



***Darwin Initiative for the
Survival of Species
Annual Report 2004-05***

1. Darwin Project Information

Project Ref. Number	162/12/007
Project Title	<i>Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Gorilla Research and Conservation Project</i>
Country(ies)	<i>Nigeria</i>
UK Contractor	<i>ResourceAfrica, P.O. Box 198, Cambridge, CB3 0TF</i>
Partner Organisation(s)	<i>(i) The Cross River State Forestry Commission (FC); (ii) The Nigerian Conservation Foundation (NCF); (iii) Pandrillus; (iv) The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) and (v) Fauna & Flora International (FFI)</i>
Darwin Grant Value	<i>£117,900</i>
Start/End dates	<i>April 03/March 06</i>
Reporting period (01 Apr 200x to 31 Mar 200y) and report number (1,2,3 ..)	<i>01 April 04 to 31 March 05 and report No 2 (annual report)</i>
Project website	<i>N/A</i>
Author(s), date	<i>Jon Hutton, Matt Rice, Daniel Pouakouyou – April 30, 2005</i>

2. Project Background

Afi Mountain is situated within the rainforest block in the border region of southeast Nigeria and southwest Cameroon. This region is an international biodiversity “hotspot” and was identified as one of West Africa’s three “deforestation hotspots” by the EC-funded TREES programme in 1998.

The IUCN African Primate Survival Plan (1996) identified Afi Mountain-Okwango forests as among the most important in Nigeria for Primate Conservation. Afi Mountain is home to the Cross River Gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla diehli*) recognised as the rarest and most endangered subspecies of gorilla with a total population of approximately 250. It is also home to the most endangered subspecies of chimpanzees in West Africa restricted to only Nigeria and South-West Cameroon. A recent “Regional Action Plan for the Conservation of Chimpanzees in West Africa” included Afi Mountain as part of an exceptionally high-priority area that must be considered for immediate conservation measures. The endangered drill monkey also roams the forest at Afi.

Today, the area surrounding Afi Mountain is fairly densely populated. Because the local population has grown rapidly in recent years and the local economy is based upon agriculture and locally available natural resources, farming and hunting pressures have increased, land for farms has become scarcer and wildlife both inside and outside protected areas has been drastically reduced. Many of the areas surrounding or near the reserve and the Sanctuary, in particular in the North, are entirely deforested, and some of the Forest Reserve is heavily degraded.

Hunting is the greatest immediate threat to the Afi gorillas and chimpanzees survival. Unlike the situation in areas of the Congo Basin, however, wildlife populations on the Mountain have been so reduced that animals killed there are consumed locally rather than exported and hunting is not a significant source of income to the local community. Nevertheless, because the great ape’s populations are so small at Afi Mountain and their reproductive rate so slow, any hunting is potentially devastating.

Two further very serious threats reduce and degrade the available great ape habitat: agricultural encroachment within the Sanctuary, and fire for farm clearance, set during the dry season that escapes onto the Mountain. Afi Mountain represents the main, if not the only, source of clean water and sanitation for the tens of thousands of people in the surrounding areas.

This project was designed to address those major threats by supporting a broad, locally-managed conservation programme at Afi through support to the Forestry Commission and its local partners. Specifically, the project was established to: (i) build the capacity of staff from the Forestry Commission Department of Wildlife and Eco-tourism (DWE) to manage the Sanctuary effectively; (ii) assist the Forestry Commission in the implementation of a Sanctuary monitoring and protection programme; (iii) increase local communities’ support for the Sanctuary; and (iv) raise awareness in the local communities of the importance and objectives of the Sanctuary.

3. Project Purpose and Outputs

The purpose of the project is the protection of the fauna, flora and overall ecosystem function of the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary through locally integrated and effective management without external assistance. Four specific outputs were defined and have not been modified so far. These were:

- Increased capacity of Forestry Commission staff to manage the Sanctuary effectively;
- An effective ranger-based protection and monitoring programme carried out by Forestry Commission staff;
- Consultations between Sanctuary staff and communities occurring regularly in all villages;
- School conservation clubs initiated education materials.

Progress against each output is summarised in the logical framework (Annex 1) and it must be stressed that these outputs or proposed operational plan have not been modified during the period under review and there is no plan to do so for the period 01 April 05 – 31 March 06 when this support ends.

4. Progress

- **Brief history of the project to the beginning of the reporting period.**

Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary (AMWS) originally formed the north-western 20-25% of the Afi River Forest Reserve established in 1930. This portion of the reserve was spared from logging due to its mountainous and rugged terrain, but suffered from small scale farming activities and uncontrolled bush fires. From the mid 1990s, the NGO coalition led by Pandrillus, WCS and FFI, triggered a string of efforts which culminated in the gazettelement of this section of the reserve covering some 8,500 ha as wildlife sanctuary in May 2000 by the Cross River State Forestry Commission (CRSFC). As it is often the case, this policy decision was not backed by adequate resources and the CRSFC had a very weak capacity to manage the Sanctuary. The NGO coalition working under the umbrella of the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Partnership from 2001 undertook to mobilise resources and to establish a strong management presence at the Sanctuary. The Darwin grant was amongst the sources of support secured for this project from 2003. This particular grant has been used primarily to strengthen the capacity of the Forestry Commission in managing the Sanctuary, mobilizing the local communities to support the Sanctuary, enhancing the school environmental education activities and peripherally, in establishing the Afi Wildlife Educational Development Fund to provide logistical supports to the primary schools around the Sanctuary.

- **Summary of progress over last year**

As part of the capacity building package designed to boost the skills of the Forestry Commission staff in managing the Sanctuary (Output 1), refresher courses were organised at the headquarters for the protection and monitoring team. In addition to the ongoing on the job-training, the Rangers attended a specially tailored skill development training course at the New Bussa Wildlife College in Niger State. This course lasted for eight weeks. Monitoring and protection work continued as planned (Output 2). Based on the information provided by the monitoring data from last year, it was decided that a ranger's post should be constructed in the northern part of the Sanctuary. This specific investment is scheduled for the period April 05-March 06 and will be possibly supported with resources from the United Fish and Wildlife Service which has been approached. Together with the community scouts to be recruited, it should be possible for the Sanctuary management to relocate about 40% of the workforce to that post. The Permanent Secretary of the Forestry Commission went on a study tour at IGCP territories in Uganda and Rwanda. Consultations were initiated and pursued with the local communities and a team of 18 representatives was put together from the different villages around the Sanctuary (Output 3). These representatives received training courses during the period under review and will continue to receive further training this year. The idea is that if they can grasp some level of understanding of the importance of the Sanctuary and how to manage it

within the existing legal framework, it should be possible to communicate it more effectively to their respective villages. A similar approach was adopted for the school heads and the conservation club facilitators (Output 4). The production of the Sanctuary newsletter and the radio programme through which the progress activities are disseminated have enhanced the project profile. This is particularly important with the new tourism development programme for which Afi Sanctuary has already been selected as one of the main destinations in Cross River State.

- **Account of the project's achievements during last year**

The study tour which took the Permanent Secretary (PS) of the Cross River State Forestry Commission to the International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) in Uganda and Rwanda resulted in a complete change of attitude from this government senior official. Through discussions with his counterparts in Uganda and Rwanda, the PS realised that protecting the Sanctuary, and possibly habituating the gorillas living within it to friendly human presence of the kind experienced at IGCP could be a source of revenues not only for the local communities around the Sanctuary, but also for the government through the gorilla-viewing fees. The government has requested the NGO at the Sanctuary to habituate the gorillas to friendly human presence. However, although such request is understandable considering the potential benefits that gorilla viewing might bring, it was decided that the habituation should be guided by an informed feasibility study. That study is currently in preparation under the leadership of RA/FFI and full collaboration with all the partners.

Using the information generated by the protection and monitoring team last year, the project identified the northern portion of the Sanctuary as the area in need of greater attention. This trend, which was later on confirmed through a swift wildlife census (see report in Annex 3) is partly due to the fact that the northern part of the Sanctuary is not easily accessible. The muddy road is almost impassable during the rainy season and the swift deployment of the rangers is always hampered during this period. This situation has prompted the management of the Sanctuary to propose the construction of a ranger's post in that part of the Sanctuary. Hopefully, with the possible financial support from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (through the Great Apes Conservation Fund), this post will be constructed towards the end of 2005. Ten to twelve community scouts will be employed from May 2005 to provide additional support to the rangers and some of them will be permanently posted in the northern section of the Sanctuary to ensure a year round protection.

As a result of long sensitisation campaigns few new farms were established within the Sanctuary during the period under review, although the enlargement of existing ones were experienced in some areas. Overall, no plantation of cocoa was established this year as part of the agreement between the Sanctuary management and the communities through the Traditional Rural Council. This was based on the realisation by all interested parties that establishing new plantations implies a long term investment in an area where human activities are prohibited by law. Meetings with the Traditional Ruler Council resulted in the recommendation that the Sanctuary management should move and without warning, destroy any new plantation. It is expected that should this agreement for the establishment of new plantations hold it will then be possible to extend it food crops farms.

