

## END OF PROJECT NARRATIVE REPORT

**NAME OF ORGANIZATION:** AFRICAN RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

**REGISTERED ADDRESS:** C/O CARMEN CHAMBERS, P. O. BOX 50626, FALOMO, IKOYI  
LAGOS, NIGERIA

**MAILING ADDRESS:** DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA  
AYADE SHOPPING MALL  
1 RANCH ROAD  
P.O.BOX 103, OBUDU  
CROSS RIVER STATE  
Email: [dinbateriko@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:dinbateriko@yahoo.co.uk)

**CONTACT PERSON:** TRACEY L. DRAPER  
Email: [tldraper@bigpond.com](mailto:tldraper@bigpond.com)

**PROJECT IDENTIFICATION:**

**PROJECT NO:**

**PROJECT TITLE:** ACTION SURVEYS, DOCUMENTATION AND VILLAGE  
MOBILISATION TO STOP ILLEGAL LOGGING IN THE RAIN  
FORESTS OF CROSS RIVER STATE (NIGERIA) AND  
TAKAMANDA FOREST RESERVE (CAMEROON)

**LOCATION:** CROSS RIVER STATE

**PROJECT DURATION:** DECEMBER 2002 – MAY 2003

**BUDGET AND FINANCE:** (A SEPARATE FINANCIAL REPORT IS ATTACHED AS ANNEX 3  
AND 4)

## **LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

DFID	Department for International Development
DIN	Development in Nigeria
ERDAS	Earth Resources Data Acquisition System
ESRI	Environmental System Research Institute
FMC	Forest Management Committees
GIS	Geographical Information Systems
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
PRA	Participatory Rapid Appraisal
RRDC	Rainforest Resource and Documentation Centre
RDPU	Research, Documentation and Policy Unit
VFPO	Village Forest Protection Organisation
WEMPCO	Western Metal and Plastic Company

## FINAL PROJECT REPORT

### 1.0 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

#### **PROJECT CONTEXT AND INTRODUCTION**

- .1 Funded by Cordiad, the project addressed the problem of illegal logging as a major cause of deforestation in Cross River State, where more than 50% of the Nigeria's last remaining block of tropical rainforest is located.
2. In 1998, the World Resources Institute reported that the rainforest along the border of Nigeria and Cameroon is the larger of the two remaining blocks of tropical rainforests in West Africa. The Cross River rainforest and adjoining watersheds is reputed as one of the most biologically rich areas in Africa with at least one-third of Africa's primate species – and the most endangered, the drill monkeys (*Mandrillus leucophaeus*), and gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla deilhi*). Recent study shows that the Cross River gorilla may prove to be a distinct subspecies.
- .2 Despite the area's reputation and importance, illegal logging, largely supported by Federal and State government office holders of the highest rank, as well as by international timber companies, has been growing at an exponential rate.
- .3 Alarmed by the rate of forest loss, the project was initiated as part of a two year forest advocacy programme that aims at developing the capacities of community based organisations to control illegal logging from community forests and other forests held in common. As a component of the forest advocacy programme that is being funded by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, the project focused on community mobilization and creation of baseline data on illegal logging in support of forest advocacy and lobbying at the village and state levels.
- .4 The project began by obtaining baseline data in support of community empowerment and effective advocacy and lobbying in six villages, namely: Abinti I, Abo Ogbagante, Balep, Biajua, Opu and Otchakwe. The 6 villages, with a total population of about 25000 persons, located in northern and central Cross River State were selected to reflect differences in management capacities and the varying scale of logging intensities in the State.
- .5 Community mobilisation and research carried out during the preliminary phase of the forest advocacy programme provided an opportunity for Development in Nigeria (DIN) and Rainforest Resource and Development Centre (RRDC), to gather baseline information. This information guided the identification of possible opportunities at both community and state levels where the proposed programme's intervention strategies could be most effective, and beneficial to target communities.
- .6 The project was jointly implemented by DIN and RRDC considering their comparative advantages. While DIN is experienced in field based research and mobilisation of community groups (i.e. women and youth), RRDC is an environmental advocacy NGO with experience in lobbying and campaign.

