



Darwin Initiative
Annual Report 2004-5

**Institutionalising Participatory Integrated Forest Management
in Nepal:**

Reconciling Biodiversity Management with Local Livelihoods



**Overseas Development Group,
University of East Anglia**

1. Darwin Project Information

Project Ref. Number	11-020
Project Title	Institutionalising Participatory Integrated Forest Management in Nepal – reconciling Biodiversity Management with Local Livelihoods' (formerly Institutionalising Participatory Forest Biodiversity Management in Nepal)
Country(ies)	Nepal
UK Contractor	Overseas Development Group, University of East Anglia
Partner Organisation(s)	Institute of Forestry Pokhara
Darwin Grant Value	£178,447
Start/End dates	1 st October 2002 – 30 th September 2005
Reporting period (1 Apr 200x to 31 Mar 200y) and report number (1,2,3..)	(1 Apr 2004 to 31 Mar 2005)
Project website	http://www.uea.ac.uk/dev/odg/pfbm/
Author(s), date	Oliver Springate-Baginski, 17/1/06

2. Project Background

- Briefly describe the location and circumstances of the project and the problem that the project aims to address.

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).

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 are:

- Field tools for local Participatory Biodiversity Assessment, and Action Planning (BA/BAP) process developed
- BA/BAP implemented and documented in at least 12 FUGs.
- District-level Biodiversity Action Planning (DBAP) process implemented in at least 3 Districts

The outputs for the '04-05 period (ie 'key milestones') are listed and discussed in the log-frame presented in Annex I and table C),

- 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).

Outputs have not 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 30 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.

Subsequent to this there has been 1) further development and adaptation of the field tools, 2) the implementation of village level and district biodiversity assessment across districts, and 3) the development of the specific research strands. By the beginning of the current reporting period 6 VCFUG-level Biodiversity Action Planning processes have been completed.

Additionally a range of specific research strands had been initiated by the research team members, and lead responsibility for each strand specified.

- Summarise 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.

Draft version of methods and tools for district biodiversity assessment and management action planning (PBA&MAP) has been prepared. The PBA&MAP includes primarily the methods and tools within a framework that links biodiversity and livelihoods planning of local level forest user groups (FUGs) with the planning practice adopted by the government at district level. It also emphasize the

process with which conservation and livelihoods policy objectives adopted at central level could be effectively transferred to and adopted at district level in Nepal.

The experience of facilitating District level Participatory Biodiversity Assessment and management Action Planning (PBA&MAP) in Myagdi was shared across the research team and reviewed and implemented in Sankhuwasabha, Sarlahi and Dang districts, that together comprise the four districts covered in the project. PBA&MAP includes awareness raising across district stakeholders and broad level of appreciation among them of the diverse biodiversity values, especially for enhancement of local livelihoods through an integrated management of forest biodiversity.

The processes adopted in the district and FUG level action research work has been compiled for all four project districts and 15 Forest User Groups (FUGs). The analysis is ongoing and yet to be uploaded to the project website.

A reflection session was organised during August 2005, during the visit of Project Coordinator to Nepal. The August reflection concentrated on the technical progress of research strands of the project, and formats for each strand were harmonized. The meeting also realized the need that the project's research papers could better be developed as a book, which would require extended time of researchers to complete. The provisional title of the book was identified as 'Reconciling Livelihoods and Biodiversity in Forest Management in Nepal' Further comprehensive reflection is planned for November 2005.

The Learning Group meeting process, that started right from the first year of the project implementation continued to the third year. Stakeholders, primarily from government's Ministry of Soil Conservation, bilateral forestry projects, conservation NGOs, FUG federation(FECOFUN) were invited two times to discuss project activities and outcomes at district and local level and reflect over conservation and livelihoods issues and identify spaces of collaboration at various scales. In addition, separate meetings and joint reflections were carried out with these organisations and projects.

Specific work on investigation of marketing opportunities for NTFPs and FUGs was undertaken at field level in Myagdi district, and at central level in collaboration with FECOFUN. This endeavour reviewed non-timber forest product use, collection, marketing and processing and associated institutional schemes. It was found that, despite realisation of NTFP values for rural livelihoods, there was lack of an appropriate framework for NTFP marketing in a manner that yielded sustainable and equitable income opportunities for FUG members and forest dependent people. It was necessary for concerted advocacy action towards facilitating of emergence of NTFP cooperatives- which is being promoted through FECOFUN. The documentation of the strand observations and findings of this endeavour are fitted into a research strand- outputs of which will come together with other strands.

