



Darwin Initiative

Final Report

July 2006

1. Darwin Project Information

Project Reference No.	162/12/007
Project title	Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Gorilla Research and Conservation Project
Country	Nigeria
UK Contractor	ResourceAfrica, P.O. Box 198, Cambridge CB3 0TF
Partner Organisation (s)	(i) Cross River State Forestry Commission (ii) Nigerian Conservation Foundation, (iii) Fauna & Flora International (iv) Pandrillus, (v) Wildlife Conservation Society,
Darwin Grant Value	£117,900
Start/End date	01 April 2003/31 March 2006
Project website	Under development – see: http://www.resourceafrica.org/work/national/amwsgrcp.php
Author(s), date	Jon Hutton & Daniel Pouakouyou, July 2006

Table of contents

1.	Darwin Project Information.....	0
2.	Project Background/Rationale	2
3.	Project Summary	3
4.	Scientific, Training, and Technical Assessment.....	5
4.1.	Training and capacity building	5
4.2.	Protection and monitoring strategy.....	6
4.3.	Consultation and community mobilisation	6
4.4.	Environmental Education.....	7
5.	Project Impacts	7
6.	Project Outputs	10
7.	Project Expenditure.....	11
8.	Project Operation and Partnerships.....	11
9.	Monitoring and Evaluation, Lesson learning.....	13
10.	Actions taken in response to annual report reviews.....	15
11.	Darwin Identity.....	15
12.	Leverage	16
13.	Sustainability and Legacy.....	17
14.	Value for money	18
15.	Appendix I: Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)	19
16.	Appendix II Outputs.....	21
17.	Appendix III: Publications	24
18.	Appendix IV: Darwin Contacts.....	25
19.	Appendix V: Report of Project Achievements against the Logical Framework	0
20.	Appendix VI: Modules for in house training course	0
21.	Appendix VII: A report on Afi sweep wildlife census	3
22.	Appendix VIII: Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Training Curriculum.....	12
23.	Appendix IX: Guidelines for the Educational Development Fund.....	16
24.	Appendix X: MoU between the Sanctuary and the community benefiting from the EDF	20

2. Project Background/Rationale

This project was implemented at Afi Wildlife Sanctuary, situated within the rainforest block of Cross River State, Nigeria, at the border region of south east Nigeria and south west Cameroon from April 2003 to March 2006. This region is an international biodiversity hotspot of global significance, but identified as one of the West Africa's three "deforestation hotspots" by the EC-funded TREES programme in 1998. Cross River State by one estimate contains 30% of the Nigeria's remaining rainforest. The IUCN African Primate Survival Plan (1996) identified the Afi Mountain-Okwangwo forests as among the most important in Nigeria for primate conservation. Afi Mountain is home to the Cross River gorilla (*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 chimpanzee in West Africa (*Pan troglodytes vellerosus*) restricted only to Nigeria and South West Cameroon. A 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 is also found at Afi. Afi is a Birdlife International "Important Bird Area", being the second largest African roost for the migratory European barn swallow (*Hirunda nustica*) and a nesting site for the rare bare-necked rock fowl (*Picathartes oreas*).

At the time of the creation of the Afi River Forest Reserve more than 70 years ago (part of which was gazetted as Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary in May 2000), the density of human population was extremely low. As the local population has grown rapidly in recent years and the local economy is based upon agriculture and use of locally available natural resources, farming and hunting pressure have increased dramatically, lands for farms have become scarcer, forest cover has diminished considerably and wildlife both inside and outside the core protection zone has drastically reduced. Today, AMWS alone is surrounded by 16 communities with well over 30,000 inhabitants and the pressure has reached a critical point so much so that the areas surrounding the reserve and the Sanctuary, in particular in the north, are entirely deforested.

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. The need was identified by the members of the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Partnership established a year later in 2001 after the gazettelement of the sanctuary and which comprised five organisations namely the Forestry Commission (FC) as the statutory authority in charge of the management of the site, the Nigerian Conservation Foundation (NCF), Fauna & Flora International (FFI), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) and Pandrillus.

3. Project Summary

The purpose of the project was the protection of the fauna, flora and overall ecosystem functions of the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary through locally integrated and effective management without external assistance. As provided in the logical framework, the project had four outputs including:

- 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.

No change was brought to the logical framework and all the outputs were delivered as initially planned. The version attached is therefore the one included in the grant agreement (Appendix V). The project achievements are reported against each output.

The articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) which best describe this project are the followings:

- Article 6: General measures for conservation and sustainable use
- Article 7: Identification and monitoring
- Article 8: In-situ conservation
- Article 12: Research and training
- Article 13: Public Education and Awareness

The extent of the project contribution to the different measures for biodiversity conservation defined in these CBD articles is provided in Appendix I.

In terms of meeting its objectives, this project was successful and all the objectives were met to the satisfaction of all the partners including the government, NGOs, the traditional ruler's council and the local communities at large. In particular:

- The capacity of staff from the Department of Wildlife and Ecotourism, the NGO and the local community was built and strengthened in protected area management. This training included not only the theoretical aspects of protected area management received by the government rangers at the New Bussa College in Niger State, but also and perhaps more importantly, regular refresher courses provided to all the protection and monitoring team following the curriculum developed to this effect (Appendix VIII). Also, additional skills in wildlife survey were acquired by the rangers when they joined the scientific team led by the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) during the sweep census of wildlife at the Sanctuary.
- Through regular patrols and constant monitoring of activities at the Sanctuary, the protection and monitoring team was able to reduce the level of illegal activities to the strict minimum. In particular, hunting was drastically reduced with the prosecution of key hunters and no gorilla or indeed any key wildlife species was killed at the Sanctuary for the last 3 years. Along the same line, although logging had continued for most of this time at the nearby forest reserve, no single tree was felled in the

Sanctuary. The expansion of farms in the sanctuary was halted using a combination of force and dialogue. Although the farms were not successfully removed from the Sanctuary as required by law, fewer new farms were created and where these did happen, only food crops were allowed against cash crops such as cocoa. Negotiations are ongoing through the traditional ruler's council to remove those farms as soon as this is politically less sensitive. Finally, wildfires are no longer amongst the main threats to the Sanctuary and through the early burning strategy promoted by the Sanctuary management it has been possible to train farmers on how to control bushfires.

- In the past three years, the project managed to achieve what was initially impossible, that is dialogue and not confrontation among the key stakeholders and particularly between the Sanctuary and the local communities. Also, the dispute between the Forestry Commission and the traditional ruler's council on the ownership of the sanctuary was finally resolved when the project managed to bring the two parties around a negotiation table to find out where the state government law and the traditional customary law meet with respect to the sanctuary. Also, through training (Annex VIII) and regular consultations with the 18 community delegates put forwards by the local communities themselves, it was possible to change the mind of so many with respect to the biological importance of the sanctuary, the resources within it and the need to protect it for the benefits of current and future generations.
- The school environment education programme was significantly boosted during the period under review under the leadership of NCF with support from WCS, FFI and ResourceAfrica. Several education materials were developed and disseminated as appropriate including the Afi Wildlife Sanctuary Newsletter which is produced on a six monthly basis. The project also instituted what is today known as the Afi Wildlife Sanctuary Wildlife Educational Development Fund to provide logistical support to the local schools around the sanctuary. This single achievement on its own had tremendously improved the relationship between the sanctuary management and the communities. The provision of such a support follows guidelines developed and agreed with all concerned (Appendix IX). Recently, the management of the sanctuary with inputs from all the members of the Afi partnership instituted a memorandum of understanding between the sanctuary management and the benefiting community laying out the role and responsibilities of each party (Appendix X).

There have been three additional accomplishments at the Sanctuary during the tenure of this project which should be mentioned in this final report.

The first one is related to the establishment of key infrastructure in support of law enforcement. During the period under review and with support from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), it has been possible to install a radio communication system at the Sanctuary. The importance of such an equipment in the protection and monitoring work can not be overemphasised, but overall, communication has improved, the protection and monitoring has become more effective and the Sanctuary is in a better shape than any time before.

The second accomplishment is related to the construction of the ranger's outpost in the northern section of the Sanctuary and the renovation of the Sanctuary's headquarters for which the project recently secured funding from the UFWS. The ranger's outpost in particular will help in resolving the chronic transportation difficulties between the north of the sanctuary and the headquarters particularly during the rainy season when accessibility is a major challenge.

The third and final additional accomplishment is concerned with the sustainability of the project through the promotion of tourism as a non consumptive use of wild resources. During the period under consideration, the project designed and secured funding for the feasibility study of gorilla habituation to friendly human presence in prelude to a possible gorilla viewing of the kind known with the International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP). If such a study which will be completed at the end of this year proved positive and that gorilla-based tourism can be possible within the existing ecological and socio-economic settings, it should be possible for the communities to derive tangible benefits from their wildlife not through hunting this time, but through the non consumptive use of wildlife resources. It should also be possible for the sanctuary to sustain itself, at least partly, from the resources within it.