Following this sensitisation campaigns, 18 community representatives were elected throughout the project area. These community representatives as well as the Sanctuary staff, the school environmental education heads and other influential members of the community received regular training in protected area/wildlife management and conservation based on a modular curriculum developed and agreed by all the Sanctuary partners (Annex 4). The training is administered in the form of workshops organised around the villages. It is intended to take as long as necessary and villages with no direct contacts with the Sanctuary have expressed the need to be included.

The Nigerian Conservation Foundation, with support from ResourceAfrica/FFI and WCS developed and maintained constant contacts with school environmental education clubs around the Sanctuary and extended this activity the nearby Mbe Mountains where the Cross River Gorillas are also found. The partnership completed the first round of grant to primary schools around the Sanctuary through the Educational Development Fund. Five schools benefited from this support and plan is ongoing for the second round with possible support from the US Fish and Wildlife Service. A report of achievement is appended (Annex 5). This was initially not an output for this project, but was developed in response to the specific request made by the community around the Sanctuary. The Educational Development Fund has no financial implication on Darwin funding, but has helped to improve on the relationship between the Sanctuary management and the local communities.

- **Significant difficulties encountered and mitigating measures**

There was a serious social unrest involving two neighbouring villages which resulted in the death of more than 20 people axed with machetes between April and May 2004. The windscreen of the project vehicle was smashed with a gun, but the Conservation Coordinator escaped luckily unscarred. Fortunately, the insurance paid for the replacement and repairs on the vehicle, but the project experienced a delay of about 2 months as all the staff has to be evacuated. This prompted the management of the Sanctuary and other members of the Afi Partnership to question the wisdom behind the protection strategy in line with the “fines and fences” approach in these communities where lawlessness is not uncommon.

- **Changes in the project design**

There was no modification to the project design and the initial methods, and indicators for measuring achievements were kept to the original version. As indicated last year, further emphasis was put on community sensitisation during the period under review. This has allowed productive discussions and decisions with the communities particularly on the sensitive issue related to removing farms from the Sanctuary with no compensation package attached to it. Also, as part of the exit strategy from next year, RA/FFI in collaboration with other partners is exploring potential fits to continue this work. Part of this strategy will be to assist in establishing a tourism scheme at the Sanctuary which has already been selected as one of the main tourist destination by the Cross River State Government. However, we will be guided through this route by the upcoming feasibility study which will inform on the suitability of this site for tourism and particularly for gorilla-based tourism in the light of the ecological and existing socio-economic context.

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

A detailed workplan for the period April 05 and March 06 is provided as Annex 2.

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

There was no specific request from last year’s review so no action was necessary.

6. Partnerships

RA/FFI maintained strong working relationships with host country partners particularly with the Forestry Commission and the Nigerian Conservation Foundation. FFI in particular signed a contract with NCF. This contract allows NCF to manage FFI affairs on the ground in Nigeria and particular at Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary. Similar relationships were maintained with WCS and Pandrillus a local NGO. Discussions to finalise the all parties MoU bringing together all the NGO members working at Afi and the Forestry Commission continued, but no final decision was reached. However, despite the lack of a MoU, the roles played by all the members of

the Afi partnership are complementary for the benefits of the Sanctuary and the local communities. For example, WCS conduct ecological research on the mountain, the results of which are used to inform the management action implemented by RA/FFFI in collaboration with NCF. This is a win-win arrangement which also allow partners to collectively address any problem that might arise and also to put stronger pressure on the Forestry Commission if more action is needed from the government. There was no specific problem in this arrangement last year apart from the delay experienced by FFI and NCF in finalising the terms of the contract linking both organisations.

This project has not established new links with local or international organisations involved in biodiversity conservation in Cross River State, but it has helped tremendously to reinforce the links which already existed between several organisations: WCS, NCF, Pandrillus, FFI and the Forestry Commission.

7. Impact and Sustainability

For a State like the Cross River which currently hosts more than 30% of the remaining rainforest in Nigeria, any attempt to protect this forest or enhancing the sustainable use of its resources is generally subject to considerable attention. Afi Wildlife Sanctuary as well as the nearby Okwangwo Division of the Cross River National Park is amongst the 3 forest blocks which have been earmarked for strict protection. As it is generally the case in developing countries, gazetting an area for protection purposes is one thing, but actually managing that area and effectively protecting it is quite another. The Cross River State Forestry Commission invited high profile international NGOs – FFI and WCS in particular – to join with the national NGOs – Pandrillus and NCF – to provide the support needed for the effective management of these protected areas.

As indicated last year, this region is receiving significant attention nationally and internationally. The Cross State as a whole has launched a large tourism development programme and Afi is listed as one of the main destinations. The President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria visited the drill ranch on the outskirts of the Sanctuary a few years ago and Governor Duke of the Cross River State is constantly asking about progress at the Sanctuary. Following the study tour which was organised during the period under review and which took the Permanent Secretary of the Forestry Commission to the IGCP territories in Uganda and Rwanda, the government put a formal request to explore options for gorilla-viewing at Afi. But as indicated earlier such a move should be informed by a detailed feasibility study.

Publicity-wise, one of the project partners, NCF has secured a slot on the regional radio station where news about the work at the Sanctuary is broadcasted regularly. High profile meetings such as those organised with the Traditional Ruler Council are largely diffused through this programme. In addition to the radio programme, the project managed to launch the highly awaited Newsletter about the Sanctuary. Progress on all aspects of the work at the Sanctuary is reported in this quarterly newsletter. The Editor in Chief, the Permanent Secretary of the Forestry Commission Dr Chris Agbor said during the launching of the newsletter “...*this is certainly one of the most significant pieces of achievements at the Sanctuary and this newsletter will go a long way to sensitize the local communities about the needs to protect this Sanctuary and the wildlife within it for prosperity...*” The Newsletter is distributed free for the time being and the production is largely covered by this Darwin grant.

Afi partners are already thinking about the exit strategy for when this Darwin grant ends. The development of tourism in the region and possibly the launching of gorilla-viewing are amongst the options currently on the table. The project partners are aware that this process will take a long time, but resources will be made available through other sources including the Cross River State Government through the

Tourism Development Board which was established recently. In addition, the long term ecological research will be maintained as this is by no mean incompatible with tourism. As the project progresses, it should be possible for the NGOs to make themselves redundant and transfer the management of the Sanctuary entirely to the Forestry Commission and the Cross River State Government.

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

Not applicable

9. Outputs, Outcomes and Dissemination

There have been no deviations from the initially agreed project outputs and most activities fall well within the project implementation timetable. However, the full outcomes of some outputs (3&4 in particular) will only be ascertained at the end of the project as some activities related to those are ongoing. No additional outputs were achieved, apart from the establishment of an Educational Development Fund to support local schools around the sanctuary.

Same as last year, reports on the project activities were disseminated to other donors including the Wallace Global Fund (USA), the British American Tobacco (BAT) and some UK charitable trusts. Regular updates on the project activities were made through a radio programme secured by NCF one of the Afi partners. A presentation of the project activities was made at the annual meeting of FFI Africa Programme held at Lewa Conservancy in northern Kenya. This presentation looks at whether or not the CAMFIRE model of Southern Africa is transferable to the Afi context. The production of the Sanctuary's newsletter was another way of disseminating the project activities nationally and internationally. It is believed that at the end of the Darwin funding, such activities will be pursued with funding from other sources and particularly from resources generated through the tourism programme. The indicator measures to assess achievements are provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Project Outputs (According to Standard Output Measures)

Code No.	Quantity	Description
6B	10-18	The Ranger team attended an 8-eweeks skill development training course at the New Bussa Wildlife College in Niger State. Refresher courses were organised once every 3 months at the Sanctuary Headquarters. 18 community representatives are also trained on protected area management in the form of workshops organised in villages.
7	500	These essentially locally produced leaflets summarising the modules used during the training sessions with different groups as indicated in Annex 4.
8	2	The project officer from the UK visited the Sanctuary 3 times during the period under review. FFI Director of Africa Programme visited the project once during that time and attended one of the partnership meetings.
16A	300	The first issue of the Sanctuary was produced and distributed nationally and internationally. Another edition will be produced soon, but it is intended to be produced on a quarterly basis.
19A	12	Progress in the implementation of the project activities is broadcasted in the local radio once of month.

20	3	The project bought 1 desktop computer and a colour printer for the Forestry Commission. This equipment is used in the production of the Sanctuary's Newsletter. A laptop was equally bought for the Conservation Coordinator
23	£41,000	This amount was raised from various sources including the Tubney trust (UK), Allen and Nesta Ferguson (UK) and the Wallace Global Fund (USA)

No publication was made during the period under review as the result of the project activities.

- 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 £
N/A				

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

No change to the budget has been requested and the slight variation in the office costs is well below 10%.

11. Monitoring, Evaluation and Lessons

The day to day monitoring of project activities was conducted by the Conservation Coordinator in close collaboration with the Wildlife Officer in secondment from the Forestry Commission. The two ensured that the field staff and particularly the rangers conducted patrols as scheduled. Three Afi Mountain Partnership meetings were held during the period under review and brought together representatives of the Forestry Commission, WCS, Pandrillus, NCF and RA/FFI. During these meetings, progress was reviewed and any matter arising discussed and a plan developed.