Visits and field action research on 15 forest user groups (FUGs) all together in four project districts was completed. Existing provisions of the CF operational plans and constitutions were reviewed in the light of real objectives and de facto practices adopted by the communities. A generic observation was that these formalized documents served primarily the legal requirements of the government, rather than facilitating action by FUG members. Detailed discussions with women and men of various wealth rank, occupations and caste/ethnic groups reflected the diversity of needs of the members and helped identify objectives they really wish to pursue through forest biodiversity management. The 'social biodiversity assessment' process was followed such that local people identified resources, the cultural, religious, economic and conservation values they attach to the resources, and identify and

implement management actions that serve social objectives. This review served as inputs in cases when FUGs were in the process of revision of OPs, while in others when OP revision was not allowed, FUGs informally adapted the activities as inputs from this review.

Mainly qualitative data was sought during the field-based action research work, which has been compiled into the 'data analysis formats'. These data are categorized by district general data, district level stakeholder interviewing, FUG level discussion with key informants, focus groups and occupational group discussions, FUGC discussions, etc. The compilation of the data is being fed into research strand papers.

The main activities towards the outputs are as follows:

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

A reflection session was organised in August 2005 for within-project reflection for internal review of the project progress and status of outcomes. The national level workshop is planned for November 2005.

Nepal team members received inputs and suggestions for collating and analysing the qualitative data during the visit of Dr. Oliver Springate-Baginski in August 2005.

The field action research on 9 FUGs (cumulative number of FUGs: 15) was carried out with social biodiversity assessment, institutional analysis, and biodiversity action planning. Qualitative data inputs from all 4 project districts and 15 FUGs have been collated, and field process draft is prepared.

Tools-cum- manual for use in facilitating district and local biodiversity action planning was continuously adapted and revised since previous versions, and is being edited for final versions.

The development of dissemination materials, including bulletins, posters and leaflets was considered appropriate once field observations, plans and issues were fully drawn up and analyzed once data analysis is completed. Its plan is shown later in next section of this report.

One press release was carried out, which was published in Spacetime (Nepali National Broadsheet). A radio programme, with Hari Dhungana of the research team and Bhola Bhattarai of FECOFUN discussing on the equity issues in community forest management was aired on Radio Sagarmatha from Kathmandu.

- 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).

During the third year of the project, intensive field work was carried out including action research, facilitation, and local level biodiversity action planning (BAP) work at local level. Based on previous work in Myagdi district, the BAP facilitation was scaled up into 3 districts: Sankhuwasabha in eastern Nepal, Sarlahi in central Nepal and Dang in mid-western Nepal. District BAP included close working relationships with key district based stakeholders, especially by fitting in livelihoods and biodiversity conservation issues in their own planning processes. At the district level, forest user groups meetings were held in Myagdi and Sankhuwasabha, while stakeholder consultations, discussions and interactions were held in each of the four project districts. These exercises have resulted in a broad realisation that NTFP enterprise and marketing opportunities are currently underrealised and needed more focused advocacy action. Thus linking project lessons with advocacy organisations, especially FUG Federation (FECOFUN), was pursued and Nepal research team is closely liaising with FECOFUN to push NTFP enterprise and marketing agenda as a policy issue. The facilitation support at local level has resulted into more improved planning and institutionalisation schemes at the forest user groups. In addition, qualitative data has been collated and being fed into research strand papers, and a number of key research papers were published.

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

The ongoing Maoist insurgency has created hostile situations particularly in the countryside, and also affected local life and development work. In particular, movement of Nepal research team members frequently troubled due to general strikes, yet planned activities continued with slight rescheduling, as there was no specific threat to any research team members.. Moreover, the forest user groups remained active and generally intact despite great social dislocations that ensued from the insurgency. This was largely the strong side that enabled the research team to work with forest user groups who were keep to cooperate.

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

During the third year, there was intensive field work compared to previous two years. Another focus was on upscaling of previous experience of biodiversity action planning at district and local levels and dissemination activities through paper presentations, radio feature, and learning group meetings. Exit strategy include dissemination materials, increased collaboration with key agencies, especially FECOFUN (e.g. on NTFP marketing agenda), and Kathmandu-based NGO, called Resources Development and Research Centre (RDRC) have committed to continue to work on the livelihoods and biodiversity agenda.