4. Scientific, Training, and Technical Assessment

The research component of the Afi Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme was the responsibility of WCS. The full account of the project presented in this section is therefore focused on training and capacity building activities, the establishment of a protection and monitoring strategy, community consultation and mobilisation, and finally, environmental education in primary schools around the Sanctuary.

4.1. Training and capacity building

Starting with a workshop during which the training needs of the Forestry Commission officials in wildlife management were identified, the training plan was developed and agreed by all concerned. The first step was the development of training modules for the rangers as part of long term protection and monitoring programme. The assistant conservation coordinator at that time in the project cycle and the wildlife officer on secondment from the Forestry Commission received on the job training in how to organise effective patrols including briefing and debriefing rangers, basic facilitation and community mobilisation techniques.

A second wildlife officer based at the commission headquarters in Calabar attended and completed a computer training course to acquire the skills needed for the production of the sanctuary's newsletter which was and continues to be seen as the most effective way of disseminating the information about the protection programme at Afi sanctuary.

The team of government rangers went on to attend a specially tailored course for 8 weeks at the New Bussa Wildlife College in Niger State. This training was regularly backed up by refresher courses organised at the sanctuary headquarters with practical sessions at the sanctuary itself in the real field situation so that rangers can learn by doing.

The study tour which took the Permanent Secretary of the Cross River State Forestry Commission to the International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) in Uganda and Rwanda resulted in a complete change of mind and attitude of 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 steady source of revenues not only for the local communities, but also for the state government through the gorilla viewing fees. The feasibility study for gorilla habituation which started at the sanctuary just when Darwin input was winding up is the result of that visit to IGCP after which the PS and the government of Cross River State requested for gorilla habituation.

The latest waves of training involved the training of community rangers recruited over a year ago and the 18 community representatives or community delegates. The training of community rangers was mostly done in house and mixing them with the government rangers who had already some experience in the job. Theoretical guidelines were also given to them in the form of refresher courses with all the protection and monitoring team. As part of post-Darwin project, further community members will be trained as tourist guides, but the strong protection and monitoring team will remain to stop illegal users of the sanctuary from returning.

4.2. Protection and monitoring strategy

The protection strategy of the sanctuary was really weak before the beginning of the tenure of this Darwin funding. Bearing in mind that the best chance for the survival of the gorillas and other wildlife species within the sanctuary depended on practical actions to counter the threats of hunting, habitats fragmentation and habitat loss through farming, logging and bushfires, the project put in considerable resources to ensure that the capacity of the protection and monitoring team was fully established to immediately address those threats. Vital equipments were acquired for the team and included rucksacks, sleeping bags and tents. The project equally acquired a strong 4WD Toyota for the rapid deployment of the rangers. At the same time, the installation of basic infrastructure at the sanctuary was initiated with the headquarters established in a building provided by the Boki Local Government Area.

The data generated by the protection and monitoring team have allowed the management of the sanctuary to identify pressure hotspots throughout the sanctuary. These data have identified the northern portion of the sanctuary as the area in need of further attention. As a result of this finding, ResourceAfrica/FFI and WCS recently secured support from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to construct a ranger's outpost in the northern part of the sanctuary and to move a group of rangers there permanently. This will solve the problem of difficult access particularly during the season when the muddy road is almost impassable, hampering a swift deployment of the rangers.

Throughout this project, it has been rewarding to realise that no gorilla or chimpanzee was killed. At the same time, significant amount of wire snares and traps were removed from the sanctuary, the expansion of farms was significantly reduced, the boundary of the sanctuary was successfully re-demarcated with the steel sign posts erected, and wildfire was no longer a major threat thanks to a successful localised early burning technique.

4.3. Consultation and community mobilisation

For a sanctuary which was initially gazetted without consulting the local community, building rapport with such a resentful community was an uphill struggle. Early meetings were stormy as several members of the community raised voices against the gazettelement of the sanctuary in the first place in a situation of growing human population, scarce farming areas and fast fading economic opportunities. The management of the sanctuary needed time and tact to deal with this including absorbing all the accusations and slowly raising issues in subsequent meetings. During the same period, it was important for the government and the traditional rulers to reconcile and to bridge the gap between the two institutions if any important behavioural changes were to be expected from the local community. The project facilitated meetings between the Forestry Commission and the Traditional Rulers' Council to discuss and agree on the protection strategy for the sanctuary.

To the credit of this project which supported amongst other things long sensitisation campaigns, the number of new farms established within the perimeter border of the sanctuary has reduced considerably. Overall, no new cocoa plantation was established within the sanctuary during the tenure of this project, thanks in part to the agreement between the sanctuary management and the traditional ruler council. At last, it was rewarding to realise that farmers understood that establishing cocoa plantation is a long term investment in an area where no human activities except those deemed necessary for its management are prohibited by the current law of Cross River State.

The selection of the 18 community representatives or community delegates based on criteria developed and agreed by all the stakeholders including primarily the communities themselves has been a massive achievement. These community representatives, together with the sanctuary staff, the school environmental education heads, and other influential members of the community were regularly trained in protected area and wildlife management using the modular curriculum developed and agreed with all the partners of the sanctuary (Appendix VIII). This training was usually administered in the form of workshops organised around the villages. There are strong indications that this interesting forum will carry on with the good work after the end of Darwin support.

4.4. Environmental Education

The Nigerian Conservation Foundation, with support from ResourceAfrica/FFI and WCS developed and maintained constant contacts with the school environmental education clubs around the sanctuary. At the request of the local communities, this scheme was extended to the nearby Mbe Mountains to the satisfaction of all the Afi partners including the Forestry Commission. Educational materials including gorilla posters, pamphlets, leaflets explaining the biological importance of the sanctuary and the needs to protect it for the benefit of the present and future generation were produced and distributed widely.

The Afi partnership established the wildlife educational development fund to provide logistical support to the schools around the sanctuary. The first and second rounds of support were provided to the schools during the tenure of this project with the support from Allan and Nesta Ferguson Charitable Trust in the UK and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. This was initially not an output under this project, but had to be developed in response to overwhelming request from the community. It had no direct financial incidence on Darwin funding, but did help in improving the working relationship with the local communities.

5. Project Impacts

There are strong indications that in the past three years the pressure on the sanctuary had reduced considerably as evidenced through the protection and monitoring records. The number of gunshots, wire snares and hunting camps has decreased considerably during the tenure of the project and so had been the expansion of farms, cocoa plantations and wildfires. Furthermore, the improved relationship between the local communities and the management of the sanctuary has considerable positive impacts for the future in terms of sustainability beyond the tenure of this Darwin support.

Two unexpected impacts were also recorded during the tenure of this project.

The first one is related to recent unplanned trips made by the gorillas outside the core protection zone into community farmlands. Although this was probably the result of food shortage in the sanctuary, it is interesting to note that the secured environment which today prevails at the sanctuary largely allowed these excursions although the unpleasant side of the trips was crop raiding.

Secondly, with the reduced hunting pressure, it is possible that gorilla might now be habituated to friendly human presence in preparation for a possible gorilla viewing of the kind known in the East Africa region. Together with the state policy to promote tourism across the region, gorilla viewing, if successfully established, will become a source of tangible benefits not only for the state, but perhaps and more importantly, for the local communities.

Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary is seeing by both the federal and state government as a conspicuous model for practical implementation of many elements of CBD in Nigeria. At the beginning of the project, the implementation of CBD provisions in Nigeria wasn't and still not strong enough, partly as the result of several years of military rules. Today, the model implemented at Afi is easily replicable to other areas of high biological significance across the country and provides for an integrated package of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Furthermore, the Afi model combines well the classical law enforcement culture with a deliberate attempt to promote community participation in protected area management. By so doing, it would be possible for the country to draw on Afi example to inform future policy reform and the development of national strategies for the conservation and management of the country's biodiversity hence fulfilling article 6 of CBD.

At the level of the Cross River State government, the Forestry Commission in particular is looking at the sanctuary as an example of a success story which brings together the protection of the state's threatened natural heritage with the needs of a growing human population. In particular, the state welcomed the development of tourism using Afi as a key destination site and sees this as an alternative and innovative approach to biodiversity conservation. The plan is for the Commission to support the establishment of key infrastructures at the sanctuary in support of tourism, and to encourage as resources permit, training, education and direct involvement of the local communities in tourism related activities. However, in order to promote the merit of this non consumptive use approach, the Commission needs to crack down on illegal timber logging which, although not carried out directly within the sanctuary but at the adjacent Afi River Forest Reserve, remains a serious impediment to maintaining the ecological integrity of the entire site.

The table in Appendix I show the contribution made by the different components of this project to the measures for biodiversity conservation defined in the CBD Articles.

Capacity building was one of the key outputs of this project and targeted not only of the Department of Wildlife and Ecotourism of the Forestry Commission, but also the NGOs and community groups.

The commission staff and particularly the ranger's received strong training in the theoretical and practical aspects of protected area management. While the theoretical aspects of the training were provided further away at the New Bussa College the practical aspects were administered directly at the sanctuary. This team of rangers which recently was backed by a team of community rangers can operate almost independently with little to no supervision. They can operate basic GPS instrumentation independently and are well capable of collecting the protection and monitoring data.