By training and equipping staff from the FC and the monitoring team, and by associating the local communities in the management of the Sanctuary through dialogue, consultations and direct involvement in the project activities, it is understood that the project is moving towards achieving its purpose. Quantitative indicators of such achievements are provided in Table 1. The project has equally made significant progress on the environmental education front and there has been invitation from the nearby communities at Mbe Mountains to expand the activities to their area.

Two key lessons were learned during the period under review:

- Negotiation with the local communities is much easier if they derive or expect some form of tangible benefits from their involvement in the management of the Sanctuary. The ethical value of biodiversity conservation is hardly perceivable in this kind of poverty stricken communities. The promotion of the non consumptive use of wildlife resources at the Sanctuary through ecotourism is probably one of the main long term strategies for this project and it is anticipated that with careful thoughts and planning, this can easily be achieved with the current political momentum throughout Cross River State.
- The protection strategy in line with the “fences and fines” approach can become utterly unproductive in a situation of civil unrest or in communities where lawlessness is not uncommon. Associating community members in the protection and monitoring team will go a long way to bridge the gaps between the Sanctuary management and the local communities.

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>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 • The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources 			
<p>Purpose: Protection of the fauna, flora and overall ecosystem functions of the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary through locally integrated and effective management without external support</p>	<p>Data generated by the ranger based monitoring used for improved conservation and management of the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary</p> <p>Reduction of farm encroachment, poaching and wildfires in the Sanctuary</p> <p>Effective management and implementation of mechanisms for regular consultations between the Sanctuary staff and communities</p>	<p>The monitoring data are continuously generated by the ranger team. A preliminary analysis of the data from last year indicated areas of significant pressure on the Sanctuary. This trend was confirmed during a swift wildlife census (Annex 3).</p> <p>Overall, no new farms were opened in the Sanctuary during the period under review apart from some attempts to enlarge existing one, but the discussions to destroy those farms are complex and ongoing.</p> <p>The selection of 18 community delegates and the regular training they receive has improved the relationship between the Sanctuary and the communities. The recruitment of 10-12 community scouts from May 2005 to support the overstretched ranger team will further improve this relationship.</p>	<p>The main lesson learned is that the protection team should be positioned around the Sanctuary as swift deployment from the headquarters always creates delays due to the rugged terrain. As a result, it has been decided that a ranger post should be constructed in the northern part of the Sanctuary to improve on the effectiveness of the protection and monitoring team.</p> <p>The early promise that the destruction of farm within the Sanctuary should be accompanied by a compensation package hasn't helped the discussions. By the current Nigerian laws, no farming activities are allowed within the Sanctuary and therefore existing farms should be destroyed with no compensation as they are illegal in</p>

			the first place.
Outputs			
Increased capacity of Forestry Commission staff to manage the Sanctuary effectively	Key DWE, NGO and community staff trained in wildlife and natural resource management techniques	The Ranger team attended an 8-weeks skill development training course at the New Bussa Wildlife College in Niger State. Refresher courses are organised every six months at the Sanctuary headquarters. The Permanent Secretary of the Cross River State Forestry Commission went on a study tour at the International Gorilla Conservation Programme in Uganda and Rwanda to learn about an example of a successful gorilla-based ecotourism.	Some form of guarantee should be obtained from the Forestry Commission that staff trained under this project should serve a minimum of 2 to 3 years with the Sanctuary before any transfer to other duties is possible.
An effective ranger-based protection and monitoring programme carried out by Forestry staff	Reduction in agricultural encroachment, poaching and wildfires in the Sanctuary	The protection and monitoring team conducted constant patrols around the Sanctuary to check for farming, wildfires, logging and hunting. This patrol was intensified during the Christmas period from 04 Dec 2004 to 10 January 2005 when hunting for bushmeat increased.	A special taskforce drafted from the Forestry Commission and other NGO partners is always necessary during the Christmas period when community members are desperate for bushmeat.
Consultation between Sanctuary staff and communities occurring regularly in all villages	Consultation between local communities and Forestry Commission staff through community meetings	Consultations with communities were established and maintained, focusing primarily on issues related to the presence of farms within the Sanctuary. The traditional ruler council agreed that farms within the Sanctuary should be destroyed, but the chief police officer for	Farming within the Sanctuary is a contentious issue as some influential members of the Traditional Ruler Council appear to have a stake in it directly or indirectly.

		<p>the area warned against such action following the civil unrest which occurred in March/April 2004. 18 community delegates were successfully selected and have since been receiving training in natural resource/wildlife management and conservation. The training curriculum for the community delegates and other target groups including Afi staff was developed around 4 modules spread across several sessions as presented in Annex 4.</p>	
<p>School conservation clubs initiated education materials</p>	<p>NGO staff liaise with local schools/teachers to develop a range of activities and materials</p>	<p>NCF with support from RA/FFI and WCS developed and maintained constant contacts with school environmental education clubs in villages around the Sanctuary. The Environmental Educational Development Fund provided support to 5 schools towards the development of infrastructure (Annex 5). The equipment required for the Forestry Commission was provided and the Sanctuary's newsletter was finally launched.</p>	<p>Engaging with the local communities is made easier if they derive tangible benefits as the result of their involvement in the management of the Sanctuary.</p>

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.

Annex 2: Annual Workplan (April 2005-March 06)

OUTPUT 1: CAPACITY BUILDING (TRAINING)

ACTIVITY	Responsible Person (s) and time Allocated (Days)	Others involved and time Allocated (Days)	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	Means of verification	Remarks/ Assumptions
<i>1.1. 1 x 1 day short course on Introduction to the Management of the Sanctuary for community scouts</i>	CC – 3	WO – 1 AWO – 1 ACC – 1		◆											Course held by 31 st May.	Community scouts are recruited on time
<i>1.2. 1x 2 day in-house training course on Radio Communication and GPS instrumentation for Rangers and community scouts</i>	CC – 4	WO – 2 AWO – 2 ACC – 2			◆										Course held by 30 June and Rangers able to use equipment and conversant with radio operating procedures	FC acquired radio frequency operating licence. Radios bought and equipment installed on time. Office space made available. At least 4 GPS units needed
<i>1.3. 1 x 2 Training of community representatives</i>	CC 4	WO – 4 AWO – 2 ACC - 2	◆					◆					◆		Course attendance and level enthusiasm documented in the six monthly reports	Language barriers overcome through the use of local translator as possible
<i>1.4. 1 x 2 day in-house training course on fire prevention and control.</i>	WO – 4	CC – 2 AWO – 3 ACC – 2								◆					Course held by 30 th November 2005	
<i>1.5 1 x One week study tour to a protected Area within the region by WO and AWO of AMWS</i>	CC – 3	WO – 10 AWO - 7								◆					Study to be conducted by end of November and tour report produced by mid-December 2005.	

OUTPUT 2: SUPPORT TO FIELD TEAM / SANCTUARY PROTECTION AND MONITORING

ACTIVITY	Responsible person(s) and time Allocated (Days)	Others involved and time Allocated (Days)	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	Means of verification	Remarks / Assumptions

2.1 Sanctuary Protection and Monitoring Patrols	WO – 36	AWO – 60 ACC – 36 CC – 24	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	• At least 14 days conducted each month for the first six months and at least 21 days conducted each month as from October 2005. At least 3 local patrols conducted every month.	Community scouts picked up the skills needed rapidly and there is no conflict of power between them and the rangers.
2.2 Analysis of Protection and Monitoring records	AWO – 12 ACC - 12	WO – 6 CC - 6	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	Patrol forms analysed by the end of the first week of the new month and analysis/summary chaste completed.	Results of analysis to be used in law enforcement and monitoring to ensure that effect of management interventions are understood and applied adaptively.	
2.3. Feasibility study for gorilla habituation to friendly human presence	DFC- 10					♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦			The final report covering the ecological, socio-economic and health situations finalised by end of February 2006	Funding from the US Fish and Wildlife Service on time and the all the Partners agreed rapidly on the Terms of reference for the consultants.	