#### **OUTPUT**

##### *Research results*

- .7 A series of participatory rural appraisal exercises was carried out in each of the six villages of Abinti I, Abo Ogbagante, Balep, Biajua, Opu and Otchakwe targeted for the forest advocacy programme. The exercise provided an opportunity for mobilization and gathering of socioeconomic information about the target communities. The result of the six PRA exercises, which was written as a project working document (see **Annex 1**), guided the identification of opportunities where the proposed programme's assistance could be most beneficial to target communities.

- .8 Desk research on the role of policy and officialdom in perpetuating illegal logging was conducted by RRDC. The result of the desk research was prepared as a working document and submitted to DIN. The report highlights failures of the government and multinational companies as well as individual timber operators to ensure compliance with forest laws (see **Annex 2** attached).
- .9 Using Geographical Information Systems techniques, the area of forest cover in 2001 was calculated using a 2001 vegetation and land use map of Cross River State. The map was a product of satellite data analysis based on Landsat thematic images taken on 10 December 2001 and processed by Flasse, a consultant to a DFID-funded community forestry project (1999 – 2002).
- .10 The result of the GIS analysis using ArcView GIS, a product of Earth Systems Research Institute (California, USA), shows that tropical high forest made up 30.14% of the total landmass of Cross River State. Swamp forests, mangrove forests and open forests constituted 2.54%, 1.52% and 5.88%, respectively. Rubber plantations made up 0.86%; regenerating forests, 0.07%; oil palm plantations, 0.88% and gmelina plantations, 0.47%, while farm and other land uses made up 57.7%.
- .11 Towards the end of the GIS analysis, data presented in **Table 1** below, being the result of Flasse's analysis of 1991 and 2001 images for the entire State, was received. A comparison of the data sets shows little difference between Flasse's figures and those of the Cordaid funded project. Errors associated with on-screen digitizing, which was adopted owing to lack of a digitizer, accounts for the subtle difference between the two datasets.

**TABLE 1: SIZE OF LAND UNITS IN CROSS RIVER STATE BETWEEN 1991 AND 2001**

Land use	1991		2001		Difference	
	Area (ha)	%	Area (ha)	%	Area (ha)	% (loss or gain)
Tropical high forest	729 000	34.27	<b>640 635</b>	<b>30.37</b>	- 88 365	-12.1
Open forest*	19 400	0.91	<b>120 691</b>	<b>5.72</b>	101 291	522.1
Swamp forest	52 000	2.44	<b>51 686</b>	<b>2.45</b>	- 314	-0.6
Mangrove forest	48 000	2.26	<b>47 675</b>	<b>2.26</b>	- 325	-0.7
Regenerating forest	1 500	0.07	<b>1 471</b>	<b>0.07</b>	- 29	-2.0
Oil palm plantation	21 900	1.03	<b>18 568</b>	<b>0.88</b>	- 3 332	-15.2
Rubber plantation	14 600	0.69	<b>13 402</b>	<b>0.64</b>	- 1 198	-8.2
Gmelina plantation	9 500	0.45	<b>10 164</b>	<b>0.48</b>	664	7.0
Farm/other land	1 231 600	57.89	<b>1 205 021</b>	<b>57.13</b>	- 26 579	-2.2
CRS Total	2 127 500	100.00	<b>2 109 311</b>	<b>100.00</b>	- 18 189	-0.9

Adapted from Flasse (October 2002)

*Community mobilization*

- .12 The project began the work of community mobilisation by obtaining data from desk research, in support of effective lobbying and advocacy by RRDC. This work aimed at making government comply with laws. Therefore, during the project's preliminary field visits and each of the PRA exercises, meetings were held with village authorities; creating appreciation of the communities' potential in checking illegal logging from community forests and other forest commons.