Also, one key wildlife office at the Forestry Commission headquarters was trained in computing and today handles most of the sanctuary's computer work including the production of the Sanctuary's Newsletter.

National NGOs, mainly the Nigerian Conservation Foundation (NCF) has been the main beneficiary of this project. Initially, the role of NCF at the sanctuary was reduced to environmental education in the schools in collaboration with WCS. NCF role rapidly grew when FFI, a partner of ResourceAfrica established a strategic partnership with NCF, not only for the management of the sanctuary, but also for other biodiversity conservation work across the state and recently outside the state. Recent development in this partnership between FFI and NCF includes the development of an intervention strategy in the Niger Delta region to provide vital support to the conservation and management of biodiversity in the 7 protected areas which are found in this oil rich region, the use of recent advance in communication technology to monitor environmental pollution and elsewhere in the Taraba state in partnership with the government, the use of mobile phone technology to control illegal logging and to provide early flooding warning system for the region.

Also, 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 Appendix VIII.

Though not directly supported by the Afi project, the Wildlife Officer who was trained at the beginning of this project in computing went on to secure a master degree course in conservation biology at Joss University. She will be bringing her new skills to the sanctuary at the end of the course next August.

To the credit of this project has been the restoration of dialogue and collaboration between the Forestry Commission of Cross River State and the Boki Traditional Ruler Council, the traditional institution under which falls Afi Sanctuary. Before the tenure of this project the relation between the two institutions was tense due partly to the fact that since the gazettelement of the sanctuary in May 2000 the Forestry Commission has consistently ignored the TRC which nevertheless sees itself as the custodian of the sanctuary and the resources within it including the gorillas. Classical example of dualism between government enacted legislation and the traditional customary rights? This can work well for the benefits of biodiversity if the right mixture of both is sought and the right mixture is just what the project tried to catalyse.

The main beneficiary of this project has been the local communities around the sanctuary who has seen the interests in their region rise to unexpected heights. Afi today is well spotted on the map of Cross River State and of the Federal Republic of Nigeria as an example of an adequately managed protected area, and with no desire to exaggerate any statement, well before most of the Nigeria's national parks which are directly supported by the Federal Government in Abuja. Three other tangible benefits have also accrued to the communities as a result of this project.

The first one is the establishment of what is today known as the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Wildlife Educational Development Fund shortly known as EDF. This scheme established with the initial financial support from the Allan and Nesta Ferguson Charitable Trust in the UK and which later on obtained follow up support from the US Fish and Wildlife Service is providing direct logistical support to the school around the sanctuary. This support is tied to the compliance with the protection of the sanctuary

through a MoU and also requires that the benefiting school establishes and maintains a Conservation Club towards further support will be directed.

The second tangible benefit has been the employment of the community as part of the protection and monitoring team: the community rangers. In total, 10 members strategically selected from the different communities today work and earn a monthly salary from the sanctuary to support their families and communities. This is a typical example of a win-win situation whereby a ranger benefits from this steady and reliable source of income in exchange for the compliance of the community where he is from with the protection of the sanctuary. Using these community rangers had proved really productive in the protection of the sanctuary as not only it has allowed the communities to understand and accept that other forms of benefits can be derived from the sanctuary apart from the threatened and increasing scarce bushmeat, but also and perhaps more importantly, to get critical tip offs which have proved highly essential in the fight against the elusive outside hunters. This group of hunters has been until very recently, the biggest challenge to the management of the sanctuary due to the fact that rangers could not geographically pin them down. Through complex relationships and interests, outside hunters always operate in complicity with the local communities who generally know about them more than anybody else not even the most motivated government ranger. But because more than 50% of these communities today have their representatives well embedded in the protection and monitoring team, it is increasingly difficult to conceal illegal activities.

Afi Mountain today is listed among the main tourism destination in Cross River State, alongside other splendid resorts such as the recently renovated Obuju Cattle Ranch. In time, this should be a source of income for the local communities through their involvement either as tourism guides which the project is trying to nurture or indirectly through the delivery of services in the village. A possible added value to this site would be gorilla viewing which, if successfully developed, will bring in a different group of visitors particularly those who enjoy watching great apes in their natural habitats. Of course the successful establishment of this gorilla viewing requires significant investment, but the support from Darwin this time has played its part by allowing the effective protection of the sanctuary, creating an ideal condition for possible gorilla viewing.

6. Project Outputs

All the project outputs are quantified in Appendix II using the coding and format of the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures. Differences (if any) in actual outputs against those in the agreed schedule are also explained with where possible additional outputs provided.

No publications and materials have been finalised for this project to date. However, two articles are currently in preparation and will be published in peer review journals. These papers are based on the monitoring and protection data as well as the role of the local community involvement in the protection and monitoring work. Samples of newsletters are included.

Throughout the project cycle, information about the project activities were disseminated to other donors including the Tubney Charitable Trust, Allan and Nest Ferguson Charitable Trust, Wallace Global Fund and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Furthermore, in addition to the sanctuary's newsletter which was and will continue to be produced every six months, regular updates on the project activities were broadcasted through a local radio programme secured by NCF one of the project partner. Finally, a website is under construction and will be completed probably before the end of the year.

Detailed information related to this project will be posted there and will be accessible on completion at: <http://www.resourceafrica.org/work/national/amwsgcrp.php>.

7. Project Expenditure

Table 1 summarises the budget and expenditure incurred during the tenure of the project. The table is presented as in the grant agreement.

Table 1: Funding summary of Darwin grant to ResourceAfrica for Afi Sanctuary

Item	Budget	Expenditure	Balance

Overall, there were no changes to the budget and the project was managed as per the budget agreed with Darwin Secretariat. Wherever possible, unforeseen expenditures were taken care of through the co-financing which the project managed to leverage quite successfully (see section 12 for details). The only variation in expenditure above 10% of the initial allocation (£4,280) arose from the printing budget line where £967.45 (22.6%) could not be spent. This was variation was incurred in the first year as the result of the delay in producing the Sanctuary's newsletter.

8. Project Operation and Partnerships

The project was initially planned with five partner organisations which have remained today and form part of what is known as the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Partnership. In addition to the Forestry Commission, these included national and international NGO listed below.

- o The Forestry Commission of Cross River State which is the statutory authority in charge of the management of the sanctuary. Throughout the tenure of the Darwin funding, the Forestry Commission provided more than 50% of the workforce particularly the government rangers and the wildlife officers all on secondment from the Commission.
- o The Nigerian Conservation Foundation (NCF) – NCF was initially involved in the school environmental education programme implemented in close collaboration with WCS. The role of NCF in the management of the sanctuary became prominent when ResourceAfrica and FFI, after the mid term review of the project, decided to consolidate their working relationship with NCF and to pass on to NCF the direct responsibility for the management of the sanctuary which until then was handled by FFI. Under the terms of this agreement, ResourceAfrica and FFI had to channel all the resources to NCF for the management of the site in partnership with all the other members of the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Partnership.
- o

- Fauna & Flora International (FFI) – the development of an integrated conservation programme for the sanctuary was the responsibility of FFI. Until 2004, FFI hired and supported a Conservation Coordinator to manage the sanctuary with a counterpart from the Forestry Commission and in close collaboration with other NGO members of the Afi Mountain Partnership.
- Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) – WCS has been conducting research on the ecology of the gorilla at Afi for more than 10 years and has accumulated enough data on the feeding behaviour of the gorilla, their ranging patterns, their reproductive rates, etc. During this ecological monitoring work, WCS also collected data related to the level of threats in the sanctuary such as gunshots, wire snares, etc. WCS has been responsible for the sweep wildlife sanctuary used by the management of the sanctuary to assess the impact of the protection and monitoring work.
- Pandrillus – was initially a Calabar registered NGO, but has since registered as a 501 (c) (3) Company in Oregon in the US. Pandrillus currently runs the drills and chimpanzees ranch on the outskirts of the sanctuary. Pandrillus is really a doyen of wildlife conservation in the state and has been working in the area for more than 17 years. Pandrillus has provided vital support to the management of the sanctuary and were one of the key actors in its gazettelement in May 2000. Discussions are ongoing for the possible re-introduction of the drills and chimpanzees at Afi as soon as all the international requirements for safe re-introduction are met.

All the partners played complementary roles in the protection and management of the sanctuary to the point that today it is hard to rank them in terms of active, less active or not active, etc. As indicated elsewhere, all the partners' organisations involved at Afi are part of this partnership arrangement which meet at least once every six months to review the progress at the sanctuary, address problems, plan for further activities including fundraising, etc. Apart from slight modifications to the initial plan in response to the adaptive management strategy adopted for this project, the only prominent modification which arose as the result of local consultations has been the recruitment, training and employment of community rangers in support of the government rangers overstretched and battered by illegal activities at the beginning of the project. Regular consultation with community representatives, the traditional ruler council and the local community at large led to the decision that community rangers should be recruited to provide the much needed support to the protection and monitoring team. Another key decision which has been taken as the result of local consultation has been the involvement of the local community in the monitoring of forest activities at the nearby Afi River Forest Reserve using a GPS-enabled technology. This will be a post-Darwin initiative for which follow up support from Darwin will be welcomed.