OUTPUT 3: SANCTUARY INFRASTRUCTURE, HEADQUATERS AND OFFICE EQUIPMENT

ACTIVITY	Responsible person(s) and time Allocated (Days)	Others involved and time Allocated (Days)	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	Means of verification	Remarks / Assumptions
3.1 Construction of Ranger post (Northern camp)	CC - 11 WO - 17	ACC- 12 AWO - 9							♦	♦	♦	♦			Construction commences by October and completed by 31 December 2005 Ranger post in use & fully equipped by January 31, 2006	A section of the monitoring team including the Rangers and community scouts agreed to relocate to the northern section of the Sanctuary
3. 2 Boundary clearing and marking	WO - 36	CC - 4 ACC - 15 AWO - 40	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦								Boundary clearing & marking with teak completed by end of August 2005	Most clearing to concentrate on south and eastern area (open canopy section) Closed canopy areas (West and Northern areas) to be cleared while replanting teak.
3.3 Renovation of sanctuary headquarters	CC -4	ACC – 10 WO - 2		♦	♦	♦									Office renovation completed by July 30, 2005	Boki LGA provided assurance that the office building provided will be permanently used as the Wildlife Sanctuary

3.4 Purchase of additional sanctuary office furniture & equipment	CC - 1					♦											Equipment/ furniture purchased and in use at sanctuary HQ by June 30, 2005	
3.5 Purchase & Installation of Radio and additional solar equipment	CC- 1	APO - 5					♦										Radio and additional solar equipment purchase and installed by July, 2005	FC obtaining radio frequency operating license

OUTPUT 4: COMMUNITY OUTREACH, CONSULTATIONS AND MOBILISATION

ACTIVITY	Responsible person (s) and time Allocated (Days)	Others involved and time Allocated (Days)	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	Means of verification	Remarks / Assumptions	
4.1 1 x 1 day Communities & sanctuary management liaison meeting with the Boki TRC and Boki LGC	CC - 3 ACC - 5	PS - 3 DFC - 3 WO - 1 AWO - 1 WO (HQ) - 3								♦					Meeting held by end of November 2005 and minutes produced by December 31, 2005	Cordial relations between CRSFC sanctuary staff and local communities maintained	
4.2 3 x 1 day meeting between sanctuary staff and community liaison representatives	ACC - 9 CC - 4	WO - 3 AWO - 3				♦				♦			♦		Meetings held after every 3 months and minutes /reports produced	Cordial relations between CRSFC sanctuary staff and local communities maintained Meeting to be used as a platform to also explain the roles and responsibilities of community representatives	
4.3. Production of summary report for community outreach consultations and mobilization	CC - 10	WO - 3 ACC - 8											♦	♦	Draft report produced by January 2006 and final report produced by February 28, 2006		
4.4. 8 x 1 day bush burning prevention and control awareness meetings with communities in most affected areas.	ACC - 24	CC - 3 WO - 6 AWO - 6											♦	♦	♦	Summary report produced for each meeting	Cordial relations between CRFC, sanctuary staff and Local Communities maintained
4.5. Production and circulation of AMWS Newsletter and promotional materials	WO (HQ) - 30	EC - 6				♦				♦				♦	First issue of the newsletter for this period produced by July 2005 and very quarter after that		
4.7 Conservation education meeting(s) and workshop(s) in schools	CEC - 192	ACEC - 174	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	Activities documented in progress reports and where necessary separate minutes and reports produced	One workshop to be funded	

OUTPUT 5: PROJECT MANAGEMENT, IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

ACTIVITY	Responsible person(s) and time Allocated (Days)	Others involved and time Allocated (Days)	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	Means of verification	Remarks / Assumptions
5.1 Quarterly workplans and budgets produced	CC - 18	WO - 8 ACC - 4 AWO - 4	♦		♦			♦			♦				Quarterly work plans produced and copied to the partnership. Budget sent to NCF/RA/FFI and copied to CRSFC	
5.2 Production of quarterly Technical and biannually / Annual reports	CC - 9	WO - 3 AWO - 3 ACC - 3				♦			♦			♦			Reports produced in accordance with project requirements and circulated to AMWSCPP	Annual/ biannual reports to be produced in conjunction with APO NCF/RA/FFI
5.3 Production of financial reports	CC - 12		♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	Monthly financial reports produced	
5.4 3 x 1 day quarterly planning and review meeting with staff	CC - 3	WO - 3 ACC - 3 AWO - 3				♦			♦			♦			Meeting held at least ten days before the beginning of a new quarter with all staff attending. Minutes of meetings produced.	
5.5 Activities of the protection and monitoring team, Gorilla Research and conservation education coordinated	CC - 6		♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	Activities undertaken included in projects reports	
5.6 Dissemination of project results, progress & information	CC - 10	WO - 4 APO - 2 AWO - 4 ACC - 4				♦							♦		* Radio feature during the last quarter of the year * Two articles contributed by March 31, 2006 to RA/FFI/NCF newsletters - one on conservation education and the other on sanctuary protection & monitoring.	
5.7 Production of a plan of operations for 2005/2006 Year	WO - 6 CC - 5	AWO - 6 ACC - 5											♦	♦	Plan of operations and budget produced by March 15, 2006	

ANNEX 3: REPORT ON AFI SWIFT WILDLIFE CENSUS – MARCH 2005

1. Summary

This report is based on data collected during a sweep census of Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary in March 2005. Coordinated by Imong Inaoyom, a total of 20 people were used for the survey, including two staff from the Cross River State Forestry Commission. Five teams were able to survey the entire mountain in seven days. Although gorillas were not sighted directly a total of 22 gorilla nest sites were found including ten recent (< 2 weeks old) nest sites. The last sweep survey (coordinated by Chris Ransom in May 2004) suggested either a single group of 22 individuals, or perhaps two groups totaling 35-40. Data from this survey suggest the presence of one group of at least 23 individuals concentrated in the southern-central area of the sanctuary, and the possible presence of another small group of about 4 animals. Evidence of gorillas was discovered in the Olum area for the first time since a devastating fire swept through the area in 1997. Chimpanzees, drills and three other species of monkey were also encountered. Trapping on the mountain has increased dramatically: 258 wire snares were collected during the current census compared to only 46 during the May 2004 census.

2. Background

Cross River (or “Nigerian”) gorillas were described by Colin Groves in 1970 as having differences in their cranial morphology compared to other western gorillas. Based on the results of a new study published in 2000, Esteban Sarmiento and J. Oates argued that these differences were sufficient to recognize *Gorilla gorilla diehli* as a “good” subspecies (one that had been recognized in the early 20th century, but later sunk into *G. g. gorilla* by Coolidge, 1929).

Restricted to the hill country at the headwaters of the River Cross in the Cameroon-Nigeria border region, Cross River gorillas inhabit an area of about 3,000 km². Human activity (especially farming and cattle-raising) has been steadily eroding the gorilla’s forest habitat, and the patches that remain are becoming increasingly isolated. Long hunted, gorillas survive only in the most rugged areas, protected by their own adaptability and by the relative inaccessibility of the region. But as the human population continues to grow, as new roads are developed, and as the demand for farmland and forest products (including bushmeat) has increased, the gorillas’ status has become critical.

3. Afi Mountain

Afi Mountain is situated within the rainforest block in the border region of southeast Nigeria and southwest Cameroon, an area recognized as one of Africa’s biodiversity “hotspots”. Along with the Cross River gorilla, Afi Mountain is home to the newly recognized *Pan troglodytes vellerosus* subspecies of chimpanzee (restricted to Nigeria and south-west Cameroon only), and to drills (*Mandrillus leucophaeus*), another of Africa’s endangered primates also restricted to the forests of south-east Nigeria and south-west Cameroon.

Created in 1930 the Afi River Forest Reserve covers an area of 383 km², including the area known as Afi Mountain. Following renewed international attention during the late 1980s the creation of a wildlife sanctuary at Afi Mountain for the conservation of the Cross River gorilla and other wildlife was recommended. In May 2000 the Cross River State Government gazetted the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary covering at least 85 km² and incorporating the 30-35 km² the gorillas are believed to inhabit. Because of its mountainous, rugged terrain, the wildlife sanctuary has never been logged and farm encroachment is limited. However the region has been subject to intense hunting pressure over a number of years and as a result populations of all large mammals are relatively low.

In 1996, Kelley McFarland of City University of New York launched the first long-term field study of Cross River gorillas at Afi, working closely with the Cross River State Forestry Department and the local NGO Pandrillus, and supervised by John Oates. After her departure in 1999, the research was continued by a team of trained field assistants, supervised by a series of volunteers. The permanent presence of the research team on the mountain acted to deter poaching, albeit in a relatively small area of the mountain restricted to the immediate vicinity of the research camp. Previous estimates of the gorilla population at Afi have ranged from: 20-35 (McFarland, 2001) to 20-40 (Ransom, 2004). The Afi gorillas are geographically separated from the nearest population in the Mbe Mountains by the Ikom-Obudu highway.

4. Methods and Itinerary

4.1 Census Methods

Due to the relatively small size of Afi Mountain and the small number of gorillas believed to inhabit the area, an attempt was made at a total nest count. Provided that it is carried out carefully this method is believed to have a very low error compared to density based population estimates or estimates based on transect nest counts (Sarmiento, 2003). Each gorilla in a group (other than infants), usually makes a new nest every night so the number of nests constructed each evening represents the number of gorillas. Ideally, nests made on consecutive nights are noted, to ensure that no nests are overlooked and that the gorilla group(s) censused exhibit a constant membership.

To avoid overestimates of population size the entire mountain was surveyed in as short a time as possible. Divided into five teams, a total of twenty people were used for the census, with each team responsible for surveying a different section of the mountain. Each team comprised two gorilla trackers and two field assistants, so that the teams could split into two further teams if required and hence cover larger areas each day. All five sections of the mountains were searched simultaneously with each team located at a central base camp. These base camps were situated at: Base Camp (BC), Odoja Lower Cave (OLC), Pig Rock Cave (PRC), Irruan Base Camp (IBC) and Olum Base Camp (OBC). Where necessary the teams established additional camps to allow access to remote areas that could not be reached easily from the base camp. Overlap of teams was minimized by the use of flagging tape to mark the areas searched and by clearly defining the extent of each of the 5 sectors according to easily recognizable features such as trails, peaks or streams.

