to 31 March)**



Item	Budget (please indicate which document you refer to if other than your project schedule)	Expenditure	Balance

- *Highlight any recently agreed changes to the budget and explain any variation in expenditure where this is +/- 10% of the budget.*

The main deviation from the plan budget has been the increased expenditure on field activities (Other). This is largely due to increasing the scope of our activities to 5 districts and 4 FUGs in each. Costs to cover this have been scraped together from reducing expenditure in other areas; travel, seminars and office costs have been economised.

#### **11. Monitoring, Evaluation and Lessons**

- *Discuss methods employed to monitor and evaluate the project this year. How can you demonstrate that the outputs and outcomes of the project actually contribute to the project purpose? i.e. what are the indicators of achievements (both qualitative and quantitative) and how are you measuring these?*

We have tracked the activities and outputs according to the log-frame and schedule. The main positive outcomes we have seen are:

Improved awareness of the importance of biodiversity management and its practice in the FUGs and Districts we are working in. At national level the main objectives of the project have been accommodated within the National Biodiversity Implementation Plan (2003), and so we feel that the policy environment is becoming increasingly sympathetic.

- *What lessons have you learned from this year's work, and can you build this learning into future plans?*

The biggest challenge has been to keep biodiversity / livelihood issues on the agenda in the face of extreme civil unrest. We feel this has been possible at least in specific FUGs and Districts. The challenge remains developing practical tools and processes for planning, which are simple yet rigorous.

#### **12. OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements of your project during the reporting period (300-400 words maximum)**

##### **■ I agree for ECTF and the Darwin Secretariat to publish the content of this section**

In this section you have the chance to let us know about outstanding achievements of your project over the year that you consider worth highlighting to ECTF and the Darwin Secretariat. This could relate to achievements already mentioned in this report, on which you would like to expand further, or achievements that were in addition to the ones planned and deserve particular attention e.g. in terms of best practice. The idea is to use this section for various promotion and dissemination purposes, including e.g. publication in the Defra Annual Report, Darwin promotion material, or on the Darwin website. As we will not be able to ask projects on an individual basis for their consent to publish the content of this section, please note the above agreement clause.

Annex 1 Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year: 2003/2004

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2003-Mar 2004	Actions required/planned for next period
<p><b>Goal:</b> To draw on expertise relevant to biodiversity from within the United Kingdom to work with local partners in countries rich in biodiversity but poor in resources to achieve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conservation of biological diversity,</li> <li>• The sustainable use of its components, and</li> <li>• The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Purpose</b></p> <p>Biodiversity Action Planning processes in Nepal at District and Forest User Groups levels are institutionalised, ensuring the protection of biodiversity and its equitable and sustainable utilisation.</p>	<p>Number of FUGs with Biodiversity Action Planning (BAP) process institutionalised, and FUG Operational Plans accommodating biodiversity issues. Number of Districts with Biodiversity Action Planning process institutionalised. Evidence of maintained or improved biodiversity in Community and National Forests.</p>	<p><i>(report impacts and achievements resulting from the project against purpose indicators – if any)</i></p>	<p><i>(report any lessons learned resulting from the project &amp; highlight key actions planning for next period)</i></p>
<p><b>Outputs</b></p>			
<p>Field tools for local Participatory Biodiversity Assessment, and Action Planning (BA/BAP) process developed</p>	<p>Field tool documentation produced</p>	<p><i>(report completed activities and outcomes that contribute toward outputs and indicators)</i></p> <p>Field tools have been further refined over the period.</p>	<p><i>(report any lessons learned resulting from the project &amp; highlight key actions planning for next period)</i></p> <p>Completion of Field Tools documentation</p>
<p>Action planning (BA/BAP) process implemented and documented in at least 12 FUGs</p>	<p>BA/BAP documentation for 12 FUGs produced, including biodiversity assessment data</p>	<p>CFUG-level BAP processes have been conducted in 6 FUGs, according to the tools developed. Documentation is in draft form, and formats are being developed. Conflict situation has been prejudicial to fully completing this output.</p>	<p>Completion of BAP process implementation and documentation.</p>
<p>District-level Biodiversity Action Planning (DBAP)</p>	<p>DBAP documentation produced for 3 Districts</p>	<p>District level processes have been initiated in 5 Districts.</p>	<p>Further elaboration of District BAP process.</p>

process implemented in at least 3 Districts			
--	--	--	--

*Note: Please do NOT expand rows to include activities since their completion and outcomes should be reported under the column on progress and achievements at output and purpose levels.*