There has been no other Darwin project throughout Cross River State during the tenure of this project. However, a ranger based protection and monitoring scheme is operational at the nearby Okwangwo Division of Cross River National. There was a plan for Afi rangers to get support from the national park rangers, but the rivalry between the State and Federal governments did not make this possible. By Nigeria's laws, national park rangers are allowed to carry fire arms which make their work much easier in this highly volatile environment in comparison to their counterparts from the state government who, whatever the level of threat they might be experiencing from poachers, are not allowed to carry fire arms. A combination of state government rangers and federal rangers would have been an interesting learning opportunity for future wildlife policy reform in this country, but personal greed fed by acute incompetence did not allow this to flourish.

There is nothing like the country's Biodiversity Strategy Office in Nigeria, but depending on the level of intervention, one might be dealing either with the state government or with the federal government. This project was implemented in partnership with the state government of Cross River through the Forestry Commission. However, because Afi is home to the Cross River gorilla and that the focal point for the UNEP-Great Apes Conservation Survival Project (GRASP) in Nigeria is part of the Federal Ministry of the Environment collaboration was equally sought at that level in the country. The focal point for GRASP in Nigeria was associated to this project as often as possible.

In relation to the activities and effectiveness of the local partnerships after the Darwin project, it must be mentioned that Darwin is winding up just at the time when things are getting even better and increasingly exciting. The partnership between the organisations working at Afi is getting stronger and recently, the Cross River Tourism Bureau joined this partnership as it became obvious that Afi has been earmarked as one of the main tourism destinations in Cross River State. Also, the relationship between the local communities and the sanctuary management is getting stronger and more transparent. Discussions about hunting for example which used to be taboo before the sanctuary management is now a topic which can be discussed openly. In all the cases reported during the last months of the Darwin about hunting in the sanctuary, it was interesting to realise that the communities were able to support the prosecution efforts initiated by the sanctuary management with the support of the local police.

There is need to maintain if not to improve this level of community engagement in the management of the sanctuary and all the Afi partners are working hard towards that aim, building on the achievements realised with Darwin support. Also, with the current development of tourism in the state, there is room for the involvement of the private sector in this initiative. Recently, FFI, one of the Afi partners approached the Toyota Foundation for possible involvement, but the feedback is still awaited. Another possibility is to engage with the recent advances in information technology to find out how to use such system for the benefit of biodiversity conservation. A case currently contemplated is the possible use of mobile phone technology and a GPS enabled system to monitor forest activities and the management of the sanctuary building on the experience acquired in this kind of work by ResourceAfrica in the southern Africa region.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation, Lesson learning

The day to day monitoring of the project activities was conducted by the Conservation Coordinator in close collaboration with the government wildlife officer on secondment from the Forestry Commission. The Conservation Coordinator worked with the protection and monitoring team to track and report on realisation of the project outputs as listed in the grant agreement document, as well as the output-level indicators provided in the logical framework. These were presented in the quarterly and six monthly reports allowing the progress to be monitored against agreed milestones. At least twice every year of the project, members of the Afi Mountain Partnership met to review progress, deal with matters arising and planning for the next phase.

By training and equipping staff from the Forestry Commission and the monitoring team, and by associating the local communities in the management of the sanctuary through the recruitment of community rangers, dialogue, regular consultations, the project has been able to achieve the stated purpose. Today, the flora and fauna of Afi sanctuary are in better shape than never before hence maintaining all the ecological functions that make it a viable ecosystem. Because such a vital goal has been met, it is now possible to find ways of deriving some direct tangible benefits from the management of this site, so that when outside support eventually ends, it should be possible for the local government and the local communities to continue to maintain vital ecological processes

which make this site such a wonderful tourism destination in Nigeria.

In terms of baseline information collected, before the beginning of the tenure of the Darwin project, there were already some ecological data on the gorilla. These data were collected by the WCS gorilla research programme which became fully operational two years before Darwin project in 2001. The portions of these data which contained details related to human activities within the sanctuary were used as our baseline data at the beginning of the project against which the impacts of the protection and monitoring efforts were measured. Further collection of similar data this time in a more robust and systematic way followed and allowed the management of the sanctuary to adjust the intervention strategy as appropriate.

During the tenure of Darwin funding the project went through some uphill struggles, but two prominent ones can be reported here in no chronological order.

The first one was the social unrest involving two villages around the sanctuary and which resulted in the death of more than 20 people bluntly axed with machetes between April and May 2004. The project vehicle was among the collateral damages and the windscreen was smashed with a gun shot as the Conservation Coordinator was trying to flee the place. Luckily enough, he escaped unscarred; but this incident brought all the partners of Afi Wildlife Sanctuary in order, particularly those who, until then, continued to question the wisdom behind the policy of dialogue as the best way of ensuring the protection of the sanctuary in this volatile environment.

The second, but less disturbing difficulty is associated with work fatigue which the protection and monitoring team experienced during the first year. Towards the end of 2003 specifically, the team showed signs of serious work fatigue as it battled to deal with farm encroachment, hunting for bushmeat, logging, etc. At the time, the number of rangers was considerably low, so a request was made to the Forestry Commission for more rangers.

The social unrest mentioned earlier inflicted a two-month delay in the implementation of the project activities, but there was no significant modification to the project design, the initial methods, and the indicators. There was however a need to put more emphasis on community sensitisation during the remaining tenure of the Darwin funding. This approach allowed productive discussions and decisions, particularly with the sensitive issue of farm removal from the sanctuary and the expected dilemma of compensation.

During the tenure of the Darwin project there were no external evaluations, but internal evaluations were conducted regularly by all the members of the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Partnership. There was no obvious need for an external evaluation, particularly for a project of this size where all the partners seemed to be on top of all the matters arising as the project unfolded.

Some key lessons were learned during the tenure of this Darwin project which might be valuable not only to other projects taking place in Nigeria, but perhaps worldwide in similar or closely related ecological and socio-economic environment. These included:

- The power of community participation should not be overemphasised, particularly if the decisions are reached with the communities in front of their leaders. During the tenure of this project, it was agreed with the local communities and the traditional ruler council that the boundaries of the sanctuary should be re-demarcate to reduce the level of mistaken encroachments. The boundaries were to be cleared and planted with teak trees (*Tectona grandis*), which is an exotic species hardly mistakable. To the bewilderment of the sanctuary management, these trees were later on either damaged upright or strategy pulled off the ground, just enough to let them dry and die. This suggested one of the following two scenarios or both. The first was that the local communities did not want a physical boundary so that their

illegal activities and particularly farming can be easily concealed no matter what they said in public. The second scenario was that perhaps the fact that some of these plants were uprooted and taken to individual farmers' plot might be an indication that the community wanted to plant teak trees for their own uses. Further investigation into the community desire to plant tree proved fruitless and they showed no major interest in the small teak nursery which the sanctuary management established in one of the troublesome village.

- Negotiations with the local communities are much easier if there are direct tangible benefits at stake. This is nothing new in conservation or in life in general, but the lesson here is that the ethical value of biodiversity resources is always hardly perceivable in the kind of poverty stricken communities where this project was implemented, raising the everlasting question of conservation for whose interests and why.
- The protection strategy in line with the "fences and fines" approach can become completely unproductive and irrelevant in lawlessness societies where members of the community or the community at large can easily take the laws in their own hand. Associating these communities in the protection and monitoring team seems to be the most productive way as this not only improves the sense of ownership over the initiative and also and perhaps more importantly, provides them with direct tangible benefits.

10. Actions taken in response to annual report reviews

Two annual reports were submitted prior to this final one, but issues were only raised for the first year report (2003-04). In that report the reviewers needed to see the minutes of the meetings held, the training package for the rangers, the partnership arrangement for the management of the sanctuary, the section on the project impact and sustainability, progress reports and finally the monitoring data. Relevant information was rapidly compiled for the attention of the reviewers, but no further comments were received indicating satisfaction. These were rather minor issues anyway and did not need discussions with the project collaborators.

11. Darwin Identity

It is extensively known throughout the State of Cross River and beyond that the Conservation Programme at Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary was supported in the last 3 years with funding from the Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species. From the project vehicle which carried and continues to carry the logos to the sanctuary's newsletters which were widely circulated nationally and internationally, Darwin logo was posted on everything work related to this project. Visit the Forestry Commission office in Calabar, the south eastern regional office of the Nigerian Conservation Foundation/WCS in Calabar, Pandrillus drill ranch in Calabar, etc. to see logos of the Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species everywhere.

Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species is undoubtedly well known throughout Nigeria following the numerous projects which this funding opportunity has supported from North to South, from East to West over the years. Two years after the Darwin grant was awarded for the Afi project, another Darwin support was awarded during the 13th round of funding to the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) towards the development of a participatory management of priority biodiversity sites in Taraba State further north of Cross River State. Darwin Initiative is therefore well known in several State Forestry Commissions, national conservation organisations, universities, research institutions, etc.