An intensive search of each sector was carried out using old hunting trails, transects and by making new trails. Searches were carried out systematically around each of the camps, with the teams moving in a different direction each day. The primary focus of the survey was to locate fresh nest sites, but any trails, feeding evidence or dung encountered were also recorded. An attempt was made to follow trails to the next nest site. Close contact with the animals was avoided so as not to influence their movement. Whenever a nest site was located, data were collected on number of nests, height above ground and diameter of each nest, age of nests, type of vegetation, and location. Wherever possible a GPS unit was used to record the location. Nests were determined to be either gorilla nests or chimpanzee nests according to the judgment of the observers (many of whom have considerable prior experience of this work). Factors considered were the presence of distinctive trilobed dung (typical of gorillas) and the height of the nests – in general, though many exceptions have been noted – gorillas tend to nest close to the ground and chimpanzees high up in trees. In cases of uncertainty, observers noted this.

The precise age of nests is difficult to determine. Kelley McFarland found that gorilla nests on Afi Mountain rarely survived more than four months after which time only the branch network remained; after just one month leaves on broken branches are generally brown and rotten, or brown and dry in the dry season. Leaves on branches that are only bent, not broken, tend to remain green for much longer, and hold the nest together for longer. In general, ground nests tend to decay faster than tree nests. Due to these factors, nest ages recorded are only estimates. Nest sites suspected to be less than two weeks old were classified as ‘Recent Gorilla Nest Site’ (RGNS). Older sites were classified as ‘Old Gorilla Nest Site’ (OGNS). All nest sites were labeled with flagging tape to avoid them being recorded more than once.

In addition to data on gorillas, information was collected on other primates. Drills, chimpanzees and guenons at Afi have been relatively neglected by past research efforts and little is known about them compared to gorillas. Systematic data on other wildlife was not collected, but notes were made on signs of human activities.

4.2 Census Period

The census was carried out from the 11th to the 17th of March, 2005. Five teams each spent a total of seven days in an intensive search of the mountain.

4.3 Itinerary

10th March: Teams depart villages and climb to their base camps.

11th March: Teams begin searching the mountain.

18 March: Teams return to villages. Team leaders bring data sheets to Buanchor.

4.4 Census Teams and Team Leaders

**Base Camp
Cave****Imong Inaoyom (NCF-WCS)**

Peter Oned (Ebok-Boje)

Livinus Abang (Buanchor)

George Obi (Ndemechang)

Odoja Lower Cave**Charles Ewa (Kakwagom)**

Anthony Osang (Ebok-Boje)

Matthew Otu (Ebok-Boje)

John Oban (Boje)

Pig Rock**David Ocha (Buanchor)**

Henry Otu (Buanchor)

Francis Osang (Olum)

Denis Abang (NCF-WCS)

Irruan Base Camp**Tony Bankong (FC)**

Dennis Osang (FC)

Fidelis Eja (Bitiah)

John Aji (Bitiah)

Olum Base Camp**Jonas Attah (NCF-WCS)**

Leo Abang (Olum)

Peter Ewa (Olum)

Henshaw Ojie (Kanyang I)

4.5 Mapping

Teams were instructed to collect GPS data during the survey to help improve the available maps of Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary. GPS positions were recorded for nest sites, caves and camps, as well as any other distinctive geographical features. Unfortunately the thickness of the canopy cover in certain areas occasionally prevented the acquisition of GPS location data.

5. Results and Discussion**5.1 Gorillas**

Table 1 summarizes the data collected on gorilla nest sites during the survey. Signs of gorillas were recorded by four out of five teams, only the team based at Irruan was unable to find any evidence that gorillas had used the area in the last year. A total of 22 gorilla nest sites were located during the survey including ten recent nest sites (< 2 weeks old). The number of nests at each of these sites varies from 1-25. The largest single nest site contained 29 nests and was estimated to be 3-4 weeks old.

A total of 3 nest sites were recorded from the Olum area. During the last survey no gorilla signs were discovered in Olum. The largest nest site contained 6 nests, the remaining 2 nest sites each contained a single nest. Two small satellite nests were found in the group of 25 nests at Odoja Lower Cave on the 14/3/05, strongly suggesting that there are a number of young animals present in the group. The presence of two small satellite nests was also noted by Ransom in 2004. Two fresh nest sites of 1 day old were discovered on the 16/03/05: the largest containing 23 nests was found south of OLC and the smallest containing 4 nests was found at Base Camp indicating that there could be as many as 27 gorillas on the mountain (provided that the age estimates are accurate). The presence of a single nest site of 29 nests on the 13/3/05 suggests

that the group could be as large as 29 although it is known that an individual gorilla can construct more than one nest each night. It can be difficult to accurately age nests due to factors outlined above, but the experience of members of the survey teams suggests that the age estimates are quite reliable.

Table 1: Summary of Gorilla Nest Sites Recorded

Date	Team	Location	No. of Nests	Approx. age on day located	Approx. age on last day of census	Comments
11/3/05	Base Camp	08-BC trail 06° 18.107' 08° 57.885'	17	1-2 months	1-2 months	Leaves dry, a few dropping off, dung dry. Nests 4 – 12m above ground.
11/3/05	Base Camp	08-BC trail, 06° 17.943' 08° 58.149'	10	3 months	3-4 months	All leaves dead and brown, some fallen, broken branches dead and dry. Nests 0-8m above ground.
11/3/05	Olum Base Camp	Leo's trail, 06° 24.212' 09° 01.200'	1	3 months	3-4 months	Nest on ground
12/3/05	Base Camp	16E-TC Kala 06° 18.849' 08° 57.520'	24	1-2 weeks	1-2 weeks	Nest breakings dry, leaves brown, no dung visible. All nests on the ground.
12/3/05	Base Camp	OT-BC trail, 06° 19.094' 08° 58.060'	5	3 weeks	3-4 weeks	Most leaves dead, dung found old and disintegrated. Nests 12-16m above ground.
12/3/05	Base Camp	OT-BC trail, 06° 19.030' 08° 58.282'	13	4-5 months	4-5 months	nests old and deteriorated
12/3/05	Base Camp	OT-BC trail, 06° 19.196' 08° 58.031'	2	3-4 months	3-4 months	nests old and deteriorated
12/3/05	Odoja Lower Cave	NE of OLC, 06° 20.175' 08° 57.992'	19	3-4 days	1-2 weeks	Breakings, feeding remnants fresh. Nests 0-17m above ground.
12/3/05	Pig Rock	PR-Udoja's trail 06° 20.210' 08° 58.372'	19	2-3 days	7-8 days	breakings have some dry sap, nest material still looks fresh, nests 0-16m above ground

12/3/05	Olum Base Camp	Peter's trail 06° 24.450' 09° 01.219'	6	2 months	2 months	Most leaves dry but not fallen, broken branches still fresh, nests 0-18m above ground
13/03/05	Base Camp	BC-Boje trail 06° 18.788' 08° 57.021'	29	3-4 weeks	>1 month	Nests starting to deteriorate. Nests 0 – 10m above ground.
13/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Pillar 1 trail 06° 24.429' 09° 01.304'	1	2-3 months	2-3 months	leaves very dry, but breakings still have some signs of freshness, nest on ground
13/03/05	Odoja Lower Cave	NE of OLC 06° 19.829' 08° 57.417'	14	4-5 days	1-2 weeks	trail to this nest continuous from nest site of 19 nests (06° 20.175'; 08° 57.992') above. Nests 0-17m above ground.
14/03/05	Odoja Lower Cave	06° 19.646' 08° 57.948'	25	1-2 weeks	1-2 weeks	nest materials still intact and fresh. Nests 0-10m above ground, includes 2 'satellite' nests
15/03/05	Odoja Lower Cave	Lowland area	23	3-4 months	3-4 months	Two nest sites of 7 and 16 nests c. 75m apart believed to be a group of 23 individuals. Lowest nest 4m and highest nest 12m.
16/03/05	Odoja Lower Cave	South of OLC	23	1 day	2 days	nest material and dung very fresh; dung samples collected. Nests 0-14m above ground.
16/03/05	Pig Rock	PR-Dennis camp trail 06° 20.514' 08° 59.681'	19	8-10 days	9-11 days	nests still green, but some leaves starting to change colour, nests 0-9m above ground
16/03/05	Base Camp	14-BC trail, 06° 19.387' 08° 58.440'	1	12-13 days	2-3 weeks	Nest intact and very green, very fresh leaves and breakings, fresh and intact dung. Nest 7m above ground.
16/03/05	Base Camp	06° 19.557' 08° 58.346'	4	1 day	2 days	fresh dung present and samples collected, nest materials very fresh, gorillas heard calling (screaming?) c. 350m from nest site in valley bottom
16/03/05	Base Camp	14-BC trail 06° 19.849' 08° 58.497'	24	2 weeks	2-3 weeks	Nest 0-13 m above ground, fresh leaves still present and some dung remaining although dry.
16/03/05	Base Camp	14-BC trail 06° 19.634'	1	1 week	1 week	leaves and broken branches still very fresh, trail fresh,

		08° 58.730'				nest on ground
17/03/05	Base Camp	14-BC-TC Kala 06° 19.346' 08° 58.356'	13	2-3 months	2-3 months	OGNS. Leaves dead, breakings dry, no dung visible. Nests 0 – 12m above ground

The absence of gorilla signs from Irruan has been noted before: McFarland (2001) believes that gorillas only exploit the Irruan area at specific times of the year to feed on particular fruit species. The discovery of gorilla sign in the Olum area is noteworthy, the last evidence of gorillas in this area was found in 1996. The absence of gorillas from Olum from 1997 to 2004 is believed to be due to a bush fire in 1997 that devastated more than half the area and destroyed a significant amount of gorilla food resources (McFarland, 1999).

