



DARWIN INITIATIVE



Pre-Project Funding Report

This report should be completed and submitted with a Stage 1 Darwin Application

Project Title	Community Resource Management Planning in the Maichin River Valley (Chile)
Country(ies)	Chile
Project Ref No. (if known)	EIDPR50/ App 1/694
UK Organisation	ESRC Centre for Economic and Social Aspects of Genomics (CESAGen), Lancaster University
Names / Titles of those who travelled to the host country	Dr. Paul Oldham
Grant Value	£2,740
Start and Finishing Dates	4 th of September 2005 to 14 th September 2005
Report Date	7 th October 2005

1. Please provide a concise overview of the activities undertaken during the pre-project development visit. (Please also include relevant activities before and after, as appropriate). Please highlight those that were not planned.

The pre-project visit was based on an initial site visit in December 2004 to discuss the potential project based on a request from the All the Lands Council (Consejo de Todas las Tierras) as the potential local project partner. The purpose of the Darwin funded pre-project visit was to further discuss the project and developed a detailed proposal directly with the partner.

During the visit consultations were held with the biodiversity team of the All the Lands Council and the majority of the work focused on developing the Stage 1 and Stage 2 proposals including the planning of fieldwork and budgets. A meeting was also held with the heads of six of the eight communities within the area and an additional meeting was held with the Human Rights Observatory to consult on the provision of specialist legal advice. We were also able to engage in consultations regarding the availability with local universities (i.e. Universidad de la Frontera) of training in GPS and resource mapping which have now been built into the project.

2. Were any difficulties or setbacks encountered? If so, how did they impact on the intended achievements for the visit, and on the intended Darwin project proposal.

It had originally been envisaged that John Quinton (Environmental Science/Lancaster Environment Centre) would participate in the site visit to assist on evaluation of the environmental science component. This was not possible due to receipt of a large DEFRA grant. However, digital photographs, maps and digital maps were obtained and satellite images are also being pursued to assist with further planning and implementation of these elements.

Additionally, a second meeting with senior staff at the National Forest Corporation (CONAF) was planned to follow up on the earlier meeting. However, due to unforeseen circumstances this was cancelled and it was not possible to rearrange a meeting with

CONAF. This will be pursued by the project partners if the application proceeds to stage 2.

3. Briefly explain how the pre-project funding has helped to confirm or change the planned project intervention – what difference did getting the grant make?

The grant made a major difference in terms of permitting the detailed planning of the project proposal and the development of a detailed work plan and outputs. In particular the opportunity for detailed discussions with the project partner and a field site visit enabled a realistic assessment of what would be achievable during the project and the logistical and training requirements. As a consequence of these discussions it was decided that the original proposal from the All the Lands Council to establish a community managed protected area could not be realistically be pursued at this stage without significant capacity-building work. The proposal for the two year project therefore focuses on capacity-building issues. The establishment of a community managed protected area therefore remains as a potential outcome subject to progress in the earlier phase outlined in the proposal. However, it was agreed that this was one among other outcomes and could not be prejudged prior to the capacity-building work. A second and related impact of the pre-project visit was the ability to discuss and define legacy. In particular, the project in the Maichin valley is viewed as a platform for dissemination of knowledge and training to other Mapuche communities within and beyond the Villarrica National Reserve. The project has now been designed with this in mind as a major outcome and as a basis for possible further research collaborations between Lancaster and the project partners. On balance, the pre-project funding facilitated a more critical assessment and discussion of realistic project objectives, time-frame, outputs and legacy than would have been possible based on the December 2004 visit alone.

4. Briefly describe the outcomes and conclusions arising from discussions with the host institution(s). What is the value of the project to the host institution(s) and what will their intended contributions be. Have any other partnerships evolved as a result of the pre-project grant?

The main outcomes have been described in section 3. The major outcome can be described as a decision to focus on capacity-building and training as the focus of the project targeted directly towards legacy. Capacity-building was defined as the major desired outcome and value of the project by the proposed partners. The partners will make in-kind contributions to the project. A new partnership is evolving with the Human Rights Observatory to provide specialist legal advice for the project.

5. Conclusion and lessons learned from the Pre-Project Grant

Briefly highlight the main conclusions (positive and negative) gained from the pre-project grant. Please also include any suggestions you may have for improving the impact of this funding scheme.

See above.

Signed: Paul Oldham (signed)

Date: 7/10/2005

Name / Title: Dr. Paul Oldham

Please restrict this report to no more than two pages in length and send the completed form to ECTF with your Stage 1 Application Form either via email to darwin-applications@ectf-ed.org.uk or by post to ECTF, Pentlands Science Park, Bush Loan, Edinburgh EH26 0PH.