The Darwin support for Afi Wildlife Sanctuary was part of a broader Conservation Programme initiated at the site since its gazettelement in 2000, but which was poorly resourced technically and financially until the Darwin grant was secured. The identity of Darwin is therefore distinct and all the stakeholders at Afi including the local communities are fully aware of the contribution made by the Darwin grant to the programme and the vital role it has played in its development, consolidation and expansion. Today, the development of tourism which everybody sees as the way forward at Afi could not have been possible if the rate of destruction which was going on at this site had not been abated.

In 2004, the project contributed to the design phase of the SPACE (Sustainable Practice in Agriculture for Critical Environment) project. SPACE is a three-year project supported by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and focused its activities in buffer zone areas throughout the State of Cross River including the Mbe Mountains.

12. Leverage

FFI the main partner of ResourceAfrica in this project managed to capture additional funding to supporting this work. The summary of that additional funding is provided in table 2.

Table 2: Additional funding secured by FFI/ResourceAfrica during the tenure of Darwin project at Afi Wildlife Sanctuary, SE Nigeria

Funding sources	Amount (£)	Status and main uses
Tubney Charitable Trust, UK	31,000	This grant was secured almost at the same time as the Darwin grant in 2003 for one year and did help in supporting staff salaries and welfare during the early phase of the development of the protection and monitoring strategy. During the first year, the bulk of Darwin funding was directed towards the purchase of equipment and capital investment including the purchase of a 4 WD vehicle which is still in very good shape today.
Allan and Nesta Ferguson Charitable Trust, UK	10,000	This one year grant helped in setting up the Wildlife Educational Development Fund at the Sanctuary and supported the first round of support to local schools.
Wallace Global Fund (USA)	12,180	Secured and disbursed in 2 instalments since July 2004. This was a 2-year grant awarded to FFI for gorilla conservation across Africa. The amount indicated here corresponded to the proportion earmarked for Cross River gorilla work at Afi and was spent on various activities until June 2006.
US Fish and Wildlife Service 1	37,883	Secured and disbursed towards the end of 2005 for one year. This grant runs until the end of 2006 and will cover various aspect of protection work.
US Fish and Wildlife Service 2	19,683	Secured. Grant offer confirmed. This fund will be directed towards tourism development and particularly the feasibility study of gorilla habituation starting in September 2006

US Fish and Wildlife Service 3	14,654	Revision submitted and grant agreed. This is a £51,279 grant jointly awarded to FFI and WCS for work in Cameroon and Nigeria. The amount allocated for the Afi work is £14,654 as provided in the corresponding column. This amount from the USFWS will be used to establish infrastructure in support of law enforcement including the construction of the ranger's outpost in the northern section of the Sanctuary. The construction and equipment of the ranger's outpost will cost £8,837. The remaining £5,817 will be directed towards the renovation of the sanctuary's headquarters at Boje.
Total	125,400	

This amount does not include additional investment by partners which is difficult to quantify, but during the tenure of the project it is believed that WCS in particular put in at least US\$35,000 per year for gorilla research work at Afi. The contribution from NCF has been mainly through staff time and so has been the contribution from the Forestry Commission. Pandrillus investment at their Drill ranch on the outskirts of the sanctuary has not been included too, but it is believed to be substantial.

ResourceAfrica/FFI fundraising efforts in particular are deployed with the full implication of the local partners mainly the Forestry Commission and the Nigerian Conservation Foundation. By so doing, local partners acquire the capacity to fundraise nationally and internationally. The bulk of the bridge funding currently used to run the sanctuary has been secured internationally through these joint efforts with local partners except where indicated. FFI will continue with this partnership arrangement which has been successful in every aspect for the benefits of biodiversity at Afi mainly the gorillas and the people of Boki.

Sustainability and Legacy

About 30% of the remaining 10% of the natural forest cover in Nigeria is found in Cross River State, making any initiative to preserve these forests a matter of long lasting legacy. Afi Wildlife Sanctuary and the nearby Okwangwo Division of Cross River National Park are part of the 3 forest blocks which have been earmarked for strict protection in the State, the other being the Oban Division of the Cross River National Park further south. As it is often the case in developing countries rich in biodiversity resources but poor in financial resources, until Darwin funding was secured, no comprehensive protection and monitoring mechanism was in existence and the little efforts made by the State government had no significant impacts. The protection programme established at Afi will continue and with the local communities increasingly fully aware of the role of this sanctuary, there is hope that such positive attitude will continue to benefit biodiversity and the people.

In relation to the fate of project staff and resources, the entire protection and monitoring team is currently at work and nobody has moved. All the resources including the equipment acquired with the Darwin funding are in place at Afi and will continue as before. Only Darwin funding has come to an end, but other financial packages (see table 2) have already been put in place to carry on with the good work until such a time that, for example with the current development of tourism, the sanctuary might be able to sustain itself or function with minimal external technical and financial assistance. Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Partnership is also intact and will remain with all the partners committed to this region for the long run. There are partners at Afi such as

Pandrillus who have worked in the region for nearly two decades and do not plan to leave. The partnership is even expanding and recently welcomed a new member: the Cross River Tourism Bureau which will be focusing its efforts on tourism development in line with the State policy.

One of the prominent investments in the region by the State government in support of the development of tourism has been the construction of a 385 m rainforest canopy walkway on the outskirts of the sanctuary. This is the longest canopy walkway in Africa continent, an indication that all the partners are in the region for the long term and has been one of the conclusions and output of this project: raising the profile of Afi Sanctuary to the level where it can attract significant attention nationally and internationally.

All the aspects of the project are continuing including: capacity building of local government this time trying to associated law enforcement with tourism development, protection and monitoring to make sure the ecological integrity of the sanctuary is maintained, consultation and mobilisation of the local communities to maintain the momentum generated during the tenure of the Darwin grant and environmental education as a continuous process. ResourceAfrica/FFI and other partners will continue to explore potential fit with other foundations, private individuals and government sources to carry on with all the aspects of this vital work.

13. Value for money

For an investment of the size of Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme and all the complexities surrounding the management of the site in this volatile environment, the project offers good value for money. An obvious evidence is that with its small size, the investment has left behind long lasting legacy and the opportunity to make this sanctuary self sustainable in the medium to long term. To the credit of this Darwin funding support which is winding up with praises, it must be mentioned that a multi-millions Euros project funded by the European Commission and implemented by WWF UK at the nearby Okwangwo Division of Cross River National Park until 1998 with similar ecological and socio-economic realities left behind a string of unresolved challenges and problems most of which remain today.

The Darwin funding at Afi focused on a specific purpose with clearly defined and easily achievable outputs. Afi is today presented as an example of a properly managed protected area even if at the gazettelement there was no hope due to the presence of 16 communities immediately adjacent to the sanctuary with well over 30,000 inhabitants most of who rely on the forest and forest resources for their livelihoods.

14. Appendix I: Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

Please complete the table below to show the extent of project contribution to the different measures for biodiversity conservation defined in the CBD Articles. This will enable us to tie Darwin projects more directly into CBD areas and to see if the underlying objective of the Darwin Initiative has been met. We have focused on CBD Articles that are most relevant to biodiversity conservation initiatives by small projects in developing countries. However, certain Articles have been omitted where they apply across the board. Where there is overlap between measures described by two different Articles, allocate the % to the most appropriate one.

Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity		
Article No./Title	Project %	Article Description
6. General Measures for Conservation & Sustainable Use	5	Develop national strategies that integrate conservation and sustainable use.
7. Identification and Monitoring	10	Identify and monitor components of biological diversity, particularly those requiring urgent conservation; identify processes and activities that have adverse effects; maintain and organise relevant data.
8. In-situ Conservation	40	Establish systems of protected areas with guidelines for selection and management; regulate biological resources, promote protection of habitats; manage areas adjacent to protected areas; restore degraded ecosystems and recovery of threatened species; control risks associated with organisms modified by biotechnology; control spread of alien species; ensure compatibility between sustainable use of resources and their conservation; protect traditional lifestyles and knowledge on biological resources.
9. Ex-situ Conservation	0	Adopt ex-situ measures to conserve and research components of biological diversity, preferably in country of origin; facilitate recovery of threatened species; regulate and manage collection of biological resources.
10. Sustainable Use of Components of Biological Diversity	0	Integrate conservation and sustainable use in national decisions; protect sustainable customary uses; support local populations to implement remedial actions; encourage co-operation between governments and the private sector.
11. Incentive Measures	0	Establish economically and socially sound incentives to conserve and promote sustainable use of biological diversity.