The age estimates and locations of the nest sites suggest that there is one group of gorillas of at least 23 individuals concentrating their activities in the southern-central area of the sanctuary. There is some evidence to suggest the presence of a second smaller group of 4 individuals. The total population is therefore in the range of 23-29 individuals. These results are similar to previous mountain-wide censuses by McFarland in 1999, by Kortenhoven in 2002, and by Ransom in 2004. The composition of the main group is not fixed and would appear to be changing constantly with smaller sub-groups continually splitting off and subsequently rejoining the main group after a period of time. These smaller sub-groups tend to range further afield than the main group and have recently extended their range to include the Olum area. The absence of any gorilla sign, either fresh or old, from the Irruan area is not so surprising: the census in May 2004 only found old gorilla nests estimated to be 4 months old.

5.2 Chimpanzees

Evidence of chimpanzees was found by all teams except the team at Base Camp, a similar situation was recorded during the census of May 2004 (Ransom, 2004). The majority of this evidence was in the form of nests and calls heard although chimps were sighted on two occasions by different teams at Pig Rock and at Irruan. The first of these sightings was of three individuals in the Pig Rock area close to Dennis Central Cave. The second was by the team in Irruan where 2 individuals were seen, the group was estimated at seven. Nest sites were also recorded in the Olum and Odoja Lower Cave areas.

Table 2: Summary of Chimpanzee Evidence Encountered

Date	Team	Location	Evidence	Comments
11/3/05	Olum Base Camp	Leo's trail 06° 24.094' 09° 01.130'	Nest site	2 nests: 25m & 28m high
11/3/05	Olum Base Camp	06° 24.094' 09° 01.130'	Nest site	2 nests, 5-6 days old, leaves and breakings still fresh

11/3/05	Olum Base Camp	Leo's trail, 06° 23.934' 09° 01.225'	Nest site	3 nests, 5 months old, most leaves fallen and breakings very dry, nests 0-8 m above ground
11/3/05	Olum Base Camp	Leo's trail, 06° 24.156' 09° 01.230'	Nest site	2 nests, 4-5 months old, nests very much deteriorated; nests 7m and 8m above ground
12/3/05	Olum Base Camp	Peter's trail 06° 24.382' 09° 01.205'	Nest site	11 nests all in trees from 8-30m above ground
12/3/05	Olum Base Camp	Peter's trail 06° 24.420' 09° 01.175'	Nest site	4 nests, 1-2 weeks old, all nests in trees between 12m and 16m
12/3/05	Pig Rock	Pig Rock-Odoja trail 06° 20.210' 08° 58.372'	Calls	
12/3/05	Odoja Lower Cave	Peter's trail 06° 24.449' 09° 01.147'	Nest site	11 nests: 2 weeks old; nests b/w 5m & 20m above ground.
12/3/05	Odoja Lower Cave	06° 20.175' 08° 57.992'	Nest site	3 nests: 22m, 18m & 26m high up in trees
12/3/05	Odoja Lower Cave	NE of OLC 06° 20.175' 08° 57.992'	Calls	
12/3/05	Odoja Lower Cave	south of Pillar rock 06° 20.048' 08° 57.947'	Calls	
13/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Pillar 1 Valley 06° 24.570' 09° 01.260'	Nest site	4 nests high up in trees
13/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Pillar 1 trail 06° 24.543' 09° 01.166'	Nest site	1 nest, 2-3 weeks old, Leaves and breakings still have signs of freshness, nest 13m above ground
14/03/05	Pig Rock	Pig Rock-Dennis Central Cave (DCC)	Sighting	3 adults, a male and 2 females feeding
15/03/05	Irruan Base Camp	North of Irruan Upper Cave area	Calls & Sighting	Two adult chimps seen, 7 estimated in group.

Data from this survey indicates that although chimpanzees use a wide area of Afi Mountain they appear to avoid the Base Camp region. A very rough estimate is that there is a total population of no more than 20 individuals that generally associate in only small parties.

5.3 Drills

Evidence of drills was found by all teams with the exception of the team based at Irruan. Drills were seen on four separate occasions, with three sightings in the same day by three different teams. It is uncertain how many different drill groups these sightings may represent, or what the total population size of drills on Afi may be. However, based on this evidence, found over widely separated areas and within a period of only a few days, it appears that there may be at least three groups present on Afi. It is believed that there is at least one group in the south-central part of the mountain, at least one group in the Olum area, and at least one group in the Pig Rock/Odoja Lower Cave area. These findings are comparable with results from the May 2004 census (Ransom, 2004).

Table 3: Summary of Drill Evidence

Date	Team	Location	Evidence	Comments
11/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Leo's trail	Dung	
11/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Kache – Kanshi trail	Tracks	
11/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Leo's trail	Feeding trail	
12/03/05	Pig Rock	Pig Rock – Odoja trail	Sighting	Seen feeding then fled, no estimate of group size
12/03/05	Odoja Lower Cave (OLC)	East of OLC	Sighting	30 estimated in group; seen feeding
12/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Peter's trail	Sighting	20 estimated in group; 2 feeding on Musanga fruits
12/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Peter's trail	Calls	
12/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Peter's trail	Dung	
14/03/05	Base Camp	06° 19.879' 08° 58.753'	Dung	
17/03/05	Pig Rock	Dennis's camp	Sighting	18 estimated in group; 3 males and 5 females actually seen feeding.

5.4 Other Monkeys

In addition to the drill, three species of monkey were recorded during the survey (Table 4). These are the mona guenon (*Cercopithecus mona*), the putty-nosed guenon (*C. nictitans*), and the red-eared guenon (*C. erythrotis*). Monkeys were sighted on only 3 occasions: a large group of *C. nictitans* was seen east of Pig Rock, a group of *C. erythrotis* was seen at Leo's trail at Olum and a group of *C. mona* was seen east of Antenna Ridge at Irruan. The majority of monkey calls were of *C. mona* and *C. nictitans*, the red-eared guenon *C. erythrotis* is less common.

Whenever monkeys were seen during the survey they fled almost immediately, making it difficult to accurately count the number of animals in the group. Like other wildlife on the mountain, monkeys on Afi tend to be very shy of human presence, this is likely to be a result of the high hunting pressure. Although monkeys appear to be present in all areas of the mountain (no monkeys recorded at Odoja Lower cave?) encounter rates during the current census are lower compared to the May 2004 census (Ransom, 2004).

Table 4: Summary of Guenon Sightings/Calls

Date	Team	Location	Evidence	Species	Comments
11/03/05	Pig Rock	East of Pig rock	Sighted	Putty-nosed	Seen playing
17/03/05	Pig Rock	Dennis's camp	Calls	Mona	
12/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Peter's trail	Calls	Putty-nosed	
11/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Leo's trail	Sighted	Red-eared	One actually seen
12/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Peter's trail	Calls	Mona	
14/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Nsatray valley N06 24.052 E09 01.045	Calls	Mona	
15/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Major trail	Calls	Mona	
15/03/05	Olum Base Camp	Major trail	Calls	Putty-nosed	
11/03/05	Irruan Base Camp	NE of Obirimbi cave	Calls	Putty-nosed	
16/03/05	Irruan Base Camp	East of Antenna ridge	Sighted	Mona	20 estimated in group
11/03/05	Base Camp	08 – BC trail	Calls	Putty-nosed and Mona	Mixed group, calls heard from same location, same time.
15/03/05	Base Camp	NW of Base Camp	Calls	Mona	Calls were heard regularly from this location throughout the census period.

There were 19 encounters with guenons during the May 2004 census compared to only 12 encounters during the current census and there were only 2 encounters at Pig Rock during the current census compared to 11 encounters in May 2004. It is known that there has been an upsurge in hunting activity in the Pig Rock area since the last census (see Table 5), although much of the recent hunting on the mountain has employed wire traps rather than shotguns and so may not have affected arboreal species like guenons.