*Strategies Adjusted to local situations*

- .13 Based on the respective community's real needs identified by local people during the PRA exercises, the following modification to activities to be carried out in the IUCN will be made:

- a) Environmental education to create awareness about the impact of excessive logging will be carried out in the communities of Biajua and Abinti I, where pressure from a multi-national company, Western Metal and Plastic Company (WEMPCO), and local timber agents is heaviest. The community of Otchakwe with relatively intact timber resources, but desperate for a road in exchange for timber resources is also selected for an environmental education programme.
  - b) Domestication of bush mango as a non-timber forest product that generates income to local people will be most beneficial to the communities of Abinti I, Abo Ogbagante, Balep, Opu and Otchakwe who identified bush mango as the most important source of forest derived income. Training in domestication of afang (*Gnetum africana*), a delicacy in high demand in most city hotels and by most communities, will be most effective in Biajua where this forest creeper was rated the most important to the community and as a major source of income for women and youth.
  - c) Adult education will be most effective in Biajua where there is a non-functional Adult Education Centre, but with a local instructor who expressed interest in voluntary service to his community if adults can be encouraged to attend the Centre.
  - d) Otchakwe Village Council will be encouraged to establish a forest management committee that can take responsibility for forest stewardship and advocacy.
  - e) A programme for strengthening forest management committees (FMC) in the other target communities through training workshops and exchange visits will be developed. Balep community where there is a misunderstanding of the roles of the FMC and the village forest protection organisation will benefit most from this capacity building programme.
- .14 The project designed and hosted a website for DIN ([www.aradin.org](http://www.aradin.org)) as tool for communication and lobbying. Through the website, DIN staff and managers can access their email accounts and keep in touch with others. With information on the website translated into 8 international languages (e.g. French, Espanol, Italiano etc) the website will provide critical updates on deforestation in Cross River State.

### **IMMEDIATE BENEFITS TO PROJECT PARTNERS, PARTICIPANTS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES**

#### *Further development of staff and management skills*

- .15 Training workshops on GIS and PRA techniques, held in December 2002 and February 2003 respectively, provided learning opportunities for project staff. Skills acquired through the training workshops and adaptations to field conditions have prepared field staff for the upcoming IUCN project, scheduled to commence in June 2003.
- .16 A series of project review meetings held by DIN and RRDC staff provided an opportunity for project coordinators to further develop their skills in monitoring, evaluation and preparation of mid-term reports.

#### *Information pack in support of forest advocacy and lobbying*

- .17 Summary of information generated during the project will guide the RRDC forest advocacy and lobbying programme. In general, project partners have gained substantial knowledge of the socio-economic and ecological impacts of illegal logging in the State. This knowledge will support the work of both partners in their individual forest conservation programmes.
- .18 Studies and review of forest policies carried out by RRDC as an integral part of the project, and the result thereof, provides the basis for RRDC to lobby government and timber companies to comply with existing laws.

#### *Promotion of GIS initiative*

- .19 The project promoted a GIS initiative within DIN and the local conservation community in the following ways:
- a) On December 3 – 4, 2002 an enlightenment workshop targeting conservation NGOs was facilitated by DIN.
  - b) A staff of DIN attended a two-week course in the use of ERDAS Imagine as a GIS and digital image processing tool at the Federal Department for Agricultural Land Resources, Kaduna (Nigeria).

### *Community's awareness about the impact of logging*

- .20 Preliminary field visits and PRA exercises carried out in the target villages helped in raising local people's awareness about the impact of illegal logging and other unsustainable forest uses. The socioeconomic data gathered and the insights gained will help DIN in designing alternative livelihood interventions and poverty alleviation programme – a key component of DIN's work.