12. Research and Training	15	Establish programmes for scientific and technical education in identification, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity components; promote research contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, particularly in developing countries (in accordance with SBSTTA recommendations).
13. Public Education and Awareness	30	Promote understanding of the importance of measures to conserve biological diversity and propagate these measures through the media; cooperate with other states and organisations in developing awareness programmes.
14. Impact Assessment and Minimizing Adverse Impacts	0	Introduce EIAs of appropriate projects and allow public participation; take into account environmental consequences of policies; exchange information on impacts beyond State boundaries and work to reduce hazards; promote emergency responses to hazards; examine mechanisms for re-dress of international damage.
15. Access to Genetic Resources	0	Whilst governments control access to their genetic resources they should also facilitate access of environmentally sound uses on mutually agreed terms; scientific research based on a country's genetic resources should ensure sharing in a fair and equitable way of results and benefits.
16. Access to and Transfer of Technology	0	Countries shall ensure access to technologies relevant to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity under fair and most favourable terms to the source countries (subject to patents and intellectual property rights) and ensure the private sector facilitates such access and joint development of technologies.
17. Exchange of Information	0	Countries shall facilitate information exchange and repatriation including technical scientific and socio-economic research, information on training and surveying programmes and local knowledge
19. Bio-safety Protocol	0	Countries shall take legislative, administrative or policy measures to provide for the effective participation in biotechnological research activities and to ensure all practicable measures to promote and advance priority access on a fair and equitable basis, especially where they provide the genetic resources for such research.
Total %	100%	Check % = total 100

15. Appendix II Outputs

Please quantify and briefly describe all project outputs using the coding and format of the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures.

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
Training Outputs		
1a	Number of people to submit PhD thesis	0
1b	Number of PhD qualifications obtained	0
2	Number of Masters qualifications obtained	0
3	Number of other qualifications obtained	The Wildlife Officer at the headquarters of the Forestry Commission attended computer courses in Calabar and was awarded a Diploma.
4a	Number of undergraduate students receiving training	0
4b	Number of training weeks provided to undergraduate students	0
4c	Number of postgraduate students receiving training (not 1-3 above)	0
4d	Number of training weeks for postgraduate students	0
5	Number of people receiving other forms of long-term (>1yr) training not leading to formal qualification(i.e not categories 1-4 above)	18 community delegates selected in 2005 are regularly receiving training in natural resource/wildlife management and conservation.
6a	Number of people receiving other forms of short-term education/training (i.e not categories 1-5 above)	At least 2 training workshops per year were organised for school heads and conservation club facilitators in partnership with NCF and WCS.
6b	Number of training weeks not leading to formal qualification	The team of 10 rangers attended a 8-weeks skill development training course at the New Bussa Wildlife College in Niger State. 10 community rangers also selected later in 2005 also receiving refresher courses at the sanctuary as well as on the job training
7	Number of types of training materials produced for use by host country(s)	More than 200 posters of Cross River gorillas summarising the protection status of the species, its narrow natural distribution range, the level of threat faced and the role of the government and local people in ensuring their protection.
Research Outputs		
8	Number of weeks spent by UK project staff on project work in host country(s)	The project officer from the UK visited and worked for at least 1 week in Nigeria 3 times a year. The Director of ResourceAfrica/FFI Africa Programme also visited the project for a week in June-July 2004.

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) produced for Governments, public authorities or other implementing agencies in the host country (s)	0
10	Number of formal documents produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording.	0
11a	Number of papers published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals	0
11b	Number of papers published or accepted for publication elsewhere	0
12a	Number of computer-based databases established (containing species/generic information) and handed over to host country	1 protection and monitoring database established providing information on farming, number of wire snares, empty gunshots, etc. These data will be displayed on a GIS map to the distribution of pressures across the sanctuary
12b	Number of computer-based databases enhanced (containing species/genetic information) and handed over to host country	0
13a	Number of species reference collections established and handed over to host country(s)	0
13b	Number of species reference collections enhanced and handed over to host country(s)	0
Dissemination Outputs		
14a	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops organised to present/disseminate findings from Darwin project work	0
14b	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	0
15a	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in host country(s)	0
15b	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in host country(s)	0
15c	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in UK	0
15d	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in UK	0
16a	Number of issues of newsletters produced in the host country(s)	4 issues of Afi Wildlife Sanctuary Newsletter produced and circulated nationally and internationally (UK, USA)
16b	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the host country(s)	More than 300 copies per issue distributed across the state
16c	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the UK	Approximately 30 per issue mainly to partners of ResourceAfrica including Fauna & Flora International
17a	Number of dissemination networks established	0
17b	Number of dissemination networks enhanced or extended	0
18a	Number of national TV programmes/features in host country(s)	0

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
18b	Number of national TV programme/features in the UK	0
18c	Number of local TV programme/features in host country	0
18d	Number of local TV programme features in the UK	0
19a	Number of national radio interviews/features in host country(s)	At least once a month, there is a special programme on the local radio about the sanctuary and the project
19b	Number of national radio interviews/features in the UK	0
19c	Number of local radio interviews/features in host country (s)	The conservation coordinator at the sanctuary is usually the presenter of the sanctuary programme at the local radio in collaboration with the coordinator of environmental education
19d	Number of local radio interviews/features in the UK	0
Physical Outputs		
20	Estimated value (£s) of physical assets handed over to host country(s)	Approximately £20,000 including 1 four wheel drive vehicle, 3 motorbikes, computers, etc.
21	Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisation established	0
22	Number of permanent field plots established	0
23	Value of additional resources raised for project	£125,400

16. Appendix III: Publications

Provide full details of all publications and material 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 that is currently being compiled.

Mark (*) all publications and other material that you have included with this report

Type * (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. contact address, website)	Cost £

No publications and materials have been finalised for this project to date. However, two articles are currently in preparation and will be published in peer review journals. These papers are based on the monitoring and protection data as well as the role of the local community involvement in the protection and monitoring work.

Also, a website is under construction and will be completed probably before the end of the year. Information related to this project will be accessible at: <http://www.resourceafrica.org/work/national/amwsgtcp.php>

17. Appendix IV: Darwin Contacts

To assist us with future evaluation work and feedback on your report, please provide contact details below.

Project Title	Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme
Ref. No.	162/12/007
UK Leader Details	
Name	Dr Jon Hutton
Role within Darwin Project	Project Leader
Address	ResourceAfrica, P.O. Box 198 Cambridge CB3 0TF
Phone	
Fax	
Email	
Other UK Contact (if relevant)	
Name	Dr Daniel Pouakouyou
Role within Darwin Project	Project Officer
Address	FFI, Great Eastern House, Tenison Road, Cambridge CB1 2TT
Phone	
Fax	
Email	
Partner 1	
Name	Prof. Emmanuel Obot Asuquo
Organisation	Nigerian Conservation Foundation (NCF)
Role within Darwin Project	Partner – the Conservation Coordinator of the Sanctuary for the last 12 months of the Darwin grant was hired through a NCF contract.
Address	Lekki Conservation Centre, Km 19, Lagos-Epe; Express Way, Lagos, P.O. Box 74638, Victoria Island, Lagos, Nigeria
Phone	
Fax	
Email	
Partner 2 (if relevant)	
Name	
Organisation	
Role within Darwin Project	
Address	
Fax	
Email	

18. APPENDIX V: Report of Project Achievements Against Logical Framework

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2003-Mar 2006
<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. Preliminary analyses have indicated areas of significant pressure on the Sanctuary. This trend was confirmed during a sweep wildlife census (Appendix VII)</p> <p>Overall, fewer 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 politically complex and socio-economically sensitive. This problem is currently handled through the Traditional Ruler's Council (TRC) which is the only reliable structure which can handle this issue satisfactorily.</p> <p>The selection of 18 community delegates and the regular training provided to them helped improve the relationship between the Sanctuary and the communities and has also facilitated the regular consultations with the TRC. The recruitment and training of 10 community scouts from May 2005 to support the overstretched ranger team has further improved the relationship between the sanctuary's management and the local communities.</p>
<p>Outputs</p>		
<p>Increased capacity of Forestry Commission staff to manage the Sanctuary effectively</p>	<p>Key DWE, NGO and community staff trained in wildlife and natural resource management techniques</p>	<p>The Ranger team attended an 8-weeks skill development training course at the New Bussa Wildlife College in Niger State. Refresher courses were organised every six months at the Sanctuary headquarters (Appendix VI). The Permanent Secretary of the Cross River State Forestry Commission went on a study tour at IGCP in Uganda and Rwanda to learn about an example of a successful gorilla-based ecotourism.</p>

		The project recruited and successfully trained 10 community rangers who are today completely integrated in the protection and monitoring team.
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. These patrols were hugely facilitated by the acquisition of a 4 WD vehicle with Darwin funding and allowed for farming, wildfires, logging and hunting to be checked constantly. As hunting pressure is always high during the Christmas period, special and intensive patrols were always organised in December 2003, 2004 and 2005.
Consultation between Sanctuary staff and communities occurring regularly in all villages	Consultation between local communities and Forestry Commission staff through community meetings	This project managed to restore dialogue between the Forestry Commission and the Traditional Ruler's Council (TRC) following years of dispute about the ownership of the Sanctuary and the resources within it. Consultations with communities were established and maintained, focusing primarily on issues related to the presence of farms within the Sanctuary. The TRC agreed that farms within the Sanctuary should be destroyed, but the chief police officer for 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 Appendix VIII.
School conservation clubs initiated education materials	NGO staff liaise with local schools/teachers to develop a range of activities and materials	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, later on renamed Wildlife Educational Development Fund (WEDF) was established and provided support to 5 schools in the first round and 3 others in the second round. This support was aimed at providing logistical support to those schools in exchange for support to wildlife conservation (Appendix IX). The linkage between the development of educational infrastructure and wildlife conservation was later sealed with a formal MoU whereby each party laid out its roles and responsibilities (Appendix X).