5.5 Human Activities

5.5.1 Hunting

Table 5 records the number of spent shotgun shells and traps collected by the survey teams. In addition to the traps and shells found, two hunters armed with shotguns were encountered on the mountain. No gunshots were heard, 10 shells were collected during the current census compared to 8 in the May 2004 survey. However a total of 258 wire snares were found compared to 46 in the last survey. There has been a **massive** increase in the incidence of trapping on the mountain during the past year, particularly in the Pig Rock area. This is likely due in part to the departure of the conservation coordinator in October 2004 and perhaps also as a result of the closure of the research camp on the mountain in January 2004.

Table 5: Summary of Traps and Spent Shotgun Shells Collected

Area	No. of Shotgun Shells	No. of Traps	Comments
Pig Rock	0	111	
Odoja Lower Cave	0	65	
Olum Base Camp	6	7	Two hunters with shotguns, Edwin Ejason (from Olum) and Amage (from Obudu), encountered on 10/3/05. Both ran off after seeing the gorilla monitoring team.
Irruan Base Camp	2	43	
Base Camp	2	32	
Total	10	258	

6. Conclusions

Data from the current survey suggest the presence of one group of at least 23 individuals concentrated in the southern-central area of the sanctuary, and the possible presence of another small group of about 4 animals. Evidence of gorillas was discovered in the Olum area for the first time since a devastating fire swept through the area in 1997. To improve our estimate of the size of the gorilla population a sweep survey is recommended every three months. Improved mapping of the mountain is also required together with the use of a GIS system to map nest sites.

Although fire frequently damages major parts of the mountain it appears that the habitat can recover in as little as ten years and that gorillas are able to recolonise areas previously devastated by fire. Evidence of other wildlife remains scarce however and poaching is undoubtedly a major problem for the management of the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary. Poaching must be controlled before any gorilla habituation is attempted on the mountain.

7. References

Kortenhoven, A. (2002). Census of Afi Gorillas – March 12- May 3, 2002. Report to the Afi Mountain Partnership.

McFarland, K.L. (1999). Census of Afi Gorillas – February-March 1999. Report to the Afi Mountain Partnership.

McFarland, K.L. (2001). Ecology and Conservation of Cross River Gorilla in the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary, Cross River State Nigeria. In Proceedings of the International Workshop and Conference on the Conservation of the Cross River Gorillas, Calabar, Nigeria.

Oates, J.F., McFarland, K.L., Groves, J.L., Bergl, R.A., Linder, J.M. & Disotell, T.R. (2003). The Cross River gorilla: natural history and status of a neglected and critically endangered subspecies. Pp. 472-497 in A.B. Taylor & M.L. Goldsmith (eds.), *Gorilla Biology: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ransom, C.M. (2004). Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary. Gorilla Survey: 19-27 May, 2004. Research Report Prepared by Chris Ransom, NCF-WCS Biodiversity Research Programme.

Sarmiento, E.E. (2003). Distribution taxonomy, genetics, ecology, and causal links of gorilla survival: The need to develop practical knowledge for gorilla conservation. Pp. 432-471 in A.B. Taylor & M.L. Goldsmith (eds.), *Gorilla Biology: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Annex 4: AFI MOUNTAIN WILDLIFE SANCTUARY TRAINING CURRICULUM

INTRODUCTION

This curriculum contains:

1. Overview of the AMWS (Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary)
2. Information on Policy and Legislative frameworks for AMWS
3. Opportunities for the various categories of stakeholders
4. Strategies for supporting the implementation of policies and legislation on AMWS
5. Capacity building for Sanctuary Staff

The curriculum is designed to target the Boki Local Government Council, Traditional Institution and AMWS communities.

Broad Objectives

- To further inform the AMWS Stakeholders on the imperatives of the AMWS initiative
- To advocate for more visible and emphatic institutional (Local Government and Traditional) commitment/support from the stakeholders
- To further strengthen community involvement and participation in AMWS project

Facilitation Skills and Experience

The curriculum is designed for use by the AMWS Conservation Coordinator and /or Facilitator(s) who:

- Have extensive knowledge of the AMWS project
- Are actively involve in the AMWS
- Have relevant qualification, professional experience and strong development bias.

Overview of Curriculum Content and Structure

Curriculum Aim

The aim of the curriculum is to provide the necessary mechanism for strengthening relations between AMWS partners with the local administration and AMWS communities and engender the desired commitment.

Training Goals

At the end of the training, it is expected that;

1. Participants will be more informed about the AMWS Project
2. The Boki Local Government Council will institute appropriate mechanism to support the policy and legislative content with regard to the AMWS.
3. The relationship between the AMWS partners and the other stakeholders in the AMWS project will be further strengthened

4. The framework for increase community participation will evolve.

Module 1: Session Overview

Target: Boki Local Government Council/Sanctuary staff

Specific Objectives

- To provide cogent and specific information, and increase the knowledge of the Executive and Legislative arms of the Council on AMWS
- To encourage the Boki Local Government Council to legislate bye-laws and evolve policies and programmes that will support and sustain the AMWS
- To facilitate the institution of appropriate mechanism for regular dialogue between AMWS partners and stakeholders

Sessions

The sessions in this module include:

1. Overview of AMWS

- AMWS focus and perspectives
- Goal and Objectives of AMWS and Lessons Learnt by Partners
 - Partners, Partnership Roles and Responsibilities in the management of the Sanctuary
 - Cross River State Forestry Commission Fauna and Flora International (FFI)
 - Nigerian Conservation Foundation (NCF)
 - Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)
 - Pandrillus
- Expectations of the AMWS Project
From stakeholders in the management of the sanctuary;
 - The Boki Local Government Council
 - The Traditional Institution
 - AMWS (Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary) communities

2. Policy and Legislative Frameworks

Policy

- Sustainable Forest and Natural Resource Management
- Tourism and Eco-tourism
- AMWS a Major Eco-tourism initiative

Legislation

- Forest laws and Regulations
- Environmental Laws
- Conventions on Endangered species

3. Challenges, Gaps and Oversight

Challenges

- Poaching and Habitat loss
- Establishment of Plantation Agriculture
- Revenue collection and benefit sharing mechanisms

Gaps

- Absence of Local content (community and Local Government Council in the Management strategy)

Oversights**4. Opportunities in AMWS**

- Livelihood Options
- Income Generation
- Employment
- Community intervention, development and infrastructure provision

5. Mechanisms and Policy/Legislative Infrastructure for strengthening AMWS

- Local Government bye-laws to support the protection of AMWS (against illegal exploitation and lumbering, bush burning, encroachment by farmers, hunting etc)
- Support the framework for regular dialogue among and between AMWS communities and stakeholders
- Empowerment of youths of AMWS communities through gainful employment, micro-enterprise scheme

Module 2: Session Overview**Target: Traditional Institution****Specific Objectives**

- To provide cogent and specific information, and increase the knowledge of the Traditional Institution on AWMS
- To obtain greater commitment and a more proactive support of the Institution to the AMWS

Sessions

The sessions in this module include:

1. Overview of AMWS

- AMWS focus and perspectives
- Goal and Objectives
- Partners, Partnership Roles and Responsibilities
- Expectations of the AMWS Project

- Lesson Sharing by Partners

2. Policy and Legislative Frameworks

Policy

- Sustainable Forest and Natural Resource Management
- Tourism and Eco-tourism
- AMWS a Major Eco-tourism initiative
- Evidence based policy Analysis/Advocacy

Legislation

- Forest laws and Regulations
- Environmental Laws
- Conventions on Endangered species

3. Challenges, Gaps and Oversights

Challenges

- Poaching and Habitat loss
- Ownership status
- Benefit sharing mechanism
- Community participation

Gaps

Oversights

4. Opportunities in AMWS

- Livelihood Options
- Income Generation
- Employment
- Community intervention, development and infrastructure provision
- Sustainability of Resources

5. Mechanisms and Policy/Legislative Infrastructure for strengthening AMWS

- Local Government bye-laws to support the protection of AMWS (against exploitation and lumbering, bush burning, encroachment by farmers, hunting etc)
- Support the framework for regular dialogue among and between AMWS communities and stakeholders
- Empowerment of youths of AMWS communities through gainful employment, micro-enterprise scheme and livelihood activities

Module 3: Session Overview

Target: AMWS Communities/Delegates

Specific Objectives

- To provide cogent and specific information, and increase the knowledge of the specific targets (women, youths, opinion leaders) on AMWS
- To engender commitment, support and increase participation of the AMWS communities in the sustainable management of AMWS PROJECT
- To strengthen the capacities of the specific targets to promote and encourage Non Timber Forest Products as livelihood alternatives and options and other income generation opportunities.
- To build the capacities AMWS communities in collective decision- making process on natural resource management and utilization

Sessions

The sessions in this module include:

1. Overview of AMWS

- AMWS focus and perspectives
- Goal and Objectives
- Partners, Partnership Roles and Responsibilities

2. Supporting the Policy and Legislative Frameworks for AMWS

- Local institutions e.g (Age grades, Youths & Associations, etc)
- Folklores, community norms & values
- Customary and traditional practices

3. Strategies for overcoming Challenges, Gaps and Oversights by increase community participation and involvement

- Dialogue and stakeholders-Partnership engagement

4. Natural Resources Management and Utilization

- Land Use mapping & Resource Identification and Allocation
- NTFPs (Non Timber Forest Products) Production, Processing and Marketing

5. Opportunities in AMWS for the AMWS Communities

6. Mechanisms and Infrastructure for Strengthening AMWS through local laws, norms and values

- **Local institutions**
- **Conservation Scouts**
- **AMWS Schools Conservation Clubs**

Module 4: Session Overview

Target: AMWS Schools Conservation Clubs

Specific Objectives

- To provide cogent and specific information, and increase the knowledge of the pupils and students on AWMS
- To encourage and promote the development of appropriate conservation attitudes and values for biodiversity conservation and in particular the AMWS.