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

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Time</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analysis • Compilation of strand papers, submission of detailed project report • Revision, finalisation, publication & dissemination of booklet & posters • Editing & finalisation of book ready for publication 'reconciling livelihoods and biodiversity in forest management in Nepal' • Final policy-oriented sharing workshop 	By End Sept 05

Project supported students Hari Dhungana and Shankar Dahal have already submitted their draft theses at the School of Development Studies of the University of East Anglia and both have been upgraded from MPhil to pursue PhD upon demonstration of satisfactory level of research competence. Both the students have scheduled to submit PhD theses by May/June 2006.

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.

We have revised the project in the light of the previous review as follows:

Review Point requiring actions:	Response
<p>it is not clear to what extent the village level process is integrated into existing management plans ...'</p>	<p>This is the crucial issue of the project. Currently at village level Forest User Groups have 'Operational Plans' for management of their Community Forests, however these are based on a silvicultural epistemology and mindset – forest as resource for timber production. Our project seeks to rethink this and incorporate both biodiversity protection and sustainable utilisation principles, based on participatory planning process. Users themselves have been very receptive and have revised working practices. However the FD's OP preparation process is more difficult to evolve, despite recognition for the need. Therefore we have been facilitating local FUGs to develop both separate users' biodiversity management plans, as well as working with the Forest Depart to overhaul OP preparation procedures.</p>
<p>'How will the project seek to ensure that FUGs, DFOs and service providers have the capacity and resources to conduct biodiversity action planning in the future?'</p>	<p>Again a crucial question. The institutional arrangements already exist and perform forest management planning (District Forest Office and Range Post staff, Forest User Groups). We are simply trying to reform their management planning processes to incorporate biodiversity management issues. Therefore the existing capacity will be used into the future. We are also hoping that existing resources currently outside of this planning process, such as schools, and key biodiversity users such as Ayurvedic doctors are incorporated into planning.</p>
<p>Could the project provide further information on the issues experiences whilst testing the tools....? This is a very important project and the report does not clearly draw out the project experiences and the lessons learnt'</p>	<p>We will be documenting the process in publications currently under development to be released in the next few months.</p>
<p>Little evidence of institutional analysis at district level. .. Could the project leader clarify whether or not this has been done ...'</p>	<p>Institutional analysis has been conducted as part of the district process. Again this will be fully documented in forthcoming process documentation.</p>
<p>It is not clear how the information will be drawn together at the District level...</p>	<p>The District Development Committees (DDC) are the basis of local government, and the key development planning organisation. Therefore we have been working with them, and where they exist the District Forest Sector Coordination Committees. The main stakeholders we have involved have been the District Forest Officers and their staff, and the Federation of Forest User Groups District personnel.</p> <p>Developing the District process is necessarily opportunistic in the current unpredictable crisis. We have been developing tools and processes. Where there are policy issues emerging we can convey them to the national policy group.</p>
<p>How has the project built on previous networks</p>	<p>We have been linking with key stakeholders and participation in interactions. We plan to disseminate output through these networks.</p>
<p>Inventory issue</p>	<p>Yes this is also a very crucial point which the review, who clearly understands the intricacies of the Nepal scenario – has pointed out. It is widely recognised that the current inventory process is failing. An increasing number of FUGs have out of date Ops, yet DFOs are overwhelmed with the schedule for conducting inventories in order to revise Ops. The change from 5 to 10 year Ops will hardly help this. Indeed there is a total lack of expertise in conducting the absurdly meticulous inventory which the regulations require in order to calculate 'allowable offtake' for tree species. The new inventory guidelines approved into policy last year have</p>

hardly helped matters – as they hardly address the biodiversity or NTFP issues, and maintain the technical mystification of the prevailing silvicultural epistemology which treats forests as timber plantations. Currently many Ops prepared in this way are forgotten by users themselves – who instead follow ad-hoc rule of thumb management practices from year to year.

For communities to successfully manage their forests there must be a middle way – technically correct but user friendly. The prospect is still far off, but we are trying to develop a process which works in our groups, with DFOs' tacit support. If we can demonstrate it works at national level we may get some progress in policy finally!

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 collaboration has continued smoothly, with three visits to Nepal by Dr. Springate-Baginski

- 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?

Some interaction has continued with the Darwin-funded King Mahendra Trust / UNEP WCMC project, and also with IUCN

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?