19. Appendix VI: Modules for in house training courses

The in-house training provided to the Assistant Conservation Coordinator and to the team of rangers focused on 4 modules and included:

- *Module 1:* Basic protect area management – this was essential theoretical and built mainly from experience elsewhere with specially attention to the Nigerian context.
- *Module 2:* How protect area and local communities can work together in the context of Nigeria. This module included an overview on the current wildlife legislation in Nigeria, the Endangered Species Act of 1991 and other reform that have taken place in the country in the last 10 years in relation to wildlife protection and management. Avenues to involve the local communities in the management of protected areas and particularly the Sanctuary were explored.
- *Module 3:* Awareness raising, education, information sharing and community mobilisation. This module was build essentially around the work of NCF on environmental education in local school. The module ensured that attendees could see the clear linkages between the protection and monitoring work and the environmental education activities. Ways to avoid spreading conflicting messages were also explored.
- *Module 4:* Planning for the protection of Afi Sanctuary – this module focused essentially on how to organise and conduct patrols, the main geographical areas to focus on, what kind of intelligence network should be established, etc

A special section was held on the care and management of field equipment as this was likely going to be a sticky point on the project budget. The details on that particular section are provided below.

Finally, the draft protection and monitoring plan was discussed to ensure that the entire team was familiar with what it entails and what the expectations were. This plan is provided as a final section on the training component.

CARE AND MANAGEMENT OF TENTS, SLEEPING BAGS AND RUCKSACKS.

AIM: To ensure proper care and maintenance of field equipment by field staff

OBJECTIVES: At the end of the training courses, all rangers will be familiar with and be able to

1. Assemble and disassemble the one man tents issued to them for field patrols.
2. To care and maintain tents, sleeping bags and rucksacks.

TRAINING METHODOLOGY:

TENT (SLEEPS 2 ADULTS)

TYPE: HIGHLANDER FORCES 2 GEO-DOME. TEN 70

1. this is a special lightweight (3.5 KG) of compact outdoor tent measuring 145cm x 210cm x 105 cm

CONTENTS:

Each tent pack has the following

- a) Fly sheet (nylon)
- b) Inner tent (nylon)
- c) 2 x sets of shock fibre/glass corded poles
- d) 6 x high visibility guy ropes
- e) 20 x 9" tent pegs
- f) Repair kit

SETTING THE TENT

5 basic steps for setting the tent are:

- a) **S**ite selection
- b) **A**ssemble tent poles and erect inner tent
- c) **P**eg down the tent at each corner and sides
- d) **P**eg down guy ropes
- e) **A**adjust tent pegs and guy ropes to shape the tent correctly

Remember the word **SAPPA** before you start setting your tent.

SITE SELECTION

- Select a level area, clear the area of stones, twigs any sharp objects etc. the size of the area to be cleared should be slightly larger than the base of the tent.
- On the cleared area, lay the inner down flatly with the front door facing the desired direction and spread the corner of the main body of the tent. (At the area which the peg and pole anchor points are located)

ASSEMBLING THE POLES AND ERECTING THE INNER TENT.

- Assemble the tent poles and feed them (push) through the main body pole sleeves. The entrances of the main body poles sleeves are located just above each corner.
- Anchor the ends of the poles into the holes provided in the anchor plates. This action will erect the tent.
(NB): The tent poles are fed through the main body poles sleeves diagonally ie. From one corner to the opposite corner.
- Check the top of the tent and tie the poles to the inner tent.

PEGGING DOWN THE TENT.

- (NB):** before starting this process, make sure the door zips are closed.
- Peg down (using the 9" pegs) at each corner of the main body, tensioning it carefully and not too tight.
- Peg down the sides and fabric of the tent so that the fabric becomes tense (**DO NOT STRETCH THE PEG ELASTIC IN THE PROCESS**)
- Cast the flysheet over the inner tent making sure the door of the flysheet is on the same side as the inner tent's door.
- Evenly peg down the flysheet so that it sits in correspondence to the inner tent.

PEGGING DOWN GUY ROPES.

- Attach guy ropes to the flysheet and peg these down applying even tension. These ropes are essential to keep the flysheet in position, maintain shape of tent as well as ensuring that water (in the event of rain) is quickly shed-off the tent.

ADJUSTING TENT PEGS AND GUY ROPES.

- Make final adjustments to tent pegs and guy ropes to shape the tent correctly

SITTING YOUR TENT IN RELATION TO OTHER TENTS AND CAMP FIRE SPOTS.

- Always site your tent at least 2 meter away from adjacent tents (in the event of fire in one of the tents, your tent will be saved)
- Always site your tents at least 3 m from a camp fire spots
- Always avoid sitting your tent down wind from a camp fire spot.

OTHER SAFETY PRECAUTIONS

- Do not smoke inside tents (smoke at least 2m away).
 - Do not use matches, candle or kerosene (paraffin lamp) inside the tent.

- Sharp objects (e.g. Machetes) should be properly placed to ensure that they do not cause damage to the tents floor/sides. Always put your machete in its sheath before taking it into your tent.
 - The use of any gas camping appliances near this tent is not recommended at all.
- (DO NOT UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES USE OR ALLOW A NAKED FLAME IN OR NEAR THE TENT WHILE YOUR TENT HAS BEEN CONSTRUCTED USING FLAME RETARDANT FABRIC, FIRE SAFETY PRECAUTION ARE PARAMOUNT.)**

PACKING MAINTENANCE AND STORAGE

- Proper packing of tent is very important. To avoid damage, always keep tents pegs in tent peg bag.
- Always repair rips or holes (using the provided repair kit) to prevent them from spreading.
- Take care of the fibre glass poles as sections can easily be splintered.
- Before packing, dry the tent thoroughly, if not possible, dry the tent immediately you arrive at your base/station.
- Clean the tent off all debris, spot cleaning can be done using warm water and soap flakes.
- Always store your tent in a dry and ventilated place, packing it moist or having moisture build up in it may result in mildewing which can be washed with warm water and soap flakes

NB: When this happens, the condition of your tent is deteriorating.

OTHER EQUIPMENT.

1. Highlander Voyager light weight (900g) large sleeping bag. This sleeping bag packs down to 25cm x 13.5cm (Ultra Compact)
Dimension: 225 x 70 x 30cm (practical) (demo)
Be proud of your field equipment, look after it.

CARE OF SLEEPING BAG.

- If your sleeping bag becomes wet, dry it thoroughly before packing (if you cannot do this in the field dry it immediately you arrive at your base/station).
 - If packed moist, like your tent, mildewing will result.
- Rucksack (Vango) check in internet

20. Appendix VII: A Report on Afi sweep wildlife census

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	Odoja Lower Cave	Pig
Rock Cave		
Imong Inaoyom (NCF-WCS)	Charles Ewa (Kakwagom)	David Ocha (Buanchor)
Peter Oned (Ebok-Boje)	Anthony Osang (Ebok-Boje)	Henry Otu (Buanchor)
Livinus Abang (Buanchor)	Matthew Otu (Ebok-Boje)	Francis Osang
(Olum)		
George Obi (Ndemechang)	John Oban (Boje)	Denis Abang (NCF-
WCS)		
Irruan Base Camp	Olum Base Camp	
Tony Bankong (FC)	Jonas Attah (NCF-WCS)	
Dennis Osang (FC)	Leo Abang (Olum)	
Fidelis Eja (Bitiah)	Peter Ewa (Olum)	
John Aji (Bitiah)	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 trai 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' 08° 58.730'	1	1 week	1 week	leaves and broken branches still very fresh, trail fresh, 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 E Jason (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.

21. Appendix VIII: 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 AWMS
- 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 Oversights

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 AMWS
- 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 AMWS
- 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

22. Appendix IX: Guidelines for the Educational Development Fund

About the Small Grants Programme

The Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme has established an Educational Development Fund (EDF) to provide support to schools around the Sanctuary. This fund will make Small Grants to selected schools. The Small Grants will range in size from ₦200,000 to ₦400,000.

The 1st phase of the Small Grants programme ran from April to July 2004, the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme intends to continue to seek further supports for help to more schools.

Who is Eligible for Small Grants?

The Small Grants programme is limited to schools within the communities around Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary who did not benefit from the 1st phase. **Please note that applicants outside the Communities around Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary and communities who benefited from the 1st phase are not eligible to apply to this 2nd phase of the Small Grants programme.**

Kinds of Projects Supported by the Grant

The Educational Development Fund will provide Small Grants to schools around Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary for the improvements of 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.

Projects That Are Not Eligible for Small Grants

The Small Grants programme is designed to support small projects, not to contribute small amounts for much larger budgets. It is not intended to provide **partial** support for ongoing activities that will not change in any significant way. Therefore, the EDF will not support requests for projects that do not fulfill these criteria.

The Small Grants programme will equally not support projects that can occur only after certain "contingencies" are met. For example, if a project cannot be carried out promptly after a grant is made -- because additional funds must be raised or for other reasons -- the grant request will not be considered. If the proposed project costs more than the amount requested, other funds must have been raised or formally pledged at the time the proposal is submitted. In either case, convincing evidences must be submitted with the application.