Sessions

The sessions in this module include:

Session 1: Overview of AMWS

Annex 5: AFI MOUNTAIN WILDLIFE SANCTUARY CONSERVATION
PROGRAMME
EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND GRANT: PROGRESS REPORT

Reporting Period: April to September 2004

Report Number: 1 (One)

Reporter and designation: Norman Rigava : Conservation Coordinator, Afi Mountain
 Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme, Cross River State,
 Nigeria

1.0 INTRODUCTION

A grant was received by Fauna & Flora International from the Allan and Nesta Ferguson Charitable Trust, UK. This grant was used to establish the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary (AMWS) Educational Development Fund (EDF). The purpose EDF is to provide Small Grants to schools around Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary, for the improvements to infrastructure and provision of essential teaching equipment and materials. Grants will also be made for items such as purchase of desks, repairs to roofs and the installation of proper sanitation.

Most schools in the communities around Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary are old and dilapidated and lacking in basic equipment and teaching materials making it difficult for the children to cope with the learning environment and for teachers to deliver quality education. The technical rationale behind the establishment of this fund is that pressure on Afi would be lessened if the young generation who are the future leaders are educated and their awareness raised sufficiently to make the conservation of this mountain and its rich biological resources an asset to protect for prosperity. One of the ways in which this can be achieved is by contributing to the establishment of a conducive learning environment as well as enhancing the capacity of schools to deliver quality education; and strategically linking this to the current protection and monitoring efforts of Gorillas and other fauna and flora within Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary.

Work on the implementation of the grant began in earnest in April 2004 and a four months implementation timeline was drawn up. This timeline / implementation schedule was broken down into six activities/ discernable implementation phases; namely; creation of Small Grant Guidelines for schools around AMWS; awareness raising on existence of Grant; call for, receipt and processing of proposals for Small Grants; award of grants and release of funds; monitoring of implementation and production of report(s) on grant performance.

Fauna & Flora International has since the beginning of implementation of the grant activities been working very closely with the Nigerian Conservation Foundation, the Forestry Commission and other relevant agencies in the administration of the Educational Development Fund.

2.0 PROGRESS/TARGETS ATTAINED AND IMPORTANT DEVELOPMENTS DURING THE PERIOD

2.1 Activity # I: Creation of Small Grant Guidelines for schools around AMWS

Progress: The main objective was to draw up guidelines detailing the conditions on how the grant can be accessed. Working closely with the Cross River State Forestry Commission and the Nigerian Conservation Foundation, The “Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Educational Development Fund” guidelines were drawn up during the month of April and input was received from other collaborating partners.

Status: Completed.

2.2 Activity # II: Awareness raising on existence of Grant

Progress: A meeting to raise the awareness of the School heads on the existence of the grant, explain in detail the EDF guidelines as well as to call for applications or proposals from the schools was held in June.

Status: Completed

2.3 Activity # III: Call for, receipt and processing of proposals for Small Grants

Progress: A very high interest on the grant was shown and applications from all the twelve primary schools located in communities around Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary were received during the month of June. A summary of all the applications and other relevant additional information were compiled in July for subsequent use by the Review Panel.

A Review Panel consisting of the Cross River State Forestry Commission, and four collaborating NGO partners, namely, the Nigerian Conservation Foundation, Fauna & Flora International, Pandrillus and the Wildlife Conservation Society was set up.

The review of proposals was completed in July. Initially six schools were selected as beneficiaries. The application for one of the schools was declined after it failed to submit a detailed budget.

Status: Completed

2.4 Activity # IV: Award of Grants and Release of Funds

Progress: This activity commenced with the drawing up of a grant agreement in July. The grants were awarded at a ceremony held during the first week of August. At this ceremony the benefiting schools received the first disbursements of funds (as detailed in the EDF Guidelines). The ceremony was covered by the Cross River State Broadcasting Corporation radio and television; and was broadcast on the State and National news channels.

It is anticipated that the funds disbursement will be in two phases and the next disbursement will only be released after an evaluation visit by the grant administration team and upon satisfactory completion of the project milestones by the respective schools.

Table #1 below show the names of the benefiting schools and the projects they are going to use the grant for.

Table #1: Benefiting schools and the project(s) to be undertaken.

Name of Primary School / Village	Grant (Amount - Naira)	First payment (Naira)	Project(s)
1.Holy Trinity / Olum	300 000	180 000	Construction of 80 pupils desks
2. Ebranta / Ebok	300 000	225 000	Plastering and flooring of school blocks. Painting the school blocks
3. Njua Kaku / Njua Kaku	300 000	159 500	Construction of 100 pupils desks, repairs to classroom block roof blown off by rain storm, purchase of table and chairs and chairs for headmaster and teachers, purchase of musical instruments, wooden cupboard & two iron bells. Mounting of goal posts in soccer field.
4. Kakwagom Irruan / Kakwagom	296 100	222 075	Re-roofing of school block, repairs to collapsed corridor and painting of renovated block.
Esekwe / Esekwe	286 000	214 500	Plastering of school block, fitting of doors and windows. Painting.
TOTALS	1482 100	1001 075	

Status: Mostly complete. This activity will be deemed complete upon the Grant Administrator disbursing the second and final funds to the schools.

2.5 Activity # V: Monitoring of implementation

Progress: The grant administration team took photographs of the benefiting schools so as to assess the impact the grant will have on the schools upon completion of the envisaged projects. Each grantee is expected to submit a fortnightly report on progress made, constraints, suggested solutions and planned activities in the next two weeks. In addition the grant administration team

is expected to make regular visits to assess the implementation of the projects and progress towards meeting the grant's objectives.

Status: In progress. Monitoring schedule being drawn up.

2.6 Activity # VI: Report on grant performance

Progress: This report constitute the First progress report produced

Status: Final report that will also include full expenditure details pending will be produced in due course.

3.0 CONSTRAINTS AND ACTIONS TO OVERCOME THE CONSTRAINTS

Grant implementation progress stalled as a result of unanticipated community clashes during the month of April. For security reasons this necessitated a temporary suspension of activities at Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary for a period of two months until the end May. In June, the original implementation schedule was revised and activities resumed and new realistic time lines were set. The original and revised implementation schedule is included in this report (see appendix I).

The implementation has also been affected by the lack of communication infrastructure necessitating more lead time to plan, consult and reach consensus with key stakeholders on timing of some activities. While the grant administration team harnessed its experiences in implementing projects under such conditions and looked at innovative ways of tackling the problems, it is not unusual for one or more of the planned activities to take slightly more time than originally planned.

Given that progress stalled during the months of April and May, to expedite the implementation when the process resumed in June some activities were merged, that is, the raising of awareness on the existence of the grant and calling for proposals (See 2.2 and 2.3 above).

In order to ensure that all communities are informed about the grant, the school headmasters were asked to hold meetings with their respective Parents Teachers Associations (PTA) and inform them about the grant. The PTAs were then expected to brief their respective communities about the grant. From all indications this exercise went according to plan. This served time and resources especially eliminated the need by the grant administration team to organize meetings with individual communities to raise awareness on the existence of the grant. In addition, each proposal had to have the support of the PTA.

4.0 CONCLUSION

To date substantial progress has been made towards achieving the grant objectives. While the implementation of the grant has slipped approximately 60 days, it is anticipated that progress for the remaining activities will be implemented on schedule with no major obstacles anticipated.

5.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The funding support of the Allan and Nesta Ferguson Charitable Trust, UK is gratefully acknowledged. The FFI UK office, Nigerian Conservation Foundation, Cross River State Forestry Commission, Boki Local Government Council and other collaborating partners provided much appreciated support and advice during the period under review.

Appendix I: Original and Revised Implementation Schedules

The tables presented below illustrate the original and revised grant implementation timetables

Table #1: Original Grant implementation Timetable April to August 2004

Activity	Month				
	April	May	June	July	August
1. Creation of Small Grant Guidelines for schools around AMWS	===				
2. Awareness raising on existence of Grant		===			
3. Call for, receipt and processing of proposals for Small Grants		===			
4. Award of Grants and Release of Funds			===		
5. Monitoring of implementation			===	===	
6. Report on grant performance					===

Revised Project Timeline (April to September 2004) – Revised June 2004

Activity	Month					
	April	May	June	July	August	September
1. Creation of Small Grant Guidelines for schools around AMWS	===					
2. Awareness raising on existence of Grant and call for proposals			===			
3. Receipt and processing of proposals for Small Grants			===	===		
4. Award of Grants and Release of Funds					===	
5. Monitoring of implementation					===	===
6. Report on grant performance						===