The profile of the project continues to increase through national learning group workshops and press releases and networking, and circulation of working papers.

Increasing capacity for biodiversity is primarily from village and district level learnings. Evidence for this is highlights in project process documentation papers, shortly forthcoming.

Working together with partners from the Ministry and Institute of Forestry have raised awareness of the importance of biodiversity consideration in policy and forest management training, and are leading to a changed approach to these issues.

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?
 - Follow-on support to project villages

- Scaling up to clusters around project villages
 - Promotion of District process and building on existing outcomes
 - Scaling up to District clusters
 - National level process – promoting learning partnerships
- 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?

The lead coordinating organisation, RDRC, senior Ministry personnel and members of FECOFUN have all expressed a strong interest to consolidate the project impacts through further scaling 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?
- 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?
- 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
14A	1	National Workshop held
8	6 weeks	OSB - in country supporting fieldwork & analysis
9	6	local FUG level BA/BAPs produced,
9	3	District level BA/BAPs produced
7 / 10	1	Tools manual for participatory BA/BAP produced at local and District level in English and Nepali
7		Bulletins, posters and leaflets summarising tools & processes produced at local and District level in English and Nepali
15A/B	6	press releases in Nepal 3 local and 3 national
19A	1	National radio feature on Nepali Community Forestry show

- 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 * (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. contact address, website)	Cost £
Journal 'Forestry: Journal of Institute of Forestry'	"Inventory Guidelines for Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs): A Critical Review" Dutta, IC & Paudel, BK (2005)	Institute of Forestry, Tribhuwan University, Pokhara	Institute of Forestry POB No: 43, Hariyokharka, Pokhara, NEPAL	US \$5.00 (Whole Issue)
Report	"Community Forestry in Nepal Tarai: Status of Proposed Community Forests in the Tarai, Inner Tarai and Churia" Dhungana, H. & Bhattarai, B. (2005)	Federation of Community Forest Users, Nepal (FECOFUN), Kathmandu	FECOFUN POB No: 8219 Purano Baneshwar, Kathmandu www.fecofun.org	NA
Journal 'Journal of Forests and Livelihoods'	"Potentials and challenges of biodiversity management through community forestry" (Nepali text) Dev, OP & Dahal, SP (2005)	ForestAction, Kathmandu	ForestAction POB No: 12207 www.forestaction.org	NRs. 30 (whole issue)
Proceedings 'Proceedings of the Fourth National Workshop on Community Forestry'	"Strengthening local capacity for non-timber forest product management and marketing: the need for policy reforms in community forestry in Nepal" Dhungana, H & Dahal, S (2004)	Community Forest Division, Department of Forests, Kathmandu	Community Forest Division, Department of Forests, Babarmahal, Kathmandu, NEPAL cfid@wlink.com.np	NA

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.

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?

In District level learning groups there has been a stakeholder review of the project process.

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

Working with multiple stakeholders has been a complex and fascinating learning experience for all concerned. It seems that this district process has initiated much awareness raising and capacity-building that can be further mobilised in the future.

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: 2004/2005

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2004-Mar 2005	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Goal: 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"> • The conservation of biological diversity, • The sustainable use of its components, and • <i>The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources</i> 			
<p>Purpose <i>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.</i></p>	<p><i>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</i></p>	<p><i>Biodiversity Action Planning processes are institutionalised in 5 districts and 15 CFUGs</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consolidate learnings through output dissemination and national level policy influencing.</i>
<p>Outputs</p>			
<p>Field tools for local Participatory Biodiversity Assessment, and Action Planning (BA/BAP) process developed</p>	<p>Field tool documentation produced</p>	<p>Develop tools & Methods for District PBA&MAP: Completed. Toolkit was piloted in one district.</p>	
<p>BA/BAP implemented and documented in at least 12 FUGs.</p>	<p>BACAP documentation for 12 FUGs produced, including biodiversity assessment data</p>	<p>Revisit & review existing FUGs & Districts – <i>Field Biodiversity assessment and action planning reviewed in the 12 FUGs & 3 Districts</i></p>	
<p><i>District-level Biodiversity Action Planning (DBAP) process implemented in at least 3 Districts</i></p>	<p><i>DBAP documentation produced for 3 Districts</i></p>	<p><i>'Scale-up' District PBA&MAP across 3 district: District Tools & method, 3 District processes & 12 FUGs (6 new, 6 revised) documented (to website)completed</i></p>	