Only one proposal from a school will be considered for Funding under the Small Grants Programme.

In addition, the Small Grants Program generally will **not** favour proposals seeking funds for:

- Direct grants, scholarships, or loans to individuals
- General fund drives or annual appeals
- Debt retirement or operational deficits

How to Apply For a Small Grant

Before submitting a request to the Small Grants Program, applicants should familiarize themselves with these Guidelines and be certain the type of project envisioned is eligible for consideration.

Typed proposals may be submitted to The Administrator, Educational Development Fund, AMWS Headquarters, Boje, Boki LGA, CRS, Nigeria before 1600 hours (local time), October, 31st 2006

Incomplete or ineligible proposals will not be considered.

The Application

Please note that the information you enter into the application form is what the Reviewing Panel will see in evaluating your proposal. Please make certain that the required information is complete and accurate before submitting your application.

About the School

- School name
- Mailing address
- Year School was built
- School enrolment
- Name of School Head
- Project contact person

About the Project for which Funds are requested

- Describe the project and what it would accomplish.
- Explain the need for the project and why it is important.
- Explain specifically how the funds will be used.
- Project duration (number of Weeks or months)

Beginning date of the project and expected period of completion

Budget Section

Applicants should describe what the funds will be spent on, the costs, other sources of support, and a description of in-kind contributions if applicable. .

If all or part of your request is based on a quote from a supplier or contractor, please include a copy of the quote.

To be eligible the total cost of the project or amount requested should not exceed ₦ 400,000 excluding in-kind contributions

Please note: A school that has received and currently benefiting from a grant under another Trust programme or a Non Governmental Organization should disclose this in its application.

Before Submitting

Applicants are strongly encouraged to ensure that (a) all the information requested has been included in the proposal / request and, (b) print a copy of their applications prior to submitting because after submission the application will no longer be accessible.

Please note: Proposals received after the application deadline will not be processed.

After Submitting

After the application has been submitted, you will receive a confirmation by post.

Reviewing proposals and Awarding of Grants

All eligible applications will be forwarded to a Review Panel for action

Proposals submitted to the Small Grants programme compete only with other Small Grant requests. Decisions to fund Small Grants requests are based on many factors and are affected by competition for limited funds. Applicants should therefore understand that a decision by the Review Panel to decline funding does not necessarily mean that the Review Panel disapproves of the proposed project or fails to appreciate its merits. The Review Panel will therefore not be able to discuss reasons why a request was not funded.

Small Grant proposals are funded or declined within three weeks of the submission deadlines. The Review Panel notifies applicants of the decision as soon as possible. Award winning applicants will also be required to submit an electronic copy of their application to the Conservation Coordinator of Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme.

Funds Disbursement Schedule

Where a Grant is awarded for the improvement to infrastructure an initial amount constituting 75% of the grant awarded will be paid to the Grantee and the remaining 25% will only be paid after a mid-term review including a physical inspection by the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme. Any outstanding concerns raised by the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme must be rectified and a report submitted to this effect before relevant payment is released.

Where a Grant is awarded for the purchase of equipment, 100% of the grant may be paid to the grantee if the equipment is readily available from suppliers. Such a disbursement should be accompanied by competitive quotations from at least three suppliers. If the equipment is to be manufactured an initial disbursement of 50% of the grant awarded will be paid to the Grantee and the remainder 50% will only be paid when supporting vouchers and a report from the Grantee certifying that the equipment has been manufactured in accordance with the Grantee's requirements and that it is ready for delivery. The Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme reserves the right to conduct a physical inspection of the equipment before the final disbursement is made.

Small Grant Reporting Requirements

Reports during implementation

Where a grant is awarded for the improvement to infrastructure, the Grantee will be required to submit a fortnightly report with supporting vouchers and receipts to the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme. The report will cover relevant aspects of the project implementation (progress made, problems encountered, how

resolved and progress expected to be accomplished before the next reporting period)

Where a 100% grant is awarded for the purchase of equipment the Grantee will be required to submit any supporting vouchers and receipts and a report certifying that all equipment has been received in good condition the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme.

Where a grant is awarded for the purchase of equipment and such equipment is being manufactured over a period of more than two weeks, the Grantee will be required to submit a fortnightly report to the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme. The report will cover relevant aspects of the work being undertaken by the manufacturer (progress made, problems encountered, how resolved and progress expected to be accomplished before the next reporting period)

End of Project / Final Reports

The Grantee is required to submit a final report within two weeks from the date of completion of the project. The report will cover all relevant aspects of the project implementation (how the grant has helped in achievement of project objectives, major problems encountered, how resolved)

Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects

Each Grantee will be required to open a file where all relevant documents pertaining to the grant including complete records of all costs charged to the grant, will be kept. The Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme will undertake regular monitoring and evaluation visits to all Grantees. During such visits the Grantee will be required to furnish the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme with all relevant information they may require.

Suspension or Termination of Grant

The Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme may in writing, suspend or terminate the grant if it detects any misappropriation of funds or has notice of or has through monitoring and evaluation, reasonable cause to believe that the grantee is unable to fulfill the project's objectives. Any unspent funds including vouchers and receipts will be issued to the Grantor. The Grantee will also be required to refund to the Grantor or its representative any funds received from the Grantor that represent reimbursement for any costs determined by the Grantor not to meet the terms and conditions of the Small Grant.

Please note: Failure to submit the required reports may result in suspension of the grant. Copies of suspension or termination of grantee will be distributed to the Ministry of Education, Boki Local Government Council and the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme Partnership. Legal proceedings may also be preferred against the Grantee.

23. Appendix X: MoU between the Sanctuary and the community benefiting from the EDF

The Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary Conservation Programme established an Educational Development Fund (EDF) to provide support to schools in the communities around the Sanctuary. This fund make Small Grants to selected schools through the communities for the development of the school. One of the primary objectives of the small grant is to gain the communities support for the protection of the Sanctuary. The Small Grants of *-(amount) -----* is hereby given to

- Name of School _____
- Name of Community _____

To be used for

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

The beneficiary school _____ agree that

- The fund will be used for only the work listed above towards the development of the school.
- She will carryout regular and proper maintenance of the infrastructure to ensure its longevity
- Payments shall be made to the grantee in Nigerian currency
- Initial disbursement shall be made in accordance to the provision set out in the Education Development Fund guidelines.
- Subsequent disbursements will be made by the Grantor only on certification that planned activities have been completed as specifically agreed in the EDF guidelines
- Maintain complete records of all cost charged to the grant and make such available for grantor or its representative review at any time
- Establish functional school conservation clubs in the school and encourage active participation of the pupils/students and teachers
- Her teachers and pupils/students shall not enter the sanctuary illegally and shall report any illegal activities observed therein to the appropriate authority.
- The grantor or its representative has the right to monitor the use of the fund and implementation of agreed work regularly
- She will compile and submit to the grantor report not later than 2 week of the completion of the project
- The grantor has the right to terminate the agreement and stop further disbursement of fund if report indicates that the grant guideline is being abuse
- The grantor, Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary and or its representative does not assume liability for any third party claims for damage(s) arising out of this grant

The _____ Community agrees that

- The fund will be used for only the work listed above for the development of the school.
- She will carryout regular and proper maintenance of the infrastructure to ensure its longevity
- the community will contribute goods and services to **xx** amount towards the project??
- Payments shall be made to the grantee in Nigerian currency

- Initial disbursement shall be made in accordance to the provision set out in the Education Development Fund guidelines.
- Subsequent disbursements will be made by the Grantor only on certification that planned activities have been completed as specifically agreed in the EDF guidelines
- Maintain complete records of all cost charged to the grant and make such available for grantor or its representative review at any time
- The community member(s) shall not enter the sanctuary illegally and shall report any illegal activities observed therein to the appropriate authority.
- No community member shall farm, hunt or collect any thing whether living or dead from the sanctuary
- She will create a conducive environment for the Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary authority to carry out its normal works of conserving the sanctuary
- The grantor or its representative has the right to monitor the use of the fund and implementation of agreed work regularly
- She will compile and submit to the grantor report not later than 2 week of the completion of the project
- The grantor has the right to terminate the agreement and stop further disbursement of fund if report indicates that the grant guideline is being abuse
- The Grantor, Afi Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary and or its representative does not assume liability for any third party claims for damage(s) arising out of this grant

This MOU is agreed upon and signed on this _____day of _____year two thousand and six (2006) by the representatives of Cross River State Forestry Commission, Nigerian Conservation Foundation, _____school and _____community as follows;

1. **Cross River State Forestry Commission,**
 - Permanent Secretary: Dr. Chris Agbor
 - Sign & date _____
2. **Nigerian Conservation Foundation (NCF)**
 - Regional Secretary: Alhaji Ibrahim Inahoro
 - Sign & date: _____
3. _____ **School**
 - a) Chairperson PTA: _____
 - Sign & Date _____
 - b) Head teacher: _____
 - Sign & date: _____
4. _____ **community Development Association**
 - a) Community Chairman: _____
 - Sign & date _____
 - b) Secretary: _____
 - Sign & date _____