### **ANTICIPATED ON-GOING OR LONGER-TERM BENEFITS**

- .21 As a result of increased interest in GIS and the need to sustain the initiative, DIN has developed a GIS implementation plan for the next three years (2003 – 2006). The plan provides the framework on which analysis of spatial information in the coming years will be based.
- .22 Baseline socioeconomic information about the target communities, which was gathered during the PRA exercises will guide monitoring and evaluation of the proposed programme and other future projects in the area.

### **PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION**

- .23 Bank protocols slowed down the money transfer process. This affected the project timetable as the start date was adjusted by one month (1<sup>st</sup> November to 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2002).
- .24 Despite explanations at the beginning of each PRA in the respective communities, some communities remained apprehensive of the purpose of the study. This difficulty had an effect on community members' willingness to divulge sensitive information about the timber trade and illegal logging in the area.
- .25 The project duration (i.e. 6 months) originally allowed was too short considering communication and logistical difficulties. For example, it took the project almost 7 months to source for satellite images for dates in the 1970s and 1980s. Having received a mosaic of 1980s images in July, 2003 it was too late to analyse the data in this preliminary phase of the programme.

### **STEPS TAKEN TO ADDRESS PROBLEMS**

- .26 Once bank protocols were established, project partners submitted monthly budget two weeks before the beginning of the next month. This facilitated prompt disbursement of money for project activities.
- .27 In the case of unwillingness to divulge sensitive information about logging, interviews were held with sympathetic informants that field staff identified in each of the study communities.
- .28 Considering the time constraint, analysis of 1980s data has been carried forward to the next phase of the programme, which is being funded by IUCN. For the present phase, the project relied on the analysis of 1991 data carried out by Flasse Consulting, UK (2002).

## **2.0 ASSESSMENT**

### **EXTENT TO WHICH PROJECT GOALS WAS ATTAINED**

- .1 The project achieved the main objective, which was to collect and analyse basic information at both the community and policy levels, so that RRDC can have reliable data for effective advocacy and lobbying that can persuade government and timber companies to comply with forest laws.
- .2 It was not possible to carry out analyses of vegetation and land use data integrating GIS and remote sensing techniques. However, an arc coverage of the State with a mosaic of image subsets for 1980s was accomplished. In the next phase of the programme, the 1980s data will be analysed and forest cover for 2001 will be compared with that of the 1980s.

- .3 Preliminary field visits and the PRA exercises provided opportunities for making contact with community groups and village authorities. Much of the community mobilisation work (e. g. paralegal training in forest laws) will be carried out in the second phase of the project. The PRAs also provided DIN with information for the village economic development of the IUCN phase of the project.

**OBJECTIVE NOT ATTAINED**

- .4 It was not possible to carry out video coverage of logging activity as this became a very sensitive issue. As presented in the PRA report, logging by timber companies is now done through community leaders and elites.

**PRINCIPAL STRENGTHS OF PROJECT**

- .5 The project had two key strengths:
- a) The involvement of two environmental NGOs with comparative advantages; while RRDC is experienced in desk research and environmental advocacy, DIN is experienced in field based research and mobilisation of community groups (i.e. women and youth). This understanding guided the task sharing during the project.
  - b) The research carried out during the project covered both the local community and government levels providing a chance for thorough and balanced assessment of issues at both the grassroots and state levels.

**PRINCIPAL WEAKNESSES**

- .6 The PRA team, comprising DIN and RRDC staff, was male dominated. It is feared that this gender imbalance possibly influenced judgments as perceptions of male and female researchers vary.

**LESSONS LEARNED FROM PROJECT**

- .7 The most important lesson gained from the project is the need to conduct feasibility study before project implementation. A project feasibility phase such as this one provides an opportunity test strategies and make adjustments before implementation. Adequate information on the local conditions prevalent in an area is a basic requirement for effective and efficient project implementation.

**3.0 FUTURE POSSIBILITIES**

The project was implemented as an integral part of a forest advocacy programme that will be carried out over the next 2 years. Initiatives developed during the project (e.g. GIS and remote sensing) will be sustained over a longer period of time.