Table C

<b>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</b>		
<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Output ref. no.</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>2002/2003</b>		
<b>Oct 03</b>	8	<i>Inception planning meeting in Kathmandu with research team OSB – 1 week in country</i>
<b>Oct 03</b>	9	<i>Future research programme reviewed &amp; revised</i>
<b>Jan / Feb 03</b>	4B	<i>Research team 2 weeks training in biodiversity assessment</i>
<b>Jan / Feb 03</b>	8	<i>Team to pilot FUG Biodiversity Action Planning process OSB - 4 weeks in country</i>
<b>Mar 03</b>		<i>Review Paper of existing practices produced &amp; circulated</i>
<b>Mar 03</b>	12A	<i>Web database for local and District Biodiversity Assessment and Action Plan data established</i>
<b>Mar 03</b>	17a	<i>Dissemination network established in Nepal via National 'learning group'</i>
<b>Mar 03</b>	15A/B	<i>3 local and 3 national press releases in Nepal</i>
<b>2003/2004</b>		
<b>May-July 03</b>	8	<i>OSB - 4-8 weeks in country supporting fieldwork &amp; analysis</i>
<b>Sept. 03</b>	9	<i>Biodiversity assessed in 6 FUGs, 6 management plan documented</i>
<b>Sept 03</b>	7 / 10	<i>Tools &amp; processes for participatory local Biod. Action Planning documented &amp; circulated</i>
<b>Sept. 03</b>	14A	<i>National Workshop held</i>
<b>Mar 04</b>	15A/B	<i>3 local and 3 national press releases in Nepal</i>
<b>Mar 04</b>	15C/D	<i>1 National and 1 local press release in UK</i>
<b>Mar 04</b>	19A	<i>1 National radio feature on Nepali Community Forestry show</i>
<b>2004/2005</b>		
<b>Sept. 04</b>	14A	<i>National Workshop held</i>
<b>Sept-Mar 03</b>	8	<i>OSB - 4-8 weeks in country supporting fieldwork &amp; analysis</i>
<b>Mar 05</b>	9	<i>6 further local FUG level BA/BAPs produced, 3 District level BA/BAPs produced</i>
<b>-"-</b>	7 / 10	<i>Tools manual for participatory BA/BAP produced at local and District level in English and Nepali</i>
<b>-"-</b>	7	<i>Bulletins, posters and leaflets summarising tools &amp; processes produced at local and District level in English and Nepali</i>
<b>-"-</b>	15A/B	<i>3 local and 3 national press releases in Nepal</i>
<b>-"-</b>	15C/D	<i>1 National and 1 local press release in UK</i>
<b>-"-</b>	19A	<i>1 National radio feature on Nepali Community Forestry show</i>
<b>2005-2006</b>		
<b>April - Oct 05</b>	8	<i>OSB - 4-8 weeks in country supporting fieldwork, analysis &amp; presentation of findings</i>
<b>Sept05</b>	14A	<i>Final National Policy Seminar workshop, 3 district workshops</i>
<b>-"-</b>	22	<i>12 FUGs &amp; 3 districts will have Bio. Assessment process established in their forests</i>
<b>-"-</b>	1A	<i>2 MPhil / PhD theses to be submitted</i>
	1B	<i>2 MPhil / PhD qualifications for Nepali team members attained</i>
<b>-"-</b>	14B	<i>At least 3 international conferences attended where findings presented</i>
<b>-"-</b>	15A/B	<i>3 local and 3 national press releases in Nepal</i>
<b>-"-</b>	15C/D	<i>1 National and 1 local press release in UK</i>
<b>-"-</b>	19A	<i>1 National radio feature on Nepali Community Forestry show</i>
<b>-"-</b>	20	<i>£800laptop computer handed over to partners, &amp; Rs.80,000 desktop computer &amp; printer</i>

**Table D**

<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION TIMETABLE</b>	
<b>Date</b>	<b>Key milestones</b>
<b>2002-2003</b>	
Oct	<i>Inception planning meeting in Kathmandu with research team</i>
Oct – April	<i>2MPhil / PhD students to UEA Norwich</i>
Oct-Jan	<i>Review of existing literature and state of knowledge related to research objectives</i>
Jan	<i>Field Tools &amp; Processes developed</i>
Jan	<i>Field training of team in participatory biodiversity assessment methods takes place</i>
Jan	<i>Piloting Biodiversity Assessment and Action Planning process in 1 FUG</i>
Feb-Mar	<i>Review &amp; revision of process</i>
<b>2003-2004</b>	
Apr-Jul	<i>BAP process ‘scaled-up’ across 6 FUGs in 3 Districts in 3 Development Regions (including biod. assessment over 3 seasons with local facilitator)</i>
Sept	<i>Tools &amp; method &amp; 6FUGs process documented (to website)</i>
Sept 03	<i>Annual process reflection workshop &amp; coming year planning</i>
Nov	<i>FUG Biodiversity Action plans reviewed in each existing site</i>
Nov- May	<i>BAP process ‘scaled up’ across 6 new FUGs in same 3 Districts for contrasting issues – e.g. same NTFPs in different Region)</i>
Dec	<i>Plan for District PBA&amp; MAP</i>
Jan	<i>Pilot DPBA&amp;MAP in 1 district</i>
<b>2004-2005</b>	
April 04	<i>Develop tools &amp; Methods for District PBA&amp;MAP</i>
April-Jul	<i>‘Scale-up’ District PBA&amp;MAP across 3 district</i>
August	<i>District Tools &amp; method, 3 District processes &amp; 12 FUGs (6 new, 6 revised) documented (to website)</i>
Sept 04	<i>Annual process reflection workshop &amp; coming year planning</i>
Sept.	<i>National learning group meeting takes place to discuss outcomes</i>
Sept-Oct	<i>Investigation of marketing opportunities for NTFPs and FUGs takes place</i>
Oct 04	<i>Revisit &amp; review existing FUGs &amp; Districts – Field Biodiversity assessment and action planning reviewed in the 12 FUGs &amp; 3 Districts</i>
Nov-Mar	<i>Analysis of findings</i>
<b>2005-2006</b>	
April-May	<i>District level sharing workshops – sharing &amp; handover process</i>
May	<i>Regional level sharing</i>
May-Sept05	<i>Final reports written Produce materials, books &amp; articles: e.g. inventory manual, toolkit, posters, booklets</i>
Sept 05	<i>National/International Level review workshop takes place</i>

***Attachments:***

1. Field tools and Instruments (Draft – under development)
2. Outline of field programme
3. Revised Logframe